

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_2A_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

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.

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.

Answers driven by largely own knowledge were rarer this year but a significant number of candidates failed to interrogate the sources preferring to fact check selected quotations against their own knowledge. Some of these included valid inferences which enable marks within level 3 but fewer were able to distinguish between information, claim and opinion to achieve level 4/5 marks. A disappointing number of answers this year displayed little or no understanding of the historical context of the sources. Many candidates were unable to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which they were drawn which restricted their access to higher level 4 and level 5 marks.. The use of the sources in combination continues to improve and in the better answers and even the weaker answers retained a focus on the question.

A number of candidates were disadvantaged in this section by poor examination technique. Some candidates ran out of time and were unable to reach judgement having spent a disproportionate amount of time in extended explanations which were not relevant to the question. Questions 3 and 5 were the most popular questions in each option and most candidates had sufficient information to produce a reasonable answer but a significant number struggled to organise their knowledge in way which addressed the question. The answers to Question 4 and 6 were generally less well answered with candidates unsure how to address the words “completely” and “complete”. A significant number of answers still indicate an inability to

set criteria by which to judge the question.

Question 1

This question was reasonably well answered. There were some very thoughtful well argued answers to this question which combined reasoned inferences with sufficient knowledge of the historical context to discuss effectively what can be gained from individual sources and the sources in combination. Most candidates were able to retain their focus on the question, but a significant minority were unable to resist the temptation to explain why King Harold lost the Battle of Hastings from their own knowledge. Better answers, however, were able to consider how far the historian could make use of the sources to investigate the reasons for the defeat of Harold Godwinson.

In general source 1 was investigated more thoroughly than source 2 with candidates considering the type of documents the author might have been exposed to in the writing room at Durham. Although most candidates identified the tone of source 1 as relatively neutral, better answers noted evidence of a more sympathetic approach to the difficulties faced by Harold Godwinson, concluding that Simeon's account reflected his exposure to an English perspective on events.

The treatment of source 2 was less discerning. Most candidates identified William of Poitiers' support for William I with many describing his approach as propaganda in support of William's claim to the throne but fewer failed to support that assertion with a thorough interrogation of the source. Many candidates mentioned the Papal banner and some referred to William wearing the relics on which Harold had sworn to support him but few seemed to understand why this was of any importance in the 11th century which relates to the comment in the previous paragraph on a worrying lack of awareness of the historical context.

Although many noted the description of Harold as a murderer and of Queen Edith praying for William to succeed in the battle, these claims were accepted by most as a fact and evidence of Harold's lack of popularity in England. Few answers actually challenged this assertion by Poitiers. Some commented that it was odd, as Queen Edith was presumably Anglo Saxon but fewer knew that she was Harold's sister. Only the higher level 4 and 5 answers questioned whether she was likely to have prayed for the defeat and possible death of her brothers Harold, Gyrth and Leofwine.

Many candidates displayed a sound understanding of the preparations for and conduct of the battle and were able to analyse the source material in the context of Harold's difficulties following the battle of Stamford Bridge and the battle tactics and leadership qualities displayed on both sides during the battle of Hastings itself.

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

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Sources 1 and 2 are most useful due to their variation of perspective - as the provenance shows ^{one is from a Norman monk written in England and focuses on Harold} ^{the other is from a Norman monk written in Normandy and focuses on William}. ~~open to~~ ^{the most} ~~of both~~ ^{of both} ~~will~~ ^{will} provide a more nuanced view. ~~The~~ ^{as} said, Source 2 is more useful than Source 1 due to the fact its content covers more of the key reasons for Harold's failure, his overhaste, William's army's strength and the fake retreat. While Source 1 covers similar topics such as speed and army makeup as well as the army's crucial loss of their leader (Harold) - its attempts to glorify the battle as David's last stand and his reputation after the defeat renders it less useful.

Moreover, there are many aspects of use in source 1. Firstly its provenance makes it useful as its author used resources from a 'monastery' to write it. Monks who wrote these 'manuscripts and documents' ~~whoever~~ ^{who} had the most knowledge to do so and therefore, in this time, monastic documents would be the most reliable source of information - This therefore suggests the content will be grounded in a lot of truth compared to Source 2 that used ~~even~~

eyewitness accounts. The records of a monastery would be much more reliable. This is reflected in many areas of the content. Despite its optimistic tone around it, source 1 does note the lack of numbers Harold's army had. This was a key reason for failure as once they were drawn into 1 on 1 combat (around 2pm) the English stood no chance. Firstly it notes how 'many of the English had fallen' at Stamford Bridge and got Gataehelford. It especially notes they were some of the bravest (line 5). This is useful as it suggests Harold was already at a place of weakness. ~~This is a point~~ Combined with the 'great speed' (line 6) he travelled with Harold had little time to recover numbers. This is further reinforced on line 7 as 'half of his army' had ~~been~~ arrived by the time he left. Contextual knowledge suggests this to be a crucial cause of failure as many records note William aimed to defeat the Saxons before sundown in fear of reinforcements coming to Harold. Another reason the content is useful is it looks at the impact of Harold's death. far as already row on ~~Harold's~~ key figures ('bravest... warriors') Harold's death let the English army fall apart as the source when 'Harold himself fell at twilight' many of his army were 'also slain'. This is ^a crucial cause of failure as many see Hastings as essentially over at that point - ~~William~~ almost the entire English army fell afterwards. Due

to these being key elements of Pauline the source can be seen as useful.

This being said, it is not entirely useful, due to its provenance. Firstly it ~~isn't~~ was written in '1120', because it is a hindsight document it can be inferred the writer will aim to celebrate Harold as heroic ^{in comparison to the fact} due to not wanting to glorify ~~William~~ ^{following} William I (1066-1087) was characterised by intense brutality. Therefore ^{the fact} this document ^{was} written in England ^{especially on the north side to} could possibly attempt to reflect this. This being said, despite its origin being in England, the writer himself was born in Normandy and did not come to England until 1071. Therefore his own view may depart from what is expected of an English written source as ~~in fact~~ he did not experience the England before - furthermore 1071 is after the largest sections of Norman brutality (such as the hanging of the North) unusually the content is still does still appear to have an agenda and moreover while the author's Norman ~~view~~ heritage doesn't seem to play a part - the North's 'documents' may have as they ~~where~~ experienced the full brunt of William's violence. The reason this can be suggested as a flawed source is due to the content. An aspect commonly viewed as a Pauline (the speech Harold went to Hastings) is presented ~~as~~ as a ~~blatant~~ ^{blatant} valiant attempt. When

Harold was informed about William's presence, it's recorded both his mother and brother suggested ~~they go~~ Gyrfi go first in order to weaken William and allow Harold to strengthen his army. Instead of acknowledging that this Harold 'immediately marched' to William. The sources use of phrases such as 'with great speed' (line 6) and 'as quickly as he could' ~~are~~ suggest a diligent warrior. It reflects language used in sources about Stamford Bridge and Gatefulford where his speed did win him the battle. Therefore this can be seen as a weakness of the source as instead of acknowledging Harold's mistake of letting William go he (in his burning of nearby villages). It shapes it to mimic his successes. As mentioned, this may be due to the fact it's based on Durham monastic sources which when written would want to support Harold as a warrior.

~~Because of~~ Source 2 focuses much more on the elements of William's efforts as reasons for the outcome. It is for this reason the sources are ~~the~~ most useful together. Alternatively, source 2 is firstly useful due to its proximity. William of Poitiers was ~~oneachably~~ ^{extremely} close to William, as demonstrated by the fact he was also the one to record the events of William and Harold's 1066 'oath'.

He was also a knight who would have a deep understanding of military situations and events. Because of this he was likely to have a large amount of knowledge on the battle which could prove crucial for its outcome. It is also more useful than source 7 due to its larger scope of events. It records what are seen as the crucial reasons for Harold's defeat - Harold's overhasty haste (that resulted in loss of numbers) but also William's ability to both organise an army and lead a battle. It mimics the language of source 7 saying Harold 'quickly marched south' this suggests it is integral as both sources mention it. He goes further than source 4 to make a direct note of how Harold tried to replicate the previous battles by ~~even~~ saying 'he thought' a 'surprise attack' could help him win' (lines 24 + 29). This misjudgment as mentioned in ¹ ~~one~~ is so important in why his army was too weak and therefore both sources are more useful for referencing it. As well as this it puts emphasis on William's ability. Not only in his structuring of his army ('he placed ... so he could direct operations') which as it meant a ~~position~~ strong point of leadership. As compared to the English shield wall that once it fell so did the army. Furthermore the sources mention of the 'Feigned flight' is a key reason for loss as it broke that wall. Sources deliberate if it was feigned however is recorded well as early as 1055 suggests it was. This technique was common

and therefore the source's emphasis also on how much it weakened the Saxons is useful. Other notable examples of William's skill in battle include the strong of his face to boost morale. These references ~~don't~~ demonstrate his specific importance in the 'defeat'!

This being said, source 2 is not completely useful. Like source 1 it has a Norman writer however where source 1's writer had clear English influence and was also ~~an~~ much more of an observer to the situation - William of Poitiers' prevalence throughout William's reign may mean he has created an agenda that it was predominantly down to William I.

This theory is aided by the time the source was published (1071-77) at that point William I's reign was increasingly fragile still due to the prevalent rebellions of 1067-70. While the harraging of the North quelled them there was still notable distrust for his rule and therefore his source may attempt to be a supportive piece of propaganda. This is supported by the overwhelmingly reference to William's claim in the source. Despite not being directly linked to his win, William's right to the throne is a continuous topic such as Harold 'breaking the Oath' (sworn by Protestors); the fact Harold was 'enemy of the good' as well as the fact William has a banner!

shows a laudable attempt at justification for his actions that may have led to a verdict of high agency. However its context keeps it useful especially with 1.



This is a Level 5 response in which the sources are interrogated with confidence and the evaluation is justified and fully applied. The Level 5 qualities are particularly demonstrated on pages 3-5 where the analysis and evaluation are integrated, accessing all the bullet points to reach a judgement. For example, on page 3, in evaluating the reliability of Source 3[BP3], there is a reasoned inference about the author painting an 'heroic' picture of Harold[BP1] and then interrogating this with carefully selected contextual knowledge [BP2] of both the time of writing, which would affect how the author presented Harold, and the events, such as Harold's rapid march south, that is presented as 'valiant' by Simeon but had been considered foolhardy by other historians. The sources are weighed to reach a supported judgement. Level 5: 20 marks [L5 L5 L5]



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

Question 2

Question 2 was answered less well than Question 1 principally owing to a lack of rigour in interrogating the source material; indeed in many cases sections of source 1 were ignored altogether. The nature and purpose of the documents were not fully examined in many cases and few attempts were made to judge the weight the evidence of the sources will bear in coming to a judgement.

Most candidates made determined attempts to consider the sources in combination; unfortunately in weaker answers this meant focusing exclusively on the threat presented by William the Lion as this is referenced in both sources 3 and 4. Some candidates determined that the Great Rebellion could only be considered serious if other reigning monarchs were involved, so restricted their answers to William of Scotland and Louis of France.

Better answers did consider the threat posed by the Young King and his brothers Richard and Geoffrey with rarer mentions of Eleanor of Aquitaine's role in supporting them, but only the high level 4 and level 5 answers also considered the part played in the rebellion by the 'men of Aquitaine', 'the count of Flanders', 'the Earl of Leicester', 'the Earl of Chester' and the 'so many and great barons who deserted the elder King and other English barons'. Henry's powerful supporters, including Richard de Lucy, the barons of the exchequer, the city of London and the merchant classes were equally rarely considered when determining the seriousness of the rebellion.

Some candidates were unsure how to determine the nature and purpose of source 3 and many restricted themselves to the assertion that truth could be expected from a "clergyman"; however better answers noted that William of Newburgh was not personally involved with Henry II and might be considered relatively impartial while noting a certain disapproval of the actions of the young King in this source.

Most candidates struggled with source 4 as few seemed to know what minstrels were and therefore ignored the fact that the source is clearly intended to be recited and it is written in verse. Most candidates however did attempt to use the sources in combination.

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

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Source 3 offers ~~high~~ relatively high value to a historian investigating the Great Rebellion's seriousness in the years 1173-74. Its claims hold a fairly high degree of certainty, with support from its provenance. ~~and that~~ The source claims the Great Rebellion was a great internecine struggle within Henry's family, "provoked" against his father by the malicious advice of the French. This inter Henry's sons were manipulated against him. This claim adds value to the source because it has a high degree of certainty. In the Great Rebellion the only son who didn't rebel was John, furthermore the manipulation of Louis VII is prevalent, notably from the birth of Phillip in 1165, one example being at a Christmas reunion in which Louis began sowing the seeds of rebellion in Henry the Younger's mind forcing a wedge between him and Henry II. This reveals that the Great Rebellion was a massive internecine struggle threatening the permanent relationships between Henry and his sons. ~~this~~ This is fundamentally serious to any rebellion against a king. Another claim the source ~~now~~ makes is that Henry faced serious resistance, "added a more ferocious enemy". This claim stresses the seriousness & scale of the

Rebellion, It holds a high degree of certainty. Henry faced two kings, Louis VII of France and William I 'lion' of Scotland, along with numerous English and Breton barons such as William le Gros and Hugh Earl of Chester. This reveals Henry faced real threats across a broad geographic scope along with range of power. Henry was attacked on all fronts, from William in Northern England to Louis VII on the continent. This rebellion was not small or insignificant it was of serious scale, therefore this claim is valuable in revealing how serious the rebellion was. However whilst the force Henry faced was undoubtedly large and 'powerful', in practice it was less so. The King of Scots being ferocious was not seen in this rebellion, he never once faced Henry ~~head to head~~ face on until Scotland became a part of England. This suggests the sources claims may be exagerrated and potentially imbalanced. In terms of provenance the sources ~~reliability~~ reliability is somewhat questionable. The source was constructed through the ~~manuscripts~~ ^{the monastic} manuscripts and oral accounts. This brings some question, on one hand monasteries were the ~~libraries~~ ^{libraries} of the 12th century keeping records as accurately as possible, ~~however~~ moreover the oral accounts would provide a range of interpretation.

allowing William to make as accurate a recollection as possible. However on the other-hand no 2 versions of one event are the same, taking Pope Urban II's Proclamation at Clermont in 1095 for example, there are a multitude of versions with some consistent themes and other anomalous claims. This demonstrates how recollection of these events gets distorted and lost. Therefore this source may not be the most reliable means to evaluate the Great Rebellion. The Author William, lived through it will see Henry's demise, this may add reliability because he would have time to gather relevant material, ~~gather~~ the scope of his life is ideal for studying the Great Rebellion and potentially increases the reliability of the source. Overall Source 3 adds relatively high value to a historian studying the seriousness of the first rebellion. Its claims hold a relatively high degree of certainty with expected exaggeration in parts. The source is likely to be slightly imbalanced to Henry's favourable representation which takes away from its overall accuracy.

Source 4 and offers low value to a historian investigating the seriousness of the ~~year~~ Great Rebellion in the years 1173-4. Its claims have limited

Score and weak Provenance. One claim the source makes is that the Great Rebellion was a short-term ordeal, "Now the worst ended, and your Kingdom in Peace" this inters the end of the Great Rebellion, the capture of William I by Richard de Lucy in 1074 was the beginning of Peace, this presents the rebellion to be an unserious matter in Henry's role, when in reality it set the precedence of internal fighting within his family, it led to the schemes that would see him deposed. The source offers little value in seriousness if not none at all. It is to be expected because of its Provenance. The source's intended purpose was to be a song for minstrels, minstrels purpose is not to recall accurately and strictly the events of ~~the~~ Battle; war or rebellion, they were to engage audiences humorously conversationally. This means most of the time the only thing accurately depicted is the outcome, in this instance being William's capture and the end of the rebellion. The source whilst lacking explicit accuracy somewhat reveals Henry's response to the rebellion, "Come a piece of News" this inters Henry had informational infrastructure in place throughout. This claim has a high degree of certainty and reveals some of Henry's behaviour during the rebellion, Henry appeared he stocked

castles, used Normandy as a base of operations and left England in complete trust/control to Richard 2nd. whilst a lighthearted source is somewhat ironic Henry's tactical setup which was intricate inducing an intricate serious response to a serious threat. In this way the source offers some value to a historian investigating the seriousness. However overall at face value the source's lighthearted tone and lack of detail do not provide necessary means for a historian to begin correctly assessing the seriousness of the Great Rebellion.

Looking at both sources together their value is relatively limited, though not without notability in some areas. For example source 3 is more focused on Henry's opponents whereas source 4 is focused on Henry in Westminster among allies. This allows for comparison, the sources contrasting tones ~~are~~ are misleading, source 3 highlights the scale and formidability of Henry's opponents illustrating the rebellion in a serious light. Whereas source 4 illustrates Henry in a comedic fashion being unaware of the thought of bad news. From these points alone it would indicate Henry is the weaker side facing a great opposition when in reality he extinguished the flames of rebellion. This is not useful

for a historian other than to see the scope of differing interpretations. Another point for comparison is that Source 3 focuses on the beginning of the rebellion or prior to it whereas Source 4 focuses on the end. Source 3 is serious presenting Henry's opponents as manipulative and calculating which most would assume in the beginning because Henry faced 2 kings along with many barons. Yet the image created by Source 4 represents the rebellion as finishing so simply in a letter to an uncrowned king. This highlights how the seriousness of the Great Rebellion among contemporaries potentially shifted as time went on, starting with an unknown British match up ending with dominance in military and feudal powers from Henry. This is slightly useful to a historian ~~but~~ ~~very~~ seeing the change in attitude/demonstration of the Great Rebellion. Overall Sources 3 & 4 offer ~~rather~~ ~~very~~ limited usefulness to a historian studying the Great Rebellion, the sources of interpretations leave all major points of contention unaddressed with contrasting tones and little empirical value.



This is a Level 5 response with clear focus on the task. It demonstrates interrogation of both sources and reaches judgements. The evaluation of Source 4 is stronger than that of Source 3, discussing the impact that the nature of the source has upon its reliability. Secure knowledge is employed to interrogate the sources and there is a real sense of understanding the values and concerns of 12th century society.



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 and in general was very well answered. Most candidates had a good working knowledge of the key features of the Anglo Saxon economy, the control of the coinage and the silver penny in particular. Many had a clear understanding of the trading relations of Anglo Saxon England and it was pleasing to note a much better understanding of the importance of inland ports and key centres of population than in previous years. Candidates were able to demonstrate how the successful economy supported a sophisticated taxation system which enabled effective government.

Most answers were able to identify other reasons for the strength of Anglo Saxon England including the role of the king as the only one able to raise the army and the lawgiver at the head of the well developed legal system with the shire and hundred courts. Many answers noted the role of central and local government identifying the contribution of the Earls Sheriffs and reeves in securing the strength of Anglo Saxon England under Edward.

Most candidates also identified the Earls, Harold and Tostig Godwinson in particular in securing the peace of England. In dealing with this topic candidates displayed how far they understood the need to maintain focus on the question. Weaker answers restricted themselves to a brief mention of the silver penny and an extensive description of the Welsh campaign conducted by Harold and Tostig with analysis of the tactics and weapons used and the frequent descriptions of the fate of Gruffydd ap Llewelyn. Unfortunately, some more promising answers ran out of time to continue their analysis of the various factors contributing to the strength of Anglo Saxon England, having spent too long discussing how Harold was able to defeat Gruffydd.

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

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

I do agree that the economy of England during Edward's reign did strengthen England, however the justice system and ~~Harold's~~ the Godwins' military ability also strengthened it. ~~& The Godwins'~~ (Mainly Harold Godwinson's ^{leadership} ~~military capability~~) was the reason why England was so strong as it kept the flourishing economy safe and deterred invaders who may have desired the wealth for themselves. The economy did mean England could trade with other countries and the justice system kept England in order, however they weren't the main reasons.

The economy played a role in making England so strong as it was a trusted ~~or~~ currency. This allowed for extensive trade, with routes ~~for~~ extending across the continent all the way to Constantinople. This meant England could import more than it exported and lords could enjoy luxury goods such as

spices and amber. The coinage was so trusted because ~~it was well~~ all coins were handed back in every 5 years and ~~made~~ swapped for a new coin - for a tax of 15%. This kept profits for Edward and they also acted as a symbol of royal authority. Coins were also only made at the 60 royal ~~not~~ mints, ensuring they were trusted. However, although ^{it was} one of England's biggest strengths it also ~~to~~ was its biggest weakness - its ~~hamartia~~ hamartia. The ^{news of} ~~the~~ flourishing economy was spread through trade so it was well-known England was wealthy. This made it incredibly attractive to invaders - evident ~~when there was~~ in 1066 when ~~Danes~~ ^{Vikings} and Normans invaded. Without a strong army directed by Harold, England were a large target and so the biggest ~~so~~ reason England was so strong was due to the ~~Godwins~~ ^{Harold} protecting it.

The main reason England was so strong was due to Harold ~~& (and the Godwins)~~ ~~military~~ ability. Edward himself did not lead the English army, for ~~for~~ ^{most} of his reign Harold Godwinson was sent out

to take care of any threats. This was evident in 1063 when Harold and Tostig's land and sea operation led to the defeat of the Welsh king Gruffydd. They were successful in bringing his head to Edward, leading Wales to degenerate back to warring principalities and cease to be a serious threat to England. Harold gained a reputation as a capable warrior ~~that~~ and so the reputation of a fearsome English army kept England strong and protected. Furthermore, Harold's abilities in diplomacy kept England safe from civil war. The 1065 Northumbrian ~~to~~ uprising was solved by Harold without the need for battle, exiling his own brother for the good of the ~~country~~ country. Furthermore, he married Morcar's ~~the~~ ~~east~~ (who he made earl of Northumbria) sister to unite the fiercely independent North with the South. ^{*}If not for Harold's leadership, England would not ~~have~~ be protected from threats, ~~or~~ safe from civil war or deter any prospective invaders, making him the reason England was so strong.

A further, but less convincing reason, England

was so strong in Edward's reign was due to its justice system. Day-to-day issues were held in shire or hundred courts to ensure justice was brought about. This system was so ~~ff~~ efficient that it was kept by the Normans post-1066. The king himself presided over more serious cases such as murder, keeping the king's authority.

Furthermore, all men over 12 belonged to a tithing which were groups ~~who~~ designated to monitor each others' behaviour and ensure they followed the law. ~~The~~

There were also trials such as trials by iron to ~~fi~~ determine ~~to~~ someone's guilty or innocent. However, ^{although} ~~at the~~ the justice system kept England a lawful place, it ~~did~~ was not so strictly followed in the North.

The North was a more lawless place ~~and with~~ where blood feuds were still common and people took justice into their own hands, settling disputes among themselves rather than ~~through~~ ^{although} the legal system. Therefore, ^{although} the justice system was sufficient, it was still basic. ~~and~~

~~did not keep~~ it did not keep England a safe, strong, protected country in the

was Harold's leadership did as it was not ~~accepted~~ followed by all, making Harold's leadership the main factor making England so strong during Edward the Confessor's reign and free from invasion.

* However, Harold and his family had too much power over the king, being wealthier than Edward by £2,000^{a year}. Although they threatened Edward's power they did not threaten the strength of England as a whole ~~for the most part~~ (once back from their 1051 exile) and their strength contributed to England's as a whole.



This is a Level 5 response. BP1: The key issues are explored by a sustained analysis. E.g. on pages 1-2, there is an examination of the strong economy and the development of the argument that it was not the key reason as it required the Godwins to defend it. This argument is sustained throughout the answer. [L5] BP2: Excellent knowledge is deployed throughout, e.g. the effectiveness of the legal system in north and south. BP3: Valid criteria are established – principally the importance of the Godwins – and applied in discussing the relative importance of each reason. The final judgement does not return to the given reason. [L5] BP5: The response is well organised and logical and coherent throughout. [L5] Level 5: 19 marks [L5 L5 L5 L5]



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

Question 4

This question was answered by half as many candidates as Question 3 and was in general less well answered. The principal difficulty encountered by candidates answering this question aligns with comments made in the introduction to the report on the sources' questions, viz little or no understanding of the historical context. It is surprising that it is possible for A level candidates to have such a limited understanding of why the relationship of the king with the church is of consequence in 11th century England. A number of candidates noted that both William 1 and William Rufus were both Catholics and that neither had chosen an alternative religion or none. In general the relationship of William I with Lanfranc was better understood than the approach of either William Rufus or Anselm. Better answers were also able to identify the role of the papacy in relations with the English King.

There was some understanding of the Gregorian reforms and many candidates were able to identify problems with simony and pluralism but fewer were able to examine similarities in the approach of William I and his son, in particular their determination to retain their authority as Kings. A number of candidates confused the role of Anselm in disputes with William Rufus with his later problems with Henry I regarding lay investiture. There were some very good answers but many candidates struggled with the concept of 'completely different' and restricted themselves to listing the interactions of William with Lanfranc and William rufus with Anselm without determining how far they could be determined as completely different.

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

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

It is very accurate to say that William I's relationship with the Church was completely different to William Rufus' (WR) relationship with the Church in terms of church reform, relations with English/Norman clergy, and relations with Rome. While there are minor similarities in the distance kept from Rome and the permissive policy in some cases, the relationships are very different.

Where there is perhaps the most difference is in the ~~response to~~ reforms implemented or not implemented by William and WR. William I's conquest of England included control of the church, and thus the immorality under canon law practiced by the Anglo-Saxon clergy was a large point of upset for William. This is perhaps clearest when considering the Council of London in 1075, which made

clear that abuses of canon law common in Anglo-Saxon England such as pluralism, practiced by Stigand, for example, ~~and~~ simony, nepotism, and clerical marriages were firmly outlawed. This harsh and clear adherence to reform of the English Church was not kept up by WR, whose father had effectively ingrained into the Anglo-Norman clergy the distinct opposition of the crown to abuses of canon law. The effective policy of morality reform under William meant that reforms attempted under WR, such as the beginnings of the lay investiture controversy, were now vehemently opposed by the Crown. The opposition of WR to ~~the~~ further reform of the church differs vastly from the view of William that the English Church needed severe reform. However, there is some overlap in their relationship to church reform as both were unwilling to give up the power of investiture, which

was fine under William as there were many other places to focus his energy, however WR's retaining of investiture caused controversy with Rome, suggesting that despite the conceptual agreement over crown influence in the church's appointments, the actuality of the 2 kings' situations were very different. ~~and there~~ It is thus clear that, in regards to Church reform, the relationship between WR and the church and William and the church were very different.

Where there is some similarities between William and WR's relationship with the Church is in their relationship with their clergy and the power the Kings wished to exert over them. Both William and WR had rebellious clergy, William with Odo's attempt to invade Rome, as well as Odo under WR instigating the 1088 rebellion and Anselm leaving for Rome in 1099. The overlap of

Odo as a rebellious figure is perhaps the biggest similarity, as he was very highly ranked by William initially as Earl of Kent, and then exiled for his attempted papal coup. His reemergence as a rebellious bishop under WR is a key piece of evidence when considering the relationship between clergy and king and demonstrates some similarity between William and WR and their trouble controlling clergymen emboldened by Norman deals of war. However, William had a far more positive relationship with his clergymen, especially Lanfranc as Archbishop of Canterbury (AoC) compared to Anselm, WR's AoC. The primacy of the office of AoC and the stark difference in cooperation between Lanfranc and William compared to the constant arguments of WR and Anselm suggest that the 2 kings had ~~an~~ very different

relationships with the Church in regards to clergymen. The success of Lanfranc's reforms under William, as well as his contributions to defence and role in ~~the~~ preventing the Revolt of the Earls in 1075 demonstrates William's positive relationship with clergy. It can also be said that due to the deliberate replacement of all but 3 ^{English} priests by 1086 with Norman clergy, William was inevitably going to have a more positive relationship with his clergymen as he chose them all. WR, on the other hand, had no say in the clergymen in office upon his ascension to the throne and was also a deeply unreligious man for the first 6 years of his reign. His reluctance to appoint a new archbishop after the death of Lanfranc is key evidence of this, and is something William I would have disapproved of as a genuinely pious king. Even after WR gained piety, his relationship with Anselm

was shaky and resulted in WR confiscating Anselm's lands and title when he left England in 1098³ to convene with the Pope over secular power of lay investiture. The tenuousness of WR's relationship with the clergy due to his new piety, Anselm's insistence on removing secular influence from religious practice, and the inheritance of his clergy contrast drastically with William's proactivity in reform and piety, his avoidance of huge controversy over lay investiture, and his control over Norman replacements for English clergy. It is therefore clear that despite the consistency of rebellious clergy, the relationships William and WR had with the Church differed vastly.

The final area in which there is some similarity between the 2 kings and their relationship with the Church is their attitudes

to Rome. This is where the most overlap is, although WR is arguably far harsher in his treatment of Rome than William I. Both kings desired autonomy over the church, and thus both performed piety to an extent - William with the papal permission for the Norman Conquest and WR in making up with Anselm over ~~many~~ church reforms. ~~Despite this,~~ This is a clear demonstration of the papal influence on Norman kings, however it is clear that WR desired far more autonomy than Will I from the papacy as he banned papal legates from entering England where William had welcomed them, perhaps due to a legate's responsibility of deposition used most famously on Stigand. WR also did not allow papal decrees to be sent to England without his express permission, which Will I never banned. These 2 actions

by WR demonstrate his desire to keep distant from the papacy as he was not a very pious man. The lack of restrictions on the papacy in England under William I supplement the argument that the relationship of the 2 kings and the church was very different.

In conclusion, it is ~~was~~ accurate to say that the relationships of William I and WR and their church were completely different owing to WR's disdain for the papacy and his AOC, disdain that William did not share. The vast difference in conceptual and practical agreement over the implementation of church reforms is also a key separator of the 2 kings and their relationship with the church, and the lack of consensus over this is the most glaring divide. William's relatively positive relationship ~~and~~ was not continued in WR's reign, and thus it is concludable that the 2 kings had completely different relationships with the church.

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 20 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 40 MARKS



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. Its organisation to look at a range of features of the relationships with the Church is an effective way of conducting a comparison and reaching a conclusion, e.g. Church reform, investiture, relationship with the clergy and their relationship to the papacy.



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

Question 5 was the most popular question in option 2A.2 and was reasonably well answered. Most candidates had sufficient knowledge of the Assize of Clarendon and Henry II's other legal reforms but fewer were able to use their knowledge to structure an answer to address the question. Some candidates were very vague on the contents of the Assize of Clarendon and claimed a range of legal reforms that did take place under Henry II but were not part of the Assize. This tended to undermine judgements. Too many candidates simply listed Henry II's legal reforms in date sequence without coming to a sustained judgement which addressed the question. A number of candidates lost focus on Henry's legal reforms and spent time examining the exchequer or actions to reduce the power of the barons. The most effective answers possessed sufficient knowledge to substantiate a judgement in favour of the statement that the Assize of Clarendon was the most significant reform and others argued equally clearly in favour of e.g. the Assize of Northampton or less frequently the Inquest of Sheriffs. The defining factor in the most successful answers was an ability to establish valid criteria by which the question could be judged.

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

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒
Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

It is accurate to a large extent to say that the assize of Clarendon was not the most significant reform introduced by Henry II in the development of the legal system. Although the assize of Clarendon was very useful in improving the roles that juries of presentment and sheriffs played in justice by increasing their respective legal powers it was instead the case that the assize of Northampton's work in splitting the English counties into six districts to be visited by justices simultaneously and the introduction of the possessory legal actions of Novel Disseisin and Mort d'Ancestry which played a much greater role in the development of the legal system.

One way that the assize of Clarendon helped to develop the legal system is by improving the powers held by juries of presentment. This is demonstrated by the assize of Clarendon requiring sheriffs to take names of the juries of presentment believed to have committed a crime and then being tasked to make enquiries and bring them to trial. This meant that ~~juries of presentment~~ members of juries of presentment who were ordinary freemen now had a greater impact over the legal system. This is especially important as the members of the juries of presentment are more likely to be able

to present accurate information regarding criminal offences than the previous system of one sheriff in each county ~~being able to~~ having to be responsible for dealing with recording all criminal offences. ~~As a result~~ This meant that, as a result of the assize of Clarendon's introduction in 1166 there was much greater information to justices regarding the crimes committed by those put on trial, thus leading to fairer cases being heard as well as an increasing instance of criminals facing punishment for their crimes. Therefore, Henry II's decision to implement the assize of Clarendon was imperative for imposing fairer justice. As well as this the Assize of Clarendon increased the power of sheriffs by enabling sheriffs to enter anyone's lands in the pursuit of a criminal and require anyone's help in doing so. This meant that for barons, creating mini-kingdoms was no longer possible and barons could also no longer hide their vassals from facing justice. This meant that the assize of Clarendon ended the ability for barons and vassals to escape punishment from their crimes. As a result, the ~~just~~ legal system was developed in a way whereby no ~~was~~ one was above the law, thus leading to barons becoming increasingly compliant with the laws imposed by Henry. This clearly shows that the introduction of the assize of Clarendon led to a developed legal system where all of Henry II's subjects received equal justice. Therefore, it is clear to a fairly large extent that the Assize of Clarendon developed the legal system.

However, it can be argued that Henry II's introduction of the

assize of Northampton in January 1176 led to a more significant development in the legal system. This is demonstrated by the assize of Northampton splitting England's counties into six separate districts which were to be visited by justices simultaneously. This was significant as regular visitation by justices helped to increase the profile of the crown's authority in the shires. This meant that the assize of Northampton helped to lead to an increasing number of cases heard in crown courts by justices rather than in barons private galleys which were used before. As a result, this shows that the assize of Northampton helped to bring about a greater connection between the crown and localities as before most legal cases heard by the crown ~~were only~~ only involved very serious matters. Therefore, this helped to improve the standardisation and experience of justice throughout the realm, especially given that all justices were from London. This meant that the views of justices were more likely to be impartial and not influenced by landowners as had before been the case. As a result, this led to a standardised system of justice which became increasingly recognised and respected. Therefore, this clearly demonstrates that Henry's decision to introduce the assize of Northampton in 1176 helped to develop the legal system by increasing the standardisation of justice by increasing the number of cases heard in the localities by justices.

A final way that Henry II developed the legal system is by his introduction of *Novel disseisin* and *Mort d'ancestor* in 1176.

Naves d'issin could be brought by a plaintiff if they believed they had been unfairly dismissed from their land whereas Mort d'ancestor was concerned with not being given their rightful inheritance. These pleas were very affordable, thus leading to great demand for them among free tenants. This meant that the introduction of these possessory legal actions made justice in reach for most people, thus giving greater protection for free tenants. This was important as before free tenants had to take their cases to barons private galleys where judgements were irregular with no standardised procedure. As a result, these possessory legal actions allowed for free tenants to use the legal system to their advantage. Therefore, the ~~increased~~ huge increase in demand for these possessory legal actions led to further development within the legal system. This is illustrated by the creation of the court of the king's bench in 1179 where five members of the curia regis stood permanently at the palace of Westminster to hear the backlog of cases created by demand for the possessory legal actions. This meant that justice ~~and~~ was now in reach of all free tenants and in the form of a standardised procedure. As a result, this helped to lead to the creation of a core body of professional judges who together would work to create a standardised system for all justice. Therefore, this exhibits clearly that Henry II's decision to introduce Naves d'issin and Mort d'ancestor led to a huge improvement in the accessibility of justice for ordinary free-tenants and improved the standardisation of justice throughout the realm.

Overall, it is clear to a fairly large extent that Henry II's introduction of the assize of Clarendon in 1166 was not the most significant reform ~~by~~ ~~it~~ in the development of the legal system. Although it helped to increase the powers of juries of presentment by giving ~~an~~ ordinary people a greater role to play in the legal system as well as ensuring that all of Henry II's subjects forced equal justice by increasing the powers of sheriffs, it was instead the introduction of the assize of Northampton and the posterior legal actions ~~with~~ of Naves d'irein and Merc d'oreiter which had a much more significant impact on the development of the legal system. This is due to their contributions in increasing the crown's presence in the localities regarding justice as well as increasing the standardisation of justice and making justice accessible to all. Therefore, it is clear to a large extent that Henry II's introduction of the assize of Clarendon was not the most significant reform in the development of the legal system in the years 1154-89.



This is a level 5 response which achieves level 5 in all four bullet points. The key issues are explored and the analysis is sustained throughout the answer. The range and depth of knowledge is excellent. Significance is thoroughly evaluated and it reaches a secure judgement.



This question focuses on significance. To address it effectively, you need to establish the relative importance of each factor in relation to the given factor [the Assize of Clarendon] in order to develop a judgement on whether the given factor is most important.

Question 6

As there were a relatively small number of answers to this question, it is more difficult to identify common trends in candidates' answers. There were a wide range of answers to this question ranging from level 4 and level 5 answers, which identified valid criteria by which a complete failure in Henry II's control of the church could be judged, to lower level answers which focused entirely on the relationship of Henry II with Becket. The role of the papacy was not well understood. The Compromise of Avranches and the years after Becket's death were ignored by a significant number of candidates. In some answers, too much time was devoted to pseudo-psychological assessments of both Becket and Henry II, which lacked supporting evidence and in no way informed the final judgement.

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

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

Henry II came to the throne in 1154 and dedicated his reign to establishing his royal authority, which extended over the church as they were his vassals in the feudal system of land ownership. Henry II appointed his accomplished Chancellor, Thomas Becket, as the Archbishop of York in attempt to gain influence over the church with an ally. Henry II's turbulent relationship with Thomas Becket corrupted his attempt to extend control over the Church, however Henry II ~~did not hold~~ still maintained influence over the Church by 1174.

Henry II failed to extend his control over the Church as a result of his insistence that Thomas Becket was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, the most senior clergyman in the country. Thomas Becket was chosen due to his

close relationship with Henry II as Chancellor, over other experienced bishops such as the Bishop of London. This was due to Henry II's desire to extend his royal authority over the Church, through placing a strong ally of his in an influential position such as the Archbishop of Canterbury. The monks at Canterbury agreed after Richard de Lucy ~~was~~ was able to convince them, that Thomas Becket would be ordained as the Archbishop ~~this~~ in 1162. This decision from Henry II was set up for success, until Thomas Becket experienced a religious transformation. Some chroniclers regarding how he seemed to be an entirely different person, which led to the subsequent deterioration of the good relationship he and Henry II shared. This became clear at the Council of Westminster in October 1163, where Henry II stated to Becket that he wished to return to the 'ancient customs' of the Norman Kings which would diminish the ~~royal~~ power the ecclesiastical courts held over criminal clerics. Thomas Becket refused to acknowledge that, as it opposed the ~~the~~ canon law

of the Church that had been established by Pope Gregory VII in 1040. This was the beginning of Henry II's failure to extend his control over the church as Becket continued to refuse to accept Henry II's ancient customs. This was clear when Becket refused to sign the written Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164, and even though he accepted a chirograph at the time ~~a~~ he continued to ignore Henry II's ~~will~~ will to impose his authority over the church, which was clear when he fled to Pope Alexander III in 1164, after Henry II tried to put him in a trial for financial crimes he committed as Chancellor in Northampton. Henry II continued to fail to establish control over the Church, as ~~he~~ Becket was made papal legate in 1166, which he exploited and placed ~~the~~ interdicts on England and excommunicated Bishops, which ~~he~~ put more pressure on Henry II, who was trying to establish control over his barons at the time. Thomas Becket continued to rebel against Henry II's demands, when

peace talks were hosted by Louis VII at Montmirail in 1169, he repeated the phrase to Henry II in regards to his customs - "except for saving our order". This demonstrates Henry II's lack of control over the Church, as Becket in its highest position continues to humiliate Henry II and undermine his authority, ~~refusing~~ demanding £20,000 from him at Montmarte as compensation and a kiss of peace. This continues, until Henry II crowns his son with the Archbishop of York in 1170, which directly involves the Pope placing an interdict on Henry, who allows Thomas Becket back into the country without having to acknowledge his customs. Therefore, Henry II completely failed to establish his authority over the Church due to Thomas Becket's constant opposition to his demands, and he himself ultimately submitted to the authority of the Pope.

However, Henry II's attempt to control the church was not a

complete failure by 1174. This is clear when Henry II is able to exploit the papal schism between Pope Alexander III and his antipope Victor IV to grant him papal dispensation in Ireland in 1170, and an early marriage between his son, Henry, and Margaret princess of France. Henry II exerts control over the church in England, as there are Bishops who provide their seal for the Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164, and those who oppose Thomas Becket's rebellion in support of Henry II such as the Bishop of Salisbury. Henry II also manages to ~~est~~ establish control when the Archbishop of York crowns Henry II's son, Henry, in 1170, whereas previously in 1161, the Archbishop of York had refused to in the absence of ~~an~~ an Archbishop of Canterbury. Therefore Henry II was able to exert some control over the Church in England as they were his vassals.

In conclusion, Henry II failed to

extend control over the Church as the relationship between church and king did not return to what it was under Henry I, and the ecclesiastical courts continued to prosper with prosecuting criminals who indulged in the 'benefit of the clergy', escaping the harsh punishments of Henry II's secular courts. Henry II's attempts cannot be considered a complete failure, as Henry II was able to effectively establish his feudal rights he controlled the Church through the feudal system and was able to ~~to~~ increase royal revenue through taxing them. ~~However~~ Ultimately, Henry II was always going to fail to extend control over the Church, even if Thomas Becket was not Archbishop of Canterbury, as the Gregorian reform in the 11th Century meant an increase in papal authority over secular rulers like Henry II, as demonstrated in the Compromise of Avranches in 1172 where Henry II pledges money to Pope Alexander III as penance for Becket's murder.



This is a level 5 entry response. It has a heavy focus on the relationship between Henry II and Becket but does consider the King's attempts to extend his control over the church, e.g. in trying to enforce the 'ancient customs' and Becket's resistance, and considers the counter case that Henry was largely able to retain control over his bishops, utilise the papal schism to his advantage and exercise his rights over the coronation of Young Henry. It has a secure conclusion with reference to some of Henry's failed aims, e.g control over church courts, issues of Gregorian reforms and the maintenance of control through the feudal system. If some of these issues had been explicitly explored in the main body of the answer, it would likely have achieved more in level 5.



Always plan answers before writing to ensure focus on the explicit wording of the question.

Paper Summary

Key points based on the questions on this paper:

Section A questions : Continuing improvement on using the sources in combination but candidates need to be reminded that this involves more than just identifying where the sources are in agreement. Further work is needed on the consideration of the nature, origin and purpose of the sources as the nature of sources 2 and 4 in particular were not fully examined.

Section B questions: Examination techniques require improvement, in particular retaining a focus on the question, and avoiding extensive irrelevant digressions and identifying valid criteria by which the question can be judged.

Issues of knowledge and understanding

- Sound knowledge of the events leading up to the Battle of Hastings and detailed knowledge of the tactics employed by both sides and their influence on the course of the battle.
- Sound knowledge of the Anglo Saxon Economy and the role of the King and the legal system.
- Disappointing lack of awareness of the context of 11th century society, in particular the role of religion and the Catholic Church.
- Reign of William Rufus and his relationship to the church not well understood.
- Further work is needed on the role of the Barons and Henry II's family in the Great Rebellion.
- Reasonable knowledge of Henry II's legal reforms but some confusion over their implementation and consequences.
- Knowledge of Henry II's relationship with the church needs to be extended beyond his relationship with Becket.

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>

