



Examiners' Report **June 2024**

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 or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



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. 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.

June 2024

Publications Code 9HI0_2A_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 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. There continues to be an increase this year in the number of scripts that were seen that posed problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting, some of which were almost entirely indecipherable. Examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There did seem this summer to be evidence of a greater number of candidates using the language of the mark scheme in their responses. However, many of these responses were not doing what they claimed to be doing and it was felt that generally this was not a very helpful approach. There was also some evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, eg the use of gov instead of government. This is not a development that is welcomed.

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 continues to be disappointing to have to note that a number of candidates do not explicitly address the focus of the enquiry, but rather discuss issues arising from the sources in general terms. This question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and most candidates are now able to deal with this reasonably well. Approaches to how it is approached do vary, but that is perfectly acceptable, as long as it is present. Some candidates still continue to use their contextual knowledge 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, on occasion, 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. It continues to be the case that there are a number of responses that have 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 counter argument, 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 continue to 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.

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 which allowed access to level 4 and above. The question attracted a wide range of answers. There were many well-focused answers which interrogated the sources effectively and were able to address the reasons for Pope Paschal's letter to Matilda of Scotland and show how this could be used in conjunction with Eadmer's description of how a resolution was eventually achieved. The most successful answers were able to use their contextual knowledge of the issues surrounding lay investiture including the Gregorian reform movement promoted by the Papacy and supported by Anselm and the reasons the King desired to retain the practice of lay investiture together with the importance of homage in the case of clergy who were significant tenants of the crown. A number of the most successful answers were also able to interrogate Source one in the context of the pressure applied by the Pope to the Queen both through the traditional role of a queen as mitigator of the actions of a king and in recognition of Anselm's role in the permission for Edith/Matilda's marriage and his own actions in crowning her as Queen.

A significant number of candidates were impeded in being able to fully understand and interrogate the source material by a lack of knowledge of the issue of lay investitures, some asserting that the Pope was trying to force Henry I to undertake lay investitures while others were under the impression that the question related to financial contributions by the English King to the Papacy or a misconception that investiture related to the building of churches. Some candidates were able to achieve moderate answers by focusing on their understanding that there had been conflict between the Norman Kings and the Papacy over what they termed "control". However, this too frequently led to a discussion of the disputes with William Rufus rather than focusing on the situation between Henry II and Anselm. A lack of understanding of the issues between the church and the monarch 1100-1106 is a significant concern.

Most candidates were able to make relevant comments about the provenance of the sources (although too many referred to this as 'the providence'). Many considered the relative importance of a private letter from the Pope to Matilda of Scotland, with the purpose of putting pressure on her to encourage her husband to submit to papal authority, in contrast to the relatively impartial History by Eadmer. In levels 4 and 5, it is important that candidates take note of the requirement that evaluation should use criteria that are 'justified and applied'. Therefore, candidates must go beyond asserting bias or impartiality and demonstrate this with reference to evidence within the sources.

A historian could make good use of sources 1 and 2 together to investigate the nature of the conflict between Henry I and the church 1100-06 due to their differing approaches. It is clear that source 1 uses exaggerative and emotive language in order to appeal to its reader, the Queen of England, and this serves as both useful and unifying. When used with the more straightforward source 2 its emotion is counteracted with facts, however by addressing the source to Queen Matilda source 1 is perhaps too exaggerative in order to persuade Matilda and Henry to meet the demands of the papacy. Source 2 is similarly ~~but~~ ^{more} heavily favourable to Anselm as the provenance states, however its content suggests it to be more ~~reliable~~ ^{factual}, leading a historian to recognise the nature of the conflict between Henry and the church to be less heated than source 1 suggests, as both parties wanted a favourable outcome. Thus source 1 and 2 are useful together as they provide good insights into the feelings of both the papacy and Henry's court towards the conflict.

Source 1 is useful due to its provenance, which is incredibly useful in understanding the papacy's attitude towards the conflict while it was still ongoing, unlike source 2 which is perhaps written in short-term hindsight. As this letter comes directly from the Pope to Queen Matilda, its language is expectedly emotive, referring to the 'wicked deeds' of Henry and his conduct of the Investiture controversy. This emotive language, in this respect, is useful as it details the threat of excommunication and anger of the church, a key issue which hung over Henry throughout his dealings with the papacy. The nature of the conflict is telling throughout as the papal reform movement had led to growing ~~need~~ ^{desire} for a separation of church and state, however neither party wished to sacrifice too much power to meet this aim. The emotive content is also useful due to the potential of gaining 'protection within his kingdom' a promise that sustained William I's campaign 50 years prior. The wish to sweeten the loss of lay investiture, as shown in source 2, was rejected in order to reach a more just compromise that allowed Henry to maintain his power and relationship with the church without having to 'provoke the anger' of Paschal. Thus, this source when used with source 2 is useful in understanding the nature of the Investiture controversy.¹¹⁰⁰⁻¹¹⁰⁶

While its emotive language is useful to an extent, it also serves as a great limitation ~~of~~ when considering the factual evidence more clearly shown in source 2. By stating that 'he has expelled the Holy man' Parchar fails to recognise the self-imposed exile Anselm went into once tensions became too high in 1103, as well as the cordial relations maintained by both Henry and Anselm throughout this crisis (e.g. Anselm predated over Henry & Matilda's marriage in 1101). It is clear that the exaggerative tone has no regard for the true nature of the conflict, and seeks only to exploit Matilda's piety in order to force Henry into submission. This cruelty shown by the demands to 'permit Archbishop Anselm to act and preach as his position demands' is ~~is~~ ^{only} of any use when corroborated with source 2, which ~~attests~~ ^{recognises} the compromises both parties made in order to survive as pious leaders, thus demonstrating the use of the two sources together for understanding the nature of this conflict 1100-06.

Source 2, as opposed to source 1, provides a more neutral assessment of the nature of Henry and the Church's conflict and so is useful in acting as a balance for the emotive source 1. Source

2 states that 'the king declared that no one in England should ever again be invested... by the king' which ties into the assumption that Henry would have caved under the papal threats, however Anselm's compromise that the church would still accept ~~that~~ ^{churchmen} 'because he had done homage to the king'. These two statements are incredibly useful as they summarise the true nature of the ~~the~~ ^{church's} relations with England: neither party wished to condemn the other for actions out of their control, they merely wanted to work together to create the best possible working relations. Henry had kept his ability to 'appoint priests' and Anselm was able to act 'as his position demands' - thus suggesting that the conflict between Anselm and Henry was at best an intense mediation, which supports the idea that the church itself was ~~is~~ undergoing change and so needed the English king on side. This is supported by source 1's statement that the papacy was 'deeply saddened' as it faced losing an important ally in the west. Therefore source 2 is useful when used with source 1 as it helps to form a more balanced view of the nature of the conflict between Henry I and the church 1100-1106.

Finally, while few, source 2 is limited in aspects

as its provenance suggests that its purpose was perhaps to smooth over the conflict and present it as being more civilised and in Henry's favour, and so upon reading, we are not immersed in the same undisputable passion that Parchar conveys in source 1. While this may be seen as a limitation when read individually, when combined with the passion of source 1 it is clear that both sources are of great use to a historian in understanding the nature of the conflict between Henry I and the church 1100-06 only when used together and weighed against one another, as ~~the~~^{source} 1's emotion and threats of excommunication, when paired with source 2's factuality and neutral tone, ~~the~~ helps to build a clearer picture on the nature and handling of Henry's conflict with the church 1100-1106.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. In particular it demonstrates a clear grasp of the values and concerns of the 12th century society from which it originates. It has a number of developed inferences and uses contextual knowledge to interrogate the sources. Sources are evaluated but the response would benefit from a more secure judgement.



Remember to ensure that you make a secure judgement on 'how far' when weighing up the sources.

Question 2

In contrast to Question 1, the answers to this question were much more consistent with most candidates being able to interrogate the sources effectively, identifying the focus on the role of in the context of the Exchequer in Source 3 and the description of the work of Thomas Becket as Chancellor in Source 4. Most answers identified the different perspectives of the sources, identifying clearly that Source 3 focused on the chancellor in the Exchequer while Source 4 addressed the Chancellor's wider role in government. Many answers discussed the nature and provenance of the sources with a clear understanding of the objective and instructional nature of Source 3 compared to the flattering account of Becket as Chancellor in Source 4, written after his death and suggesting veneration of Becket as a martyr. The only problem with a generally well answered question was the tendency of some answers to deviate from the question into a discussion of the differences between the role of the Chancellor in contrast to that of the Justiciar.

Both sources can be used together to investigate the importance of the Chancellor in Henry II's system of government in England as they draw attention to ~~their~~ ^{the chancellor's} legal ~~rights~~ and administrative rights, within the judiciary of the government. For instance, source 1 typifies this by suggesting the Chancellor to be 'as important at the Exchequer as he is in the King's Court', which immediately underpins the level of importance, the Chancellor holds within the bounds of the legal system. This is furthered by the fact that the Chancellor 'has the custody of the royal seal' (source 1), which was a ~~per~~ legally fundamental symbol of the King's approval of writs and charters; Thomas Becket had access to this right ~~up~~ up until his resignation as Chancellor in 1162. From this it becomes undoubtedly clear to see the ~~high~~ significant level of importance the Chancellor held within Henry's government in England; access to the 'royal seal' was fundamental ~~at~~ during

Henry's legal and financial reforms, especially his authentication and production of standardised writs which proved to be prime in the standardisation of ~~the~~ England's legal system in the localities. This notion is further supported by source 2 which substantiates source 1's claims of the chancellor's important position, expressing the chancellor as being 'considered second in the realm only to the king'. From this, both sources put into perspective, especially on a feudal level, ~~how~~ the great extent of ^{importance} power the chancellor holds.

Source 2 further suggests that the chancellor 'attends all the king's councils', which underscores the chancellor's political powers too, as Becket himself was able to attend the king's private meetings, including more in the Curia Regis, without invitation. Therefore, both sources certainly converge on the notion that the chancellor's significant level of importance concerning their legal and judiciary rights in government.

The sources slightly differ in that source 1 demonstrates the chancellor's importance in Henry's

government by focusing on his role and procedures, whereas source 2 praises the successes of the chancellor with the government, and out of it. For instance, source 1 suggests that, on a working level, the Chancellor is closely tied to the role of a treasurer, suggesting that 'the Chancellor cannot dictate what is written by the Treasurer', which immediately conveys some levels of constraint within the Chancellor's role in government; it merely harmonises with other government roles as opposed to holding complete power. Source 1 continues to express convey the role of the chancellor in a procedural manner by indicating that the 'Chancellor can challenge the Treasurer' if they do not agree with what he writes. From this, source 1 lays a much greater emphasis upon the tasks, rights, and role of the ~~strategic~~ Chancellor. In contrast, source 2, delegates much more importance on the Chancellor's personal achievements, a notable ~~other~~ example being when King Henry decided to crown the King of France.

to join his daughter, Margaret'. Immediately from this it becomes transparent to see that source 2 has a ~~focus~~ closer focus on the importance of ~~the~~ the chancellor in personal affairs too, as opposed to one's solely concerning ~~the~~ Henry's role of the government. This is supported by the fact that Thomas Becket had negotiated the marriage alliance between Margaret and the young king in 1158, which only presents the chancellor as the epitome of a successful ~~political~~ political and government figure. Therefore, both sources differ in that source 1 focuses ~~of~~ on the role and procedures of the chancellor, whilst source 2 focuses greater on the personal successes and importance of the chancellor.

The provenance of the sources can also be used to credit and weaken the arguments of the sources, as source 1 proves to be increasingly more objective, provided it is an official document from the 'Dialogue of the Exchequer', written by

the influential Richard Fitz Nigel, whereas Source 2 was written by Fitz Stephen, whom was a clerk that Becket himself had authorised during his chancellorship. To begin with, Source 1, further to this, Source 1 undoubtedly, for the aforementioned reason, has an increasingly objective tone as it was solely to inform numerous clerics about the business of the Exchequer, underpinning a high level of standardisation in its message; it is not likely to be intended to ~~sway~~ sway ~~the~~ or criticise the chancellor in any means. This is expanded by the credible figure of Richard Fitz Nigel, whom worked closely with the king. In stark contrast, ~~then~~ Source 2 can largely be argued in having a political and religious agenda to present the chancellor in a positive light, which is largely supported by the fact that the source was written between 1173-74, after Becket ~~had~~ resigned his chancellorship and was murdered. Further to this Becket himself authorised Fitz Stephen to write the 'Life of Saint Thomas', thus suggesting an

immediate lower degree of objectivity
than source 2.

In conclusion, both sources can certainly be used together to demonstrate the importance of the Chancellor in Henry's government, for they both draw attention to the magnificent legal and judicial rights the chancellor holds in comparison to their other counterparts. ~~Thus~~ The provenance of source 1 further supports source 1 given its objective nature. Both sources can also be used apart as source 1 focuses on the procedural role of the chancellor, whereas source 2 credits the personal role of the chancellor, which is skewed by the provenance of source 2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. The sources are used very effectively together to distinguish between their nature and content. The response includes a number of reasoned inferences (eg on p3 of the response) and the candidate shows a range of ways in which can be used. There is a securely argued judgement.



Using contextual knowledge to interrogate the claims being made by the writer is an excellent way of developing evaluations.

Question 3

This question was by far the most popular in section B for Option 1. There were some excellent thoughtful answers which set clear criteria for evaluating the contribution of both castle building and changes in land tenure to Norman control over England 1066-87. These answers were supported by secure knowledge and closely focused on the task set in the question which was to reach a judgement on whether castle building was more significant than land tenure in William I's maintenance of control over England.

However, in spite of its popularity, this question was the least well answered in Section B. Too many answers were characterised by very limited knowledge of the reasons for and impact of castle building and even less understanding of changes in land tenure. Most candidates were aware of the motte and bailey wooden castles built by the Normans and most aware of the later rebuilding in stone. Too many answers, however, focused only on the psychological impact of castles or their influence on trade which was sometimes asserted to be the main purpose of castles, particularly after 1072. Although many were aware of the strategic location of at least some castles and used the word control to describe their purpose far fewer candidates understood the use of castles as garrisons of knights and soldiers spread throughout the country or that siege warfare was unfamiliar to the Anglo Saxons. Some candidates identified the growth of new towns around castles, but fewer were aware of the destruction of parts of cities and towns to build castles eg 166 houses destroyed in Lincoln.

Many answers were able to identify that William transferred land to his followers and some contrasted the landholding of William with the limited land held by Edward the Confessor in comparison with the great earldoms, eg Earl Godwin. Fewer were able to explain that the oaths sworn by the Norman tenants in chief to William confirmed the principle that he was the ultimate source of land and power. Few candidates understood the feudal system, even fewer mentioned *servitium debitum* and understood its significance in raising knights for the King. Although better answers were able to discuss the slower introduction of the feudal system and land disputes between William's followers, some weaker answers asserted that modern historians now believed the feudal system had not really existed under William I. The impact of the changes in land tenure on the former freeholders of Anglo Saxon England and the introduction of the manorial system and villeinage was only addressed by the most effective answers.

It is very important that candidates take note of the question asked. Many candidates wanted to turn this into a general significance question in which they discussed the significance of castles against a range of factors to establish which was the most important. Therefore, a significant number of weaker answers barely discussed changes in land tenure at all, writing instead about the harrying of the north, forest laws, the murdrum fine and even trial by combat instead. The requirement was only to look at two factors and to consider which was more important, not to examine a range of factors and consider which was most important. Taking this approach did undermine the argument of many answers.

somewhat

It is inaccurate to say that castle building was more significant than changes in land tenure in establishing Norman control in England 1066-87 due to their physical presence serving as a reminder of Norman permanence, and the defensive power they held. ^{however they were often built to consolidate rather than establish} Changes in land tenure arguably underpinned the effectiveness of castles as the system of feudalism established that all land belonged to William and that his control over daily life was absolute. Establishing Norman control through crushing the rebellious north was also crucial in securing William as undisputed king - demonstrated by the brutal 1070 Harrying of the North. Overall while castles had a somewhat significant role in establishing Norman control over England, changes in land tenure were more significant regarding the nature of day to day control and became more intrinsically linked with the majority of the population.

Firstly, castle building was a vital part of William's conquest and helped to provide a

military bases around England, as well as acting as psychological reminders of the long term aims of the Norman invasion in 1066. ^{with 80 castles ~~produced~~ by 1100} The castle built at Hastings was ^{signi}~~more~~ficant in establishing William's permanence, and it is evident that they were often used to consolidate control in rebellious areas such as Durham, Pembroke, and Tonbridge. While castle building was significant in establishing the new ^{Anglo} Norman society, inherently geared for war, castles were not as significant in establishing Norman control as they had a lesser impact on the everyday life of the wider population, and often served as a reminder of power rather than an imposition. Newcastle, established in 1080, is a good example of this Norman consolidation of power as it militarised the upper Scottish border and signified the strong Norman control which had already been implemented. Therefore, exchanges in land tenure were more significant in establishing Norman control through legal pathways which had a wider reach, whereas castle building was more significant in solidifying the control that already existed.

Secondly, changes in land tenure were the most significant factor in establishing Norman control

1066-87 due to the introduction of Norman rules and traditions into the everyday lives of the English. The concept of feudalism which came to fruition under William, was the crucial step needed to establish Norman control over the English. By making it law that all lands belonged directly to the king, William was able to exercise complete control over all classes of society, as unlike pre-conquest England, no family could have more financial power. This was significant in establishing control as it allowed knights to take a more prominent role in warfare if they chose to (scutage made them exempt from obligation) and allowed for William to raise funds for battle whenever the opportunity arose, for example the commission of Domesday to visualise how much he was able to extract from his country. Therefore, changes in land tenure were ~~the~~ ^{more} most significant than castle building 1066-87 ~~in~~ establishing control over the English as he was able to enforce financial and military control ~~without the need~~ ^{nationwide.} whereas castles were often in rebellious areas and lacked importance to those in towns with no castles.

Finally, establishing Norman control over the English

would have been nearly impossible had the rebellious north not been crushed in ^{the} 1070 Harrying of the North. While William was able to implement control through legislative changes to the nature of land tenure, and the building of castles controlled previously subdued areas, the consistent threat posed by the north with its Scottish and Viking support seriously threatened the extent of control that William was able to exercise throughout England as a whole. By paying off the Danes in 1071 and Harrying the North so aggressively, that in 1086 the Domesday survey still reported 1/3 of Yorkshire as waste, William had demonstrated his desire to hold complete control, and the effective system of tenure that allowed him to gather an army at lightning speed. The consequence of the crushing of ~~Northern~~ ^{Northern} rebellion was a series of castles built in Durham, ^{Northampton} and other Northern territories, thus demonstrating that castle building was less significant than changes to land tenure 1066-87 as while they were effective in sustaining oppression, the wider changes to land tenure created and legitimised Norman control over England and the English 1066-87.



This is a level 5 response. It has very good own knowledge which underpins the argument that land tenure was more significant than building castles. There is a bit of drift in addressing the harrying of the north but the candidate does try to tie this back to land tenure.



Top scoring answers require a tight focus on the wording of the question.

Question 4

There were a very limited number of answers to this question but most managed to achieve level 4 marks with a number of level 5 answers. Answers to this question were characterised mainly by clear analytical answers. However, some candidates encountered difficulties in establishing valid criteria to judge how similar the problems were with some lapsing into narrative. In general, answers focused on the problems faced by William in Normandy with more confidence than those of Robert Curthose with a tendency in weaker answers to move beyond the time period specified in the question to consider problems Robert later encountered with Henry I.

It is largely inaccurate to say that ^{the} problems faced by Robert Curthose from 1087-95 were very similar to those faced by William I from 1067-87. Whilst both men faced external military pressure, Robert's ~~was~~ ~~was~~ ~~was~~ faced it in a greater scope and with a slightly different nature - namely because of William II's pressure on Robert - something William I did not face. ~~However there were still~~

Furthermore, in terms of wealth and control over Normandy, Robert's situation was in stark contrast to the riches of William I - again emphasising the differences between the two's rule. However, one note of clear similarity is the presence of rebellions, although they were handled considerably differently by each ~~man~~ man. Therefore, despite appreciable similarities, it is largely inaccurate to say that the

the problems from 1087-95 for Robert
and those were 'very similar' to those
faced by William I from 1067-1087.

Whilst both William I and Robert
faced roughly similar external opposition
on the continent, there are some
marked differences that make it inaccurate
to describe the problem of external
threats as 'very similar' - ~~was~~ being the
differences in scope, nature and
threat. While on paper the King of
France opposed Normandy, during Robert's
reign he gave some support to
Robert, for example King Philip II repelled
the invasion of William II in the
early 1190's out of a desire to
see Normandy ~~destabilised~~ destabilised.
Contrastingly, William I had possession of
England, using it to his advantage in
Norman politics. He used an English
army to attack the castle of
Dol, where Ralph de Gael had fled
to. And, showing the difference of the
problem faced - William fought the

king of France and Anjou. So, whilst Robert's main threat came from England in the 1090s, and he was supported by France on occasion, William's main threat to Normandy was the alliance of Flanders, Anjou and France against him. Therefore, while in both periods the duchy of Normandy faced a similar scale of problem - a larger kingdom threatening invasion - its nature was ~~quite~~ highly different. For Robert it was the threat of an English invasion while for William it was the threat of France seizing regions like the Vexin. Overall then, ~~it is inaccurate to say that~~ the in terms of the external threat looming, it is inaccurate to say that the problems faced by Robert in 1087-95 were 'very similar' to those faced by William in ~~1067-87~~ 1067-87, due to the fact they were opposing the external threats were highly different in nature.

When considering the problems faced, further differences can be seen in the disparity in wealth between William I and Robert Curthose. This disparity magnified the problems Robert faced and caused internal issues to arise, on the other hand, William I had no such problems. He was able to use his new kingdom of England to bolster his strength in Normandy. When returning to Normandy in 1067 William took his looted treasures on parade across Normandy. He used to cement himself further with the Norman nobility through bribes and patronage. Robert attempted to do the same, giving out large bribes to Norman officials when he inherited the Duchy. However this did not last, and ~~therefore~~ Robert had to sell Henry I the earldom of Essex and Hereford for £3,000 to maintain himself financially. The ~~result~~

problem Robert & they suffered was that he could not keep his subjects on side through bribery to the same extent as William. ~~For another~~ ~~was~~ Again it is highly inaccurate to describe the problems faced by William I and Robert as 'very similar' when considering financial problems as ~~stated~~ William I was ~~not~~ able to use his wealth to subordinate his duchy, and had no money problems, whereas Robert had extensive money problems which limited his control over Normandy. These money problems were probably influential on Robert's ~~to~~ decision to give Normandy as collateral for a £6,000 loan from William I to go on crusade. Overall, in terms of financial problems it is highly inaccurate to describe Robert and William's problems as 'very similar' as whilst it was not a

problem for William I. It was very troublesome for Robert.

In terms of rebellions faced by Robert and William in Normandy there is a high degree of similarity. Maine rebelled from William I's control in the early 1080s, ~~at first~~ with rebels taking Le Mans and the wider region. The same occurred to Robert at the beginning of his reign, though the money troubles he had, which William did not, prevented him subduing the rebellion. On the other hand, William was able to crush the Maine rebels in 1086, funding the campaign with the gold system. Robert did not have this gold and therefore it could be argued that the Maine rebellion of ~~1091~~ the 1090s was a greater problem, however it was still mostly similar to William's previous

experience. Furthermore, ~~Robert~~ ~~was~~
~~only~~ ~~not~~ control of Maine was
only restored in 1098, after
Robert had left, by William II.
This furthers that while the basic
problem of rebellion in Maine
was largely similar, Robert's lack
of resources compounded it into
a more pressing issue than
it had been for William I.
Therefore, it is still inaccurate to
describe this problem as 'very
similar' for Robert and William.
While accurate for the
base problem, when contextualised,
its scale becomes much worse for
Robert, and was an appreciably
different problem.

Overall, it is highly inaccurate
to describe the problems faced
by William II as 'very similar'
to those of William I. In
their scale, nature, and
danger, Robert's problems were
more troublesome. Although at a

large level ~~with~~ the
problem of ~~the~~ ^{Norman} is the
most similar, it is still different
one contextualised. William I did
not face pressure from England,
instead from France, and he
did not have financial issues
as Robert did. Therefore, overall
it is largely, it not highly inaccurate
to say that the problems
faced by Robert from 1087-95
were very similar to those
faced by William I from
1067-87.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. It has a very clear focus on similarity and difference and is supported by good knowledge and a secure conclusion.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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 5

This question was answered by far fewer candidates than Question 6 but it was in general well answered. The strong level 4 and 5 answers were characterised by a clear understanding of the interrelations of the various French vassals of Louis VII, also displaying a clear understanding of the importance of the Vexin and Henry's control over Brittany, which has not always been demonstrated in previous years. The weaker responses tended to ignore the time period specified by the question and wrote about the entirety of Henry II's reign or they spent time discussing Henry II's reforms in England. A few answers lost focus on the question and wrote general answers about how effective Henry II was as a king without any specific focus on Henry's control of the Angevin lands in France 1154-1172.

Over the years 1154 to 72, Henry II was attempting to ~~again~~ restore England to where it would have been before 1135. The anarchy ⁽¹¹³⁵⁻⁵⁴⁾ had caused a loss of territories abroad, but Henry was ~~relatively~~ successful in restoring them. It may be argued he had central control throughout the years of his French lands due to his use of the ~~great system~~ ^{negotiations} and ~~holding off~~ ^{holding off} rebellion. However, it may also be argued it changed significantly because ~~he~~ he was struggling against Philip I and Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine.

It can be seen that Henry's control over Angevin lands in France maintained consistency because he ~~used~~ utilized the negotiations with the French king. In 1154, Henry secured the Vexin through the marriage alliance of the young king and Henry and Margaret. The Vexin was a powerful strategic section of land, offering access to key trade routes. It was also key in terms of defence. Therefore, the acquisition of it was

vital to Henry's control over France. Despite disputes with Louis, Henry maintained the land and therefore his hold over France was consistent from 1154 to 1172. ~~For example, when Louis rebelled against Henry in 1152~~ His ability to remain on good terms with Louis, for example the peace of Montmirail in 1169, meant Henry's control remained constant over his territories. ~~Therefore, Henry's~~ Henry successfully consolidated his position. Overall, he ~~significantly~~ Angoulin and ~~the~~ ~~part~~ in France was kept in control as Henry ~~had~~ remained on good terms with him throughout the period.

Furthermore, Henry asserted his authority through stopping rebellions and ~~and~~ any disputes, demonstrating himself as powerful. In 1156, there were disputes between Hoel and Eudo in Brittany. When appealed for help, Henry expelled Hoel and then set up a clear succession of the lands from Geoffrey to Conan (Bertha's son). ~~And~~ After this there were minor rebellions but Henry was able to stop them extremely

quickly. This shows Henry was able to co-ordinate his lands. Furthermore, there were no further ~~writings~~ disputes in Brittany within the period. Henry's holding on the land was thus constant. This shows that control over French land only changed a small extent because as there was an ~~increase~~ a slight loss of control during the Hoel and Evrard conflict. Therefore, it can be seen Henry's control was kept over 1154 to ~~1170~~ 1172.

However, it could be argued, Henry's control changed and lost control of the Angevin territory. At the start of the period, Henry had control of Aquitaine as he it was acquired through his 1152 marriage to Eleanor in 1152. Despite it being a matriarchal society in Aquitaine, Henry started out with a significant influence, for example travelling there as he was an itinerant king. However, in the peace of Montmirail in 1169, Richard was named the heir of ~~the~~ Aquitaine. ~~As~~ Richard had already been growing his power in ~~the~~ Aquitaine as he and Eleanor issued

royal writs in their names not Henry's. This therefore meant Aquitaine was slipping out of Henry's grasp of power. Only Henry should have been issuing writs so by doing it themselves, Richard and Eleanor were undermining Henry's authority in the territory. Therefore, ~~the control over~~ In 1154, Henry's control wasn't perfect over Aquitaine but it was key still present. However, by the end of the period, he lacked any say in Aquitaine's governing, with ~~Richard~~ Eleanor and Richard ~~as their~~ ^{as their} source of authority.

relations with
It could also be argued that Louis VII's ~~behaviour~~ were inconsistent, ~~major~~ so was Henry's control of his French territories. In 1154, Henry had Anjou, ~~maine, touraine,~~ Normandy significant hold of France, for example ~~the~~ he had Rouen, a key port for ~~the~~ trade and revenue. He also had control of Normandy. However, in ~~the 1150s~~ throughout 1150-60s there were disputes on the borders. Louis thus wanted more land. ~~the~~ This was the start of their relationship being

inconsistent. Later on in 1168, Louis raided the Vexin despite it being clearly in control of Henry due to the dowry. Therefore, Henry's control of the Vexin could be seen as weakened. As Louis was the actual King of France and Henry just had holdings there, it could be argued people began turning to Louis as the source of authority not Henry. ~~For example, the~~ ^{Louis consistent} attacks against Henry demonstrated he wasn't on his side. Therefore, the ~~power~~ ^{Henry} Henry appeared weaker. ~~Despite this,~~ ~~Henry didn't~~ ~~consequently,~~ it could be argued that Henry's control weakened as Louis grew stronger. Despite this, Henry didn't ~~actually~~ lose any lands directly to Louis. The peace of 1169 somewhat demonstrated that they were on an ~~more~~ ^{equal} level, with Louis showing little resistance to Henry after their meeting at Montmirail. ^{Overall,} it can be seen that ~~for~~ Henry and Louis struggle somewhat impacted Henry's control over French lands but it didn't propose a large enough issue ~~that~~ ^{the} the reviving end of Henry's lands.

In conclusion, ~~to~~ Henry's ^{II's} control over the Angevin

lands in France didn't change significantly from 1154 till 1172. Whilst he did face some struggles against Eleanor and Louis, Henry's power wasn't significantly threatened. Henry's power in Aquitaine was already limited due to the nature of the society being matriarchal. Henry successfully established himself as a strong ruler through his ability to resolve disputes as well as securing territory. Overall, it can thus be argued Henry II's control over his lands in France didn't change much and he was able to maintain his authority there.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response enters level 5. It has a focus on the second order concept – continuity and change – and supports its arguments with good knowledge. It presents both sides of the argument and draws a conclusion.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

When looking at extent of change, it is important also to consider what aspects stayed the same.

Question 6

This was the most popular question in Option 2A.2. There were a wide range of answers to this question ranging from level 4 and level 5 answers that addressed the opposition of the barons in equal depth to their consideration of the feuds within Henry's own family to much weaker answers which tended to focus only on the feuds within Henry's family. An unusual feature of this question was a number of candidates who lost focus on the question in an attempt to analyse the character of Henry II as the author of his own misfortunes most of which were assertion based rather than evidenced. Stronger answers were able to address the issue of how Henry's actions, particularly in relation to his own family, caused the resentment which led to the rebellion, without losing focus on the question. A number of candidates spent too long discussing the continuing feuds within Henry's family, considerably beyond the parameters of the Question. This question was relatively well answered.

Many candidates attempted to turn this into a general causation question in which they discussed the most important reason for the outbreak of the Great Rebellion. Therefore, candidates did not weigh up which was more important between the opposition of the barons or feuds in the family and often drew a conclusion that did not reach a judgment on the question set, ascribing blame in the main to Louis VII or flaws in Henry's character/actions. The requirement was only to look at two reasons and to consider which was more important, not to examine a range of reasons and consider which was the most important. Taking this approach did undermine the argument of many answers.

It is ~~uncontested~~ agreeable to argue that opposition by English barons to Henry's reforms was certainly significant ^{and contributory} to the cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74), however, it is not agreeable to suggest ^{that} it was more significant than the feuds within Henry's own family, for it was Henry's inability to delegate his son's any power that ignited the anger and tensions that characterized the rebellion. Rather, ~~it can~~ more significance can be attributed to Eleanor of Aquitaine's role in mediating the feuds within the Angevin household, yet more significantly, Henry's failure to provide power for his sons.

To begin with, it is certainly agreeable to suggest that the opposition by the barons to Henry's reforms were significant and contributory to the cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74), ~~for~~ because Henry had removed much of their power. Through the notable legal and financial reforms of the 'Cartae Baronum' of 1166,

assize of clarendon (1166), and the destruction of illegal castle program of 1155, Henry significantly curtailed large amount of baronial power, since the ineffective rule of Stephen in 1135. This is exemplified through ~~the case of the earl of Chester~~ the earl of Chester whom had his castles returned to the crown due to wardship; a similar case ~~of~~ which mirror Henry's early eradication of William Le Gros's ~~castle~~ Scarborough castle. ~~It becomes clear to see how Henry's eradication~~ This trend of weakening of baronial power was solidified by the financial reforms of 1150, and to a greater extent, 1180, where there was a standardized currency and eradication of ~~of~~ moneyers and mints committing forgers (the number of moneyers being cut by 4/5 to 17 by the end of Henry's reign). Immediately through Henry's implementation of legal and financial reforms, does it become clear to see how Henry had fueled anger and retaliation within the barons of England, thus exemplifying how their role in the Great Rebellion was

can be attributed to her growing estrangement to Henry II; she was becoming increasingly angered by his affairs, most notably with Rosamund Clifford, whom he built a ^{memorial} monument for in 1176, thus exemplifying his lack of love for Eleanor. From this we see that the Great Rebellion of 1173-74 was not merely one motivated and caused by political disappointments, such as that of the barons, but was rather ingrained by deep-rooted hurt and betrayal, thus ^{placing} the rebellion as ~~being done so~~ on a personal level. This was exacerbated by the fact that Eleanor had a lack of control within her own lands of Aquitaine, endorsed by Raymond of Toulouse paying homage to Henry II at Limoges in 1173, as opposed to Eleanor or Richard; her ~~and~~ her sons' rebellions were also due to the lack of political acceptance and approval they had from their territorial counterparts. It is therefore more appropriate to ~~to~~ argue that the Great Rebellion of 1173-74 was more significantly due to ~~the~~ the feuds within Henry's own family as opposed to

the opposition of the barons to Henry's reforms - which was merely a secondary response to withstanding family tensions.

It is more agreeable to argue that Henry's inability to delegate any power to his sons had fueled the feuds within his own family, this ~~can~~ being the most significant factor to the cause of the Great Rebellion (1173-74). Due to Henry's undoubtedly possessive personality in wanting to gain and expand his own Angevin empire, the curtailment of baronial power being exemplary of how Henry wanted to enforce the feudal principle of the king having the sole power, established a precedent for why he failed to give power and territory to his sons: he ^{solely} wanted to rule and restore Angevin power. This is put into perspective by how Henry chose all the members of young Henry's household and ~~asked~~ ^{threw} ~~to~~ ~~take~~ not to take him on any military expeditions, believing him to be too inexperienced. The extent of this issue is encapsulated in Limoges, 1173, where the young king made

a public demonstration of his disapproval of his father's treatment. Similarly, Richard too was denied of any many executive privileges, given that his right to rule Aquitaine was readily under political pressures by Henry's ^{growing} support from local lords. It therefore becomes evident to see how Henry was significantly diminishing the ruling powers of his sons, arguably having overstated the powers he'd provide his sons at the treaty of Montmirail in 1169. ~~Henry's treatment~~ of his sons contrasts remarkably to that of Louis VII, whom welcomed Richard in 1174 through knighthood, and the young king with his own seal to authenticall charters. Through this, Henry's sons undoubtedly were given powers Henry had failed to delegate them, thus expanding the fact that feuds within Henry's own family was the cause of the 1173-74 Great Rebellion, on the premise that Henry didn't give them enough ruling power.

In conclusion, it is certainly agreeable to

Suggest that opposition by English barons to Henry's reforms were significant towards the rebellion, however, it is less plausible to suggest that it was ~~the~~^a more significant cause than the own feuds of Henry's family. This is largely due to the fact that the rebellion was fueled by personal and sentimental rifts, evidenced by Eleanor's opposition, yet to a greater extent, Henry's inability to delegate any power to his sons. Therefore baronial opposition to Henry's reforms can be seen as a secondary ^{yet contributory} cause to the Great Rebellion of 1173-74.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. It has excellent focus on the question and is supported by secure knowledge. The slight wobble on the shrine to Rosamund (built after her death in 1176 and therefore out of period) does not undermine the overall quality of the answer.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

This question focuses on debating the significance of two causes. To address it effectively, you need to establish the relative importance of each cause in order to develop a judgement on which cause is more important. You do not need to discuss 'main cause'.

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 explicitly address the focus of the enquiry rather than merely discussing the issues raised by the sources in general terms
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption and 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 three bullet points that are assessed in this section of the paper.

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 presenting 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>

