

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report
June 2011

GCE History 6HI01 A

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

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

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

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

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

Alternatively, you can contact our [Subject] Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028120

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

This is the third year of GCE 2008 and the sixth examination session for Unit 1. Candidates are now aware of how to approach the examination. They understand the need to produce a balanced answer, and they know that the most effective way to structure this answer is to make a number of relevant points, support these with examples, and establish clear links to the question set. Fewer answers than previously were awarded Levels 1 and 2. Most candidates appear to have gained something from their course, and thus are likely to be awarded at least Level 3. Almost all answers include some kind of plan, though some were very long and detailed, to the detriment of their answer overall.

Many candidates still struggle to maintain a focus on the question set. Some are quick to assume that the questions set are similar to those they have met while revising. They must remember that past questions are exactly that, and cannot appear again in the same form. They need to read the questions carefully and respond to what is asked, rather than what they hope they ask or what they have prepared to answer. Knowledge needs to be adapted and employed effectively, rather than taking the form of a prepared answer that may not focus on the question set.

Equally, candidates must ensure that their entire answer focuses on the question. Question D7 required an analysis of the consequences of collectivisation. However, a number of candidates began with a lengthy explanation of the reasons for the introduction of this policy. Similarly, Question D10 required a focus on the civil rights movement, yet many discussed Black Power in their answers. This could be of some relevance, but was rarely made so.

Past reports have highlighted the importance of focusing on the timescale set in the question. Many otherwise strong answers were weakened, sometimes substantially, by failing to cover the period set. Question A11 targeted 1455-61, but many ignored this and wrote only on the causes of civil conflict. Question B1's timescale was 1517-25. Some ignored this completely, focusing instead on the long-term causes of the German Reformation. Question D11 set the parameters of 1954-63, yet many candidates discussed the roles of Truman and Johnson in their answers. An understanding of chronology, and the accurate use of dates, was often a factor which discriminated between Level 3 and Level 4 answers.

It seemed that many candidates did not have the specific knowledge which is essential for accessing the higher levels, but provided generalised examples which showed little depth. Dates, numerical evidence, reference to key individuals and events are all important if candidates are to produce a convincing analysis. If we assume that each topic is studied for at least six weeks, the majority of candidates should have this depth of knowledge.

Many candidates appear to have been armed with a writing template for their answers. The formula appeared to be taking note of the factor raised in the question and then mentioning that other factors (usually three) were also significant. Key marker phrases, such as 'however' and 'on the other hand' were then deployed before reaching some sort of conclusion. This approach can work as long as effective links to the question are established. Several answers looked at other relevant factors but failed to establish their significance beyond asserting that they were important.

Question 1-14

Question 1

The best answers were those which were able to give examples of change (or lack of it) drawn from the whole period and were thus able to consider not only the extent of change but also how this altered over time. A few very good answers also considered how 'dramatic' these changes were. Several answers focused on three key periods. Between 793 and c840 coastal raids affected many monasteries and affected the Church's ability to function in some areas. Between 840 and 865 over-wintering increased, with consequent affects on the inhabitants of some easterly areas. Finally, 865 to 877 marked the first stages of conquest and settlement. Most answers noted that the Viking threat changed over time until it led to the extinguishing of some Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. On the other hand, some responses tended to focus on a narrow range of events, for example the early raids of the years 865-77, whilst others gave a detailed narrative of the Viking invasions without considering the impact on Anglo-Saxon England.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.) 1.

I feel that Viking invasion did change Anglo Saxon England dramatically to some extent. We see by the end of 877 the the Vikings had control of three of the four kingdoms. But I feel that the invasion took time to change Anglo Saxon England.

In the early raids from say 793 to 840 the Vikings did not affect England on the whole, we only see it affecting the smaller community on the coast for example Lindisfarne 793, Iona and Shoppay in 835. For the there is evidence from the chronicle that people inland did not take much notice to these raid, they were

(This page is for your first answer.) ... often described as hit and run not very well organized. These raid did effect the smaller community through, chronic say 'greatly disrupted terrified'. At Lindisfarne we see that the Viking attack Gods church, murdered and stole.

After 840 we see the Vikings effecting the Anglo Saxon England more. In 840 was the first time the Viking began to come in land. By 851 the Vikings had begun to stay the winter in England, firstly in the Farnet Island. Then in 855 the Shetland Islands. In 851 the biggest Viking attack to date happened on London. King Ethelwulf bought 300 ships. But this was 10 times bigger than any other attacks seen in England. Maybe to over do the victory over the Vikings. In 865 the arrival of the great he see the biggest change to England as from 866 - 870 three of the four kingdoms fell. England at very much saw the Vikings as a great threat now. In 866 the the Vikings invaded East Anglia but St. Edmund gave horses to the Vikings for them to leave.

(This page is for your first answer.) The kingdom and then the Northumbria. This relationship between the ealdormen made England change quicker as more of the ealdormen were willing to ally, apart from Mercia, Mercia and Wessex. This meant Wessex did not change. The Vikings then went to Northumbria and fought Osbert and Ella at York defeating them. They then went on the Mercia in 868 and we see the alliance as Wessex ealdorman and Alfred's brother led an army to Nottingham and stopped the Viking taking Mercia. The Vikings then went and took East Angles destroying violently the Ealdorm Edmund was killed. The Vikings also ravaged Hereford on Mercia and defeated Burgred who fled to Rome. The Vikings were now in control of three of the four kingdoms. This was a huge change to England.

But there was less change to Wessex as they were able to withstand the Viking onslaught. Asser tells us that there were three or eight major battles against Wessex.

(This page is for your first answer.)

871. The lack of change was down to the Alliance with Mercia. We see this in the battle of Reading as a Mercia Eadlmann. Ethelwulf fights for Wessex. This strengthened Wessex. The West Viking also lacks motivation to take Wessex, this meant there was less change. The Vikings already had three of the four kingdoms they had more to lose. They did not want to lose more men. We see this in the second invasion in 877 as Halfdan a King of the great summer army turns to plus. This is also backed up as there were was only a smaller army to attack. Alfred at Chippingham and many had settled in other kingdoms. This all meant there was little change to Wessex.

There was change to the spiritual and learning side of England. The Vikings were often blamed for the spiritual decline in England. They also targeted monasteries and other areas meaning learning was affected. The Canterbury charter in 853 was done in very poor Latin showing the decline. Senyer though saw the Vikings as scape goats.

(This page is for your first answer.)

The invasion also affected the relationship between the king and his ealdorman. As many saw the invasion as a chance to higher these positions. Ceolwulf in Mercia was an example of someone who used the raids to higher his position. From 843 the charters now included military services like bridge building. This showed the threat of the invasion. I believe that the Viking invasion did ^{change} affect the Anglo Saxon England to some extent. But this took time and Wessex was not changed in this period from 793 to 877.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer notes how the Viking invasions changed over time, from the coastal raids of 793-840 to the fully fledged invasions from 865 onwards. The impact of these raids on Anglo-Saxon England is investigated, notably the collapse of East Anglia, Northumbria and Mercia, and the consequent effects on church and government. An evaluative response at Low Level 5.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When assessing change over time, remember to point out that some things stayed the same, and explain why this was so.

Question 2

Some answers were narrowly focused on Edington and its significance. They often took the form of a narrative of events from the Christmas raids of 877 to the Treaty of Wedmore and the conversion of Guthrum, with 879-99 tacked on almost as an afterthought. Better answers noted the significance of Edington and compared the significance of the victory with Alfred's subsequent reforms to his armed forces and the development of the burhs. There were many answers in Levels 4 and 5 which noted the division of England which was established at Wedmore, the growing prestige of both Alfred and Wessex, and Alfred's reform programme after 878. While the military and naval reforms were known well, educational reforms were often not investigated, nor were many students apparently aware of the cultural flowering which took place in a Wessex which was largely at peace.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your first answer.) I would suggest that the victory at
 Bosworth in 1485 was Alfred's greatest victory single
 victory in the period, with regard to the most
 opposition he faced in the 1000s (little opposition faced
 him in the 880s). However though larger than and
 not 'single' as I have ^{previously} mentioned, I
 believe Alfred's programme of military and spiritual
 reforms are surely ^{achievement} considered (is his ~~achievement~~ of them)
 as being Alfred's greatest achievement.
 Achievement can be measured in terms of the
 long term positive effect they have on the kingdom.
 Alfred's victory at Edington saw the end of
 seven years of a serious Viking threat to Wessex
 in the period. Edington, we might suggest is made
 even more great, by when we look at the
 build up to it. Earlier that year Guthrum (the
 remaining Viking leader after Harold and Godwin had
 settled in Mercia) had launched a surprise mid-winter

(This page is for your first answer.) Alfred an Chippingham against an unexpected Alfred, who narrowly escaped with his life, and was forced into exile as a result. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us that the Vikings 'occupied the whole land', although I do not necessarily believe that this is the case, as Alfred (with relative ease) was able to gather up his forces and resources at Athelney, before fully gathering troops at Egbert's Stone, and making an escape. So, the Vikings may not have had complete control or a politico-state over running a country might have, yet he was certainly on the side of, making his achievement in visiting at Exeter all the greater. I believe Alfred shows ability after the battle, in the conversion of Guthrum to Christianity, but his becoming a man Alfred can 'do business with' (M.A.F. Row). This might be a reaction to Guthrum breaking out of Wareham in 878 to have worked, but was strong to Alfred shows to it also a form of lesson. The long term effect of Exeter, it could be argued, is that it paved the way (in receiving Wessex) for future generations to move west and into Wessex, and to reach England for the English. Alfred was keen on this, as a campaign, he branded himself 'the reformer', so here we see numismatic evidence

(This page is for your first answer.) A slow but inevitable ~~from the~~ transformation meaning King of the English, although Alfred barely held western).

However, other great things would follow, and I might suggest had a greater long term impact on England. particularly in the ability to move and translate in future years, firstly, Alfred improved western education (and this directly is character away from war is what gave him the title 'the great'), in his spiritual and charitable reforms Alfred was keen to improve learning in western and was willing to set the example from which to follow. Thus, his autobiographer, tells us that Alfred learned to write Latin, one year after his recruitment of scholars, in 887. From here, he would translate his books of his own, each relevant to his and the situation he perceived England to be in at the time. These were the books he considered 'most necessary for all men to know' (from preface to 'Pastoral Care', one of the books he translated). He ordered his noblemen to begin learning, and his bishops, as they would have to give up their worldly possessions. Alfred also ordered his noblemen to provide their services, which is also relevant to military reform. Half was to go to God's, and half to secular

(This page is for your first answer.) affairs. That came next to Great, was a manuscript, a school to have set up and to the point of social affairs, many next to foreigners. A walk was and a address. I wanted suggest that Alfred did achieve his spiritual reforms. After all, by the time the Vikings invaded in 1066, they modeled the function of an over sophisticated English aristocracy, shown in the Bayeux Tapestry. Learning was the key to a cure to a spiritual sickness we believed caused had caused from their own darkness, and the intervention of the Vikings. Military reform involved both walkmen and address, and were created through the revenue of the nobles. They were the creation of a peasant field army, which was divided into two. Half of their time was dedicated to their own needs, and the other military service. The field army, a highly trained aristocratic fighting force was created. These travelled on horseback by night or foot. Alfred commenced the building of ships and lakes and harbours. In these he showed skill and an innovative architect. Sails were designed to keep the Vikings on the move, as previously movement had been key to their success. The building of such reforms would come in the 1100s. However, it placed a negative point on his eventual success.

(This page is for your first answer.) It is worth mentioning that their
Lithuan venge from land had suffered severely based
on the constant assault by knights and warriors,
so were rather weakened as a result. However, King said
that their desperate situation might suggest they
would be reluctant to their efforts.

892, on their arrival, no real evidence that
the vikings were not entirely complete, the vikings
also to push down themselves, the walls of an
uncompleted fort (a burh). However, from this, as
indicated the vikings were kept constantly on the
move. At Exeter in 893, they were chased down
the river to a lake where they were
eventually trapped before the king's service was
over, and they simply left (showing a weakness of
the vikings). Alfred had a great achievement at
Basingstoke that year, where with the help of a
siege was so desperate the vikings at the
house. Alfred also had a victory at Aynford.
The vikings were pushed on the move in 894 from
Exeter to Exeter, then back to no-man's land.
Now they remained, with a permanent war.
In 895, Alfred showed ability in reorganisation,
making the vikings up the river coast, blocking them
off, and forcing them back into no-man's land.
The vikings were forced to retreat in 896, with

(This page is for your first answer.) β win. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that 'famine and the death of cattle' had more of an effect on Wessex in the period. These were, Alfred combined in and programme of spiritual reform, right up to his death in 899, evidence from which can be shown in the way he only lived a couple the last 1/4 of his lifetime himself.

Alfred's great victory at Edington was a great one, and usually significant, as it relieved Wessex of such a great burden, and allowed them to do other things. However, it was still well enough for Alfred to move out, and in fact he hardly ever does for this reason, I believe it is still his greatest achievement to a moderate extent, so we had little effect by comparison to his reforms, particularly the military reforms. These proved the way of ^{to} movement at law. Depending on where you value most, the spiritual reforms are also equally more significant. Evidence of success of the military reforms can be seen in the warfare of the 890s.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer notes the importance of Edington for both the Vikings and for Alfred, whose prestige grew throughout England. Education and military reforms are addressed, with some attempt to evaluate the importance of these when set against the victory at Edington. A Low Level 5 response.

Question 3

Students were generally good at focusing on the competing claims of William and Harold Godwinson. Weaker students restricted their comments to Edward's failure to produce a direct heir and to his promises to both candidates. Most students were able to explore different reasons for Edward and Edith not having any children and to provide context for the two promises, and also address the nature of the evidence supporting the historical accuracy of the promises, and whether the Norman origin of much of the legacy can be taken at face value. Candidates were also able to widen their answer to include Harald Hardrada's claim and the legacy of Cnut's reign. Most students were then able to develop points about Edward the Confessor's direct responsibility and compare that to other factors in terms of individuals. Some candidates were able to develop their points further by addressing Edward's close links to Norman culture and society, and his conflict with the Godwin family. At higher levels answers not only explored Edward's responsibility but also the level of responsibility of other individuals, blaming Harold Godwinson's conflict with his brother Tostig for being a major factor in drawing Harald Hardrada into the conflict in 1066. These answers explicitly addressed the responsibility of Edward in comparison with the other factors.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your first answer.)

- Promised to Harold → to William
 ↳ thought God would right it.

- Edgar had a claim, Harold had made → taking
 Not sure as unauthorized: bad guy.

→ Anglo Saxon - Norman + Saxon → so: for the taking
 ↳ 1015 + 1015
 ↳ Eng itself responsible.

It can be argued that Edward was responsible for the succession crisis that took place in 1066 and specifically the conflicts. Edward had promised the throne apparently to many individuals. For example, it is claimed that William ~~was the~~ the bastard from duke of Normandy visited the England in 1051, and that Edward offered him the throne. We also know that Edward recalled his cousin from exile in Hungary, during his reign, his cousin died on arrival however left a son Edgar and Aethling. This recalling of his cousin

(This page is for your first answer.)

that Edward wanting him to take the throne, and to carry on the royal Wessex blood line. This promising of the throne, ~~to many~~ or alleged of the throne meant that Edward didn't leave a clear succession and so the succession was always going to be a violent process, with many claiming the throne to rightfully theirs. We also know that Edward was a deeply religious king, i.e. ~~his~~ his name indicates how he would regularly confess his sins to priests. This has been used to argue that Edward thought God would sort out this whole succession crisis out once he had died, thereby making him responsible for the conflicts for the throne in 1066.

Edward can also be held accountable for the succession, by way of allowing Harold Godwinson and the Godwin family to become too powerful. For example, Edward was married to Edith, Harold Godwinson's brother, and by 1158 the Godwin family controlled most of the Earldoms in England, except for Mercia. This meant that quite possibly and probably the Godwin family was wealthier than the King. Moreover, we know that Edward was in a

(This page is for your first answer.)

Edward consecrated king due to earl Godwin convincing the other earls and magnates to make Edward the king. This indicates that the Godwin family would expect something in return for making ~~the~~ Edward helping Edward become king.

So Edward can be seen as responsible for the conflicts for the succession to the throne in 1066, due to him allowing Earl Godwin and then Harold Godwinson, too much land and power, this inevitably would mean Harold would have considered the throne to be his as Edward was childless and thus William saw Harold as ~~taking~~ taking his throne, thereby leading to the battle of Hastings. So we can see that this is an important factor, in why Edward was responsible, however, Edward promising, and indicating the throne to several individuals, seems to be the most important factor of ~~his~~ his irresponsibility.

Moreover, it can also be argued ~~that~~ that Edward was not totally responsible and there were several other factors that led to the battles of 1066. Harold Godwinson also deserves a fair share of the blame. Harold alienated his brother Tostig Earl of Northumbria, in 1065 after his citizens revolted due to his unfair

(This page is for your first answer.)

treatment. This can be seen as irresponsible as Tostig then went into exile, and later attacked England in September 1066, ~~to~~ with Harald Godfraba. Had Harold not ~~so~~ ousted Tostig (possibly as Harold was only thinking about his support base for when he put a claim to be king), the Scandinavian invasion may have had less support, and may not have happened at all. Harold also ~~attacked~~ ~~England~~ ~~it~~ according to Norman sources was a usurper as he swore an ~~other~~ oath to support William's claim to the throne, so ~~to~~ he can also be seen as responsible for the Battle of Hastings. So Harold's actions, ~~are~~ ^{is} very important ~~reason~~ reasons why it was just Edward's irresponsibility that led to the conflicts.

England itself can be seen as a cause for the succession crisis. England hadn't followed the general pattern of Europe in the 10th and early 11th century in that, it didn't experience economic growth however, power didn't become decentralised and remained ^{strongly} ~~strongly~~ with the monarch and some leading noble. The economic growth can be seen, in the English currency, which continued well past the conquest, the currency was ^{very} stable, also trade

(This page is for your first answer.)

was extensive for example the system of ~~blunt~~ blunts was encouraging market towns to develop. ~~The~~ Engl- and was also stable, the system of shire, and hundreds, and the loyalty of knights went little to resistance from the people, and it could be heavily taxed. for example, in 1018, ~~A~~ Denmark was paid £72,000 in tax in the form of the Danegeld, this was astonishing considering England of received £6000 per year for the ~~treasure~~ treasury's tax. This stability ~~and~~ plus the centralised ~~pot~~ power (i.e. king leading & earls owned the majority of the land) made England very vulnerable this can be seen in 1013 and 1015 with Sweyn then Cnut's invasions, this ~~showed~~ all next England was very lucrative, so it encouraged people like ~~was~~ Harold Godwinson to attack, also William although ~~could~~ had a claim knew that if he got ~~the~~ throne all this wealth could be his. ~~this is the most~~ important reason for the ~~truce~~ truce can be seen as an important reason for the conflicts of the succession crisis, the potential ~~and~~ invades, i.e. Harold Godwinson, and William, knew that with a claim to the throne, ~~or~~ ~~to~~ to make them the legitimate heir, could bring them immense

(This page is for your first answer.)

wealth and land.

Thus, Edward can be seen as responsible for the conflicts of the succession crisis, he didn't have any sons and told apparently several people they were to be his heir, however, others ~~reasons are more~~ can be seen as responsible i.e. Harold Godwinson who, according to the Normans stole the throne and alienating his brother, who come for revenge, ~~the~~ this all led to the battles of 1066 for the succession. However, I believe the most important reason, was England due to its wealth & administrative stability the Conqueror knew a slight claim (for legitimacy) and all this could be their this is what then led to the battles of 1066.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a confident and wide-ranging answer. The candidate notes the role of Edward the Confessor and the real or supposed promises made to both William of Normandy and his exiled cousin. Godwinson's responsibility for the conflict in 1066 is noted, especially through his treatment of Tostig.

There is an interesting point towards the end of the answer which notes that the centralisation of power in England made the country vulnerable to attack, as shown by Sweyn's invasion. Maximum marks.

Question 4

Many candidates showed a good range of knowledge about the reforms initiated under Lanfranc both in terms of the reorganisation of the dioceses and the assertion of Canterbury's primacy over York. There was also discussion of other matters such as the changes in personnel and the separation of Church courts from secular authorities. The issues of continuity were discussed in less depth, with the prolongation of Stigand's position until 1070 and the fact that most ordinary English priests remained being most commonly cited. There was little discussion of the monastic aspects of reform, and the issue of the relationship between Church and State was also often ignored. Only a few went beyond William I's reign to discuss the relationship between Anselm and William II and the changes that resulted from their various crises.

Similarly, the discussion of change in the organisation of the state was often weakened by a failure to appreciate what a 'state' would be in the Anglo-Norman context. There was discussion of such issues as the coronation, the shire system, writs, geld, coinage, feudalism and legal changes (especially forest law) though some candidates described these matters without integrating them into an argument. The best answers were able to identify William's desire to continue the Anglo-Saxon system, and that changes were forced by his inability to secure loyalty, hence the mutation of the late Anglo-Saxon system. The best candidates were also able to bring William Rufus and Henry I into the discussion: the Exchequer being the best discussed topic.

Overall, candidates were undermined by imbalance when they only dealt with one aspect of the question or focused on William the Conqueror at the exclusion of the others. Most candidates attempted to weigh up the degree of change and continuity to some extent which was creditable.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
 Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your second answer.) I would argue that it wasn't, there was more continuity than change in the English state by Wamarr King after 1066 many of the changes, therefore, occurred as a result of a natural progression, which may have occurred had William lost at Hastings. There certainly were some changes, although not a very great extent.

The Normans that came over, were in many ways similar to the existing ruling class (although many of them had died out). They were a warrior aristocracy with military, and military service at the heart of their government. Significant differences can be found (almost obviously in language) and where Normans feel their relation to, naturally, the continent and not Scandinavia, like the previous aristocracy. The reason for continuity, and lack of change, lies in the strength of the government and its system that William got over, arguably one of the finest in

(This page is for your second answer.) Europe, William and his successors ~~the~~ had the intelligence to know that change could only have a negative impact on the government. It is true to say, that in Normandy, they had different ways of doing many things. William would not do the first thing I want to use England to tap its resources and wealth for his own use elsewhere (Hollander, 1060, was primarily King of Denmark). William I would use England's wealth to pursue his battle, and build territories in Normandy. So William would make few changes that might affect his wealth.

In his, the change remained the same, and the systems of producing change. There were a series of sophisticated mints all over England, which ~~reaped~~ reaped great profits for the king, previous in their work, and so William allowed them to continue to do so. The bases of estates remained exactly the same, although they fell into different hands. They brought great wealth and appeared to run very efficiently, so William had no interest in changing them. There were fewer great landowners and there is a change, although for its part they remain working at the same land. The government they ran and received as such things, would also remain much the same. The main change!

(This page is for your second answer.) It involves the changing of names. 'Steward', for example and 'Duker' come in, however they mostly filled the role that previous men had done, simply under a different title.

A witan style met council still surrounded William and made various important decisions. After without the need for William, the King, in the same way the previous government had done. A significant change that Richard saw, and saw pretty much for the first time, was Government by deputy. Whilst William used ^{for} Wardenry, other men had control of England namely (at first) William fitz Osbern and Otto of Bayeux. William left England mid 1064, after feeling it was safe enough for an O.D.S., only returning in times of crisis, such as the rebellion of Duke who was moved and and bit York (1069). William's presence renewed the gameplan.

A huge ~~unwanted~~ change of government, and law, was the introduction of feudalism. This already existed on the continent and in Wardenry, but not in ~~Scandinavian~~ Scandinavian styled Kingdom. It brought changes, however I believe some of the principles of it already essentially existed in Kingdom had been introduced by the King, all the way, to his leading noblemen in the

(This page is for your second answer.) Expectation of sq military support when William felt he needed it. Since was expected the same of their knights, those who were given land for military service, and so on down the chain. It had the potential to overcome some of the difficulties faced in English England of the past, where disgraced or disgraced noblemen could cause a kingdom's downfall. English nobles now had something to hold them to their word. Before feudalism, there were no significant changes to the law. Rather, laws were introduced then as they are today and always, have been, when they needed to be. The laws and changes in it during the period are a fine example of continuity over change. Trial by combat was introduced, "duels", but that is the only significant notable change women will have felt a change, as a result of a different woman attitude to men. They could no longer hold, buy or inherit land. They would for more become to the possession of a husband. The biggest effect on a state the would have, was in civil war during medieval same years later.

The English church would feel a change sharply in its stance. It is possible it became more connected with the Pope, and less separate and English as I might suggest it always has been.

(This page is for your second answer.) Some changes were introduced such as the election of bishops and therefore there were slightly more appointments made. Roman religious houses were brought over to fill spots, such as Robert of Lillope. The church would see finance introduced more heavily, and it was possibly one of the only areas outside government to do so. It is worth mentioning that Government, now run by women, was run in French. There was no need for you to learn English, as most of the French aristocrats had, or were seen to be so. It is believed Edwin was in 801, and war was replaced by Robert of Guernsey in 8069. The church pressed for language Latin to be the language of government. We see a change in the style of manuscripts, firstly in architecture. Then the Normans began building further manors in Guernsey, for example building one next to the spot of Harold's death at Hastings, and churches all over the kingdom which can be still seen today. Another change to the scold (physical) is the linking of cattle which women did slightly out of intimidation, shown in the disbandment of an inch piece in 1069 or simply by the appearance of bright red coat of a cattle, ~~to be~~ as a previous part,

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~enormous~~ changes within these new physical structures ~~is~~ of the language spoken within the monasteries would have held its ground or even maintained marks of Latin, French and hence English became the most significant language. These were changes, however their significance in relation to new heads in contrast of the Church and state sees my judgement that change happened but only to a limited extent. Monks changed through continuity and were not a reflection of the Norman king changes in language and the manner of the state are relatively insignificant. It is worth mentioning that the majority of the state, in namely the peasantry, would have felt very little difference as a result of the conquest. These men were also the church goers, and would have felt little difference. This is because the changes in the organisation of both, is relatively small.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer considers both change and continuity in church and state. While there were few changes to the structure of government, rule by deputies while William was in Normandy was a significant innovation. The feudal system, legal changes and developments in the Church, notably closer relations with the Papacy and changes in key personnel, are all addressed. Some evaluation overall: Low Level 5.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

The question refers to 'Norman kings'. You should therefore try to include at least some information on William Rufus and Henry I.

Question 5

The general comments noted the importance of reading the question carefully before preparing an answer. Question 5 focused on Henry II's disputes with the Church, but many candidates focused instead on the relationship between Henry and Becket. Such answers tended to be descriptive and outlined the main points of contention between the two. At a lower level were answers which focused entirely on Becket, usually including a lengthy description of his murder. Answers at higher levels were aware that Henry's difficulties with the Church stemmed from the king's twin policy of restoring the rights of the monarchy after the conflicts of 1135-54, and of addressing significant abuses within the Church. At the highest level were answers which placed the Becket-Henry quarrel within a broader context, with some even aware of some of the events of Stephen's reign.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer ☒.
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

Some argue that the dispute between Henry and the Church was solely as a result of Becket and his personality. The uncompromising nature of his personality meant he was unwilling to cede to any of the King's demands. Becket was an idealist and this is clearly shown by his immediate change of lifestyle, as having been appointed Archbishop of Canterbury he denounced his old life and began to live as an ascetic. In addition Becket although he had attended University at Paris and studied law at Bologna he had ~~not~~ not continued his studies to the logical conclusion of becoming a master. This had a significant impact for when he became Archbishop of Canterbury as he was surrounded by first rate lawyers and theologians like John of Salisbury ~~and~~ and as a result undoubtedly developed an inferiority complex. ~~and~~ He felt

(This page is for your second answer.) as if he had to prove that he wasn't a careerist and the only way to do this was by doing his job in accordance with God rather than the King.

Becket's bad political management and political skills also created the dispute. Whereas his predecessor Theobald had managed to give ground to the King on certain issues whilst remaining loyal to the pope, Becket was utterly uncompromising and the ostentatious manner in which he resigned his Chancellorship was clearly provocative. He also lost support and increased tensions by going back on his promise to agree to the constitutions of Clarendon (where many bishops had given their assent ~~to~~ as a result of Becket ~~the~~ advising them to). This lost him the support of many bishops, like Gilbert Foliot ~~the~~ and others from his household now distanced ~~themselves~~ themselves from his court. Even his ruthless excommunications whilst on exile show ~~his~~ ^{his} poor diplomacy and lack of pragmatism.

~~However~~ However in spite of this, there exists many who argue that it was not solely Becket's fault. Some claim Henry's personality caused the dispute, Henry was not someone who liked having their will crossed and was known

(This page is for your second answer.) for his violent temper - "ira et ~~ira~~ mabretra", however this was more than personality, this was part of King's whereby the King used this persona to ensure the obedience of his subjects and as a result Henry was unable to be seen as being undermined by Becket. Henry was also unsympathetic to the church, the principles laid out in the constitutions of Clarendon (which largely attempted to subordinate the ~~the~~ church to the King) had upset the clergy due to its entrenched, uncompromising nature. When such things were maintained as they had been in the past - orally, they could be negotiated in light of the politics of the day, however now they were set in stone and this is what caused the most ~~the~~ distress.

One could also argue Henry failed to realise the ~~the~~ dilemma he had put Becket in ~~as~~ as being both Archbishop of C and Chancellor had very conflicting roles and hence was shocked at Becket's behaviour and unable to control his temper, resulting in Becket's death which was a propaganda disaster for Henry.

The reassertion of royal authority also caused difficulties and Henry was determined to reassert his power and return England to how

(This page is for your second answer.) It was in the time of Henry I and ~~and~~ ^{this} ~~was~~ involved taking control of the appointment of bishops. Also he was keen to ensure that royal justice was upheld and in a place in which royal writ wasn't followed was by criminal clerics who ~~escaped~~ ^{escaped} secular punishment by being tried in church courts. After a series of high profile cases Henry II was determined to crack down on this however the church argued he was undermining custom and tradition which had been established under William the Conqueror.

Equally ~~Henry~~ Henry ~~was~~ wanted to limit papal influence over his bishops. Bishops were essential royal administrators and ~~therefore~~ ^{therefore} Henry wanted to ensure they didn't owe allegiance to the Pope above him hence he only allowed contact with the papacy if one had a license from the king himself. However Henry did not want a regional church with no papal influence ^{over the church with} he just wanted to balance his power ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the pope's claim to universal power.

This ~~was~~ centralisation ~~and~~ and assertion of royal authority clashed ~~with~~ with recent ideas of church ~~independence~~ independence. In the 11th and ~~the~~ 12th century the church had ~~been~~ ^{been} under the influence of the Reform movement which stressed spiritual

(This page is for your second answer.)

power was greater than royal power as it had divine approval. This had led to clerics seeing themselves as having a greater authority than kings and as a result various campaigns against simony and clerical marriage ~~the~~ ^{in an} attempt to escape the suffocating hold of the king. People such as John of Salisbury had claimed the king was merely a representative of the people whose arbitrary ~~acts~~ ^{actions} should be prevented by laws. This obviously clashed directly with Henry's reassertion of royal power over the church.

In addition some claim that those around Becket caused the dispute and Becket was only acting ⁱⁿ ^{universities} due to the ~~the~~ ⁱⁿ developments ~~of~~ ^{at} the time (of Church independence) and in reality it was those like John of Salisbury and Robert Becket who ~~the~~ created the dispute. Those people were ardent supporters of the Papacy and ensured that Becket expressed their views, they also gave Becket support throughout his exile which ensured he didn't give up. Becket in particular is known to have encouraged Becket to exile anyone who opposed him, which clearly provided the king to act and the dispute to flare up.

Therefore I conclude that although the dispute ^{his personality} was not solely a result of Becket and ^{it} is probably

(This page is for your second answer.) ^{best} understood as a continuation of the ^{long standing} dispute between ^{the papacy} ~~the church~~ and state over control of the church which ^{Becket} had cropped up in English history many times (William Rufus and Henry I with Anselm), that Becket undoubtedly caused the dispute to flare up in a more provocative manner and possibly led to the dispute being much greater than it had in the past as a result of the excommunications and various failed attempts at reconciliation.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A confident and focused answer which compares the roles of both Becket and Henry II in the conflict between Church and State. The personalities of both protagonists are assessed, and there is some good commentary on Henry's ambition to restore royal power after the disintegration during the civil war. The candidate also notes that this particular conflict was simply the continuation of a long-standing dispute between Church and State. Maximum marks.

Question 6

The question asked for consideration of events from 1189. Weaker answers ignored this requirement, focusing instead on the later years of John's reign. Other candidates misjudged Richard's role in the question, devoting much of their answer to 1189-99 and leaving insufficient time to consider John's difficulties. This sometimes occurred in answers of good quality in terms of both knowledge and coherence, but the imbalance influenced where the answer was placed within Level 4. John's failures in France were not well handled on the whole though most candidates were able to relate to his behaviour as king of England. Even here there was a tendency to narrate. Few candidates referred to the baronial revolt itself. Even fewer mentioned Magna Carta by name or tried to link its demands to John's behaviour as a way of structuring the assessment of 'how accurate...' There was, however, a fundamental appreciation of the attitude of medieval barons, and of how medieval kingship had to shape some relationship with the leading barons. Many answers tended to produce an analytical form but with little supporting evidence.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

The Angevine Empire was gained under Henry I through, arguably, dynastic accident. Its ephemeral lifespan of 70 years highlights the difficulties experienced in maintaining it.

A case can be made that it was this struggle to maintain the Empire that led to the Baronial Revolt in 1214-1215. First, and most importantly, was the problem of revenue Philip began annexing the Angevin states after Richard married Berengia instead of his sister Alice.

While Richard was captive under Leopold, Philip gained a strategic advantage, capturing the castle of Gisors in Normandy. The war from 1194-1199 that ensued was extremely costly. The cost of mercenaries, supplies, technological advancements and (later on) inflation, placed a huge strain on the empire. This strain was

(This page is for your second answer.) mainly exerted in England and Normandy, ^{owing} to their more centralised and effective governments. This struggle to secure sufficient funds to fight the increasingly powerful Capetian powers was ~~an~~ of huge importance. Chancellors such as Hubert Walter instigated dramatic efficiency drives to obtain as much money as possible. These changes include creation of Common Bench in Westminster, changing sheriffs more and increased fiscal feudalism. The shock factor of these increased demands on inheritance tax and scutage had dire consequences. The abuse of tradition and huge over-taxation prompted the Barons to revolt in 1214.

Coupled with the economic factor is a political factor. The absence of monarchs saw the growing power of ~~the~~ Chancellors and Justiciars. These men regularly introduced new procedures to make government more effective such as the Common bench and Office of Coroner (Hubert Walter). These changes increasingly cut barons out of government on a local and national level. This can be seen under John with the replacement of feudal barons with court barons. These changes and neglect of Barons social importance were huge driving forces

(This page is for your second answer.) behind the Baronial Revolt of 1214.

There are, however, many other factors that drove the Baronial Revolt. A strong case can be made here for the importance of personality and kingship. Richard was a strong leader with a good reputation. His display on the Third Crusade is described as heroic. It was important that a king embody important Chivalric values. This bolstered Richard's reputation at home and secured loyalty in an arguably unsustainable system. John on the other hand, was a loser. By murdering his rival to the throne, Alfred, he contravened important family values of the time and weakened the bonds of respect with his Barons. Moreover, John was a suspicious and distasteful character. His marriage to an already betrothed Isabelle of Angoulême promoted the disloyalty of the Lusignan family, whom he failed to compensate. In addition, John treated the Barons appallingly. When William de Braose defaulted on a ridiculously high repayment, John kidnapped and starved to death his wife and child. William de Braose was hounded into exile. It was commonplace for John to kidnap relatives to

(This page is for your second answer.) guarantee loyalty. John was also also a loser. His crushing defeat at Bouvines to hands of Philip removed any reason the Barons had of supporting him. The viability of Capetian power was becoming more attractive over John's failing, tyrannical rule.

To conclude, there ~~were~~^{were} certainly many factors to consider. The fiscal pressure and political neglect~~ed~~ caused by the struggle to secure Angevin Lands ~~also~~ had a big hand in causing the rebellion. The increasing reluctance to fight abroad and laws ~~imposed~~ on fiscal feudalism imposed on the king in Magna Carta reflect this. I would argue, however, that these factors did not make such a revolt inevitable. Instead, it was John's political and personal mistakes that prompted that release of tension. His unnecessarily harsh treatment of Barons and neglect of their importance gave them no reason to support him. It was Richard's good reputation that ensured loyalty, ~~whereas~~ however John's ~~poor~~ reputation was that of a loser. Thus I would say it is accurate a ~~small~~^{small} degree. The struggle to maintain Angevin Lands laid the foundation of rebellion, but it was John's bad politics and mistakes that prompted the rebellion

(This page is for your second answer.) in 1214.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer focuses on three factors which caused the baronial revolt: oppressive taxation; the sidelining of the feudal barons; and the personalities of both Richard and John. An evaluative response with sufficient range and depth for Low Level 5.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This question shows how important it is to read the exam paper carefully! This is a question focused on the baronial revolt, not on the Angevin Empire.

Question 7

Students sometimes struggled to maintain relevance in their answer to this question. The fall in population itself was described in some detail by weaker students. Material covered other consequences of the Black Death, including the increased sense of freedom that resulted in the Statute of Labourers and the Sumptuary Laws. Some candidates attempted to link these freedoms to reasons for the failure of the size of the population to rise. Better answers were much more focused on the question, addressing the recurrence of the plague and the fact that key section of the population, especially the young, were affected, and linking this to the failure of the size of the population to rise. The best answers explained these points fully, and added to them a recognition of the way in which the impact of the plague on towns caused a lack of population growth, while the psychological impact of the plague caused people to lose faith in the future and therefore avoid marriage and children. Some students were able to link the different factors they had identified. Some of the best answers took a broader view of population trends, noting that the population of England was falling before 1348/9 and therefore that the Black Death was only one reason explaining the failure of the population to rise after 1349.

Question 8

Weaker answers, which were fortunately quite rare, were from candidates who produced only an extended narrative of events, or focused on reasons for the outbreak of the revolt of 1381. Most noted the political challenge which was being mounted, and the significance of John Ball's ideas, suggesting that the poll taxes of 1379-81 provided the trigger rather than the fundamental cause of the revolt. The weaknesses of the peasants were clearly explained both in terms of their lack of unity and organisation, and by the ease with which they were eventually dispersed.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer ☒.
 Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
 and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	☒	Question 2	☒	Question 3	☒
Question 4	☒	Question 5	☒	Question 6	☒
Question 7	☒	Question 8	☒	Question 9	☒
Question 10	☒	Question 11	☒	Question 12	☒
Question 13	☒	Question 14	☒		

(This page is for your second answer.) To what extent was the Peasants' Revolt of 1381 a serious threat to the traditional powers of the king and the nobility?

Threat - demands: end of serfdom
 - Challenged the church: John Ball "When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?"

Not a threat - rioting & losing control of rebels diminished the threat as it lost the support of Londoners.

- No match for King's army
 - 2nd meeting - many peasants had gone home
 - Poor leadership - Kent & Essex rebels acted separately

Before revolt - threatened enough to warrant the introduction of Statute/Ordinance of Labourers & Sumptuary laws.
1351 1328

The Peasants' Revolt of 1381 could be said to have been a threat to the traditional powers of the king and the nobility, but it is debatable whether it was a serious threat, or indeed if the Peasants' Revolt was the only threat. It challenged the traditional powers, in that

(This page is for your second answer.) One of the main demands made by the rebels was for the end of serfdom. However, there had been previous challenges to the King's & nobility's power, enough to make them introduce the Ordinance/Statute of Labourers in 1349 and '51 respectively, and the Statute of Labourers laws.

During the Peasants' Revolt the peasants' main demand was for the end of serfdom, so lords could no longer force peasants to do various duties for them in exchange for wages. This ^{demand} greatly challenged the traditional powers of the king & nobility. There was also a challenge to the church, directed by John Ball. He believed that under the king, everyone should be equal and there should be no barons/lords and peasants, saying that ~~that~~ ^{that} was what God wanted: "When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?" This further threatened the nobility's traditional powers.

On the other hand, the Peasants' Revolt could be argued to be not a very serious threat. Although at first the king gave in to demands, these were later revoked after Wat Tyler & John Ball made excessive demands, ~~and the poor leadership, meant that some rebels~~ ^{of the rebels} started rioting ~~and~~ ~~as~~ through London and burned Savoy Palace, losing them support from Londoners, and so diminishing the threat. By the time Wat

(This page is for your second answer.) Tyler asked for a second meeting with the King, many of the rebels ~~went~~ ^{had gone} home, having got what they wanted. This meant that for the Second meeting the threat posed to the King's traditional powers had been ~~even~~ ^{further} diminished.

The poor leadership shown during the Revolt ~~meant~~ ^{meant} that a group of rebels broke away and started rioting in London, even burning Savoy palace. This lost them much support from the people in London, lessening the threat. Another example of poor leadership was that the Kent and Essex rebels acted separately. Arguably, if they had joined together the threat they posed could have been greater.

The Peasants' Revolt was not the only challenge to the traditional powers of the king and nobility. After the Black Death there was a shortage of labourers meaning that those who survived demanded higher wages. Evidently the nobility felt threatened enough that they introduced the ~~statute~~ ^{Ordinance} of Labourers in 1351, making it a statute in 1351, which capped wages at the pre-plague level and further strengthened the oppression the peasants felt from the laws. The Sumptuary laws were also introduced, limiting the type of clothing people could wear and food they could eat according to their social status. The introduction of these pieces of legislation support the fact that there had been

(This page is for your second answer.) previous challenges to the king and nobility.

In conclusion, the Peasants' Revolt did pose a threat to the traditional powers of the king and the nobility, but this threat was not as serious as it could have been, had the rebels shown stronger leadership and more organisation. Due to picking of small groups of rebels they lost the support of people in London and the threat they posed was lessened. There was also evidence to show, previous challenges to the nobility & king, in so far as they felt threatened enough to introduce legislation to limit the power of the peasants. However, despite the threat posed, ultimately the rebels would be no match for the King's army, should he have felt threatened ~~that~~ enough to call for their help.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer considers the rebels' grievances, including their demands for an end to serfdom and resentment of both the Statute of Labourers and the Sumptuary Laws. The poor leadership of the rebels is also noted. The answer tends towards description in places, and the introduction is not very effective, but there is an analytical focus here, with sufficient development of material for High Level 4.

Questions 9 and 10

There were virtually no answers to the questions in Option D5.

Question 11

Too many candidates saw the question as an opportunity to write at some length on the causes of the Wars of the Roses in the years before 1455; such answers could only be credited for providing some contextual knowledge. Better answers noted that, within the timescale 1455-61, Henry VI contributed nothing to the Lancastrian cause, while his prolonged bouts of catatonic schizophrenia may even have helped the Yorkist cause. The role of Margaret of Anjou was often handled very well. Candidates were aware of her demands to be recognised as regent for her son, and that she took control of the Lancastrian cause from 1455. Her political mistakes, notably the convening the Parliament of Devils, and her strategic error of basing her forces in the Midlands, were also investigated. The leadership of Richard Duke of York was handled with varying degrees of success. Some saw him as motivated by personal grievances because of the way he had been mistreated by Henry VI, though most were aware that he had a legitimate claim to the throne, perhaps better than that of Henry VI. While York's leadership of his cause was well documented, candidates seemed less sure of the role of the Earl of March towards the end of the period.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14 | |

York excluded.

(This page is for your first answer.) 1453 - Breakdown 1455 - St Albans - 6^{2nd} breakdown

1458 - Loveday 1459 - 3 of Heath Part of Ludford P. of Devils

1460 - 2nd Albans Northampton Wakefield 1461 - 2nd Albans M. Cross,
Ferry bridge Waterfield Tanton

M. Political interference → H weaknesses ✓

Power of York + Ambition ✓ Self preservation?

Ed IV - Combat skills, charismatic ✓

Warwick - 'kingmaker' → control of Calais ✓

P. of Devils lost Henry support Londoners
 support Calais (Warwick) ✓

Margaret fails to take London after 2nd Albans

What extent HVI + M responsible 4
 Lancast failures 1455-61?

(This page is for your first answer.) The years 1455-1461 were some of the bloodiest and unstable years in Medieval history; the families of York and Lancaster battled against each other for ~~6~~ six years, for political power and the role of king of England. The extent of ~~The fighting began~~ responsibility belonging to Henry VI and his French wife Margaret of Anjou is debateable, undoubtably they're weaknesses led in part to the outbreak of war and continuing failures suffered by their Lancastrian family over the six years, but a lot of responsibility must lie in the hands of Richard of York and his followers, as ^{two} ~~both~~ sides are needed for conflict.

The fighting broke out in 1455 at the Battle of St. Alban's, the causes of this are vast and varied but ~~arguably~~ in short it came down to York's outrage at being excluded from the court. This would suggest that York's ambition was the prime reason for the conflict, however were it not for Henry VI's mental breakdown and weakness in political matters ~~then~~ and his wife's strength of will, determination and arguably aggressive

(This page is for your first answer.) manner then York would not have been excluded from court. Margaret of Anjou's suspicion of York made her influence the king, with the help of her ally the Duke of Somerset, to exclude York, and Henry's meekness and piety (John Blacman described him as a 'fool of God') allowed her to do so. From the origin of the conflict alone we see Henry VI's weakness and Margaret of Anjou's will have a large and undeniable role in the failures of conflict.

Now to address the failures the Lancastrians suffered during the years 1455-1461. First it is unfair to say that the Lancastrians suffered only defeat, for they have a few major successes during this time also, for example, the 'rout' of Ludford was a decisive Lancastrian victory and led to York ^{fleeing} ~~and his~~ to Ireland, and his allies Warwick, Salisbury, and Edward, Earl of March, his son, taking refuge in Calais.

However it does seem that the majority of battles ~~were~~ left the Yorkist's victorious, ~~and~~ or at least saw the Yorkist's make better use of their victories. In 1460 the Yorkist's

(This page is for your first answer.) ... was the Battle of Northampton, and took Henry VI captive. This shows political ~~skill~~ and combat skill by Richard of York, and this success was only increased by his ability to get Henry VI to sign the Act of Accord, which disinherited his son and gave Richard of York the right to succession after his death. This is possibly the greatest ~~loss~~ political failure for the Lancastrians, but again, responsibility is equally shared by York's ^{power} and Henry VI's weakness. *

The nobility, and indeed the gentry must also be acknowledged in the roles they played. The Duke of Somerset, though killed at the Battle of St. Alban's played a large role in the conflict beginning, as his rise in power bred resentment in Richard of York. Another important ^{role} was Warwick, York's greatest ally. His ^{significant} part in Lancastrian downfall ~~was~~ came after the death of Richard of York, when he helped Edward of March to usurp the throne, for which he has gained the title 'king maker' by some ~~historians~~ historians. Warwick was popular with the merchants

(This page is for your first answer.) in London, who often supported whoever held Calais, this enabled Edward to take London in 1461 after the Battle of Mortimer's Cross and proclaim himself king. Of course, Edward's own charisma and skill in combat affairs were entitled him to responsibility for Lancastrian failure.

The common people in England also took part in this time of war, by supporting either side in conflict or giving them the popularity needed. In this Margaret lacked, her aggressively determined nature was disliked by many, and the Parliament of Devils in 1459 decreased Lancastrian support, as the gross misconduct of disinheriting the rebels' offspring from their titles was unusual and disliked.

Overall we can say that yes Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou are responsible for their own failures, ~~they~~ Henry was 'under-mighty' and Margaret was 'over-mighty' this combination of utter weakness in an English king and aggressive political interest in his foreign wife was a cause for resentment among nobles and gentry. However,

(This page is for your first answer.) without an opponent there would have been no conflict, and York's strength, power and military ability was a great opponent and his success is responsible for Lancastrian failures.

* Whereas, after Margaret of Anjou won the second Battle of St. Albans and had rescued her husband, she failed to follow this up and secure her success as she did not take London.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer compares the roles of Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou and Richard Duke of York in explaining Lancastrian failures in the years 1455-61. There is an awareness of the course of events, and the analysis is supported by a secure range of accurate information. High Level 4.

Question 12

Weaker answers were broadly descriptive and focused almost entirely on the Princes in the Tower. Very little else was offered to provide an argument and there was no counter argument. Henry was not discussed in any detail and the problems with Scotland were not mentioned. Occasionally Buckingham was mentioned in passing but his significance was not well known. Better answers provided a secure counter argument, with material which suggested that a short reign was not inevitable and that some of Richard's behaviour was typical of a medieval monarch. Candidates asserted that it was due to a culmination of factors both long and short term, added to some bad luck on the battlefield, that led to Richard's death. Henry Tudor's challenge was well documented, including his failed campaign of 1483, growing support from the Woodvilles and disaffected Yorkists, and the value of French support. It was interesting to see that so many candidates have accepted Shakespeare's portrayal of Richard III as a king without redeeming qualities: he was a more complex, and perhaps more successful ruler than they realised.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |

(This page is for your first answer.)

Why was the reign of Rich 3 so short lived?

- ~~opposition from woodvilles~~
- ~~Buckingham's rebellion~~
- ~~Unpopularity - Princes + wife suspicious~~
- ~~Henry Tudor + Stanley's help~~
- ~~not much noble support - Northumberland at battle~~
- ~~Alienated southern nobles~~
- ~~Support French had for H + Lancastrians~~
- ~~Death of son (untimely)~~

answer
starts



(This page is for your first answer.)

Richard III usurped the throne from his nephew Edward in 1483 after the sudden death of Edward IV. As a minor, Richard easily took the throne with the help of Buckingham, eager for power and highly ambitious. However his reign ended when he was killed at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485, successfully invaded by the claimant Henry Tudor. Therefore his reign lasted only two years, for a number of reasons including the ambitions of Henry Tudor and Richard's own mistakes.

Firstly, Richard faced much opposition from the Woodville family. As Edward IV had married into the family through Elizabeth Woodville, this family of 'commoners' rose to the ranks as she brought many brothers and sisters with her. Therefore they were very angry when they did not get to take on Edward V (Prince of Wales) protectorate when he ascended to the throne as a minor. Richard got the job instead, and easily shunned Edward and his brother Richard, Duke of York away to the Tower of London. This was the beginning of the anti-Richardian Yorkist faction among the people and especially the nobility, who were more willing to support a claimant, Henry Tudor.

(This page is for your first answer.) The support Richard gained from the nobles was not consistent or widespread. As a warrior from the north, Richard favoured the nobles in that area, and even set up a council in the north. This shows where his power base was and how the concentration of loyal nobles were located in that area. Discontent among the nobles is shown by Buckingham's rebellion in 1483. Buckingham was a huge help to Richard in gaining the throne and felt that he should have been rewarded better following his obvious display of loyalty. ~~Richard~~ Richard suppressed the rebellion, and it resulted in the execution of Buckingham, so even though it was not a serious threat it shows discontent from the nobility, and should have brought to Richard's attention that the nobles were not happy. This may have been ^{one of} Richard's mistakes in that he should have remembered other nobles because they did not support him when it came to Basmorth in 1485, explaining why his reign was so short lived.

The Battle of Basmorth ended Richard's reign in 1485, so was therefore a huge factor in explaining why his reign was so short-lived. Henry Tudor had a distant claim to the throne; it was through the illegitimate line of Beauforts so not secure but

(This page is for your first answer.) good enough to challenge Richard III. He was also an ambitious man who ~~was~~ had spent years in exile in Brittany and waited for his moment to invade at the right time, progressing through Wales in order to gather support, which he did. Therefore the ambitions of Henry Tudor may have contributed to the short lived reign of Richard. ~~Henry~~ Henry ~~III~~ also had support from the French who provided him with money, fleet and mercenaries to contribute to his invasion. As a Lancastrian ally, France was keen to support any claimant who might challenge the Yorkist throne, without France Henry may not have been able to invade with the support he had, so their support for Henry may also explain the short lived reign of Richard. There was also the role of the Stanleys during the battle events itself. Lord Thomas and Sir William had a large army and were notorious trimmers, taking sides with who was winning the battle. They decided to side with Henry, so this extra force of men was very important for him, and they managed to defeat Richard at the battlefield, and Henry Tudor became Henry VII. The lack of noble support was also shown at the battle as Northumberland did not engage his forces in Richard's time of need.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Richard's unpopularity also proved a factor as to why people didn't support him. The disappearance of the princes Edward and Richard who were being kept in the tower was suspicious, and it is widely believed that Richard was responsible for their death in order to remove the boys who had a better claim to the throne than he did. It was also suspected that he had something to do with the death of his wife Anne Neville in 1487 because he had aims to marry Elizabeth of York in order to strengthen his claim and support. Therefore the unpopularity of Richard and his characteristics added to his unappealing nature, and may have also contributed to opposition, resulting in his short reign. His son and heir Edward also died the same year which did not help him remain secure.

Therefore Richard's reign ~~was~~ was very short because of his unpopularity, the battle of Bosworth and unlucky events such as the death of his son and the ambitions of Henry Tudor. However if he had more support from nobles, especially those in the south (which he alienated) he may have been more victorious in suppressing claimants. His short reign was expected therefore for many reasons.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer explains the shortness of Richard's reign by considering the opposition of the Woodvilles, variable support of the nobles as a whole, and the ambitions of Henry Tudor which led to the battle of Bosworth. Richard's unpopularity is suggested as a reason for his failure, though this is not fully explained. High Level 4.

Question 13

Candidates were agreed that Henry had a weak claim to the English throne but there was great variety in the explanation of this. A few candidates were able to discuss the Beaufort line and its weaknesses compared with the Yorkist claim through Elizabeth of York. Good candidates were able to make a distinction between challenges and rebellions. In the case of challenges – particularly Simnel and Warbeck - the two imposters, many candidates were able to explain that as such 'feeble' plots were a distinct challenge to Henry, then his weak claim might have had something to do with it. However not many candidates considered that the timing of the Simnel plot (early in the reign) and the longevity of Warbeck plot (throughout most of the reign) as indicators of other factors also being at work. Better candidates were able to also refer to the habits of leading nobles of the last 30years for which challenging the king was a valid pastime. Others also cited the anger, jealousy and revenge of many Yorkists in general but of Margaret of Burgundy in particular, as motives for challenging Henry rather than his weak claim. The European dimension to these challenges was not widely considered beyond widespread involvement of key individuals. The strategy to undermine England's position in Europe was widely overlooked as a valid motive, whether it was in tandem with thoughts that Henry was weak/had a weak claim. Many candidates were able to identify taxation as a cause of the Yorkshire and Cornish rebellions. Some candidates made reference to the local element but very few were able to link these incidents to more factors even if Warbeck was mentioned. The evaluation which was to be drawn from the reasons for the rebellions and challenges in terms of the weak claim was often lost. In reality as the reign progressed the perception of the weak claim diminished – for example after the Battle of Stoke which compounded Bosworth or the marriage of Henry to Elizabeth of York which was an attitude changer for many Yorkists. Furthermore, the Warbeck challenge was complex – not just because of its lengthy timeframe but also because of the varied support which it attracted. In short, not all supporters of Warbeck would have had the same motive.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.) During his reign, Henry VII was challenged for the crown a number of times. His weak claim, inherited from the bloodline of his mother, Margaret Beaufort, was one of the reasons why these rebellions came about, but others include the desires of overmighty nobles and a genuine dislike of Henry's ideas and policies.

The attempted usurpation of Lambert Simnel, pretending to be Warwick, son of Clarence,

(This page is for your second answer.) was based heavily on the weakness of Henry's claim to the throne. Simnel's attempt was initially risky, as the real Warwick was still alive, but the pretender gained large amounts of support none the less, including powerful nobles such as Kildare. The attempted usurpation ended in the Battle of Stoke, and victory for Henry VII, although it was clear that Henry's claim was not strong enough to keep the throne in his ~~good~~ possession and that others with stronger claims could easily rise up against Henry.

The second major ~~usurp~~ ^{Pretender} was Perkin Warbeck, the Dutch man who was

(This page is for your second answer.) pretending to be Richard, one of the two princes in the Tower of London who were supposedly murdered by Richard III. The lengths Henry went to in order to defeat this pretender was proof that Henry's claim to the throne was not strong and that needed to deal with pretenders with better claims quickly. The Treaty of Ayton and the Treaty of Etaples, two examples of Henry's policies and desperation, closed off Scotland and France to the pretender, irritating the power of Warbeck and forcing him to invade. Warbeck was eventually captured and executed, but he proved that rival claimants were a serious

(This page is for your second answer.) threat to Henry, showing his claim was not a strong one.

However, not all of the rebellions and challenges were caused because of Henry's weak claim.

The Lovell Rebellion was caused by an overmighty noble, Lord Lovell, attempting to seize power for himself, following the example Henry had set of usurpation. This was not solely because of Henry's weak claim, although doubtless ^{this} ~~it~~ would have played a part.

Another example of a rebellion not caused by Henry's claim to the throne, was the Cornish Rebellion. This was caused by the raise

(This page is for your second answer.) in taxes that Henry had been forced to implement in order to capture the pretender Perkin Warbeck. Although it was very indirectly caused by the weakness of Henry's claim, this was not the main cause of the rebellion.

Overall, Henry's weak claim to the throne was not the only cause of challenges and rebellions. ~~at~~ The Lovell Rebellion and the Cornish Rebellion were not caused by ~~the~~ the strength of Henry's claim, although this did not help the situation. ^{However,} ~~in conclusion,~~ ~~however,~~ it is accurate to say Henry's weak claim to the throne was the main cause of challenges.

(This page is for your second answer.) and rebellions, because it was the cause of the most dangerous challenges (Perkin Warbeck and Lambert Simnel), as well as the indirect cause of other rebellions, such as the Lovell Rebellion and the Cornish Rebellion, neither of which would have happened if Henry had had a ^{much} stronger claim.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer describes the Simnel and Warbeck rebellions, and notes the Lovell rising and the Cornish Rebellion (though not the Yorkshire Rising). Much of the answer is driven by narrative, but there is a sufficiently analytical focus to allow for Mid Level 4.

Question 14

The best responses considered the extent to which Henry strengthened the monarchy throughout his reign, for example through establishing a new dynasty, his attempts to control the nobility and stop pretenders, his legal and financial policies and his foreign policy. There were some very impressive answers where candidates clearly had very detailed and wide-ranging factual knowledge of Henry's reign and were able to use and control this to come to a judgement. Most candidates were able to focus on some aspects of his reign, although in some cases there was a tendency to try to write about all aspects of Henry's reign, which led to range but not depth of detail. Some answers ignored the issue of the extent to which Henry strengthened the power of the monarchy and produced very detailed and focused answers which lacked balance or a clear conclusion.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer .
 Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.) The extent to which Henry VIII strengthened the throne is one to be assessed. Henry had seen the importance of maintaining good foreign policy after threats posed to the English throne by pretenders Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck, this had significantly increased the power of the monarchy, promising security and pensions. The way Henry VIII dealt with finance had also increased his wealth, and the monarchy giving him more access to more resources, such as retainers. The way Henry had dealt with the nobles through bonds and recognisances and attainders also gave the monarchy significant strength.

Henry had successfully crushed two pretenders in his reign, Perkin Warbeck and Lambert Simnel. This is significant for establishing increasing the strength of the monarchy. Firstly, it establishes England as a strong, and able military power, and secondly it led to improved foreign policy. ~~As a result of~~ As a result of support for the pretenders Henry had declared war on France. When Henry VIII had landed on French land they came to negotiate peace. It resulted in the Treaty of Etaples which promised to never harbor

(This page is for your second answer.) English rebels again; The dauphin would marry Margaret, Henry's daughter, promising her an income of 60,000 crowns per annum, and the French would provide a large pension to England. This significantly increased the power of the monarchy as it brought political security and wealth. Henry also had many other treaties such as Reading with Burgundy, where they also promised not to harbor any English rebels; Medina del Campo with Spain where Catherine of Aragon was to marry Henry's eldest son, Arthur and the Spanish too had promised not to harbor any English rebels. Other treaties include: Arras, Bourges and Intercom magno. Overall, good foreign relations with significant European powers was extremely useful in strengthening the English monarchy. Marriages and treaties promised a peaceful succession and pensions increased royal income. The bonus of promises not to harbor rebels also ensured a degree of political stability for Henry VII. ~~At this~~, Henry also improved English trade with these countries decreasing taxes for imports and exports, such as in Bourges.

The way Henry VII had dealt with the nobles also played a significant part in increasing the strength of the monarchy. Bonds and Recognizances punished nobles who had misbehaved, encouraging nobles to abide by Henry's rules. Attainders such as to with John also increased Henry's wealth and control over the nobility. Henry also had sold off the attainders to nobles sons who had been attainted for sometimes up to £5,000. This income alone was strengthening Henry's monarchy, but combined with control of the nobles this played a significant

(This page is for your second answer.) role in strengthening the monarchy.

Henry VIII made improvements to finances which had also significantly increased the power of the monarch. He adopted Edward IV's strategies by PA Crown revenues being processed through the King's Chamber, this meant that troubled times wouldn't occur like they had through the Exchequer. Moreover, Henry's crown lands had also increased ~~the~~ his wealth, and attainders had added to the crown lands. Henry also sold titles to Bishops and to some nobles. Henry also managed Wardships such as Buckingham's and he profited from the lands and could use the resources. Henry also sold Wardships off ~~the~~ to nobles, for a sum of money.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ Henry VIII had significantly strengthened the monarchy. Through investing time in good foreign relations, he conjured up treaties such as the Staple which greatly benefited him and kept the crown. They often brought some degree of political stability. The way Henry dealt with the nobles had also strengthened the crown ~~by~~ politically, and financially. His improvements in finance undoubtedly strengthened the crown by increasing his income significantly compared to previous monarchs.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer considers a good range of factors which strengthened the Tudor monarchy: the defeat of pretenders: a successful foreign policy: restraining the noble; and improving royal finances. There are a few gaps, notably on foreign policy and dynastic marriages, but this is a secure evaluation for Low Level 5.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This is an example of an open-ended question. It is usually better to focus on a manageable number of points rather than trying to cover everything!

Paper Summary

Those candidates who were well prepared in terms of knowledge and understanding of their topics produced answers within Levels 4 and 5, and some of these have been included in this report. For students who completed GCSE just one year earlier, the best answers are remarkable examples of young minds at work.

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>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028120 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

