

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work:

- Unit 2 – Average Level Response



**Unit 2 –January 2009 –average script containing responses to:**

- HIS2A Conqueror and Conquest, c1060–1087
- HIS2H Britain, 1902–1918: The Impact of New Liberalism

**HIS2A**

Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

- 1 (a)** Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to William's attitude towards his English subjects. (12 marks)

Following the Battle of Hastings in 1066, William's first priority was to secure the realm, and one of his main concerns was how to secure the loyalty of the English people. Source A was written by William of Poitiers, a knight in William's service. Much of his writing was designed to justify the actions of the Normans, and he was also anxious to secure William's favour. Consequently his writings possess a pro-Norman bias. He states in the source '...there was no resistance'. However, both the Norman Chronicle and the Anglo Saxon Chronicle record that there were rebellions in the years 1068 to 1075. The source continues to state that William '...treated Englishmen generously'. Once William had been crowned as king, his main aims were to secure the throne and reward those who had fought for him at the Battle of Hastings. These allies wanted land, money and status, and William made the English pay for these rewards. He took as much from the English as he possibly could, taking their land and giving it to trusted Normans. He also claimed many English treasures and sent them to Normandy and to Rome in return for the support he had received and the papal banner.

Source B was written by Orderic Vitalis, a monk, who had the benefit of hindsight. Being himself an Anglo-Norman, Orderic is sympathetic towards the English but justifies the actions of the Normans as God's Will. He states that foreigners grew wealthy, which they did: two hundred of William's tenants owned 50% of the land in England.

Sources A and B have opposing views. Poitiers states that the English were given more riches than they had received under Harold, when in fact they were heavily taxed and had their lands stolen. Orderic states that the foreigners grew wealthy at the expense of the English. William's view was that the people of a conquered nation must pay the victors.

**Examiners Comments:**

*This is well-written and shows a good general understanding of the ways in which reports of how William treated his English subjects differ. However, apart from the statement that Sources A and B 'have opposing views' and the contrast of the final paragraph, this answer fails to address the question directly. Furthermore, any similarities between the sources are implicit only. The answer is Level 2 but is placed at the top of that level because of the good contextual knowledge.*

*Level 3 (6 marks)*

Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

- 1 (b)** How far did the social and political position of the English aristocracy change in the years 1066 to 1087 as a result of the Norman Conquest? (24 marks)

In the years 1066 to 1087 many changes occurred in England. One of the main changes involved the aristocracy. There were, however, two phases of change: 1066–71 where establishing the Anglo-Norman state was William's priority and 1071–87 where the feudal system became most important.

During the first phase, William was keen to work with the nobility to create an Anglo-Norman state. This view is expressed in Source C. This happened as in the first few weeks of his reign William met with most of the major Anglo-Saxon earls and returned their land to them. In some cases, as stated in Sources A and B, William gave them more land than they had owned before the invasion. Waltheof was even given the king's niece in marriage as a gift. Even after rebellions, some earls were pardoned. This was because William wanted to be seen as the rightful heir of Edward in contrast to Harold Godwinson, who he considered to be a usurper. William did give land to his followers after Hastings but, as stated in Sources A and C, Anglo-Saxon earls were, in the main, treated fairly.

The second phase was different as William began to realise that it was not going to be so easy to create Anglo-Norman state. Rebellions resulted in the 'harrying of the North'. This was a change in policy for William, and the period of Normanisation began with the introduction of feudalism.

The Anglo-Saxon nobles lost their positions. By the time of William's death in 1087 only two Anglo-Saxon nobles still had some sort of power. This change of policy is perhaps most apparent in the treatment of Waltheof, who in 1066 had been given land and a royal wife as a peace offering from William. In 1075 William had Waltheof beheaded for a minor role in the Revolt of the Earls. This period of change is described in Source B.

The introduction of feudalism also gave William the chance to install new Norman lords instead of Anglo-Saxons. This gave William more control. He controlled the marriage of heiresses or widows and this gave him the power to replace many Anglo-Saxon lines with Norman ones.

Overall, in the period 1066 to 1087, the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy underwent a huge change. They were made second class citizens who could possess land but had to swear fealty to a Norman Lord. The Anglo-Saxons had their land taken after Hastings so that it could be given to William's followers as a reward. By 1087 the Saxon aristocracy had no land and therefore no power, meaning that the conquest had affected them greatly.

### **Examiners Comments**

*This shows general understanding but lacks some depth. Whilst it distinguishes effectively between the two periods of William's rule, it makes no attempt to separate the political and social factors and its treatment of the former is particularly thin. Apart from Waltheof, the answer is devoid of specific examples and whilst the sources are referred to, there is no attempt to provide appropriate quotations in support of ideas. The answer is clearly expressed and with some balance, making it worthy of Level 3, but insufficiently precise or wide-ranging for higher.*

*Level 3 (14 marks)*

**HIS2H**

- 2 (a)** Explain why the campaign to win the vote for women became increasingly militant in the years 1906 to 1914. (12 marks)

By 1906 the suffragettes resorted to violence as a means to attract more public attention and finally to be recognised and be represented in Parliament.

The WSPU had been set up by Emmeline Pankhurst and her two daughters Christabel and Sylvia in 1903. They disagreed with the Suffragists led by Millicent Fawcett who believed in peaceful methods. They believed in 'deeds not words' and they set up branches all over the country to encourage middle and upper-class women to campaign for the vote.

They used arson attacks, window smashing tactics and the pepper filled letters to the MPs. The suffragettes smashed windows in Downing Street and chained themselves to railings to cause a public nuisance. Emmeline Pankhurst believed that by being violent the Liberals would finally give in and attend and answer their needs.

Their violent methods did result in a lot of public attention, however the Liberals could not be seen giving in to violence whilst Ireland was watching. This could drive the Ulster Unionists to do the same and cause future chaos.

The most important reason for suffragette militancy was the failure of the peaceful campaigning and the unwillingness of the Liberals to co-operate and reach a solution with the suffragettes. If the Liberals were democratic and willing to support female suffrage it wouldn't have allowed the autocratic nature of the Pankhursts to surface.

**Examiners Comments:**

*This response is overly narrative and does not address why the campaign became 'increasingly militant' over the 1906 to 1914 period. It explains some of the reasons for violence but it also includes mention of why the violence failed, which is not what is asked for. There is also some uncertainty (or possibly problems of expression), particularly in the sentence beginning, 'If the Liberals were democratic...'. Overall the answer is worthy of a Level 2 mark.*

*Level 2 (5 marks)*

- 2 (b)** 'Women won the right to vote in 1918 entirely because of the contribution they had made to Britain's war effort from 1914.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

When the women achieved the vote, under the Representation of the People Act, only 8 million were enfranchised; and although this number was not very large it was considered as a big leap forward for the suffragette movement. The women achieved the vote for many reasons including their war effort, the creation of suffragette violence and the support of the Liberals pre-1914.

Women's war work increased respect for women and converted a lot of women to female suffrage. However, the women who actually did the work during World War I were under 30 years of age and were not married or propertied. This means that they were not covered in the enfranchisement bill, and middle-class women who undertook less dangerous jobs were given the vote. Also, many women who had worked during the war, worked pre-war as well, only in

less provocative jobs such as munitions factory. So the war did not cause a revolutionary change.

There were also other reasons why women got the vote in 1918. The cessation of suffragette violence was a major factor. The suffragettes had smashed windows and properties to attract public attention to their cause. And so when they halted their violence they showed society the more reasonable, loyal and patriotic response of women, this increased respect for them and converted many people to their cause. In addition, the French women were not given the vote despite their war efforts due to the lack of campaigning pre-war years.

Another reason which enabled the women to become enfranchised is the Liberal support of pre-1914. This can be exemplified by the Qualification of the People Act in 1907. This enabled women to become council members and stand in by-elections. This was not a big leap forward, however it was accepted by the WSPOU as this step can be modified and in future bigger and more effective acts can be put in place to enable women to vote.

Another reason which enabled the women to get the vote was Suffragist lobbying in 1916. This great effort from the voters to persuade influential figures such as members of parliament was effective as it converted many MPs to the cause and allowed them to vote in favour of the women enfranchisement in 1918's Representation of the People Act.

In conclusion, after looking at all the factors which resulted in the enfranchisement of women in 1918, I disagree that the war work alone enabled women the vote. Most of the women that actually did the work were not rewarded. The rules which accompanied the votes such as the age limit of 30 or over were seen as accurate and correct by the government as women who were 30 were less likely to be affected by radical, socialist ideas, especially with growing fears about Bolshevism and its radical ideologies. Even after 1918, women still continued to work hard and campaign for full suffrage and equality until in 1928 when all women of all ages and social backgrounds got the vote, as equally as men. It took more than 100 years to be free and equal, but women proved their determination and finally achieved what they wanted - the vote and equality.

#### **Examiners Comments:**

*The answer understands the question well and displays quite a good awareness of the various factors which enabled women to achieve the vote in 1918. However, these are presented as a list. War work is addressed and then 'other factors' but there is limited evaluation of these factors either individually or as a whole. There is some argument, but the conclusion moves away from this into what followed rather than reinforcing the judgement. This answer just reaches Level 4 but needed a more sustained and developed analysis of the factors for higher.*

*Level 4 (17 marks)*