

Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS2A: Conqueror and Conquest, C1060–1087



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS2A Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: history@aqa.org.uk

AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers

General Introduction by the Chief Examiner

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

Unit 1

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

GCE History HIS2A: Conqueror and Conquest, C1060–1087

Responses to June 2009 Questions

Candidate 1

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to William's treatment of those who opposed him. (12 marks)

Orderic Vitalis' ecclesiastical views on William's treatment of opposition varies in severity from the Anglo Saxon Chronicle, although both suggest aggressive reactions to opposition.

The Chronicle's contemporary account of the 1067 Welsh border rebellion implies by use of the term "ravaged their land" that harsh consequences were offered. However, use of the financial claim "taxed...heavily" suggests appropriate and politically suitable sanction. In contrast with the ecclesiastical history, where dramatic description that William made "no effort to restrain his fury" gives the impression of an unjust emotional tirade. Orderic Vitalis would appear to be correct in stating that "the whole region was stripped of sustaining life", as many years later the Domesday book merely records 'waste' for the entirety of Yorkshire.

Source A, the Anglo Saxon Chronicle, sheds more light on William's diplomatic methods. Source B makes no mention of Williams negotiation tactics, although this is due to the nature of the 1069 rebellion. It is known that when Malcolm of Scotland entered the North in 1072, William, despite raising an army negotiated with the king. The chronicle claims that William treated rebels "leniently" a point certainly not supported by Source B.

Sources A and B do agree on certain aspects of William's reaction to rebels. However Orderic Vitalis describes the harrying of the North with far more severity than the chronicle describes the rebellions. This however is partly due to the magnitude of the Northern rebellion in comparison with what source A describes.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This answer had an immediate link to the question which showed judgement and a good contrast of language used in the sources which was used to illustrate views. It displayed good contextual understanding and own knowledge was used to inform evaluation. Both differences and similarities were discussed to arrive at a judgement and good skills and written communication were shown throughout. Level 4 – 12 marks.

Candidate 2

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to William's treatment of those who opposed him. (12 marks)

The views in source B differ greatly to those in source A regarding William's treatment of those who opposed him.

Firstly, the view in source A states William's lenience towards his opposers. For example, his treatment of Exeter was surprisingly lenient, considering their previous rebellions.

Also, source A shows William could settle agreements pragmatically: he came to an agreement, for example, with the Danes, and also with previous earls, which further displays his leniency.

Source B, however, is less positive in its view of William's attitude towards opposing parties. For example, it portrays the incident with the Danes very differently, claiming William responded by destroying land and burning down homes; this was also evident in the Hanging of the North, proving William responded in this manner on more than one occasion.

The extracts ultimately provide very different descriptions of William's attitude – source A tends to be more positive, claiming William was able to pragmatically solve disputes, whereas source B is negative. However, there is further evidence to support this, such as the Hanging of the North, and also in Wales where William repressed the local people.

Overall, each view is very different – however, source B would prove more sound, as it can be backed up further with evidence of numerous incidents in which William reacted in an oppressive manner. This can also however, be seen in source A, through the taxation of those who opposed him, although source A is predominantly supportive of William.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This answer relied on the content of the source and was very descriptive, often paraphrasing rather than relating the material to the question and as a result, there was limited evaluation. No similarities were discussed which affected judgement and actual knowledge was not secure which led to confusion in relation to relevant incidents – again limiting judgement – and giving rise to assertion. Level 2 – 5 marks.

Candidate 3

- 1 (b) How far was the failure of rebellions in England, in the years 1068 to 1072, due to lack of unity? (24 marks)

William became king of England in 1066, and faced many rebellions and uprisings soon after he was crowned.

The rebellions that were to follow happened all over the country over a number of years, and for a variety of reasons. William had to face uprisings in the North 1069, in the Fens 1067, in East Anglia 1068. This meant that the Rebellions were not united, as if the Rebellions had all been at once, and in different areas of the country, William would not have been able to deal with them, as he would have either had to split his army, or deal with them one at a time. Source A shows how all the Rebellions occurred at different times and in different places, giving William time to prepare for the next rebellion, and Source C is a good example that if Edwin, Morcar and Sweyn's sons had all united and rebelled at once, William may not have been able to negotiate with Malcolm of Scotland. The disunity of the Rebellions also relates to the fact they weren't actually rebelling against William. Hereward the Wake was rebelling, due to the fact he wanted lands that had been taken off him back. In Exeter, they rebelled against high taxes set by Odo. In the Northern Rebellion, they wanted independence. This shows that the rebels only wanted certain things, not to totally overthrow William.

Another reason the rebellions might have failed, was due to the fact that outside help did not pull through. This is apparent in both sources B and C. Source B shows how the Danes did not help in the Northern Rebellion, and source C shows that William was able to negotiate peace with Malcolm of Scotland. William had stated collecting a tax called Danegeld: This tax had the sole purpose of paying of the Danes if they were to attack. It gave William relief, and meant he didn't have to worry about Danish attacks. The failure of outside help also shows as William was able to prevent Malcolm of Scotland helping in the Northern Rebellion by marching to Scotland, and forcing him to sign a treaty. The failure of this outside help meant William could focus purely on the English who rebelled, and didn't have to worry about foreign help.

Also, the rebellions may have failed due to Williams military skill, and how he dealt with the rebellions. Source A shows how he dealt with the different outbreaks and rebellions. It also shows that he was careful to use the right amount of force on the people rebelling, as he did not want to make enemies, or bring the country to ruin. Sources B and C show how he had to be firm and brutal after the Northern Rebellion to ensure it never happened again. What the sources do not show however is how William prevented further rebellions in certain areas by building castles. He built these castles in Geopolitical areas. This means he built them in places that had rebelled, or were likely to rebel, in order to prevent future problems. Source C shows he built castles at Warwick and Nottingham in order to prevent future problems.

Even though the disunity of the Rebellions was a major factor contributing to their failure, it was Williams actions to prevent further Rebellions that meant the rebellions failed from 1068 to 1071.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This answer was well organised, giving a range of reasons to show historical

interpretation and remained focused. Sources and own knowledge were effectively synthesised, with all sources used and points well supported. There was some lack of overall judgement, the conclusion being more of a summary than an answer. This limited effective argument. Level 5 – 22 marks.

Candidate 4

- 1 (b) How far was the failure of rebellions in England, in the years 1068 to 1072, due to lack of unity? (24 marks)

Lack of unity was a major factor in the reasons why the rebellions in England failed in 1068 to 1072. However they are not the only reason why the rebellions failed.

Lack of unity in the rebellions meant it was much easier for William to handle the rebellions. This can be seen in all three sources. Firstly the rebellion on the Welsh border was crushed because of lack of unity, this was because the Welsh had no set king so when Eadric the Wild did rebel it was merely just a small rebellion pillaging for gold and treasure.

The second rebellion was not crushed due to lack of unity but due to the Vikings being payed off as stated in Source A B + C. This meant that a large part of the rebellion fled back to their home lands because they had much treasure.

However (source A +C state that) the third rebellion did not have a lack of unity as many men joined forces to take the North for themselves. This rebellion consisted of Edwin, Morcar, Malcolm Canmore (King of the Scots) and some Scandinavian troops. This rebellion was crushed however because the Danes and the Scots feared the Royal army so fled.

The lack of unity was not the only feature of the failure of the rebellions. As William had created a dense system of Castles, which were easy to protect but very hard to attack, which meant the rebellions had little affect. Also many of the rebels were merely peasants, unlike the the Normans who were all fully trained knights who were better equipped.

In conclusion, although lack of unity did help the Conqueror in stopping the rebellions, it was also helped by the building of castles and the fact that the rebels were peasants who used whatever they could get their hands on as weapons, unlike the Norman Soldiers.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This answer lacked a firm grasp of overall context and sound knowledge and the issues involved. As a result, it relied source content and basic comment. Limited factual support resulted in some assertion. It did give some range of reasons and remained relevant, if limited. Only 2 sources were used. It failed to reach Level 3 due to this lack of development and the fact that it lacked defined and supported judgement. Level 2 – 11marks.

Candidate 5

- 2 (a) Explain why William introduced castles into England. (12 marks)

William introduced castles into England mainly to defend his new lands.

Before 1066 there is not many castles in England (the only ones being of Normans, who settled in England), but after the Norman Conquest there was one in nearly every major town. William used these as a way to oversee the land, to make sure that the people did not revolt but also as a way to clearly mark that the land was now his.

Other reasons for castles were not for all residence of the King like those in Normandy, but for a short stay of the king (about 2 weeks) if he needed to visit the area. The castles in Chester, Herefordshire and [as written by the candidate] were set up as Marcher lordships, to help protect the Kingdom from Welsh invasion, but also to try and put English influence into Wales.

In conclusion it is clear that William introduced Castles into England to show that he was now ruler of the land, and to stop rebellions.

Principal Examiner's Comments

Although there was a limited range of reasons in this answer, those provided showed relevant understanding and some contextual grasp. However, there were more reasons that could have been considered and those provided lacked evidential support. No overall link was clear. Level 3 – 7 marks.

Candidate 6

- 2 (b) 'William's policy towards the Church in England was mainly one of reform.' Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (24 marks)

William reformed the Church of England, over his reign, to continental standards. In the Domesday Book, 2000 churches were recorded – the power of the church expanded greatly in his reign.

It is true that William reformed the church greatly, following his promise to the Pope. He banned the offences of Simony (selling church posts), nepotism (securing positions for family and friends), pluralism (holding more than one post) and clerical marriages. William replaced Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Winchester, thus a pluralist, with Lanfranc. He created the role of Archdeacon, a station below Bishop, and this made the church more structured. More monasteries, nunneries and abbeys were built.

William was a very pious man, and thus keen to reform the church. He restored the payment of Peter's Pence to Rome, a charitable payment. He built Battle Abbey on the site of the Battle of Hastings, in order to ask for penance from God. He chose not a Norman, but an Italian, Lanfranc, to be Archbishop of Canterbury, famed for his knowledge and scholar credentials.

However there were also personal benefits for William in reforming the church. He had increased military power by placing feudal quotas on Abbeys. Overall, the church provided him with 800 knights at his disposal. He put especially heavy

burdens on areas of rebellion such as Rochester and Peterborough (it alone had to provide 60 knights). He also put men of military skill in church positions in areas of rebellion. He had economic gains too. In 1070 he demanded all the cash reserves of the monastery. In 1086, the church held a quarter of all land in England, and under the feudal system, the land technically belonged to William. Along with his 1/5 of the land, he controlled nearly half the land in England.

The primacy of Canterbury over York was established with Lanfranc. This meant that the power of the church shifted from the north to the south. This was a political advantage to William as it further lessened the power of the rebellious north.

William separated ecclesiastical matters of the law into the episcopal church. However, he also turned the church into a norman authority. During his rule, no new Anglo leaders were elected, and at his death, only one remained, Wulfstan of Worcester. William also fell into disagreement with Pope Gregory VII, by refusing England to become a papal fief (despite his promise), and not allowing papal legates into the country. These actions indicate that Williams policy to the church was not just of reform, but also for personal advantage, and without the political, economic and military gains, it is less likely that he would have reformed the church as much as he did.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The question was understood and supported by a range of evidence. It was quite well organised and attempted to put forward a range of ideas in order to discuss both sides of the argument. For this reason it achieved Level 4. However, it did lack sufficient explanation in places which affected overall judgement and made it rather descriptive in parts which limited the mark within the level. Level 4 – 19 marks.