



# **Examiners' Report**

## **June 2023**

**GCE History 9HI0 2A**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### 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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2023

Publications Code 9HI0\_2A\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 2A, which deals with Option 2A.1: Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman Kingdom, c1053–1106 and Option 2A.2: England and the Angevin Empire in the reign of Henry II, 1154–89.

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question that is based on two linked sources. 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 and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. A minority of scripts continue to pose some problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting; examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is disappointing to note that a number of candidates talked in general terms rather than explicitly addressing the focus of the enquiry. This question requires candidates to use the sources ‘together’. It was pleasing to see that candidates had taken on board the advice offered last summer and relatively few are now attempting to use the sources ‘together’ throughout the entirety of the answer, which last year led to some problems for candidates. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to continue to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up little or no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. These were not always weaker candidates; some answers were seen that were strong in bullet points 1 and 3 of the mark scheme but had very little that could be credited for bullet point 2. The impact of this was to hold down the marks that were achievable in this question.

In section B, it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or alternatively shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. More responses were seen this summer that had a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were a sophisticated analysis of that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a debate, where appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question. It was disappointing this summer to note that a number of candidates seemed to have only a weak grasp on the timing of key events.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## Question 1

Option 2A.1 has a larger entry than option 2A.2 and hence the majority of candidates answered this question. Most candidates were able to interrogate the sources and in addressing this question very many used the sources in combination. Most answers identified the key information from both sources and identified the direct action taken by William Rufus in Kent and the failure of Robert Curthose to arrive as key features in William Rufus's ability to defeat the rebellion. Some answers did not consider risings in other parts of the country, describing the whole rebellion as being in Kent despite the evidence of the first paragraph in source 1. Although almost all candidates identified the significance of William Rufus addressing the forest laws in his promises to the English people a significant number then lost focus on the question in a lengthy explanation of the forest laws. Candidates should use their contextual knowledge to interrogate the claims made in the sources in this case relation to the reasons why William Rufus was able to defeat the rebellion rather than to add information. While some candidates had little to offer beyond what was in the source material, many had a good knowledge of the role of Odo and the reasons why William Rufus was able to deal with him as well as the support that William Rufus enjoyed from a minority of the major barons and the majority of the lesser barons and were able to use their knowledge effectively in their evaluation. It is important that candidates make good use of the information in the captions to assist them in evaluating the sources. There were some good responses that were able to use Henry of Huntingdon's Anglo-Norman origins to comment on the likelihood of him maintaining a relatively impartial stance, and who considered the value of Florence's Chronicle particularly in the light of his access to a now lost version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. However, some answers found little to distinguish the authors of the two sources apart from noting the dates of writing and a number interpreted the statement that Henry of Huntingdon had 'good political contacts' as a criticism of his or his source's integrity. Too many candidates fall back on the claim that the sources were written by 'priests who would never lie'. This is a stereotypical comment that does not achieve outside of level 1 in bullet point 3 and should be avoided. In general, the key feature of the answers to this question was the ability of the candidates to use the sources in combination which explains why it was relatively well answered.

The provenance of source one details that this narrative is a retrospective creation, with supporting articles or writings of the time to create 'The History of the English People'. The upbringing of this author is useful to historians as by being brought up in a household of the bishops of Lincoln', ~~these~~ religious people were the only teachers and writers of in the ~~Anglo-saxon~~ Anglo-norman period, so Henry of Huntingdon will provide a well informed construction. However the usefulness does weaken due to it being written after the rebellion, whereas an eyewitness or current writing historian gave her narrative.

The usefulness of content for historians, in source one, is abundant as it highlights the many factors that allowed William II to defeat the rebellion of 1088. Firstly, a huge advantage to William was 'Bishop Wulfstan' calling 'on the most high God' which 'reinforced rebel @ pie'. This religious intervention and factor, enabled William to strategise his best defensive plan due to the many sparse rebellions occurring in his newly gained Kingdom. This source highlights to historians the methods <sup>William</sup> ~~Henry~~ took that were not always combative. Another section of usefulness was Williams plan to stop the rebellion by dealing with the grievance not liked

in the Norman reign is a main one being foreign lands. By the rebels easily halting to these agreements (despite William's lack to keep this promise in years to come) William not only ceased the rebellion for half of the rebels, but ~~also~~ also understood how to ~~prevent~~ pacify them in future if they were to rebel again.

In contrast to this view, the historians can also utilise Source 1 to see how other factors had led to the victory over the rebellions in 1088. As consequence to the succession crisis between William and his older brother <sup>Robert</sup> ~~Richard~~, the Duke of Normandy was 'keen to come to England to take possession of the <sup>royal</sup> Kingdom' as succession argues it is rightfully his. Had his involvement been possible, the rebellion against William, which easily could have concluded with the unification of England and Normandy under one leader, with Robert on the throne. Luckily the tactical intelligence to have spies who sank the Normandy and of those trapped at Pevensey, ultimately granting William's success. Without this factor historians could argue the assistance from the Norman Kingdom could have changed the tide. Therefore it is clear historians can utilise ~~the~~ Source 1 as an insight into the factors that could have been a causation for a loss to William but due to his leading led to his victory.

Source 2 provenance details to historians that the author, Florence, was a contemporary writing this account ~~is~~ aligned with when this occurred. Florence provides a useful and trustworthy account that ~~is~~ reliable due to its completion in real time. This prevents historians being given information added retrospectively, or incorrect to inflate the victor or loser. It does however lead to possible bias as it was commissioned by Bishop Wulfstan, a supporter of William 2<sup>nd</sup>, thus bias is prevalent due to creating a positive narration of William's abilities.

Source 2 provides context to historians into the military tactics of the King. With in detail sections of each siege and defences put in place, with source one it's clear William could utilize military and political tactics to his advantage. The sources detail of tactical shift to besiege Tonbridge first and then Rochester is useful to historians to understand the varying measures and battles it took for William to defeat the rebellions of 1088. This is important when understanding the rebels he was up against; especially Odo. Bishop Odo's siding with Richard was his tactical downfall, but to have a rebellion where he was against you was threatening to William, especially as he was a formidable man reinstated with all his powers on William's deathbed. Thus it highlights the extent of how much William had to do to overcome him. Evident in 'the place was strongly fortified, but he made

constant effort to destroy it?

However due to this source, and mainly one also, the lack of ~~the rebellions~~ the rebels narrative suggests Williams victory was purely down to a flawless leadership, which wouldn't be realistic; the other side must have made mistakes. Thus Florence's narrative glorifies the work and highlights Williams abilities to secure victory but doesn't establish the mistakes on the other side that weakened their offence.

In conclusion, it is clear that historians can utilise both source one and two to gain understanding as to why William was victorious against the rebellions in 1088. ~~With~~ With both provenances in mind, historians will find more usefulness in an account closer to the time, source 2, but can also utilise the collated 'written sources and oral accounts' in ~~the~~ Henry's extract to gain ~~a~~ a deeper range of factors. As largely source 2 details the military aspects of Williams tactics that led to victory, whereas source 1 details political and religious elements that quickly destroyed the rebellions. Although both lack a balanced argument for any of Williams mistakes or the mistakes of the rebels, this can be due to the need glorify the king and the church, both of which these authors would be expected to do. Despite

this both sources provide a detailed analysis  
historians can utilise to understand the varying reasons  
as to why William was victorious in 1088 against the  
rebels.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 entry response. It analyses the sources effectively and is particularly strong in deploying contextual knowledge to examine the relationship between William Rufus and his brother Robert Curthose in the light of the inferences that could be made from both sources about Robert's right to the kingdom of England and the consequent tactic that William Rufus employed to repel an invasion. It makes good use of the position of the authors to suggest that, writing at the time, Florence would be more likely to emphasise William Rufus's skills as a general whilst Henry of Huntingdon's more detached position enabled him to consider a wider range of factors.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Justify comments on the reliability of the sources by drawing upon their content.

## Question 2

In contrast to Question 1, almost all the answers to this question focused on the purpose of the source and the position of the writer. This was, in general a well answered question with a significant number of level 5 answers that were able to discuss the sources individually in context and in combination demonstrating a clear understanding of 'the ancient customs of the crown' and Henry II's attempts to strengthen them and the implications of Gregorian reforms of the church. There were some impressive answers, especially those that were able to use 'degrees of certainty' in their evaluation, judging that while the tone and content of Foliot's source clearly demonstrated that he was a supporter of Henry II and an opponent of Becket, Gervase was only 'probably' ordained by Becket and could be considered as slightly less partial in his account. Such answers also noted the time of writing of both sources in the context of the canonisation of Becket and the cult of his sainthood as opposed to the letter written by the Bishop of London earlier during the dispute. However, a surprising number of candidates did not note this difference focusing only on Gervase's 'closeness' to Becket and Foliot's desire to be Archbishop of Canterbury. The best evaluations, achieving in level 4 and level 5, commented not only on the provenance of the source but justified comments on the weight of the evidence by applying them to the evidence in the source.

Weaker answers focused so much on the differing positions of Gervase and Gilbert Foliot that they failed to fully consider the content of the sources. Some answers contained strongly held assertions on who was responsible for the dispute between Becket and the King and turned their answer into a critique of Henry II, ignoring the focus of the question.

Some answers clearly lacked sufficient own knowledge to contextualise the content of the sources, having very limited knowledge of Clarendon and none of the Council of Westminster or court of Northampton.

When considering both of the sources in conjunction, historians can conclude that there are two ~~clearly~~ clear reasons as to why to examine the role of Becket. Firstly, there is the argument that it was not, in fact, Becket's fault, but it was Henry's desperate attempt to establish crown control over the church. Furthermore, Becket's stubborn personality must also be considered. Overall, it is source 3 which provides the more valuable evidence because it is the writing of a monk who observed events. He was only "probably" ordained by Becket, whereas source 4 comes from Foliot who resented Becket for his position and therefore undermines its credibility.

Firstly, both sources suggest that it was Becket's personality which made the conflict between church and state continue. Source 3 states that when Becket became Archbishop he adopted "the character of a monk" and was "eager for justice". This is accurate because Becket was only ordained the day before he

became Archbishop. After this, he rejected his role as Chancellor and became an extremely pious man. This means that it was Becket's intense professional attitude which angered Henry and began our conflict. This source focuses on the short-term reasons as to why there was conflict between Becket and Henry which is valuable because it allows historians to understand how quickly their alliance turned to conflict. Henry believed that installing Becket would give him ~~not~~ complete control over the Church and Chancery. Source 4 also considers the role that Becket's personality played in their conflict. However, source 4 provides evidence from later in their feud and discusses Becket's actions when he was in exile. Source 4 states Becket "revolt(ed) against the king" and that his "terrible letters" caused the conflict to continue. This is accurate because when Becket flew into exile he sent several letters to Henry threatening to exile his family and place England under an interdict. When he returned, when there were negotiations for Becket's return, he continually asked Henry for the kiss of peace,

rather than discussing the Constitutions of Clarendon. This means that Becket's personality and his desperation for church authority to rule over that of the crown was the sole reason for their dispute. However, Foliot "intended this letter to be made public" suggesting that he wanted to highlight the actions of Becket. These intentions made the source less valuable because they focus on only Becket's actions whilst in exile, rather than any role that Henry had in the conflict. Therefore, Becket's personal role in the dispute was clearly one which started the conflict and caused it to continue. However, source 4 does not acknowledge that Becket's actions stem from a desire to protect the church and Henry was threatening to take away his powers.

Both sources also consider the impact that Henry's desire to extend crown control over the church had in their dispute. Source 3 states that Henry wanted to "easily rule over the church in England" and re-establish the "ancient customs of the crown". This suggests that it was ~~an~~ a long-term goal.

of Henry that caused the disputes. Upon Henry's return to England in 1160, he had realized that members of the clergy (5% of the population) had committed hundreds of murders which had gone virtually unpunished. Church courts had a relaxed attitude to moral offences and Henry's proposal of the Constitutions of Clarendon aimed to rectify these issues. This means that, underpinning the conflict was Henry's desire to re-establish crown authority. He wanted the monarch to have the supreme legal and political power. This source was compiled by documents from a monastery which means that its intention is to inform. This means that the source is valuable when considering Henry's role because it includes information from chroniclers. Source 4 also considers that Henry's desire for power had an effect on the dispute. It states that the conflict stems from "certain ancient customs" which Henry believed were already "established." This means that it was not unreasonable for Henry to make the suggestions at Clarendon because they had been suggested by monarchs before him. Clarendon ensured that members of the clergy could be tried in a church court.

but must be sentenced by a ~~church~~<sup>Crown</sup> court. These plans come under Henry's clear aims to standardise procedures across England and re-establish himself as the ultimate authority after the Anarchy. However, this source is less valuable because it uses language such as "terrible" and "no vice" to insult Becket's actions. There is a clear aim to protect the reputation of Henry over the archbishop which means that the interpretation of events that it suggests will favour the King. Therefore, while both sources do consider the impact that Henry's role had on the conflict, source 3 has more weight because its purpose is to inform rather than source 4, which praises Henry and insults Becket.

Therefore, both sources consider the impact that Becket's personality had on the conflict between the Church and state and whether to blame Henry's actions for the disputes. Source 3 is more valuable because it neutrally explains the reasons why the conflict began. Whereas, Foliot writes with anger towards Becket because he did not

receive the title ~~of~~ Archbishop. This means that he justifies Henry's actions and states that Becket's actions whilst in exile were not for a particular reason. This blatantly ignores Becket's professional attitude and his desire to maintain Church power over the Crown.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 5 response. It has strong evaluation and does distinguish between degrees of certainty. It has a range of reasoned inferences which are supported by the source and illuminated by secure contextual knowledge. It also shows various ways in which the sources can be used. It weighs up the sources effectively. The one flaw is that it loses a little focus when considering Henry's role.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Remember to use your contextual knowledge to interrogate the claims being made by the writer and to consider how valid they are.

### Question 3

This question, the most popular for option 2A. 1, produced a number of excellent answers which examined the reasons for the Anglo-Saxon victory at Stamford Bridge and compared the importance of the given cause – Harold’s effective military leadership – with a range of other reasons, including the Viking’s lack of armour, the heavy losses suffered at Gate Fulford and the size of the Viking army as a consequence of the decision to keep the bulk of the forces with the ships at Riccall. A significant number of candidates were able to explain and justify their contention of Harold’s military skills both in the preparation for, journey to and conduct of the battle together with an explanation of why the Vikings were unprepared and why Hardrada had decided to split his forces. Some answers which achieved level 5 paid particular attention to the way the Fyrd worked and how Harold was able to accumulate forces en route to Stamford Bridge together with explaining the advantages accrued and exploited by the surprise attack. However, this question also prompted some of the least informed answers in section B. There were a significant number of poorer answers which simply reiterated that Harold had considerable military skills, travelled north at speed over varying estimates of mileage and duration of time and that the Vikings were unprepared. These factors being repeated without further explanation and relevant supporting knowledge for several pages constituted level 2 and level 3 answers.

Some candidates demonstrated effective essay writing techniques. There was an increased tendency for long introductions. Some of these introductions were very effective when they were used to establish criteria by which the question can be judged. However, a significant number were used merely to state that the candidate intended to answer the question. Some candidates used the introduction to state their conclusion on the judgement in question which worked well if it was then supported by a sustained logical and coherent argument but was not effective when the remainder of the essay contradicted that judgement or more frequently declined to come to any judgement at all. Some of the most sophisticated analytical responses were produced to answer Question 3.

The Anglo-Saxon victory at the Stamford Bridge in 1066 has been argued to be due to Harold's overall effective military leadership that outweighed Hardrada and Tostig. Others would oppose it was the Scandinavian army's unreadiness and depletion from the Battle of Gate Fulford, which they were victors of.

Harold's decision to surprise attack the invaders gave huge advantage. This military tactic enabled the Anglo-Saxons to prepare for battle but also base in territory advantageous to their abilities. This was unlike in Gate Fulford where the marshy terrain ultimately led to slaughter by Hardrada's men, as with their elite it was a usual battleground terrain. Thus the tactics that had enabled Hardrada and Tostig to defeat Edwin and Morcar were futile subsequent to Harold's military prowess of an attack, through a quiet march north without stopping, targeted at having the Viking Danish at their weakest and the Anglo-Saxons at their strongest.

In spite of this judgement, it could be argued that irrelevant of the arrival of Harold's men and knights,

Hardrada's men were at a disadvantage. Despite victory at Gate Fulford, soldiers were killed, numbers depleted and while morale was high resources and energy ran low. Thus with Harold's arrival of his strong, many, energised soldiers, the battle of Stamford Bridge was tipped in his direction for victory. This was irrelevant of his military leadership as the men would have always been outnumbered and in unknown areas to fight in. Therefore the victory at Stamford Bridge was consequence to the Danish already having fought a previous battle and their hubs probably teetering on cockiness, did the Anglo-Saxons take victory.

In contrast the actual battle was tactical fought brilliantly by Harold Godwinson. The utilisation of the shield wall was effective against the tall close combat Vikings, who subsequent to the training of the Anglo-Saxon soldiers, did not break the shield wall until the most opportunistic moment. Thus much of the battle required in very little Anglo-Saxon death, but did unfold completely ~~when~~ when Hardrada was killed - followed shortly by Tostig. Harold's military tactics therefore propelled the victory of the Anglo-Saxons and shattered any weak resistance created by the opposing side.

However, this point comes into scrutiny when the main reason for Anglo-Saxon victory was ultimately due to the unreachiness

of ~~the~~ Hardrada's men, with most of the weapons and armour being on their ships located miles away. There lacking defence cannot be questioned however when a single Viking was able to hold off the Anglo-Saxon onslaught, famously on Stamford Bridge, before the other men arrived. It could be argued therefore that the Anglo-Saxon war (Harold's military tactics) were not an overriding reason for the victory at Stamford Bridge but more so the lack of tactical ability of Hardrada and his, especially as he showed his full abilities in Gate Fulford, when he is prepared.

~~Therefore~~, In conclusion, from the points made on both sides it could be argued that Stamford Bridge was victorious for the Anglo-Saxons either because of ~~the~~ Harold's military leadership or due to Hardrada's unreadiness. The argument that holds more weight is the unpreparedness of the Vikings and Tostig. Despite Harold's clear military intelligence paying off in regards to the surprise attack, this only propelled the Anglo-Saxons due to the Vikings being depleted from their victory at Gate Fulford. In spite of Harold's quick march to the North to fight Hardrada and his brother, had they had their full force of men, weaponry and defence, it would have been an evenly weighted battle - one of which might have been a complete slaughter like Gate Fulford and easily a victory for Hardrada. Therefore the victory for the Anglo-sa-

sons at the Battle of Stamford Bridge was ~~a~~ subsequent to the consequence of the oppositions (Harold Godwinson) defence being weakened by a prior battle, not the effective military leadership of Harold Godwinson.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 5 response. It has sustained analysis and does consider the relative significance of factors. It establishes valid criteria for judgement. It has a good range and depth of factors which it explores and reaches a well-supported judgement in the conclusion.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

This question focuses on causation. To address it effectively, you need to establish a range of alternative causes and examine their significance in relation to the given cause in order to develop a judgement on whether the given cause is in fact the main cause.

## Question 4

This was the least popular question in option 2A.1. There were some effective answers that concluded that the East Anglian rebellion was a significant threat which William had to deal with personally and others arguing of the potential dangers inherent in the revolt of the earls and considering the consequences in Normandy also. In this question in particular the identification of criteria for judging the seriousness of the threat was indicative of the best answers.

However, this was the least well answered question in all of section B. For two reasons, the first being the limited knowledge of the revolt of the Earls and, to a lesser degree, the East Anglian rebellion. The second reason was that a significant number of candidates ignored the focus of the question declared briefly that neither rebellion was effective and spent the rest of the answer describing the effect of the northern rebellion or the Exeter rising failing entirely to come to a judgement on the question asked. It is very important that candidates do deal with the question they are set and do not provide pre-prepared answers to a different question that they have practised as part of their course.

4. The East Anglian Rebellion of 1070-71 involved a deposed English Thegn and son of deceased earl Aelfgar of Mercia. This revolt posed a threat due to the easily defensible location of the Isle of Ely, as well as the popularity of Morcar, whom the North of England had accepted as King. However, historians also argue the 1075 revolt of the earls also posed a significant threat to William due to the fact three of his trusted men were plotting against him. With that being said, both revolts ~~ended~~ ultimately failed and therefore did not have an effect on William I's authority in England. The response of William was more harsh on the East Anglian rebels over the earls, whom he left ~~to~~ his archbishop Lanfranc to deal with. Consequently, I believe the East Anglian rebellion was more of a threat than the revolt of the earls but, due to their failure, neither were significant. Therefore, I partially ~~dis~~agree

that the East Anglian Rebellion was a significant threat to William's authority in England but the revolt of the earls did little to threaten his authority, by using the criteria of William's response.

Firstly, historians argue the East Anglian Rebellion of 1070-71 was a significant threat. This is because deposed English Thegn, Hereward the Wake, established a base for rebellion at the Isle of Ely. The Danes, on their way back to Scandinavia from the northern rebellion of 1069, joined Hereward in the revolt against the Normans. The Danes had been a longtime threat to England and this was no different under William, particularly due to Swein's ~~relat~~ claim to the throne through his cousin Harthacnut. On top of this, Morcar joined the rebellion having been in sanctuary under King Malcolm III in Scotland. Morcar sought revenge for the death of his brother Edwin. On top of this, Morcar held great influence in the North as ~~he~~ he was widely accepted as an alternative to William. As such, the

leaders of the East Anglian Rebellion exacerbated the threat of the revolt. Despite this, the revolt ended with the ~~capture~~ disappearance of Hereward the Wake, the life imprisonment of Moncar, and the bribing of the Danes. The failure of the rebellion undermines its significance as a threat to William which is why I disagree with the first part of the statement that the East Anglian Rebellion of 1070-71 was a significant threat.

The leadership of the 1075 revolt of the earls also increases its significance as a threat, as argued by various historians. Ralph de Gael, Roger of Breteuil and Waltheof joined together to overthrow King William and divide the nation among themselves. Both Ralph and Roger were trusted ~~men~~ Norman men and Waltheof was the last remaining Saxon earl. The threat here is the fact they were influential earls who could use the resources of their earldoms to fight William I. On top of this, their ~~was~~ cooperation meant

William was threatened by three earls. However, the significance of the threat is diminished as Ralph was forced to flee, Roger was imprisoned and Waltheof was executed. Once again, the threat was insignificant due to its failure. Thus, I agree with the second part of the statement that the revolt of the earls did little to threaten his authority.

In regards to the East Anglian Rebellion it is important to address my criteria, when making a judgement on its significance as a threat. William I became personally involved in the East Anglian Rebellion but did not in the 1075 revolt of the earls. Hence, I partially agree with the statement, when drawing a comparison between the two revolts.

The East Anglian Rebellion was responded by William through his travelling to the Isle of Ely with a large fleet. The Isle was surrounded by marshland which was tricky to navigate as a

foreigner. As such, William allegedly bribed a local monk for information, blockaded the island and built a causeway through the marsh. The rebellion took a few weeks to crush ~~the~~ and the Danes were paid off. William's active response to the rebellion proves its significance. With that being said, the revolt was a failure which is why I disagree with the first part of the statement that the East Anglian rebellion was a significant threat.

Alternatively, ~~the revolt of~~ William was not personally involved in the revolt of the earls, rather entrusting archbishop Lanfranc to deal with the unrest. Waltheof got cold feet and confessed the plot to Lanfranc. In turn, the archbishop employed Ralph de Gael and Roger of Breteuil through written correspondence to abandon the plan. ~~The~~ Ralph and Roger pressed on yet no local support was rallied and the Danes failed to show up. ~~Thus~~ Ergo, the failure of the revolt as well as the lack of

response of William I leads me to agree with the second part of the statement that the revolt of the earls did little to threaten William's authority.

In conclusion, due to William's response to each rebellion, it is apparent that the East Anglian Rebellion was ~~not~~ a more significant threat to William I, than the revolt of the earls. However, both rebellions were unsuccessful and William I emerged unscathed. As a result, I disagree that the East Anglian Rebellion was a significant threat to William. In contrast, I agree that the revolt of the earls did little to threaten his authority. In this way, I only partially agree with the statement that the East Anglian Rebellion of 1070-71 was a significant threat to William's authority in England, but the revolt of the earls in 1075 did little to threaten his authority.



This is a mid level 5 response that achieves level 5 in bullet points 2 and 4 and L4 in bullet point 3. Its overall structure is organised, and it has a coherent and logical argument. Its knowledge is sufficient to address the question. However, its analysis is only partly substantiated with the candidate often not fully explaining the implications of the rebellions for William's authority which limits its explanation of the extent to which his authority was threatened.



This question focuses on significance. To address it effectively, you need to establish criteria for judgement.

## Question 5

This question was more popular than Question 6 and attracted the most consistent answers. Most candidates were able to achieve at least a high level 3 or low level 4 answer and there were a number of excellent responses. Most candidates were able to carry out an effective comparison of the purposes of *Cartae Baronum* and the Inquest of the Sheriffs and considered Henry's intentions to extend royal power, the need to secure finances and ensure that he received the full feudal dues from both the great estates and the localities. It should however be pointed out that the knowledge of *Cartae Baronum* exceeded that of the Inquest of Sheriffs, which was disappointing given that the Inquest of Sheriffs had formed part of the Section A source question the previous year. For example, only the best answers seemed to be aware that the Inquest of Sheriffs extended beyond the sheriffs to include bailiffs, bishops, abbots, barons etc. Whilst the best answers were able to set criteria and distinguish between purposes and outcomes, a number of candidates seemed unable to identify criteria for judging whether the purposes were similar or different.

~~the~~ When Henry Plantagenet ~~lost~~ was promised the crown at Westminster in 1153 the country he was about to rule laid in <sup>of England</sup> ruins. The exchequer did not work, the barons all held their own little kingdoms and the sheriffs were out of control. Henry knew reforms were the only way to bring this country back to its former glory. There were two major ~~reforms~~ <sup>inquests to reform</sup> during Henry the II reign with the Cartae Baronum in 1166 and the Inquest of the Sheriffs in 1170. Historians have since disagreed ~~about~~ about how similar the purpose of the inquests has been, which even though they concern different types of people might still be very similar.

The differences between the purpose of the Cartae Baronum in 1166 and the Inquest of the Sheriffs in 1170 laid majorly ~~in~~ regarding the area of influence of either. The Cartae Baronum was an inquest into the lands held by the tenants - in - chief, ~~to find out~~ as Henry was not convinced that they were paying enough soldiers or scutage for their soldiers as they should. He was indeed correct in believing this as many records were highly outdated and he would receive a lot more scutage following it. Even though when he tried to raise the scutage in 1168 and again in 1172 it failed due to it being highly unpopular. The area of influence

of the Inquest of Sheriffs in 1170 bid, as in the case, with the sheriffs in England. This inquest was a follow up to the Arrize of Clarendon of 1166, where sheriffs were given remarkable amounts of power, such as being allowed to enter anyone's land in pursuit of a villain. The inquest of 1170 questioned every sheriff of the payments they have made or received ~~in~~ during their time as a sheriff and as a record of every judgement they have made. ~~But~~ This was only due as there were complaints of sheriffs abusing their power and being bribed even though in 1158, 21 and 1162 half of the sheriffs were replaced, because they did not do their job correctly. Following the inquest ~~the~~ half of the sheriffs were again replaced, but this time with trusted royal officials, that have previously worked in London or locally. In summary the major difference in purpose concerned the people involved the inquests first in 1166 the knights-in-chief and in 1170 the sheriffs.

The similarities in purpose between the two inquests lay in that they both affected financial sectors of the royal administration, with the Curia Baronum Henry was looking to extract the revenue more efficiently and with the inquest of the sheriffs, Henry looked to maximise the profits of them and their influence over knights. This leads to another similarity as affected knights and knights-in-chief of England, just as in 1166 their land holdings were assessed and in 1170 their influence over the local sheriffs was minimised as now royal officials from London were installed that only followed the king's commands. Both were also part of a larger agenda of Henry not only to take power away from the

sewers but to centralise it in ~~the~~ Westminster, ~~the~~ ~~Carke~~ ~~Baronum~~ ~~both~~ both were huge surveys that took months to make and their purpose aligned with Henry's goals at the time and the major goal of centralisation. In 1166 Henry was in the process decreasing the number of Ealdormen and strengthening his in France, whilst in 1170, even though the year of Thomas Becket's death, Henry was rooting for stability in England as he had his eyes in on inheritance for his son John, Ireland. In summary the similarities in the purpose laid in financial demand and control, the size and Henry's overall aim of centralisation.

In conclusion, even though the Carke Baronum of <sup>1166</sup> ~~1166~~ and the Carke Baronum of 1170 affected different groups in Henry's royal domain, either knights-in-chief or sheriffs, the similarities outweigh this. This is because both of the massive surveys fed into his goal of control and centralisation, which affected the whole country instead of just the people of the two groups and it will even be adopted by future kings as it was so efficient. Therefore it can be said that in their purpose the Carke Baronum and the Inquest of Sheriffs were remarkably similar.



This is a mid level 5 entry response. It has explicit focus on the question and sufficient support. It establishes a line of reasoning which is valid. It considers differences in personnel, similarity in focus on finances and the common purpose in centralisation of power. It has a clear and supported judgement.



This question focuses on similarity and difference. In similarity and difference questions, a brief plan helps you to focus on the second order concept and to organise your response so that you compare features for both similarity and difference.

## Question 6

This question prompted a number of effective answers. However, there was a wide disparity between answers with many thoughtful analytical answers at high level 4 and level 5 but a significant number of answers which failed to address the question as the candidates did not know what the words 'itinerant kingship' meant. A few guessed that it had some relevance to the size of the Empire over which Henry II ruled and wrote of his travels and how his proximity to uprisings was helpful, but a significant number simply ignored the word itinerant and wrote about 'Kingship' rewriting the question to ask how effective Henry II as King was. In terms of the question knowledge of *curia regis* and how it travelled with Henry absorbing local courts for the duration was very limited as was understanding of the role of the Justiciars and the establishment of the court of the Kings Bench, the use of itinerant justices and general eyres. Financial reforms on the other hand seemed better understood and some candidates were also able to draw upon their knowledge of the legal reforms and the surveys, *Cartae Baronum* and the Inquest of the Sheriffs to contrast with itinerant kingship in terms of establishing what played the most significant role in maintaining royal power.

Itinerant kingship is simply the process of ruling a kingdom through constant movement around the land. This was a key feature in the kingship of Henry II whose lands spread across the English channel and an unbroken down to Aquitaine. However whilst it was a ~~key~~ key feature, Henry's military strength was also incredibly important, allowing him to stave off threats to his kingdom. More significant than either of these however is Henry's governance, ~~his use of diploma~~ which includes his use of diplomacy as well as his reforms (both legal and financial), for these provided the backbone of Henry's ~~power~~ <sup>control</sup>, and allowed him to maintain royal power in England and the Angevin Empire in the years 1154-89.

The significance of Henry's governance can be seen in several ways. First, his diplomatic skill was unquestionable, and increased his power and control in key areas, most notably Welsh support from Rhys ap Gruffudd during the Great Rebellion after making him the Justiciar of South Wales. More significant though ~~are~~ were his reforms. The cartae baronum in 1166 (and the second one in Normandy in 1172) gave Henry a much ~~better~~ understanding of his kingdom and allowed him to

claim the correct quantities he was owed under feudal dues, both increasing his Royal Revenue and manpower. Other reforms such as the Assize of Arms and Assize of Clarendon focused on reducing baronial power, redistributing it to himself and the Sheriffs, and his constant supervision of sheriffs (replaced 21 in 1155) ending in 1170 with the Inquest of Sheriffs (replacing 22 of 29) demonstrates the extent to which this had an impact. Likewise his financial reforms cemented and advanced the role of the exchequer, and gave him greater control over finances (e.g. reducing 47 mints left after the Anarchy to just 10). The reason this was so significant is that the power he generated and money he reclaimed is what allowed him to venture on military expeditions and ~~to~~ stockpile castles. Without the revenue, Henry was left at the Mercy of his enemies, but thanks to his reforms and good governance he was able to maintain significant levels of royal power in all areas of his kingdom.

A claim often made is that Henry's military prowess and leadership played a more significant role in maintaining royal power. Carpenter describes Henry as having a "sang-froid and demonic energy", enabling him to be victorious in the Great Rebellion, as well as defeating various other groups. Whilst Henry's military success was a significant aspect of his rule, and ~~gave~~<sup>allowed</sup> him a large presence when it came to negotiating, it is difficult to

argue this as playing the most significant role. This is because military expeditions were time consuming and costly, hence his preference to settle matters diplomatically where possible (e.g. the Treaty of Montmirail in 1169). Regardless, the only reason he was able to launch these campaigns (e.g. during the winter of 1173-74) is because he had the financial reserves to do so. This means that the whole argument for military ~~process~~ actually hinges on his successful reforms, without which he would have been unable to ~~raise armies~~ establish law or raise armies (e.g. the Brabantine mercenaries won the battle of D'el without him even present because he could afford these methods).

Finally, the argument that itinerant kingship played the greatest role is deceptive. Itineracy was a factor, or even a predicate of having such a large empire, it necessitated him travelling in order to quell uprisings and create positive relationships with the barons. ~~There~~ But more was needed than simple itineracy. The Great Rebellion in 1173-74 demonstrated that Henry required more than journeying to maintain power, and the fact that Richard de Lucy put down the barons and William I of Scotland without Henry demonstrated that once the systems were in place, itineracy was more of a psychological than anything else. Moreover, on a similar level to his military ventures, itineracy for a king was incredibly expensive. Travel, transport and

communication was all much more difficult and required immense funding (Henry had 20 ships on standby with full crews at all time, just in case he had to send a message). Therefore this also rests on Henry's financial reforms and governance, that enabled him to be this itinerant king that travelled all over his empire.

In conclusion, though itinerant kingship was undoubtedly necessary for Henry II's maintenance of royal power, it was not the most significant factor involved. Whilst it may have been the end goal, it rested on the laurels of Henry's governance + financial reforms, such that these must ~~be the~~ have played the most significant role as it facilitated each of the other aspects of Henry's rule. Likewise, though military prowess and strength was significant for the purposes of expansion and assertion of control, this too was heavily reliant on Henry's ability to raise armies, ~~to~~ supply his forces with supplies and have a smoothly running government in place to establish law and order in the meantime. This then leaves Henry II's reforms and diplomacy as the foundation for all his royal power in the years 1154-89. From ~~the~~ 1155 where he spent the whole year in England restoring order, to his final moments in <sup>Chinon,</sup> 1189 where his armies fought on without him, his changes to governance were monumental and the consistency with which he made changes shows that he too found it of utmost significance, ~~making it~~ demonstrating

that it was these that played the most significant role in maintaining royal power in England and the Angevin Empire in the years 1156-89.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a top level 5 response. It has a secure range and sufficient knowledge to support the argument. It considers a range of factors including itinerant kingship, diplomacy, military prowess and financial control. It is particularly strong on analysing significance and reaching judgements.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

This is a significance question. The most effective answers consider the given factor in some depth and compare it to alternatives to reach a judgement on whether it is the most significant factor.

## Paper Summary

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

### Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully and ensure that they directly address the focus of the enquiry in their comments
- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources
- Candidates should read the caption carefully so that they can make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain much, if any, credit
- Candidates should ensure that their responses address the demands of all elements of the mark scheme.

### Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors
- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both sides of an argument where the question requires this.

## **Grade boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

