**Section B: The Norman Conquest, 1065–1087**

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6a – 3 marks**  **In Interpretation A the illustrator portrays the important role of wealthy women in late Anglo-Saxon society. Identify and explain one way in which he does this.** |
| **Notes and guidance specific to the question set**  Points marking (AO4): 1+1+1. 1 mark for identification of a relevant and appropriate way in which the illustrator portrays the role of wealthy women + 1 mark for a basic explanation of this + 1 mark for development of this explanation.  *Reminder – This question does not seek evaluation of the given interpretation, just selection of relevant material and analysis of this is relation to the issue in the question.*  *The explanation of how the illustrator portrays the role of wealthy women may analyse the interpretation or aspects of the interpretation by using the candidate’s knowledge of historical events portrayed and / or to the method or approach used by the artist/historian. Knowledge and understanding of historical context must be intrinsically linked to the analysis of the interpretation in order to be credited. Marks must not be awarded for the demonstration of knowledge or understanding in isolation.*  *The following answers are indicative. Other appropriate ways and appropriate and accurate explanation should also be credited:*  *Answers could include the following: the woman’s role was to be hostess at a feast (1) you can see this as the women is offering the guest/warrior a drink from the mead cup (1) this was because men often prepared the food but women were responsible for preparing and serving the drink (1),*  *or the artist shows that women and men of the same class were seen as equal (1) the woman is shown next to the man seated behind the table so she isn’t seen as a waitress or just to serve, she is part of the feast (1) in Anglo Saxon society everyone has a ‘value’ called a wergild. Men and women were worth the same from the same social class (1).*  *Or wealthy women and men had different roles as you can see from the woman serving but the men behind the trestle table staying seated (1). Men were seen as warriors, you can see the shields behind the trestle table (1) however feasting was an important part of Anglo Saxon society and women were central to that as hostess (1).* |

NOTES

1 Possible responses include:

* Woman shown in central position in drawing
* Holding cup indicates she is in charge of hospitality
* Clothing is hig quality
* Position behind the high table (or next to lord)
* Visitor is addressing her not the men
* High status environment (hall )

2 Award 1 mark for each different way the illustrator portrays importance correctly identified

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question 6b – 5 marks  If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand the roles of different groups of people in late Anglo-Saxon society.** | |
| **Guidance and indicative content**  **GENERAL NOTE: Although no cand has done so there are other valid lines of enquiry apart from women, such as military society, social structure, culture** | |
| **Level 3 (5 marks)** | Answers at L3 will typically identify one or more valid lines of enquiry based on a second order concept and explain specifically how this enquiry would increase understanding of some aspect(s) of the topic / issue eg  *[Significance / Diversity]*  *In Interpretation A we can see an important Anglo-Saxon woman. I would investigate how much power and influence women had in Anglo-Saxon England. This would help us to understand whether Anglo-Saxon was really dominated by men or whether women had a say. I would also investigate whether all women had a say or whether it was just a few women from the noble class*.  **Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry with explanation of how this would improve understanding** |
| **Level 2 (3-4 marks)** | Answers at L2 will typically identify one or more valid lines of enquiry based on a second order concept and give a general indication of how this enquiry would increase understanding of some aspect(s) of the topic / issue eg  *[Significance / Diversity]*  *I would look at how important women were in Anglo-Saxon England. This would help us to understand whether or not women were treated equally.*  **OR**  *[Change / continuity]*  *I would investigate whether rights for women got better or worse after the Norman Conquest.*  **Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry with general indication of how this would improve understanding** |
| **Level 1 (1–2 marks)** | Answers at L1 will identify a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept (2 marks) eg  *I would investigate whether or not women in Anglo-Saxon England were treated equally.*  **Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry**  Alternatively, L1 answers may identify details from Interpretation A or other aspects of Anglo-Saxon life and suggest further investigation into them (1-2 marks) eg  *I would look at what sort of job the man being offered the cup does. I would want to know whether he is important or just some local man. That would tell me how important this woman was. [2 marks]*  *OR*  *I would find out more about what women did.[1 mark]*  *OR*  *I would want to know whether he is important or just some local man.*  **Nutshell: Find out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A** |
| **0 marks** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 7–12 marks**  **Interpretations B and C are both interpretations of Hereward the Wake. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?** | | |
| **Guidance and indicative content** | | |
| **Level 4 (10-12 marks)** | Answers at L4 will typically compare the portrayal of Hereward and develop this with a valid explanation of difference(s) between them. Portrayals will be supported by relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. Explanations of difference will be based on the specific purpose or context of one of the interpretations eg  *These two interpretations give us very different views of Hereward the Wake. From Interpretation C we get the impression that Hereward the Wake was a mighty hero and invincible warrior. He looks tall and commanding and even the enemy arrows flying around him do not seem to bother him. If you did not know any better you would say he was the conqueror not the Normans. Interpretation C is a bit more downbeat. It talks about Hereward making a last stand and it also mentions how he was betrayed and defeated which is very different from B. I think the reason for the difference is that B is trying to make Hereward look exciting and interesting to encourage people to come and visit Ely. The train company is trying to ‘sell’ Hereward.*  **Nutshell Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C explained with specific purpose/ nature / context of B or C**  **NOTE Responses which attempt to explain differences through generalised points (eg *The main reason why they are different is that one is an advertisement and the other is a children’s history book so she is trying to get to different audiences.)* should not be rewarded above L3.** | |
| **Level 3 (7-9 marks)** | Answers at L3 will typically compare the portrayal of Hereward. Portrayals will be supported by relevant reference(s) to the content of the interpretation(s). Answers at this level may attempt to explain differences using general points eg  *These two interpretations give us very different views of Hereward the Wake. From Interpretation C we get the impression that Hereward the Wake was a mighty hero and invincible warrior. He looks tall and commanding and even the enemy arrows flying around him do not seem to bother him. If you did not know any better you would say he was the conqueror not the Normans. Interpretation C is a bit more downbeat. It talks about Hereward making a last stand and it also mentions how he was betrayed and defeated which is very different from B. I think they are different because one is a poster aimed at adults while the other one is a children’s book so one is more violent and the other one is trying not to upset children.*  **Nutshell Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C with support**  **NOTE Answers with support from only one interpretation award 7 marks**  **NOTE Responses which attempt to explain differences through generalised points (eg *The main reason why they are different is that one is an advertisement and the other is a children’s novel so they are trying to get to different audiences.)* should not be rewarded above L3.** | |
| **Level 2 (4-6 marks)** | Answers at L2 typically use the content of the interpretations to compare individual points of similarity or difference eg  *These interpretations are quite similar in some ways. In B Hereward is shown fighting his enemies. In C the author talks about how Hereward held out against William.*  *OR*  *These two interpretations are very different. One is a poster showing Hereward the Wake fighting his enemies. The other is a children’s book explaining how he was defeated.*  **Nutshell: Selects individual points of difference**  Alternatively, answers at L2 may make a valid comparison of the overall portrayal of Hereward the Wake but fail to use and relevant support eg  *Interpretation B makes Hereward out to be a hero whereas C portrays him as more of a cautious leader looking after his people.*  **Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals no support**  **NOTE: Answers which explain reason(s) for difference(s) but fail to explain portrayals award at L2 6 marks** | |
| **Level 1 (1–3 marks)** | Answers at L1 will typically make unsupported assertions or make simplistic comments about provenance eg  *They are different because one is a poster advertising trains and the other one is a history book for children.*  **Nutshell: Assertion or simplistic provenance**  **NOTE: Answers which make no valid comparison should not be awarded above L1 (1 mark)** | |
| **0 marks** |  | |
| **Question 8\*–20 marks**  **In his TV series A History of Britain historian Simon Schama said that after the Battle of Hastings ‘One kind of England was destroyed and another kind of England set up in its place’. How far do you agree with this view?** | | |
| **Guidance and indicative content** | | |
| **Level 5 (17-20 marks)** | | Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced answer which uses at least two pieces of supporting evidence explicitly to support the argument being made on each side  e.g.  *On the whole I agree with this view. The Normans definitely did set up a new England after they defeated Harold in 1066. Almost the entire class of thegns was removed and replaced by Norman barons, as we know from the Domesday Book. Obviously this would support the claim that Anglo-Saxon England ended. Also the Normans also brought in a new language and culture. They rebuilt most of England’s cathedrals in a new style which was a deliberate attempt to try to crush English culture and identity.*  *On the other hand a lot of Anglo-Saxon England survived the Norman Conquest. Most Saxons continued to speak their own language and would not have noticed that they had a new lord as they would have had little to do with their old lord. Also the old Anglo-Saxon system of government survived almost intact. William the Conqueror continued to use writs and other measures which had been used by the Saxon kings.*  **Nutshell Balanced argument with at least two pieces of specific supporting evidence on each side**  **NOTE** Answers which argue the merits of one side of the argument and the weaknesses of the other side can be rewarded as a balanced answer rather than one-sided  **NOTE** Award 17-19 marks at L5, 20 for L5 answer with clinching argument (eg Overall I agree with this statement, particularly if we are focusing on the issue of where power lay in England. In that respect there is no doubt that the old England was destroyed). |
| **Level 4 (13-16 marks)** | | Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced answer which uses at least one piece of supporting evidence explicitly to support the argument being made on each side  e.g.  *On the whole I agree with this view. The Normans definitely did set up a new England after they defeated Harold in 1066. Almost the entire class of thegns was removed and replaced by Norman barons, as we know from the Domesday Book.*  *On the other hand the old Anglo-Saxon system of government survived almost intact. William the Conqueror continued to use writs and other measures which had been used by the Saxon kings.*  **Nutshell One sided argument with at least one piece of specific supporting evidence on each side**  Alternatively answers at L4 could construct a one-sided argument which uses at least two pieces of supporting evidence explicitly to support the argument being made eg  *On the whole I agree with this view. The Normans definitely did set up a new England after they defeated Harold in 1066. Almost the entire class of thegns was removed and replaced by Norman barons, as we know from the Domesday Book. Obviously this would support the claim that Anglo-Saxon England ended. Also the Normans also brought in a new language and culture. They rebuilt most of England’s cathedrals in a new style which was a deliberate attempt to try to crush English culture and identity.*  **Nutshell One sided argument with at least two pieces of specific supporting evidence on each side**  NOTE Answers at Alt L4 may attempt a balanced argument but support only one side with specific supporting evidence  **NOTE** Award 13-15 marks at L4, 16 for L4answer with clinching argument (eg Overall I agree with this statement, particularly if we are focusing on the issue of where power lay in England. In that respect there is no doubt that the old England was destroyed). |
| **Level 3 (9-12 marks)** | | Answers at L3 will typically construct a one-sided argument which uses one piece of supporting evidence explicitly to support the argument being made eg  *On the whole I agree with this view. The Normans definitely did set up a new England after they defeated Harold in 1066. Almost the entire class of thegns was removed and replaced by Norman barons, as we know from the Domesday Book.*  **Nutshell One sided argument with at least one piece of specific supporting evidence**  **NOTE** Answers at L3 may attempt a balanced argument but support only one side with specific supporting evidence |
| **Level 2 (5-8 marks)** | | Level 2 answers will typically construct a balanced OR one-sided answer which uses relevant information to implicitly support the argument being made   e.g.  *The statement is only partially right. Domesday Book shows what happened to land. Also the Normans built cathedrals all over the country.*  *On the other hand most English people were still speaking English.*  **Nutshell Balanced or one sided argument with implicit support**  **NOTE:** One-sided answers at this level limited to maximum 6 marks  **NOTE:** The term implicit refers to a supported argument without explaining how the support addresses the question. |
| **Level 1 (1-4 marks)** | | Level 1 answers will typically describe relevant events or developments but fail to address the question of change eg  *In 1066 the Normans defeated the Anglo-Saxons at Hastings. They had to crush many rebellions. They built castles to control the country ….*  **Nutshell Description of events or developments but not addressing change**  **NOTE General unsupported assertions 2 marks max** |
| **0 marks** | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question 9\*–20 marks**  **In an article for the *BBC History Magazine* in 2016, the historian Tessa Cole discussed the reasons why William of Normandy was able to become King of England. She wrote that 'it was definitely Hardrada and his Viking invaders that in the end cost Harold his crown and his life.' How far do you agree with this view?** | |
| **Guidance and indicative content** | |
| **Level 5 (17-20 marks)** | Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced answer which uses at least two pieces of supporting evidence explicitly to support the argument being made on each side  e.g.  *On the whole I agree with this view. If Harald had not invaded then Harold Godwinson would not have been facing two enemies and he could have faced William of Normandy with all his forces ready in the south of England. Because of the invasion Harold Godwinson had to march his forces north. Even though he won he suffered casualties and his troops had to travel hundreds of miles.*  *On the other hand it has to be admitted that Harold Godwinson made some poor decisions. For example he chose to march south immediately after Stamford Bridge so that when his forces faced William’s at Hastings many of his troops were tired. Another important factor was the quality of William’s leadership. For example in the Battle of Hastings he exploited the situation where some of Harold’s troops broke ranks to chase fleeing Norman knights. We don’t know if this was a deliberate ploy but we do know he exploited the opportunity effectively.*  **Nutshell Balanced argument with at least two pieces of specific supporting evidence on each side**  **NOTE** Answers which argue the merits of one side of the argument and the weaknesses of the other side can be rewarded as a balanced answer rather than one-sided  **NOTE** Award 17-19 marks at L5, 20 for L5 answer with clinching argument (eg Overall I agree with this statement, particularly if we are focusing on the issue of where power lay in England. In that respect there is no doubt that the old England was destroyed). |
| **Level 4 (13-16 marks)** | Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced answer which uses at least one piece of supporting evidence explicitly to support the argument being made on each side  e.g.  *On the whole I agree with this view. If Harald had not invaded then Harold Godwinson would not have been facing two enemies and he could have faced William of Normandy with all his forces ready in the south of England.*  *On the other hand it has to be admitted that Harold Godwinson made some poor decisions. For example he chose to march south immediately after Stamford Bridge so that when his forces faced William’s at Hastings many of his troops were tired.*  **Nutshell One sided argument with at least one piece of specific supporting evidence on each side**  Alternatively answers at L4 could construct a one-sided argument which uses at least two pieces of supporting evidence explicitly to support the argument being made eg  *On the whole I agree with this view. If Harald had not invaded then Harold Godwinson would not have been facing two enemies and he could have faced William of Normandy with all his forces ready in the south of England. Because of the invasion Harold Godwinson had to march his forces north. Even though he won he suffered casualties and his troops had to travel hundreds of miles.*  **Nutshell One sided argument with at least two pieces of specific supporting evidence on each side**  NOTE Answers at Alt L4 may attempt a balanced argument but support only one side with specific supporting evidence  **NOTE** Award 13-15 marks at L4, 16 for L4answer with clinching argument (eg Overall I agree with this statement, particularly if we are focusing on the issue of where power lay in England. In that respect there is no doubt that the old England was destroyed). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level 3 (9-12 marks)** | Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-side answer which uses at least one piece of supporting evidence explicitly to support the argument being made e.g.  *I disagree with the statement. I believe Harold lost because of his poor decisions. For example he chose to march south immediately after Stamford Bridge so that when his forces faced William’s at Hastings many of his troops were tired.*  **Nutshell One sided argument with at least one piece of specific supporting evidence on each side**  **NOTE** Answers at L3 may attempt a balanced argument but support only one side with specific supporting evidence |
| **Level 2 (5-8 marks)** | Level 2 answers will typically construct a balanced OR one-sided answer which uses relevant information to implicitly support the argument being made   e.g.  *The statement is only partially right. Harald landed in northern England in 1066. Harold went up to fight him and defeated him at Stamford Bridge.*  *On the other hand I do not agree. William landed at Pevensey and Harold marched the length of the country to meet him.*  **Nutshell Balanced or one sided argument with implicit support**  **NOTE:** One-sided answers at this level limited to maximum 9 marks  **NOTE:** The term implicit refers to a supported argument without explaining how the support addresses the question. |
| **Level 1 (1-4 marks)** | Level 1 answers will typically describe relevant events, changes or developments but fail to address the question of change eg  *In 1066 Harald Hardrada landed in the north of England. Harold Godwinson marched north to meet him. He beat him at Stamford Bridge. Then he …..*  **Nutshell Description of events or developments but not addressing change**  **NOTE General unsupported assertions 2 marks max** |
| **0 marks** |  |