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General Marking Guidance

• All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.

• Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.

• Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.

• There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.

• All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate’s response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.

• Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.

• When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, the team leader must be consulted.

• Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

• Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

  i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

  ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response
The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However, candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

(i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question’s terms
(ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
(iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
(iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
(v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer’s worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level
The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate’s ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4 would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication
QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate’s answer falls. If, for example, a candidate’s history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.
# Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

**Target:** AO1a and AO1b (13%)  
(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 1-6  | Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.  
**Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**High Level 1: 5-6 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.  
The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present. |
| 2     | 7-12 | Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.  
**Low Level 2: 7-8 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.  
**Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks**  
As per descriptor  
**High Level 2: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.  
The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present. |
| 3  | 13-18 | Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.

**Low Level 3: 13-14 marks**
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks**
As per descriptor

**High Level 3: 17-18 marks**
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.

The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.

| 4  | 19-24 | Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.

**Low Level 4: 19-20 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks**
As per descriptor

**High Level 4: 23-24 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.

The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.
Candidates offer an analytical response which directly addresses the focus of the question and which demonstrates explicit understanding of the key issues contained in it. It will be broadly balanced in its treatment of these key issues. The analysis will be supported by accurate, relevant and appropriately selected which demonstrates some range and depth.

**Low Level 5: 25-26 marks**
The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks**
As per descriptor

**High Level 5: 29-30 marks**
The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5.

The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing extended writing will be in place.

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

**Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**
Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

**Unit 1 Assessment Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>AO1a and b Marks</th>
<th>Total marks for question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q (a) or (b)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (a) or (b)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marks</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Weighting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on Viking victories against the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in the 860s and 870s, and the extent to which their military skills explain their successes.

In considering the stated factor, candidates may note that an important tactic which was frequently used was the element of surprise. The shallow draught of the longships enabled the Vikings to sail up rivers and attack almost without warning. Surprise was also achieved by speed of movement. Edmund of East Anglia was forced to provide a large number of horses which allowed the Vikings to move rapidly against Northumbria and then against Mercia. Battle tactics were quite basic. There were no organised formations; instead, the Vikings relied on the shield wall, spears and arrows; the berserkers sometimes influenced the outcome of battles.

Other factors which contributed to Viking success include the sheer size of the Great Heathen Army of 865 and the Great Summer Army of 871; and the strong leadership provided by Ivarr the Boneless, Halfdan and Ubbe Ragnarsson, and Guthrum. The Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were too weak to combat the Viking threat alone, and alliances between kingdoms usually collapsed. Answers may also note the divided rule in Northumbria, and Burgred’s long-standing domestic weaknesses in Mercia.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address reasons for Viking successes along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the large size of Viking forces. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The question is focused on the extent to which Alfred’s greatest achievements as king of Wessex were accomplished after his victory at Edington in 878. Candidates are not required to consider the whole of Alfred’s reign in order to access the higher mark levels, but an attempt to examine the entire reign, including the battle of Edington, is an equally valid approach. Edington and the subsequent Treaty of Wedmore established a long peace between Wessex and the Vikings which enabled Alfred to carry out a far-reaching programme of reform. Answers may refer to the improvements in both military and naval power. Existing coastal fleets were strengthened, and the burghal system and reorganisation of the fyrd proved their worth in the 890s against Haesten and the Appledore Vikings. There were significant developments in culture and religion. Alfred re-established good relations with the Papacy, and his monastic foundations and court school encouraged the rebirth of education. The codification of law was completed. Cultural growth was fostered through translations of major works of literature and the sponsoring of leading scholars such as Asser; while the Abingdon sword and the Fuller brooch are evidence of the growth of skilled craftsmanship. The growth of the kingdom may be referred to with reference to both London and Mercia. In framing a challenge to the question, answers may point out that Alfred’s victory at Edington was vitally important. By 878 Mercia, Northumbria and East Anglia had all been overrun by the Vikings, and defeat at Edington would have extinguished the last independent Anglo-Saxon kingdom. Alfred’s victory might therefore be considered as more important than his subsequent achievements. Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address either the years after 878 or develop a wider chronology, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering some of Alfred’s reforms. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the twin invasions by Harald Hardrada and William of Normandy in late 1066, and requires a judgement on why Harold Godwinson was victorious against the former but not the latter.

Haradrada and Tostig invaded with a substantial force, and defeated the northern earls in a fierce battle at Fulford Gate. The battle exhausted Haradrada's troops, which proved a contributory factor in Harold’s later success. Godwinson’s rapid march north in just four days caught the Norwegian forces by surprise; most had left their armour on their ships, believing that there were no hostile armies near them. Harold’s leadership qualities and military experience were significant in explaining his success and the virtual destruction of the Norwegian armies.

William’s landing on the south coast forced Harold to return to London and then to Hastings. He did not wait for reinforcements, and his tired troops were forced into battle before they could recover from the march south. Answers may refer to the course of the battle of Hastings, and the reasons for William’s success. These may include the different qualities of the opposing armies, with the largely peasant army from Sussex and Kent opposed by well disciplined knights used to military service; the excellent generalship of William of Normandy, which might be compared with Harold's leadership; the importance of the feigned retreat; and Church support displayed via the papal banner.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address Godwinson's campaigns against both Hardrada and William, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. For example, Hastings is likely to be considered in more detail than Stamford Bridge. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering Godwinson's leadership qualities. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The question requires an explanation of why the English were unable to resist the Norman conquest of England in the years after 1066. It is not essential for candidates to go beyond the reign of William I (1066-87) in order to access the higher mark ranges. Answers may refer to William’s increasingly fierce suppression of revolts against him. The risings of 1067 and 1068 were put down with relative ease, and William showed considerable clemency towards the rebels. However, the northern rising of 1069-70 was ruthlessly suppressed. In the months after the rebellion the systematic harrying of the north devastated and depopulated much of northern England. The building of up to 500 motte and bailey castles during William’s reign, all at strategically important points, cemented Norman control; and these were gradually improved with the introduction of stone keeps. Resistance could not be effective unless there was strong leadership, and this was lacking after 1066, especially as most of the Anglo-Saxon leaders had come to terms with William. The risings of 1067-75 were localised and without coordination, allowing William to pick off each rebellion in turn. Candidates may also note that reforms in government and the church placed greater power in the king’s hands, making it easier for him to deal with opposition to his rule. Answers at <strong>Level 5</strong> will have a secure focus on the question, will address a number of reasons for the failures of English resistance, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At <strong>Level 4</strong> candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. <strong>Level 3</strong> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by noting the harrying of the north. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <strong>Level 2</strong> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. <strong>Level 1</strong> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the reign of Henry II, and on the extent to which the king might be considered a great reforming monarch. Candidates may refer to Henry's activities within his overseas territories, though this is not essential for accessing higher mark levels.

The conflict between Stephen and Matilda in the years 1135-54 had weakened the authority of the crown and allowed for the rise of overmighty subjects, as well as increasing the power of the Church. Henry carried out a wide range of reforms, all designed to reassert royal authority in church and state. The legal system was reformed by the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, and equity in law was furthered by the itinerant justices and the Court of the King's Bench. Royal income was stabilised and increased by reforming the Exchequer and introducing effective audits of sheriffs’ returns; the recovery of royal lands alienated by Stephen further improved Henry’s financial position. The power of the barons and sheriffs was addressed, with the wholesale replacement of the latter and the restoration of royal authority over the nobility in many areas of the country. Henry’s attempts to address the growing power of the Church were only partially successful thanks to the opposition of Becket; clerical trials and the election of bishops remained matters in dispute. The whole reform programme was supervised by the king, whose itinerant kingship tried to ensure that his policies were being carried out.

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which Henry II might be considered as a great reformer, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering Henry and Becket. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the reign of King John, and requires an explanation of why opposition to the King became so bitter during his reign.

John inherited serious financial problems from his brother, and these remained a significant feature of his reign. Opposition to the King grew when he interfered with justice in order to impose huge fines, sold offices, and made heavy financial demands on the barons. John was also despised because of his failures in France against Philip Augustus. While Richard I had adopted an aggressive policy in France, John agreed to the Treaty of Le Goulet in 1200, recognising Philip as the feudal overlord of John’s French territories. By 1204 John had lost Normandy, Anjou and Poitou, and his efforts to recover England’s position in 1206 and again in 1214 failed. There was also much opposition towards the King’s small group of advisers, and to the growing centralisation of power in the Crown, which reduced the barons’ role in government. Many were appalled by the murder of Arthur, John’s nephew and a claimant to the throne, and by quarrels with the English church and the papacy which led to the Interdict of 1208 and John’s own excommunication the following year. As John’s difficulties intensified opposition led to the baronial revolt of 1214-15 and the King’s reluctant acceptance of the Magna Carta. Conflict with the barons led to the First Barons’ War of 1215-16, which had reached a stalemate by the time of John’s death in October 1216.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider reasons for the bitter and growing opposition to John during his reign, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering John’s relations with the barons. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the spread of the Black Death in the years 1348-50, and the extent to which existing social and economic conditions were responsible for that development.

In considering the stated factor, answers may refer to trade links joining English coastal towns to European and other destinations, noting the role of trading vessels in bringing the plague to these towns, especially Bristol and London. The growth of towns and cities in the early 14th century contributed to the rapid spread of the disease; overcrowding, insanitary conditions and filth in the street all played their part. Villages and isolated communities, especially in the north, were not immune from the plague; records show that whole communities were rapidly wiped out.

Other factors linked to the rapid spread of the Black Death include the limited medical knowledge of the time. Contagious diseases were not understood, nor the existence of germs. Thus the crude disposal of bodies was a factor, and those who handled bodies failed to protect themselves. Ignorance of the cause of the plague also led to a high death rate among priests and those who ministered to infected people. Moreover, the population was already weakened by the famine of 1315 and frequently inadequate supplies of food; and soldiers returning from the Hundred Years War were potential carriers of the disease.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address existing social and economic conditions along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering insanitary conditions in towns. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The question is focused on the spread of the Black Death in the years 1348-50, and the extent to which existing social and economic conditions were responsible for that development. In considering the stated factor, answers may refer to trade links joining English coastal towns to European and other destinations, noting the role of trading vessels in bringing the plague to these towns, especially Bristol and London. The growth of towns and cities in the early 14th century contributed to the rapid spread of the disease; overcrowding, insanitary conditions and filth in the street all played their part. Villages and isolated communities, especially in the north, were not immune from the plague; records show that whole communities were rapidly wiped out. Other factors linked to the rapid spread of the Black Death include the limited medical knowledge of the time. Contagious diseases were not understood, nor the existence of germs. Thus the crude disposal of bodies was a factor, and those who handled bodies failed to protect themselves. Ignorance of the cause of the plague also led to a high death rate among priests and those who ministered to infected people. Moreover, the population was already weakened by the famine of 1315 and frequently inadequate supplies of food; and soldiers returning from the Hundred Years War were potential carriers of the disease. Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address existing social and economic conditions along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering insanitary conditions in towns. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 and requires an explanation of why it failed.

Answers may refer to the nature of the complaints raised by the leaders of the revolt. Many of these were economic factors. Some complained of the unfair system of taxation, especially the successive poll taxes of 1379-81, while there was also opposition to attempts to freeze wages through the Ordinance of Labourers and the Statute of Labourers, and to the restoration of traditional labour dues. Attacks on the Sumptuary Laws were perhaps a lesser concern. However, other demands were more extreme and threatened to undermine the existing order in church and state. Much anger was directed at the king and his ministers for the military failures in France and the attacks on English coastal towns by the French. There were suggestions to confiscate church property, abolish titles and, urged on by John Ball and others, demands for a more equal and just society. While the king might have been able to amend complaints on taxation, other demands were too extreme to be considered.

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will consider reasons for the failure of the Peasants’ Revolt, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering Richard II’s meeting with the rebels. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The question is focused on the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 and requires an explanation of why it failed. Answers may refer to the nature of the complaints raised by the leaders of the revolt. Many of these were economic factors. Some complained of the unfair system of taxation, especially the successive poll taxes of 1379-81, while there was also opposition to attempts to freeze wages through the Ordinance of Labourers and the Statute of Labourers, and to the restoration of traditional labour dues. Attacks on the Sumptuary Laws were perhaps a lesser concern. However, other demands were more extreme and threatened to undermine the existing order in church and state. Much anger was directed at the king and his ministers for the military failures in France and the attacks on English coastal towns by the French. There were suggestions to confiscate church property, abolish titles and, urged on by John Ball and others, demands for a more equal and just society. While the king might have been able to amend complaints on taxation, other demands were too extreme to be considered. Answers at <strong>Level 5</strong> will have a secure focus on the question, will consider reasons for the failure of the Peasants’ Revolt, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At <strong>Level 4</strong> candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. <strong>Level 3</strong> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering Richard II’s meeting with the rebels. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At <strong>Level 2</strong> will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. <strong>Level 1</strong> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A5  Anglo-French Rivalry: Henry V and Henry VI, 1413-53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The question is focused on the Burgundian-Armagnac feud within the French ruling class, and the extent to which this conflict contributed to Henry V’s successes in France in the years 1415-20.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In considering the stated factor answers may note that the feud was so bitter that France had degenerated into civil war in 1414. Henry’s landing in 1415 and the siege of Harfleur were both unopposed because both parties to the feud were concerned with possible conflict over Paris. Despite Henry’s successes at Harfleur and Agincourt, the two French factions could not agree on a common strategy against the English. The murder of John the Fearless in 1419 at the hands of the Dauphin’s supporters led Philip the Good to form an alliance with Henry against the French rulers. It was this disarray within the French ruling class which contributed to Henry’s successes in 1415, and to the reconquest of Normandy by 1419.

Other factors which contributed to Henry's successes in France include the king’s military, diplomatic and political skills, shown before and during the invasion; the value of the English archers in pitched battles; and firm domestic support for the king and the war. The insanity of Charles VI further added to the chaos within the French government.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address the importance of Armagnac-Burgundian rivalry along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering some of Henry's victories, such as those gained at Harfleur and Agincourt. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The question is focused on the gradual collapse of English rule in France from 1429, and the extent to which the revival of the French monarchy contributed to the virtual end of English rule by 1453.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In considering the stated factor answers may note that the French monarchy was weak and with little effective leadership in the years from 1415 until the late 1420s. The intervention of Joan of Arc might be seen as a turning point for the French monarchy. The siege of Orleans was lifted, and the coronation of Charles VII at Reims in 1429 strengthened the position of the French king. Henry VI’s coronation as Henry II of France in 1430 did nothing to enhance the English position. Charles VII was given a substantial boost when Philip the Good abandoned the English alliance at Arras in 1435. For the next twenty years the French experienced growing success, notably at Formigny in 1450 and Castillon in 1453, the latter ending English rule with the sole exception of Calais.

Other factors which contributed to the gradual collapse of English power include the death of Bedford in 1435; growing divisions in England over the nature and conduct of the war; and the personal and political inadequacies of Henry VI. Changing French tactics in battle, notably the effective use of cannon, also contributed to English defeats.

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will address the importance of the revival of the French monarchy along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the role of Joan of Arc. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the outbreak of civil conflict in 1455, and the extent to which the financial weakness of the crown caused that conflict.

In considering the stated factor answers may note that the crown’s financial difficulties had been increasing for many years, and were largely linked to the steady collapse of English power in France since the early 1430s. War was ruinously expensive, and the loss of territories, particularly Normandy, only added to Henry VI’s financial problems. Answers may link the virtual bankruptcy of the Crown to problems of government, especially the obvious inability of Henry VI to rule effectively, and to the ambitions of his wife, Margaret of Anjou.

Other relevant factors which contributed to the outbreak of civil conflict include the growing ambitions of Richard of York, for himself and his family; local rivalries among the nobility; and the spread of private armies. The defeat at Castillon in 1453 and the almost complete loss of Lancastrian territories in France only deepened the crisis within England, and divisions between the supporters of Lancaster and York led to the battle of St. Albans in May 1455.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address the significance of the financial weakness of the Crown along with some other relevant factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the personal failings of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on the second reign of Edward IV and the reign of Richard III, and the extent to which both kings restored royal authority in England.

In considering the extent to which royal authority was restored answers may note that, after his restoration and the deaths of Henry VI and his son, Edward worked to extend his authority throughout the country. He relied heavily on the authority of both Gloucester and Hastings in the provinces, and on loyal sheriffs and JPs. The success of this policy might be assumed by the absence of any serious risings against the king. Edward also improved the state of royal finances by bypassing the Exchequer in favour of the Chamber, and his representatives increased the income from crown lands. The humiliation of Scotland, and the establishment of peace with France in 1475 by the Treaty of Picquigny, all pointed to enhanced stability and growing royal prestige. Although Richard III’s reign ended in defeat at Bosworth, there are signs that royal authority was maintained during his short reign. Buckingham’s rebellion was easily defeated, and there was little serious opposition to the usurpation of 1483. Most of the nobility pledged their support to Richard, though a few malcontents fled to Henry Tudor’s court in France.

In framing a challenge to the question, candidates may suggest that royal authority was not completely restored in these years. The Lancastrian challenge to the Yorkists remained in existence thanks to Henry Tudor. This challenge became more serious during Richard’s reign as disaffected Yorkists fled from England after 1483. While Richard maintained his position with reasonable success for most of his reign, his presumed murder of the Yorkist princes weakened both his support and his authority.

Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will address the extent to which royal authority was restored, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering some of the policies of Edward IV. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
The question is focused on Henry VII’s reign in the years 1485-99, and on the extent to which the king established himself securely on the throne in these years.

In considering the king’s security, answers may note that Henry had a stronger claim to the throne through victory in battle than through his descent from Edward III via Margaret Beaufort. The king took firm steps in his first years to secure his position. Both Parliament and the Papacy confirmed his title, which was further strengthened by his marriage to Elizabeth of York and the birth of their children. The Simnel rising was a serious threat to the king’s position; the defeat of the Yorkists at Stoke in 1487 did not prevent Margaret of Burgundy and others from supporting Warbeck; his threat ended only with his execution in 1499. Henry worked to establish his power over the nobility through bonds, recognisances and attainders; and there were no genuinely over-mighty subjects to threaten his rule. The king established domestic and financial stability; the former through suppressing the Northern and Cornish rebellions; the latter by using the Chamber as the main channel for receiving royal funds. The execution of Warwick and Warbeck eliminated the last serious pretenders to the throne. Candidates may refer to some aspects of foreign policy. Such material should be integrated into a balanced response.

In framing a challenge to the question candidates may note that Henry faced four rebellions during the stated period; and that the king could never rely entirely on the support and obedience of the nobility.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address the extent to which Henry secured his position as king, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering the Simnel and Warbeck rebellions. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The question is focused on the extent to which Henry VII's foreign policy was intended to strengthen the king's security within England.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In considering the stated factor, answers may note the ways in which Henry VII used foreign affairs to strengthen his position as king of England. Although the king had secure papal recognition of his title, there were significant threats from foreign powers which could destabilise his position. The Treaty of Medina del Campo was one of Henry’s greatest foreign policy successes. He was recognised by one of the great powers of Europe, and the alliance was cemented by Arthur’s proposed marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Although Anglo-Spanish relations deteriorated later in Henry’s reign, the alliance was one of the cornerstones of Henry’s policy for many years. The threat posed by France, especially after the annexation of Brittany, led to the invasion of 1492, but the Treaty of Etaples established a lasting peace between the two countries. Burgundy’s support for pretenders threatened the king’s position, but relations improved with the death of Margaret of Burgundy and the Magnus Intercursus. Scotland threatened Henry for many years, but Ayton and the Treaty of Perpetual Peace, along with Margaret’s marriage to James IV, ended the threat from the northern kingdom.

In framing a challenge to the question asked, answers may note that Henry also intended to establish his monarchy as a power of some note within Europe, as shown, perhaps, by his intervention on behalf of Brittany against France, and by the treaty with Spain. Several agreements with European powers were also designed to improve England’s export trade, notably Medina del Campo and the Magnus Intercursus.

Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will address the significance of domestic security in Henry’s conduct of foreign policy along with some other relevant points, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth before reaching an overall judgement. At Level 4 candidates will address the question well and will consider some relevant points, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure. Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps by considering some treaties concluded during the reign. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.