

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (8HI0) Paper 2A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 49846

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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>

Paper Introduction

It was pleasing to see responses of a decent standard from candidates attempting the new AS Paper 2A which covers the options Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053-1106 (2A.1) and England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154-1189 (2A.2). The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/ continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

Generally speaking, candidates found Section A more challenging mainly because some of them were not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. The detailed knowledge base required in Section A to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources was also often absent. Having said this, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B. The ability range was diverse, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Section B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was a lack of knowledge. It is important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important.

8H10_2A_Q01

Question Introduction

a) On Question 1(a), stronger responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the source material on the succession of Harold Godwinson to the earldom of Wessex and showed analysis by selecting some key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. the succession was dependent on the will of the king). Knowledge of the historical context concerning Harold's succession to Wessex was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm some matters of detail (e.g. Harold's qualities as a leader, the influence of the Godwin family in politics). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria to show the value of the source. Similarly, explanation of utility referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. the court connections of the writer). Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on the Harold's succession to the earldom of Wessex, some even confusing it with his later succession to the throne and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making basic/undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source material to expand or confirm some points but these were not developed very far. Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often drifted into 'lack of value' arguments. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. the author was a not biased because he was a monk).

(b) On Question 1(b) stronger responses demonstrated understanding of the source material on the basis of Duke William's claim to the English throne and showed analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. the negative portrayal of Harold). Knowledge of the historical context concerning the basis of Duke William's claim to the English throne was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge some matters of detail (e.g. the contradictory accounts in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. the pro-Norman stance of William of Jumièges and its retrospective date). Judgements were also based on valid criteria such as the use of duress in Harold's oath to William. Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on the basis of Duke William's claim to the English throne and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question (e.g. the disloyalty of Harold). Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source to expand or confirm points but this was not developed very far (e.g. support for William from the church). Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often lacked focus on either the 'has weight' or 'doesn't have weight' aspect of the question. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. the author, William of Jumièges, would tell the truth because he was a monk).

Examiner Feedback on Example

Part a

This is a Level 3 response. The source material has been clearly comprehended. There are valid and supported inferences relating to the favour of the king and Harold's skills. Supporting knowledge on the power of the Godwin family is used to develop the inferences. There is an attempt to establish valid criteria for judging value through comments on 'little known facts' although this could have been developed in more depth.

Part b

This is a level 4 response. The evidence is integrated with some reasoned inference and the candidate has distinguished between fact and opinion. Knowledge has been used to illuminate what is in the source as well as to discuss its limitations. The candidate has attempted to establish some valid criteria for evaluation, although the final judgement is a little weaker.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

(This is for part (a))

Source 1 is valuable for reasons why Harold succeeded his father in becoming earl of Wessex in 1033 because it was a source written, though not at the time, fairly recently after the events took place. Source 1 also suggests the reason Harold became earl of Wessex was through "the king's favour". This can be supported by Edwin's appointment of Tostig as Earl of Northumbria in 1054 showing that it was the king's authority which led to Harold's gain of the earldom. Furthermore, Harold would be favourable to the king due to his enormous influence as shown in 1051 when he returned from exile to storm the south east and force Edward to reappoint his father to the Earldom of Wessex. This shows how Harold would be a powerful ally for Edward ^{and} so a reason for Harold's appointment as Earl of Wessex.



(This is for part (a)) However, the source may be doubted due to it being written for a grieving Edith, so ~~the source~~ ^{the source} would be aiming to present her brother positively as well as being written by a monk in flanders so may not represent the ^{true} English view. Despite this though, the source is still invaluable as it shows otherwise little known information as well as showing the outside view of Harold. This is seen by "champion of the law threatened disturbers of the peace..." Though this the source also suggests a reason for Harold's succession as the earl of Wessex was due to his skill and authority in dealing with rebels and law-breakers. This is a viable reason as Harold was ^{greatly} ~~highly~~ ^{skilled} ~~influential~~ as shown in the Welsh wars when he implemented both negotiation and eventually violence to defeat the rebellious king Gruffydd of Wales. ^{The} ~~this~~ source may provide an outsider's view to however it is still valuable as the view matches examples of ^{Harold's} ~~Richard's~~ law enforcing skills and so presents a viable reason for his succession as Earl of Wessex.



(This is for part (a))

Overall, source 1 is valuable as it presents otherwise little known facts, as well as being supported by known events, it provides an outsider's view so whilst not totally reliable for how the English felt about Harold's succession, it is invaluable non the less.



(This is for part (b))

I give source 2 some weight into the ~~enquiry~~^{enquiry} for Duke William's claim ~~to~~ the throne. The source suggests ~~Ed~~ Edward the confessor had "nominate[d] him as heir to the kingdom." For this reason, the source could be reliable as it is possible the helpless king would want to ensure a successor as well as have that successor to be from Normandy, where the Anglo-Saxon king spent a long time in exile and so would have strong ties there making what the source suggest to be highly possible. However, there is no English recording of this which is strange due to it being a very significant event if it's true. There ~~is~~^{was} also no formal recognition of this in court and so source 2 can not be fully reliable.

Furthermore, source 2 also suggests "Edward afterward ~~sent~~ sent Harold to Duke William... [to] swear fealty to him concerning Edward's crown..." This gives source 2 some weighting as in 1064, Harold did travel to France, however it may have been to help his 2 nephews from



(This is for part (b)) imprisonment. The source may also be given weight as it is a popular belief Harold did swear an oath to William but there are no details of this, however Harold's supposed perjury was used in William's appeal to the pope before his invading of Hastings suggesting William felt Harold did swear an oath to help him take the throne. However, source 2 cannot be fully reliable as it was written in 1070-1 and so does not have immediacy that would make it more reliable as the source may be propaganda to justify William's reasons for taking the English throne rather than the Conquerors stand alone intervention in 1066.

Finally, the source cannot be fully weighted as it doesn't present a balanced account of events as shown through "Harold immediately seized...". From this, Source 2 portrays Harold negatively and gives no justification for the Anglo-Saxon's claim ~~to~~ ^{to the} throne due to Source 2 being written by a Norman monk who would favour the Norman king as well as being dedicated to William.



(This is for part (b)) and so would want to present Williams
and ex-rival this way. However Harold
did have some ~~of~~ ^{of} legitimacy to his claim
as he had served as a shadow king to
Edward, protecting England from Vikings and
was the most powerful ~~at~~ ^{earl} so may
have felt the throne was his as well
as claiming Edward appointing him as
his successor on his death bed.

Despite this, the source is still reliable
as there is evidence to back up its
claims, ~~so~~ ^{however} cannot be fully weighted
due to it being a bias account of
event as its purpose was to "legitimise
the duke's succession". Some weight
can also be given, as, though it lacks
immediacy, it wasn't written long
after the events and so may have
consulted people who knew the king
personally at this time, thus adding
to its value.



Examiner Comment

- (a) On Question 2(a), stronger responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the source material on Henry II's reactions to Becket's decision to go into exile and showed analysis by selecting some key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. the succession was dependent on the will of the king). Knowledge of the historical context concerning Henry II's reactions to Becket's decision to go into exile was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm some matters of detail (e.g. Henry's outrage at Becket's behaviour and the treatment of Becket's family and supporters). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria to show the value of the source. Similarly, explanation of utility referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source (e.g. command from Henry outlines the actions that he clearly intended to be taken to deal with Becket). Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on Henry II's reactions to Becket's decision to go into exile and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making basic/undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source material to expand or confirm some points but these were not developed very far. Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source material by weaker candidates was limited and often drifted into 'lack of value' arguments. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. Henry might not have meant what he said).
- (b) On Question 2(b) stronger responses demonstrated understanding of the source material on Henry II's extension of control in Ireland in 1172 and showed analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences (e.g. Henry II instilled fear in the Irish kings). Knowledge of the historical context concerning Henry II's extension of control in Ireland in 1172 was also confidently deployed in higher scoring answers to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge some matters of detail (e.g. the limited control Henry II exercised over Strongbow). In addition, evaluation of the source material was related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight referred relevantly to the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author (e.g. the pro-Henry stance of the author and his position in Henry's court). Judgements were also based on valid criteria such as the submission of the majority of Irish kings to Henry II. Weaker responses demonstrated limited understanding of the source material on Henry II's extension of control in Ireland in 1172 and attempted some analysis by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question (e.g. the power of Henry II). Lower scoring answers also tended to add limited contextual knowledge to information taken from the source to expand or confirm points but this was not developed very far (e.g. the role of Rory O'Connor). Although related to the specified enquiry, evaluation of the source

material by weaker candidates was limited and often lacked focus on either the 'has weight' or 'doesn't have weight' aspect of the question. Furthermore, although the concept of utility was often addressed by noting some aspects of source provenance, it was frequently based on questionable assumptions (e.g. the author, Gerald of Wales is a good source because he was an eyewitness to events).

Examiner Feedback on Example

Part a

This is a level 2 response. The candidate has understood the source material and made some undeveloped inferences. Knowledge has been added to the answer and the provenance has been noted. The comments on the limitations of the source are not focused on the question and cannot be rewarded here.

Part b

This is a level 3 response. There is understanding of the source material and some undeveloped inference. There is a range of contextual knowledge added to the response but on occasions the candidate does focus on addressing the enquiry rather than considering the weight of the source for the enquiry. The candidate does move towards judgement although it is developed.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

(This is for part (a)) Source 3 is a command issued by Henry II on his ~~in~~ hearing the news that Thomas Becket had fled into exile. It clearly shows Henry's anger and frustration at Becket's actions ~~however there are limitations to the source as it does not mention whether this was~~ therefore it is definitely valuable to an historian for an enquiry into Henry II's reactions to Becket's decision to go to exile in 1164. However there are limitations to this source as ~~it does~~ this is Henry's political reaction; ~~not his~~ it does not indicate a personal reaction but as we can see from Henry's strict punishment we can infer that he was extremely angry.

The source explains that Henry did not want anyone appealing to the Pope, 'court of Rome' and if they did then they were to be 'arrested and put under guard'. He also wanted all Becket's 'revenues and possessions' confiscated and finally that anyone who supported Becket and their families were to be taken ~~into~~ as prisoners. It is extremely clear from his extremely high punishments that Henry was outraged at



(This is for part (a)) Becket. It had taken a long time and many meetings for Henry to finally persuade Becket to accept the King's Law as common law and the Archbishop had gone back on his word. Therefore we can assume that Henry II was angered that Becket would not accept his demands. It was issued directly by Henry II in 1164 so we can see that ^{it is a primary source which} ~~that~~ was a direct result of his reaction of Becket going to exile. However, this is a political reaction and the source does not mention the clash in personalities between the two men and the betrayal Henry felt ~~at~~ from his lack of loyalty from ~~his~~ someone who used to be such a close friend.

Therefore ~~we can~~ I believe that the source is extremely valuable to an historian because it explains how serious Henry's punishment of Becket and his correspondents were. It is also reliable as it was Henry's own commands



(This is for part (b)) Source 4 written by Gerald of Wales in 1189 outlines how Henry II (1154-1189) was able to extend his authority in ~~England~~ Ireland in 1172 using fear and force.* However there are limitations to this source because it does not mention Rory of Connacht who he was unable to bring under his control. It also doesn't give any credit to 'Strongbow' who may have been a bad vassal did manage to capture a foothold in Ireland.

The source explains how Henry was quick to punish those who did not follow his commands. Fitz-Stephen was 'loudly rebuked' by the King of England as he "was the 'first to invade Ireland without the royal license. Henry II wanted the personal control over ~~Ireland and~~ the land and the people and would not accept any other man attempting to do the same. ~~The~~ ~~known~~ ~~reason~~ ~~he~~ ~~went~~ ~~over~~ ~~to~~ ~~Ireland~~ ~~in~~ ~~1172~~ ~~was~~ ~~a~~ ~~result~~ ~~of~~ ~~"Strongbow's~~ As Gerald of Wales continues he explains that because of Henry II's 'harsh dealing of Fitz-Stephen this resulted in other lords submitting to his power. Dermotus, King of Cork 'came of his own free will' to pay homage to the King of England and acknowledged Henry as his lord. As he began to become the Lord of many men in Ireland he was able to



(This is for part (b)) gain more control of his land as he was the main point of authority.

Source 4 describes Henry II's use of hostages in keeping control of 'Dermotius'. This meant that the King was secure in his position and would not be opposed by Dermotius. Using hostages was an effective way of keeping the loyalty and support of a vassal but sometimes it did not work. For example Rhys of Deheubarth still rose up against Henry II even with 20 of his family members held hostage. The source does not tell us whether the use of hostages was extremely effective but only that Henry did use them. The source mentions another king of Ireland who paid homage to Henry II and he was, Duvenald, the king of Limerick. It is clear from this source and my own knowledge that Henry instilled fear in many people resulting them in accepting his control without protest.

However, there are limitations to this source because although Henry was able to extend his authority in Ireland in 1172 it was not to a great extent. He only held a small foothold in the South East of Ireland near Leinster. Rory of Connacht remained very much independent from Henry's control and was never too accept



(This is for part (b)) his authority. ~~It also~~ The source also does not mention Henry's acquisition of Waterford, ~~and~~ Wexford and a garrison in Dublin. The first two areas ~~are~~ were extremely important, economically and strategically. Wexford and Waterford were both ports which allowed Henry ~~easy~~ easier access to Ireland and they provided a source of revenue due to trade. Henry's authoritative manner, punishment of rebels, ~~and~~ political ability and the help of Fitzgerald (Strongbow) were all key in the king extending his control over a small area of Ireland.

However, it must be considered who wrote this source and whether this makes the information biased or perhaps unreliable reducing the amount of weight we give it to it. It was written by Gerald of Wales in 1189 making it a primary source which we can infer means that he was present during Henry's reign and could see what the King did. As he was a chronicler his purpose would perhaps just to convey a story but if we consider the fact that he worked for Henry II in his court as a royal clerk there could be imbalance. He would not have wanted to write anything negative about the King as he was a supporter and he also might have made Henry's



(This is for part (b)) Achievements seem much more impressive. This can be seen here as he does not talk about the King's failures. The imbalance is clear to see in the first sentence as Gerald calls Henry 'the valiant King' which shows the bias towards the King of England. He did travel with Henry to Ireland and so we can assume he saw first-hand how the King dealt with the situation but there is a definite imbalance as ~~he does~~ presents Henry in a completely positive light.

Therefore we can give ~~a little weight~~ ~~to~~ ~~to~~ ~~this source~~ ~~a~~ ~~relatively high~~ ~~a~~ ~~s~~ this source a relatively high amount of weighting as it shows clearly how Henry was able to use his dominance and fear to gain control in Ireland in 1172 but we must consider the imbalance which has resulted in an opposed argument towards Henry II being left out.



(This is for part (b))

*① part B, Question 2

... therefore ^{the historian} ~~we~~ can give the source a relatively high weighting

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 20 MARKS



P 4 9 8 4 6 A 0 1 1 2 0

8H10_2A_Q03

Examiner Comment

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted the extent to which the Norman's harsh response to the rebellions in England in 1067-75 is explained by the involvement of the Vikings. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (causation) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the stated factor (Viking involvement in the rebellions in the north and East Anglia and their late arrival in 1075) and a range of other factors (e.g. the involvement of the former earls Edwin and Morcar and Edgar atheling, the treasonous acts of the Anglo-Saxon population; the ease with which William was able to bribe the Vikings to leave) was demonstrated. Judgements were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the extent the involvement of the Viking in the rebellions invited a harsh response from the Normans. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation and were essentially a rebellions and the Norman response. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the harrying of the north). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Feedback on Example

This is a level 3 response. There is some analysis and an attempt to explain the links between the relevant features and the question but the answer does tend to lapse into description. The knowledge used is relevant and does have some focus on the concepts. Occasionally the response is confused and explanations are unclear.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5
Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

After William the Conqueror claimed England after defeating Harold in 1066, England chose to respond by rebelling to their new Norman King. The first of these rebellions came when William left for Normandy in 1067. A small rebellion broke out in Kent, due to the lack of support for Bishop Odo. However rebellions became more frequent in Exeter, due to the presence of taxation and Harold Godwinson's mother. The Viking had little prominence in the stimulation of these rebellions, however their presence in England could have inspired Godwinson supporters to rebel. The most devastating rebellion came in 1068 in the Haryng of the North. After Edgar the Atheling lost his position as an Earl, he made allies with the Danish attacking Northern England. William I's response was to send troops who caused famine, mass murder and loss of crops in the North. This was stimulated by the bitterness of the Earls and supporters who opposed Norman rule. The revolt of the Earls came in 1075, where three English Earls opposed William's English rule. They



also gained Danish support, however it did not prove effective and the result was that lived for various matters of betrayal and weak opposition. * The harsh response of the Normans to the rebellions in England between 1067-1075 was explained more so by the changes William had created in England rather than the ineffective involvement of the Vikings and Danes.

The first rebellion to oppose William's rule came in 1067, after William felt confident enough to leave England in the hands of Bishop Odo. Bishop Odo was not greatly liked in England so soon and so a small revolt broke out in Kent. This revolt was ~~was~~ ineffective due to the lack of leadership after Godwinson's death and the weak, demoralised forces after 1066. Another revolt was stimulated in Exeter due to the increase in taxes and the presence of Godwinson's mother. This tells us that the main result of the hardness from these battles was the bitterness of the Godwin clan who had great influence in England but were excited after William's win in 1066. William came back to fight the oppositions from the Godwin's (as he knew were a force to be reckoned with)



and due to William's military skill, he defeated and created a truce with the rebels showing William's diplomacy and military skill. After his victory, William's harsh response was emphasised by his parading through Devon and Cornwall as a psychological and physical symbol of his power and brutality. The harsh response to this ~~rebellion~~ ^{rebellion} was caused by William's knowledge of the power of Godwin's clan who he saw as a threat and immediately wanted to ward off.

The most harsh response came from William starting in 1068, at the Harrying of the North. Edgar ~~the~~ the Atheling ~~was~~ allied with the Danes in the Northern Yorkshire region, where they attacked in a rebellion. They attacked due to Edgar's bitterness over the legal system which William reinforced, depriving the earls of England as he had seen from Harold Godwinson they could threaten his rule. William's response was to send mass troops to the North which resulted in extreme brutality. Famine, mass murder and loss of crops came in the Harrying killing thousands of people. Orderic Vitalis



stated, using archival reports, that the population of the north took centuries to regain a normal population which highlights the severity of William's response. This brutality must have shown that William saw threat from the Earls or the involvement of the Danes to his country, so he had thousands of innocents killed and the North completely destroyed. The Viking prominence/threat in this rebellion against William played some part in William's brutal response, however the threat of the Earls perhaps was greater as he had experience with knowledge of Harold's Godwinson's dominance over Edward the Confessor.

The revolt of the Earls came in 1075. This revolt was led by three English Earls: Ralph, Robert and Waltheof. These, like Edgar the Atheling, revolted due to William's changes and their deposition/lack of power. However, the revolt was a failure as Waltheof felt he was betraying the king and therefore the church so he told Bishop Odo of the revolt. Bishop Odo then ~~then~~ dealt with the threats from Ralph and Robert by isolating their forces. Robert gained Danish reinforcements to help the rebellion, however



these reinforcements were ineffective and lacked significance. William dealt with the rebellion by beheading Waltheof, then imprisoning and stripping land from Ralph and Robert. William's quick and hostile response was down to his English and religious influence, as he gained the honesty of Waltheof and had previous knowledge of the Ealders' threats. This response was harsh due to the fact he wanted to establish his power and brutality rather than getting rid of a minor Viking involvement.

To conclude, I believe the harshness of the Norman's response to the English rebellions were not due to the involvement of Vikings, to an extent. The main reason was because William wanted to take the opportunity to establish his power and prominence in England by intimidating the land with brutality and aggressive responses. William also saw Harold Godwinson's dominance over Edward the Confessor, and so he tried to challenge Ealders as much as possible so he could keep his throne as an effective and the most influential leader. The Viking involvement was prominent in the rebellions and William did see them as a



threat, however they were a minor issue and their insignificant role leads them to not be a main factor in William's reasons for harsh and hostile responses to the rebellions in England.

* William's influence is also highlighted when there is evidence for English armies supporting him in this rebellion, showing the Norman influence in England and his power over the country.



Examiner Comment

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted the reasons for William I's problems in controlling his French territories and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (the actions of hostile neighbours) and a range of other factors (e.g. the role of Robert Curthose, disobedient vassals, distractions in England). Judgements made about the relative importance of hostile neighbours were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for the end of the Terror. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the events in Normandy in the years 1067-87. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. limited comments on the French king's support for William's enemies). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Feedback on Example

This is a high L3 response. It contains analysis supported by mostly accurate knowledge and has some focus on the conceptual demands. The comment on p4 linking Philip I with Robert Curthose has hints of L4 reasoning. The general trend of the argument is clear although in places there is a lack of coherence.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5
Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

To a certain extent it can be argued the reason for William I in controlling his French territories was due to the actions of hostile neighbours such as King Phillip I of France, however other factors contributed such as the formation of new allies and the betrayal of Williams son. In 1067, after the battle of Hastings William was starting to put in place his authority in England, however increasing threats were made clear in 1067 at the county Maine. The most ^{important} reasons ~~was~~ as to why William could not keep control of his French rebellions was due to actions of hostile neighbours.

In 1067, while William was busy occupying England, Geoffrey's ~~own~~ power was increasing in Maine, he managed to keep rebellions low Williams wife who was left to rule Normandy did not have the power to help in the county of Maine therefore ~~was~~ once William was happy ~~when~~ England was secure, he ~~was~~ grabbed both English and Norman



knights in order to help recapture Maine. William was able to do this by conducting stronghold, placing garrisons and brutally destroying and burning the Land. This was a success for William but it wasn't about to last with the hostile actions of his neighbours. The defeat at Dol was a humiliating turning point for William. King Philip of France's power was increasing, he married Bertha in order to form allies against William and even offered Edga ^{a castle} ~~in positions~~. William took this as a threat and immediately deposed Edga from his court. King Philip's tactical actions were the steps towards William's defeat. ~~Ralph was forced to flee~~ Ralph fled to Brittany and established himself in a castle at Dol. King Philip ~~was~~ ~~was~~ while William made the journey down to Dol and arrived King Philip surprisingly attacked him leading his army forces and himself to retreat. Therefore without King Philip's cunning tactics William may have been able to keep control of his territories however due to this defeat he experienced great humiliation. It was clear William was starting to get great threat ~~from~~ towards



his territories.

Furthermore the betrayal of his son Robert curthose, only made restoring William I's territories more unachievable. Throughout Robert's life, William had always thought of him as lazy, often humiliating him in church or council meetings. This could be one of the reasons Robert decided to rebel however Robert became very power greedy and things turned to a crisis point where Robert and his brothers got into a brawl, shortly after he began to lay siege before fleeing into exile with his supporters. This created a generational divide between ~~William~~ Fathers who had fought together in war and invade England together and their rebellious sons. William, wanting to put a stop to this ~~had~~ took immediate action, however due to the fact William's wife had given his son money ~~rather~~ only increased his power and made it harder ~~for~~ for William to take victory. A turning point occurred when Robert wounded his father. This shows yet again another defeat ~~on~~ ~~and~~ again humiliating William and only decreasing his reputation. Therefore the



betrayal of his son ~~mean~~ made it difficult for William to control his territories, however King Phillip I took advantage of this betrayal and helped support Robert, therefore without the actions from Williams hostile neighbours, William may of not been defeated.

In 1085, William was on his deathbed, he had recently spent Christmas in Gloucester and had lost his wife. William had enemies surrounding him in England. With Malcolm on the Scottish border. and ~~Edward~~ However his enemies always had a habit of making alliances. Firstly the alliance between King Phillip I and Edgar, by offering him a castle showed crue betrayal on Edgars part and caused great threat to William and by King Phillip supporting Richard, it meant it was even harder for William to achieve victory. In 1087, the increasing power of Edgar and Malcolm alerted William, as a true fighter he was he rushed to lay siege however before he arrived he was flung off his horse. William was now weak and dying William had yet again been defeated on his death bed he



gave Normandy to Robert, his son and gave England to God in hope that God would give. Make sure it was in the hands of William Rufus. Therefore Alliances against William made it very difficult for him to control his territories and kingdoms, however if it was not for the alliances against him William would of been able to keep control of his territories.

To Conclude It is accurate to say that William's problems in controlling his French territories in 1067 to 1087 was due to the actions of hostile neighbours. However other factors hindered his control, such as the betrayal from his son, Robert Curthose and the forming of alliances between his enemies, yet without the ~~betrayal~~ actions from hostile neighbours William may of never been defeated.



Examiner Comment

On Question 5, stronger responses targeted the extent to which the Anglo-Norman kingdom in 1106 was different from the Anglo-Saxon kingdom before the Conquest. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (similarity/difference) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. kingship; money and trade, organisation of society, the church, castle building and the militarisation of the state). Judgements made about the extent of similarities and difference between the Anglo-Norman and Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the extent to which the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman kingdoms differed. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on similarity and difference or were essentially a description of features of the Anglo-Norman kingdom during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited comments feudalism of the money system). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Feedback to Example

This is a level 3 response. There is an identification and description of the features introduced into England by the Normans. There is some attempt at explanation but a drift into change rather than focus on difference and similarity. There is also an attempt to establish criteria for judgement but the overall judgement is missing.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

After William the Conqueror took England after Edward the Confessor's death, ~~largely~~ the majority of English life stayed largely the same, ~~but~~ ^{but William introduced many changes.} Examples of continuity include, methods of ~~farming~~ farming and agriculture, church ~~systems~~ systems and the basis of trade. England continued to be a large exporter of wool and ~~tin~~ tin, and trade links after the conquest, if anything, grew and developed with Europe. Taxes remained and the coinage system was relatively untouched, as William saw the profit value and knew the Anglo-Saxon system was highly sophisticated, unlike anything in Europe. Celebrations and culture stayed largely ~~to~~ intact, where Norman settlers and foreigners simply adapted to traditions. This may have been due ~~to~~ to William's argument that he was the rightful ^{claimant} ~~claimant~~, and wasn't going to change ^{anything} ~~anything~~ drastically.

In contrast, William did make ^a adjustments after conquering. For example, the introduction



of the forest laws. He dedicated large areas of forest ^{souly} to royal hunting, no one not of royal blood could hunt or build in these areas and examples include, Sherwood forest. This was devastating for many peasants as their livelihood was highly reliant on hunting. This demonstrated change as it sent a ~~clear~~ clear message ~~everywhere~~ that England was now under Norman control.

Additionally, another large change was the building of Norman castles. These were built to crush ~~rebellions~~ ^{rebellions} and sent a visual, as well as psychological, message that ~~the people were~~ ^{the people were} under Norman control. The design and architecture was unlike anything seen before in England and changed the landscape forever. ~~Castles later on~~ Castles were ~~largely~~ widely built over England because many towns were destroyed for their construction. However, later on they became hubs of trade and communications as many natives accepted invasion.

Another, large change William I made was the introduction of feudalism into the



Anglo-Saxon ~~king~~ social system. This was the idea that the king owned all the land and let it to his 'tenants-in-chief' who payed homage to William by swearing oaths of loyalty and military service. This resulted in uprisings from many Ears, who at first thought their power and influence would ~~continue~~ ^{continue}, but didn't. This ~~then~~ ^{then} resulted in further ~~change~~ ^{change} when William replaced the vast ~~majority~~ ^{majority} of ~~the~~ Anglo-Saxon Ears with allied ~~Norman~~ ^{Norman} nobles.

- Church
- ~~Church~~ reforms - wanted king to appoint church leaders - arguments with Pope ensued.
- Royal household stayed largely the same, ~~but~~ writs still written by clerks and still moved around the country to demonstrate power and influence.



8H10_2A_Q06

Examiner Comment

On Question 6, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the extension of Angevin territories in France in 1154-72 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (Henry II's skills in diplomacy) and a range of other factors (e.g. use of force in Brittany; military campaigns in Toulouse; weakness of the French king). Judgements made about the relative importance of Henry II's skills in diplomacy were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for Henry II's extension of Angevin territories. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the years 1154-72. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. limited comments on agreements with Louis VII). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Feedback on Example

This is a level 3 response. There is identification of relevant causes supported by mostly accurate own knowledge. The passage on diplomacy is well developed. Here is a little drift into Henry II's reforms although the candidate does attempt to make them relevant to Henry's use of military force to extend his territory.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5
Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

It is fairly accurate to say that the extension of ~~roy~~ Angevin territories in France between the years of 1154²-72 were achieved by Henry's skill in diplomacy, however the other measures he used, such as financial and political also had an impact on the territory that he was able to gain.

It is true that Henry II had great skills militarily as he had strong forces and he was able to eliminate any threats that occurred during this time period. Whenever he used his army to gather territories to expand his Angevin Empire, he was successful due to his strong military prowess and his leadership skills. Therefore, it is partially accurate to say that Henry was able to extend his territories by using his diplomatic skills.

However, it may also be argued that the political reforms that he made allowed him to expand his control. In England, he introduced *Cartae Baronum*, which was ~~a~~ essentially a survey about how ~~af~~ many knights belonged to a certain area of land so that he could charge *scutage*. Similarly, Henry decided to introduce ~~implem~~ent a *cartae baronum* in France, which was a way that he was able to assert his authority over any barons in France that did not approve of him taking over. Furthermore, some of the political alliances that he made benefitted him. ~~f~~ One example is the marriage the Henry had with Eleanor of Aquitaine. She had recently ~~ann~~ annulled the marriage that she had to Louis VII.



who was the King of France and this marriage meant that his family earned control of Aquitaine, which was a stable state and was relatively independent. This meant that it was a good alliance to marry Eleanor of Aquitaine as he gained a large area of France. In addition to this alliance, there was the marriage agreement of Henry and Eleanor's son ~~to~~ (Henry the Younger) to the daughter of the King of France (Margaret). It was agreed between the Angevins and Louis's family that the Vexin (an area in France) would be given as part of Margaret's dowry. This increased the power that Henry had because the Vexin would now give a link between some of the territories - eg Normandy, which had been slightly separated before. Another political strategy that Henry ~~used~~ used was the fact that although he had given ~~to~~ some of his territories to his sons, they still lacked the necessary control to ^{govern} ~~govern~~ them independently. Geoffrey was given Normandy, Young Henry was given control of England and Richard (and Eleanor) had Aquitaine. Henry chose to keep the military and financial control of these ^{states} as he was unwilling to relinquish the control that he had at the moment, ~~this~~ ^{and his} ~~sons~~ ^{sons} would not be able to run these areas however they liked because they lacked the authority to do so. Therefore, this clearly demonstrates that his political methods were beneficial when extending his Angevin territories because the mix of marriage alliances and keeping control allowed him to gain territories and keep them strong.

Another tactic that Henry used was his financial reforms that he made. It is true that they were mainly in England, however the authority went all the way to France because having England as being strong and financially stable ^{gave} ~~affected~~ Henry a source of income to expand his territories in France ~~to~~ as well ~~as~~ as allowing him to use the money on his military. One adjustment made was the ransoms that



occurred in England (both within the time period). The way in which he did this was he scrapped the old currency and introduced new silver coins that had an image of himself on the coin. The first recoinage was not hugely successful, due to there being a shortage ~~of~~ of silver, however the second one helped him greatly and was successful. He also introduced new laws that meant that anyone caught forging the currency could be hung as it was treated as a serious criminal offence. This factor links with diplomacy because stabilising the currency in England meant that he was able to spend more money on his military and thus was stronger both in England and France because of it. Therefore his financial methods/reforms made in England helped make it possible for Henry to expand his Angevin territories as he was able to stabilise situations and spend more money militarily.

Overall, it is accurate to say that the extension of Angevin territories was achieved by Henry's diplomatic skills, however his political skills and reforms and alliances had a larger impact because he was able to gain and keep control of more land, which ultimately strengthened his authority and his territories in France and his financial methods were helpful, though ~~not as~~ ^{no where} near as effective as his political methods.

~~My~~



Examiner Comment

On Question 7, stronger responses were targeted on the extent to which the nature of kingship changed during the reign of Henry II. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. the growing political, economic and legal powers of the king, the development of bureaucratic government, the power of the barons and the nature of itinerant kingship). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity in the nature of kingship were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the extent to which the nature of kingship changed during the reign of Henry II. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of the measures introduced by Henry II, or actions taken by him during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the *cartae baronum*). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Feedback on Example

This is a level 4 response. The key issues are explored and sufficient knowledge is used to develop the analysis. There is a focus on change and continuity throughout the answer. Valid criteria for judgement are established. The argument on p3 the nature of kingship did not change is sophisticated. The argument is coherent throughout the answer.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

Henry II became king in 1154, after the Treaty of Winchester in 1153. The previous king, King Stephen, had been weak and caused 20 years of civil war, meaning Henry needed to establish a powerful system in order to retain control. ^{it could be argued} ~~that~~ Kingship changed as ~~the~~ Henry used the feudal system to establish a ^{strong} ~~justiciar~~ and chancellor, and develop the Exchequer. However, the king remained itinerant and the ~~day~~ Curia regis remained fairly similar.

The use of the chancellor and justiciar was a major way in which kingship changed under Henry. Previously, itinerant kings struggled to keep control of their country whilst they were away, but Henry changed this. The role of justiciar was to act as regent in the King's absence, and Henry appointed 2 important justiciars at the beginning of his reign; Richard de Lucy and Robert earl of Leicester. Henry developed the role so that the Curia Regis could work effectively while he



was away, by establishing a permanent court at Westminster and the general eyre. This ensured all citizens had access to ~~just~~ justice at all times. Richard de Lucy was essential in the changing of kingship, as he was so powerful he put down a rebellion and won battles in Henry's name. Thomas Becket was one of Henry's important chancellors, as he took care of the parts of the role Henry didn't enjoy, allowing Henry to enjoy kingship in whatever ways he pleased*. Thus, kingship was able to change significantly during Henry's reign.

* He also established the system of itinerant judges, which was run by the justiciar, and allowed all citizens access to the king's court even when the king wasn't present.

However, many parts of kingship remained the same. The King remained the most important figurehead in all major battles + military ~~at~~ attacks. In 1157, 63 and 65 Henry led military ~~at~~ ~~attacks~~ expeditions into Wales, and throughout 1167 he led attacks on the lands of Louis VII. This shows how in a military sense, kingship didn't change



very much at all.

The king also remained itinerant, as Henry II only spent 37% of his reign in England. Much of his time was spent in France, leading attacks and negotiating with Louis VIII, including arranging the marriage between Young Henry and Margaret. An itinerant kingship was also important in maintaining relationships with leading barons. Before his reign, Henry travelled England making individual treaties with magnates, and in 1155 he spent an entire year establishing his reign. It is essential for a king to have a good relationship with his barons for the feudal system to work, as the king needs promises of military service and resources in order to effectively govern his kingdom. Therefore, in terms of itinerancy, kingship didn't change very much at all.

Overall, I think that during Henry's reign, the nature of kingship didn't change very much at all. However, Henry did make lots of changes to the way the country was run, including legal reforms, such as the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, and financial



reforms such as the recoinages. On one hand, it could be argued that kingship changed as Henry established a powerful system to run the country and the courts. However, the actual nature of kingship didn't change much at all, as kings remained distant, and were overall in charge of the courts and military.



8H10_2A_Q08

Examiner Comment

On Question 8, stronger responses targeted the threats to Henry II's control of the Angevin lands in the years 1180-89 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (the ambition of Philip Augustus) and a range of other factors (e.g. the size and disparate nature of the empire, the threat from Henry's sons, Henry's age and health). Judgements made about the relative importance of Philip Augustus' ambition were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the threats to Henry II's control of the Angevin lands. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the years 1180-89. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. limited comments agreements on the quarrel with Duke Richard). Some responses focused on vents out of the period such as the great Rebellion of 1173-74. Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Examiner Feedback to Example

This is a level 3 response. There is some analysis and an attempt to explain the links between the causes although the focus on 'ambition' is not well-developed. There is occasional repetition. The knowledge is accurate and relevant but does lack depth. There is an attempt to establish criteria for judgement but judgements are not always developed.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

~~* Philip → motive to remove
all H out France
* used H sons as pawns into
them going against H →
Richard Aquitaine~~

~~* Henry pushed son to hate
him → YK - Norm
R - Vexin + Aquitaine~~

Angerlin
Henry's control over land
in the years 1180-89 faced
threats from Philip's
ambition to extend his
territories but the trust
that Henry lost from his
son also impacted his
control over his Angerlin
land.

Philip's ambition to



extending territory and remove the Angevins from France was a ~~threat~~ threat Henry II faced to his control of Angevin lands.

Once the young king had died, Philip wanted the Vexin to be returned to his sister. By the Vexin being returned to Philip's sister it meant Henry would lose ^{some} control over his Angevin lands in France. This threat Henry faced via him losing the Vexin was due to Philip's ambition to retake the French land which was under Angevin control and for the control to be Philip as he was the King of France.

A threat also came from Henry's sons because they didn't trust Henry or his verbal agreement anymore.



~~At~~ At Easter Henry told Richard that he would always hold Aquitaine, but Henry never gave Richard the resources or money he need to run Aquitaine on his own. This lack of resources lead Richard to begin to rebel against his father. Showing that the threat of his sons rebelling against Henry again posed a massive threat upon Henry control of the Angevin lands.

* Geoffrey had also lost trust for his father, so he paid homage to Philip for Brittany and not Henry, this shows that the loss of trust between Geoffrey and Henry led Geoffrey to look somewhere else for support, this being Philip.



The most threatening thing Henry faced when concerning his control over his Angevin land was when Philip used Henry's sons against him almost as pawns. Philip used the lack of trust between Richard and Henry to his advantage, by saying that Henry will never give Richard full control over Aquitaine, which at Montmirail in 1169 was agreed to be Richard's rightful inheritance. This teamwork between Richard and Philip placed a massive threat over Henry's control because as their power together increased after they began to gain lands. The support from nobles increased which reduced the power Henry II had within his French lands by the time he died.



in 1189.

Overall, Philip's ambition to extend his territories was a factor which made him lose control of his ~~over~~ Angevin land but the loss of trust between Henry and his sons was a more influential factor because this loss of trust was the reason that Philip became a bigger threat as it meant that he now had the support from Henry's son and this was the main factor which weakened Henry's control over his Angevin land.



Paper Summary

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

Section A

Value of Source Question (1(a)/2(a))

- Candidates must be more prepared to make valid inferences rather than to paraphrase the source
- Candidates should be prepared to back up inferences by adding additional contextual knowledge from beyond the source
- Candidates need to move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source e.g. look at the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Candidates should avoid writing about the deficiencies of the source when assessing its value to the enquiry

Weight of Source Question (1(b)/2(b))

- Candidates should be prepared to assess the weight of the source for an enquiry by being aware that the author is writing for a specific audience. Be aware of the values and concerns of that audience.
- Candidates should try to distinguish between fact and opinion by using their contextual knowledge of the period
- In coming to a judgement about the nature/purpose of the source, candidates should take account of the weight that may be given to the author's evidence in the light of his or her stance and/or purpose
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to assess reliability by considering what has been perhaps deliberately omitted from the source

Section B

Essay questions

- Candidates must provide more factual details as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should take a few minutes to plan their answer before beginning to write
- Candidates should pick out three or four key themes and then provide an analysis of (for e.g.) the target significance mentioned in the question, setting its importance against other themes rather than providing a description of each
- Candidates would benefit from paying careful attention to key phrases in the question when analysing and use them throughout the essay to prevent deviation from the central issues and concepts
- Candidates should try to explore links between issues to make the structure flow more logically and the arguments more integrated

