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General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate’s response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

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

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

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
**Generic Level Descriptors: Section A**

**Target:** AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–3  | • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.  
• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.  
• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements. |
| 2     | 4–7  | • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.  
• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.  
• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions. |
| 3     | 8–12 | • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences  
• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.  
• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification. |
| 4     | 13–16| • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two enquiries may be uneven.  
• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.  
• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>17–20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interrogates the evidence of the source in relation to both enquiries with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sections B and C**

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–3  | • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.  
      |       | • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.  
      |       | • The overall judgement is missing or asserted.  
      |       | • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision. |
| 2     | 4–7  | • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.  
      |       | • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.  
      |       | • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.  
      |       | • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision. |
| 3     | 8–12 | • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.  
      |       | • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.  
      |       | • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.  
      |       | • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision. |
| 4     | 13–16| • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.  
      |       | • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.  
      |       | • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.  
<pre><code>  |       | • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>17–20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section A: indicative content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the nature of support for Henry Tudor and the reasons for his success at Bosworth. The individuals and events referred to in the extract are named in the specification, and candidates can therefore be expected to know about them and be aware of the context.  
1. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:  
   - Polydore Vergil was writing in Henry VII’s reign long after the battle of Bosworth  
   - Henry VII requested that Vergil write a history of England, which meant it was likely to look favourably upon him  
   - The history justified Henry VII’s claim to the throne  
   - Vergil consulted some of those who were at Bosworth meaning that his account contains the experience of eyewitnesses. |
| **2** | The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:  
**Nature of support for Henry:**  
   - The source claims that those who fought on behalf of Henry were obedient, disciplined and supported him willingly  
   - It suggests that once Richard was killed those who had fought on his side willingly switched allegiance to support Henry  
   - The source indicates that many of those who had fought Henry did not do so because they opposed him but because they were too afraid to go against Richard  
   - The source claims that Henry was crowned on the battlefield and this was significant in showing that he was the chosen monarch of the people.  
**Reasons for victory at Bosworth:**  
   - It suggests that the support of William Stanley and his men was a key turning point in the success of the battle  
   - It provides evidence that Richard was killed when leading a charge in person to kill Henry  
   - It claims that a significant number of Richard’s supporters were killed or taken as prisoners  
   - The source suggests that once Richard was killed many of those who had fought on his side left the battle. |
| **3** | Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:  
   - Henry VII dated his reign from the day before the battle  
   - The weaknesses of Henry’s claim to the throne by inheritance rather than victory in battle  
   - Northumberland’s conduct during the battle and the significance of the French contingent aiding Henry  
   - The significance of Henry being handed the crown at Bosworth. |

Other relevant material must be credited.
## Section B: indicative content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Henry V’s campaigns in France were a complete success in the years 1415–21.

Arguments and evidence that Henry’s campaigns in France were a complete success should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Victory at Agincourt in 1415 was both unexpected and complete, restoring faith in Henry’s leadership
- Henry’s conquest of Normandy in 1417–19 resulted in his being able to take Paris
- Diplomatic engagement with the Burgundians enabled Henry to control the whole of Northern France
- The Treaty of Troyes in 1420 was a high point of Henry’s efforts in France with his marriage to Catherine of Valois and the disinherita

Arguments and evidence that qualify Henry’s success should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- War with France significantly strained financial and military resources in England
- Henry was unable to follow up his success at Agincourt and returned to England in November 1415, only returning to Normandy in August 1417
- The revival of the Orleanists, led by the Dauphin, countered Henry’s success for a time
- The English lost the Battle of Bauge in 1421 and Henry was forced to return to France to continue his campaign
- By the end of 1421, English troops had been held up at the Siege of Meaux.

Other relevant material must be credited.
### Question 3

Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that the growing ambitions of the Duke of York were the most significant threat to Henry VI’s hold on the throne in the years 1454–60.

Arguments and evidence that the growing ambitions of the Duke of York were the most significant threat to Henry VI’s hold on the throne should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- York’s armed march to the Royal Court at Leicester in 1454 threatened the stability of the throne
- His defeat of royal troops in 1455 enabled him to demand a powerful position from the King
- York’s frequent military challenges of the King were a significant distraction for Henry
- York won the support of the nobility in 1453–4, which strengthened his threat to Henry.

Arguments and evidence that other factors were a more significant threat to Henry VI’s hold on the throne, and/or that the Duke of York was not a significant threat, should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The Yorkists were defeated in 1459 and York was attainted showing that the threat of York had been contained
- York’s claim to the throne was rejected in 1460
- Margaret of Anjou’s actions at the Parliament of the Devils in 1459 alienated members of the nobility, which threatened Henry VI’s hold on the throne
- The financial weakness of the crown in this period and increasing levels of debt limited Henry’s ability to manage the throne
- Lancastrian weaknesses, e.g. defeats in 1455 and 1460, were a more significant threat to Henry’s hold on the throne than York himself.

Other relevant material must be credited.
### Question 4

Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the accuracy of the claim that retaining decreased in importance in the years 1399–1509.

Arguments and evidence that retaining decreased in importance should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- In 1411 Henry IV sought to control the issue of liveries with clerics only permitted to issue liveries to their own servants
- The success of nobles’ retinues at Agincourt in 1415 and on the French campaign was not replicated later in the period, and marked the high point of the importance of retaining
- Edward IV dealt with the issue of illegal retaining with a statute passed in 1468 which largely prohibited retaining
- Henry VII asserted his control over retaining passing a law against retaining in 1487 which limited the size of retinues
- Henry VII issued another law against retaining in 1504 and issued fines against those nobles who continued to have large retinues.

Arguments and evidence that retaining did not decrease in importance should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Retaining was a significant feature of royal security and stability with Henry IV rewarding his servants for their loyalty in his role as Duchy of Lancaster
- Retaining played a significant role in the growth and strength of rival factions during the War of the Roses, for example under Henry VI in the 1450s
- Edward’s statute was ineffective as the term ‘lawful service’ enabled nobles to continue to carry out retaining during his reign
- Although Henry VII passed laws against retaining he still made use of nobles’ armies, e.g. noble retainers at Newark in 1487
- Retinues continued to form a major part of royal armies fighting abroad and were sent to France in 1475 and 1492.

Other relevant material must be credited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the Parliament of 1406 was the key turning point in the increasing power of Parliament in the years 1399–1509.

Arguments and evidence that the Parliament of 1406 was the key turning point in the increasing power of Parliament should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Despite two adjournments the Parliament was the longest of Henry IV’s reign, which suggests that the King needed to work with Parliament to rule effectively
- The Parliament marked a significant shift in relations between the King and commons, who were unwilling to subsidise the King without concessions
- The petition set out what issues the commons had with the King and set out a series of expectations, for example defence of the kingdom, which demonstrate the increasing power Parliament had over the King’s agenda
- The commons in 1406 established the precedent that taxes would only be granted once the King promised to address grievances, which was a curb on the power of the King.

Arguments and evidence that the Parliament of 1406 was not the key turning point, and/or that other events were more significant, in the increasing power of Parliament should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The balance of power between Crown and Parliament still depended on personality of the monarch, e.g. Edward IV was able to exploit Parliament to raise revenue and with acts of attainder
- Efforts of Parliament in 1449–50 led to Cade's rebellion in support of their position, suggesting that this Parliament showed a more significant increase in power than that of 1406
- The 'Parliament of Devils' in 1459 sentenced key Yorkist nobles to death and disinherited Yorkist heirs and was a more significant development in the increasing power of Parliament
- Changes in the power of Parliament were short-lived as Henry VII only called Parliament seven times in 24 years, suggesting that Parliament had not increased in importance by 1509.

Other relevant material must be credited.