



GCSE (9-1)

History B (Schools History Project)

J411/17: Migrants to Britain, c.1250 to present with The Norman Conquest, 1065-1087

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2025

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2025

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING RM ASSESSOR

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: RM Assessor Online Training: OCR Essential Guide to Marking.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are available in RM Assessor
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the required number of practice responses (“scripts”) and the required number of standardisation responses.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, email or via the RM Assessor messaging system.
5. **Crossed-Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed-out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed-out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM Assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)

Multiple-Choice Question Responses

When a multiple-choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate). When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only one mark per response)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth two or more marks)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space).

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add the annotation 'SEEN' to confirm that the work has been seen and mark any responses using the annotations in section 11.

7. There is a NR (No Response) option. Award NR (No Response):

- if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
- OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g., 'can't do', 'don't know')
- OR if there is a mark (e.g., a dash, a question mark) which is not an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).

8. The RM Assessor comments box is used by your Team Leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. Do not use the comments box for any other reason.

9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

To determine the level – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer

To determine the mark within the level, consider the following

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. **Annotations**

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

<i>Stamp</i>	<i>Ref No.</i>	<i>Annotation Name</i>	<i>Description</i>
	311	L1	Level 1
	321	L2	Level 2
	331	L3	Level 3
	341	L4	Level 4
	441	L5	Level 5
	3261	L6	Level 6
	811	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
	501	NAQ	Not answered question
	1371	H Wavy Line	Incorrect/muddled/unclear
	1681	BP	Blank page
	151	Highlight	Part of the response which is rewardable (at one of the levels on the MS)
	11	Tick	Tick

1. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader /PE.

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

Mark scheme

Section A: Migrants to Britain, c.1250 to present

Question 1–3 marks	
(a) Give one example of a job or role typically carried out by Indian migrants who came to Britain in the period 1600-1750. (b) Identify one reason why Irish migrants came to Britain between 1750 and 1900. (c) Identify one way the British government attempted to restrict migration to Britain in the 1960s or early 1970s.	
Guidance	Indicative content
1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	For 1(a), likely valid responses include: household servants, child servants, ayahs, nannies; Lascars; dockworkers; seamen. For 1(b), likely valid responses include: famine/ failure of the potato crop; starvation; rising food prices; increase in rents; evictions; Ireland over-populated [pre-famine]; Britain was industrialising so there were more jobs; the journey was cheap and short; poor treatment by landlords. NOTE: Do not credit general answers which could apply to any migrant group at any time, e.g. 'for work', 'for a better life', etc. NOTE: Do not allow 'religious persecution by Protestant landlords' For 1(c,) likely valid responses include: 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act; ended the automatic right of Commonwealth passport holders to live and work in Britain; Commonwealth migrants had to apply for employment vouchers; 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act; prohibited entry to anyone without a father or grandfather born in the UK; 1971 Immigration Act; replaced vouchers with work permits for specific time periods, so staying in Britain was only temporary. NOTE: Date/ accurate date does not need to be included for correct response Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.
1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	
1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	

Question 2–9 marks Write a clear and organised summary that analyses attitudes towards migrants in the medieval period (c.1250–1500). Support your summary with examples.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i> <i>Answers may show use of second order concepts such as:</i> Causation: Reasons for positive attitudes, e.g. migrants providing needed service – Jewish money-lenders, Flemish weavers, Italian bankers; Reasons for negative attitudes, e.g. resentment of Jews could be caused by their role as moneylenders; hostility towards Jews became more pronounced when alternative moneylending avenues were opened; Christians believed that Jews were responsible for the death of Jesus; Jews were falsely accused of murdering Christian children in 'blood libel' cases (e.g. Lincoln); weavers and cloth guilds resented special privileges given to their Flemish competitors. Consequence: Impact of negative attitudes , e.g. Lincoln Blood Libel case led to murder of Jews (e.g. in London, four hundred were murdered in 1263) and violence (e.g. in London, one hundred were beaten to death in 1264, and there were similar attacks in Bristol and Lincoln); resentment over Flemish competitors led to violence (e.g. during the 'Great Rising' of 1381, rebels murdered over 100 foreigners, mainly Flemish weavers and merchants, in London). Change / continuity (e.g. worsening attitudes towards Jews: still welcome 1250, hostility, then expulsion) NOTE: This needs to be a valid comparison to show change/ continuity over time. Diversity (similarity and difference): e.g. comparison of different types of attitudes, e.g. positive and negative. NOTE: Do not allow answers which are clearly about events pre-1250, e.g. William the Conqueror inviting the Jews to come to live in England. <i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise the answer, but the concepts do need to be apparent from the connections and chains of reasoning in the summary in order to meet the AO2 descriptors (see levels descriptors).</i> <i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates a well-selected range of valid knowledge of characteristic features that are fully relevant to the question, in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows sustained logical coherence, demonstrating clear use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates a range of knowledge of characteristic features that are relevant to the question, in ways that show understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows some logical coherence, demonstrating use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of characteristic features with some relevance to the question, in ways that show some limited understanding of them (AO1). The summary shows a very basic logical coherence, demonstrating limited use of at least one second order concept in attempting to find connections and to provide a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 2–9 marks	
Write a clear and organised summary that analyses attitudes towards migrants in the medieval period (c.1250–1500). Support your summary with examples.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (7–9 marks)	Typically, a summary based on second order concept(s) with two or more valid supporting examples, e.g. NOTE: For 9 marks, more than one migrant group needs to be considered [Causation] <i>Attitudes towards migrants were sometimes positive because migrant groups could meet the needs of English monarchs. For example, English monarchs wishing to capitalise on the value of English wool needed skilled weavers. So, from the 1330s, Flemish weavers were persuaded to move to England by Edward III, who promised to help them and to allow them to work wherever they chose.</i> <i>A further example relates to Jewish migrants, where official attitudes towards them worsened in the late 1200s because they were no longer needed as money lenders. By the 1260s, Italian bankers were exploiting loopholes to get around the Church's ban on loans. By taking the place of Jewish money lenders, they helped to cause the expulsion of the Jews in 1290. [9]</i> [Diversity] <i>There were differing attitudes towards migrants in this period. Some were quite positive, especially from the king. For example, from the 1330s onwards, Flemish weavers were persuaded to move to England by Edward III, who promised to help them and to allow them to work wherever they chose.</i> <i>This is very different to the attitude shown by many ordinary people towards the Flemish weavers. English weavers and cloth guilds resented their Flemish competitors. For example, during the 'Great Rising' of 1381, the rebels murdered over 100 foreigners (mainly Flemish weavers and merchants) in London. [8]</i> [Change] <i>During the 1200s, the attitudes towards Jews gradually worsened. In c.1250, they enjoyed the protection of the crown. For example, they were still allowed to take refuge in royal castles.</i> <i>This changed during the reigns of Henry III and his son Edward I. For example, in 1275, Edward I passed the Statute of Jewry which made several laws against Jews, such as Jews had to wear yellow badges. [THRESHOLD – 7 MARKS]</i>
Level 2 (4–6 marks)	Typically, a summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example, e.g. [Change] <i>During the 1200s, the attitudes towards Jews gradually worsened. In c.1250, they enjoyed the protection of the crown but this had changed by 1275. Edward I passed the Statute of Jewry which made several laws against Jews. Jews had to wear yellow badges on their clothes and they were only allowed to live in a few towns. [6]</i>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	Typically, descriptions of attitudes/ related events with no organising concept, e.g. • <i>There were official responses to migrants, such as the Aliens' Subsidy which was a tax on foreign-born residents. Unofficially, some migrants were quite well integrated, such as Flemish weavers in Colchester. [3]</i> • <i>In 1275 Edward I passed the Statute of Jewry. Jews could no longer collect interest on loans, people that owed them money no longer had to pay them back, Jews had to wear yellow badges, were forced to live in selected areas of only a few towns and were not allowed to buy land and become farmers. [3]</i> NOTE: descriptions which relate to migrant groups only, rather than attitudes = MAX 1 MARK OR Typically, statement(s) based on second order concept EITHER with no valid specific examples OR development, e.g. • (Change) <i>In 1250, attitudes towards Jews were quite positive but by 1290 they were unwelcome.</i> • (Causation) <i>Attitudes towards migrants in this period tended to depend on how much need there was for them by the English, like in the case of the weavers.</i>
0 marks	

Question 3–10 marks Why have migrants moved to Britain since 1980? Explain your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Explanations could consider: Growth of EU led to migrants from new member states, especially in eastern Europe, taking advantage of the free movement of people and moving to Britain; conflicts in Europe, Africa and the Middle East led to increasing number of refugees seeking asylum in Britain; (specific) economic reasons, e.g. availability of jobs in particular sectors unpopular with people already in Britain (e.g. seasonal fruit picking, hospitality, etc; weak economies and low wages in former Communist states); legacy/impact of earlier migration (e.g. from India/Pakistan post-partition) [allow this so long as answer is clearly rooted in post-1980 context]</i> <i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation and consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> <i>Answers which simply describe some of the features of migration after 1980 cannot reach beyond Level 2.</i>
Level 5 (9–10 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sophisticated understanding of one or more second order concepts in a fully sustained and very well-supported explanation (AO2).	
Level 4 (7–8 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show strong understanding of one or more second order concepts in a sustained and well-supported explanation (AO2).	
Level 3 (5–6 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sound understanding of one or more second order concepts in a generally coherent and organised explanation (AO2).	
Level 2 (3–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show some understanding of one or more second order concepts in a loosely organised explanation (AO2).	
Level 1 (1–2 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Uses these to show some basic understanding of one or more second order concepts, although the overall response may lack structure and coherence (AO2).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

Question 3–10 marks Why have migrants moved to Britain since 1980? Explain your answer. Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (9-10 marks)	Typically, two or more reasons why migrants moved to Britain after 1980, identified and fully explained e.g. <i>One reason that migrants moved to Britain after 1980 was the growth of the European Union. In 2007, membership had grown to 28 nations. Membership allowed the ‘free movement of people’ from one EU country to another. This meant that when nine eastern European countries joined in 2004, it led to almost 300,000 migrants from these countries moving to Britain, mainly from Poland.</i> <i>Another reason was that there were many conflicts in Europe, Africa and the Middle East, causing a mass movement of refugees to safer countries. For example, between 1983 and 2005, there was a civil war in Sudan, which caused many people to flee. There was also civil war in Syria in 2011 which led to many people being displaced. So, many of these refugees made their way to European countries like Britain, to claim asylum and find safety. [10]</i>
Level 4 (7-8 marks)	Typically, one reason why migrants moved to Britain after 1980, identified and fully explained e.g. - One reason was because of the availability of work in certain sectors in Britain, like hospitality and seasonal fruit-picking. These jobs were attractive to people coming from countries whose economies were weak, such as the former communist countries in eastern Europe. So when countries like Poland joined the EU, many people left to come to Britain to work. [8] - One reason people moved was because of their membership of the EU. For instance, In 2004, many eastern European countries joined, such as Poland and Hungary. This led to more people from these countries moving to Britain for work because the process became easier. [THRESHOLD – 7 MARKS] Explained points must: identify a valid reason provide precise evidence use this to address the question
Level 3 (5-6 marks)	Typically, identifies a reason(s) and uses this to address question (but does not provide precise evidence about the reason), e.g. - One reason was because of the growth of the EU, which led to more people from countries like Poland migrating to Britain because it was much easier. - Some people moved because of conflict in the Middle East. They moved to Britain after they were displaced or persecuted in their home country. OR Typically, identifies a reason(s) and gives precise evidence (but does not go on to say how that answers the question), e.g. - One reason was because of the growth of the EU. In 2004, many eastern European countries joined, such as Poland and Hungary. - One reason was because there were civil wars, such as the one in Yugoslavia, which broke apart into several countries in the 1990s. NOTE: One L3 = 5–6 marks Two L3s = 6 marks

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

Level 2 (3-4 marks)	Typically, describes migration since 1980 or related events/ developments, e.g. • <i>Migration increased in this period. 300,000 Poles moved in 2005. [3]</i> • <i>European migrants from places like Poland in this period were spread throughout the country. They did a variety of jobs, such as waitressing, plumbing and fruit-picking. [4]</i> OR Typically, identifies one or more reason but with <u>neither</u> of the following: • support from precise evidence (about the reason) • explaining why the reason meant people moved to Britain, e.g. • <i>People moved because of the civil wars in the middle east.</i> • <i>People moved because of their membership of the EU.</i> NOTE: One L2 identification = 3 marks Two L2 identifications = 4 marks
Level 1 (1-2 marks)	Typically, valid but general assertion(s), e.g. • <i>People moved for economic reasons.</i> • <i>They wanted jobs and a better life.</i> • <i>Refugees were fleeing the country.</i>
0 marks	

Question 4*–18 marks ‘European migrants were welcomed and accepted in Britain during the early modern period (1500-1750).’ How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate knowledge of migration from Europe during the period.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT, to achieve the two highest levels, answers must consider the alternative point of view.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concept of diversity (i.e. differences between responses to European migrants) and causation (reasons for acceptance or otherwise) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
Level 6 (16–18 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	Grounds for agreeing include: Germans/Hansa merchants: reputation and status of Hans Holbein suggests acceptance. Gypsies: Mary I's 1554 Act allowed Gypsies to stay in England; in 1562, Elizabeth I offered Gypsies born in England the chance to become English subjects.
Level 5 (13–15 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	Huguenots/ Walloons: French speaking refugees from Belgium and northern France welcomed by Edward VI who provided part of Canterbury Cathedral for their services; in 1681, Charles II offered Huguenots denizen status in England; Anglican Church raised funds to support them; in 1708 the government gave Huguenots the same legal rights as people born in England; flourishing of Huguenots in areas like Spitalfields suggests integration and acceptance;
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	In 1709 Foreign Protestants Naturalisation Act allowed European Protestants to come and live in England with full rights at the cost of only one shilling in order to attract wealthy entrepreneurs and skilled craftspeople from France and Holland.
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	Palatines: Received kindly at first and relief fund of £20,000 was raised; government tried to disperse them around the country in small groups.
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	Jews: Oliver Cromwell agreed that Jews could come to England and would be allowed to practise their religion; the fact that a few Jews
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

0 marks

No response or no response worthy of credit.

were able to settle relatively easily in places like London, Portsmouth, Hull, Plymouth and Liverpool suggests that attitudes towards them had changed since their expulsion.

Grounds for disagreeing include:

Germans/ Hansa merchants: In 1526, Henry VIII suspected some of the Hansa merchants of smuggling in Protestant literature and had three of the merchants arrested; English merchants and tradesmen sometimes pressed government to remove their privileges/ attacked the Steelyard; in 1597 Elizabeth I expelled the Hansa merchants from London.

Gypsies: anti-Gypsy legislation, e.g. 1530 (all Gypsies to leave the country within 16 days or face imprisonment / deportation), the 1554 law (though allowing gypsies to stay, made reference to them giving up their 'naughty, idle and ungodly life and company' and forced them to settle down in one place or face execution. The act also made it illegal for English people to travel with Gypsies), 1562 (condition of staying as English subjects was settling down and giving up their nomadic way of life); in 1592, five Gypsies were hanged in Durham; in 1596, seven Gypsies were executed in York; transportation as indentured labourers to the Americas/ Caribbean.

Huguenots: some hostility towards them, e.g. 1631, London's clockmakers complained that the Huguenots were taking away their business; in the late 1600s there was an anti-Huguenots riot in Spitalfields;

Palatines: Attitudes changed when it was discovered that a third were Catholics; government sent Catholics home; some people saw Palatines as a drain on resources, e.g. a group of Palatines were stoned by a mob in Kent; 5,000 Palatines deported to Ireland, given poor quality land and faced hostility from Catholic majority; government banned further German migrants from coming and many returned to Germany.

Jews: Restrictions against returning Jews, e.g. not allowed to serve in the army, attend university or become lawyers; popular songs portrayed them as cheats and criminals, suggesting prejudice.

Question 4*–18 marks 'European migrants were welcomed and accepted in Britain during the early modern period (1500-1750)' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side OR three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 18 marks, e.g. <i>There is much evidence to agree with the statement. In the sixteenth-century England welcomed and accepted German migrants. For example, Henry VIII and his court welcomed the German painter Han Holbein the Younger and German speaking Hansa merchants were accepted because they helped English wool reach markets all over Europe. This shows not just 'acceptance' but a strong 'welcome' for migrants when their skills and talents were sought after.</i> <i>However, the persecution faced by gypsies shows that they were not welcome or accepted. For example, in 1530 legislation required them to leave the country within 16 days or face imprisonment and deportation. The 1554 Egyptian Act allowed them to stay but required that they gave up their nomadic lifestyle or face execution; this led to the execution of to five Gypsies in Durham in 1562. This shows how although gypsies might be tolerated, they were not accepted.</i> <i>Yet in the seventeenth-century, Protestant French Huguenots were welcomed to England. Charles II offered them denizen status in 1681 and when Protestantism was banned in France in 1685, thousands more refugees were welcomed by sympathetic English Protestants who housed them in their own homes, with funds collected by the Church of England to support them. This demonstrates how religious ties led to welcome and acceptance of those fleeing persecution.</i> <i>However, while Palatines were at first kindly received, attitudes quickly turned against them once it was discovered that a third of the migrants were Catholics. The government sent the Catholic Palatines home, and a group was stoned by a mob in Kent. Unlike the Huguenots, most Palatines were low skilled workers escaping poverty so were in fact not accepted, and instead seen as an unwelcome threat and a drain on resources.</i> <i>Overall, migrants were only welcomed in particular circumstances – when they were seen as economically useful or held particular skills, such as the Hansa merchants or highly skilled Huguenots. However, migrants were not accepted and actually seen as a threat when they were not highly skilled, or had different beliefs, like the Catholic Palatines. [18]</i>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other) (2–1), e.g. <i>The persecution faced by gypsies shows that they were not welcome or accepted. For example, in 1530 legislation required them to leave the country within 16 days or face imprisonment and deportation. The 1554 Egyptian Act allowed them to stay but required that they gave up their nomadic lifestyle or face execution; this led to the execution of to five Gypsies in Durham in 1562. This shows how although gypsies might be tolerated, they were not accepted.</i> <i>However, Oliver Cromwell agreed that Jews could be welcomed once again into England from 1656 and would be allowed to practice their religion. Many Jewish families prospered in London, as financiers and traders, and also did well in other trading ports like Liverpool and Hull. So Britain seemed to more welcoming and accepting to these Jewish migrants and by 1700, England had around 8,000 Jews.</i> <i>Furthermore, the seventeenth-century, Protestant French Huguenots were welcomed to England. Charles II offered them denizen status in 1681 and when Protestantism was banned in France in 1685, thousands more refugees were welcomed by sympathetic English Protestants who housed them in their own homes, with funds collected by the Church of England to support them. This demonstrates how religious ties led to welcome and acceptance of those fleeing persecution.</i>

Level 4 (10-12 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g. <i>I agree. For example, in 1709, the Foreign Protestants Naturalisation Act allowed European Protestants to come and live in England with full rights at the cost of only one shilling in order to attract wealthy entrepreneurs and skilled craftspeople from France and Holland. This contributed to German speaking Palatine Protestants entering England in the summer that year. This not only shows that European migrants were accepted but actively welcomed.</i> <i>Another group that were accepted and welcomed were Jews. In 1656 a Rabbi from Amsterdam travelled to London to seek help for persecuted Jews in Europe from Oliver Cromwell. The new English republic allowed them to return and practice their own religion. This demonstrates how Cromwell did welcome Jewish migrants from Europe, because he believed the Jewish merchants would help develop English trade as well as support Protestant England against European Catholics.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1–1), e.g. <i>There is much evidence to agree with the statement. For example, Hansa merchants were protected by the Crown and given exclusive rights to the international trade in English wool. They lived in relative wealth in the Steelyard in London and other port cities on the East Coast. Their trade with other Hansa port cities in Europe meant that German speaking merchants like Georg Girsze from Danzig were accepted and welcome in London.</i> <i>On the other hand, at times Hansa merchants were made to feel unwelcome and unacceptance. In 1526, Henry VIII suspected some of the Hansa merchants of smuggling in Protestant literature and had three of the merchants arrested. English merchants and tradesmen sometimes pressed the government to remove their privileges and attacked the Steelyard. Finally, in 1597, Elizabeth I expelled the Hansa merchants from London, demonstrating just how unwelcome they were at this point.</i>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument; one explained point of support (1–0), e.g. <i>I disagree because Jewish migrants from Europe faced prejudice. Although Cromwell allowed the return of the Jews from 1656 they were restricted to living in particular locations, and working in particular occupations. For example, they were forbidden from being lawyers, serving in the army or attending university. Popular songs from the time portray them as cheats and criminals suggesting they were tolerated but not really ‘accepted’ or ‘welcomed’.</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid claim/ argument • offer specific evidence to support the argument • show how their evidence answers the question
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Typically, identification of specific reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g. • <i>I disagree because Palatines were not welcomed once it was discovered they were Catholic.</i> • <i>I agree because Protestant Huguenots were welcomed after their religion was banned in France.</i> 1 identifications = 4-5 marks 2 identifications = 5-6 marks 3+ identifications = 6 marks Alternatively, and typically, description of attitudes towards relevant migrant groups, related events, etc. e.g. • <i>5000 Palatines were deported to Ireland, given poor quality land and faced hostility from the Catholic majority.</i> • <i>Oliver Cromwell allowed Jews to return to England in 1656, but they were not allowed to become lawyers, serve in the army or attend University.</i> • <i>Huguenots were hard working skilled craftsmen that helped develop precision engineering in Britain, improving the clock-making industry in London.</i>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	Typically, valid but general assertion(s), e.g. • <i>I agree because high skilled migrants were often welcomed.</i> • <i>I disagree because lots of people thought migrants were a threat to their jobs.</i>

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

0 marks	
---------	--

Question 5*–18 marks 'Between 1750 and 1980, migrants to Britain had positive experiences.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate knowledge of migration between 1750 and 1980. It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT to achieve the two highest levels, answers must identify and consider reasons to both agree and disagree with the statement. Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of similarity and difference but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
Level 6 (16–18 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	NOTE: FOR L3+, CANDIDATES MUST SHOW HOW THEIR EVIDENCE IS EVIDENCE OF A POSITIVE/ NEGATIVE 'EXPERIENCE' Grounds for agreeing include: • Irish: The fact that there was no shortage of work in the booming factory towns meant that this was a 'positive experience' for those fleeing famine, increase in rent, etc. Some Irish migrants did not live in extreme poverty and did not all do dirty, dangerous jobs, e.g. some were doctors and policemen. There was an Irish middle class of strong and successful business people as well as writers such as Oscar Wilde and George Bernard Shaw. The Irish were also able to revitalise the Catholic Church in England and helped to speed up the move towards equal rights for Catholics. • Italians: like the Irish, benefitted from work opportunities during industrialisation, e.g. for those fleeing poverty in the Italian countryside, laying asphalt on roads was a relatively positive experience; prospered in new urban areas like Clerkenwell. • Germans: Positive experience through playing important roles in the army, trade and culture and advisors to the German kings; thinkers and political activists like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels enjoyed liberal freedoms of expression; Johann Ellerman made a fortune by establishing a shipping firm in 1886 which exported industrial goods around the British Empire; Hugo Hirst founded the highly successful General Electric Company 1888; Paul Reuter was successful in setting up the London office of Reuter's News Agency in 1852; often positive experience and acceptance because mostly Protestant and relatively prosperous running businesses across the country. • African: class affected status, e.g. Dido Elizabeth Belle in Mansfield household enjoyed upbringing alongside white cousin; Ignatius Sancho was a London grocer, householder and voter; anti-slavery campaigners like Ayuba Suleiman Diallo and Olaudah Equiano enjoyed comfort and positive public status. • Jews: Some Eastern European Jewish migrants prospered such as Michael Marks establishing Marks and Spencer; refuge and safety from Russian pogroms after 1881; European Jews escaped Nazi persecution include 'Kindertransport' children sponsored and housed by English families. • Asians: Eminent Indians, e.g. Dadabhai Naorji, Cornilia Soreabja or Prince Ranjitsinhji, etc. successful careers and eminent roles in Britain. • Belgian Refugees: positive experience because they escaped occupation and enjoyed freedom during First World War and were welcomed into many English in homes. • Commonwealth Migrants: positive experience because many were escaping poverty or natural disasters; many Caribbean migrants found work, especially in areas like the NHS and public transport; wages were 4–5 times higher than in places such as the Caribbean; migrants from India and Pakistan found work in the textile mills in West
Level 5 (13–15 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding	

of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	Yorkshire/ Lancashire; candidates may cite a range of positive stories relating to individual experience, e.g. Sam King who arrived on Windrush and eventually became the mayor of Southwark and received an MBE; development of vibrant communities such as in Brixton. • 20th C. European Economic Community Migrants: Candidates may provide specific evidence relating to the positive experiences relating to these groups; or argue that the fact that thousands chose to settle permanently by 1980 is evidence of a positive experience. • Refugees: Positive experience for those fleeing persecution as found safety, welcome and support by British Government after signing of the 1951 United Nations Convention on Refugees.
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	Grounds for disagreeing include: • Irish: migrants often did the toughest jobs (e.g. navvies, in coal mines, gas works, quarries, etc.). Life as a navvy was tough (heavy drinking and fighting were common and the Irish navvies were frequently attacked by Scottish and English gangs). Many lived in the dirtiest, most overcrowded accommodation where diseases spread rapidly. In Liverpool, the public health crisis led to nearly 60,000 being deported back to Ireland. Experienced prejudice / stereotyping in the press (e.g. as violent, drunkards, criminals, etc.). Racist anti-Irish riots were common. (e.g. Cardiff, Wigan, Preston). • Italians: worked in low skilled jobs that English people did not want to do like laying asphalt on roads in the 1870s; young boys were trafficked into the country and exploited as street musicians by gang-masters; prejudice because they were Catholic, blamed for Cholera outbreaks. • Germans: Nineteenth-century, many worked as navvies and lived in poor conditions; during First and Second World War designated 'enemy aliens' interned in camps, e.g. Georg Kennerknecht at Knockaloe on the Isle of Man 1915-1919; attacked by anti-German mobs, e.g. after the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915. • Jews: Overcrowding in Industrial cities and poor living conditions; anti-Semitism; 1905 Aliens aimed at restricting Jewish migration making Jewish community feel unwelcome; working in East End sweatshops. • African: isolated lonely lives as servants; uncertain legal status in eighteenth-century England; destitution of black American Revolutionary veterans. • Asians: Asian servants treated as property and status symbols in wealthy households. Lascars, ayahs and servants abandoned in port cities unable to find work for return passages, poor living and working conditions. 'Yellow peril' scare and prejudice against Chinese, 'laundry riots' 1911. • Belgian refugees: Resented guests as war dragged on; experienced official hostility as British Government made it clear that it expected all Belgium refugees to return once the war was over. • Commonwealth Migrants: suffered discrimination on a daily basis, e.g. hotels, restaurants and dance halls refused entry to Black people; Caribbean migrants often lived in the poorest, most run down areas, e.g. Tottenham and Paddington in London, Handsworth in Birmingham, etc.; 1958 'Summer of Violence' in Notting Hill and in Nottingham; murder of Kelso Cochrane; 1971-81 race-related street violence and conflict with the police, e.g. Mangrove Nine Protest 1971.
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 5*–18 marks 'Between 1750 and 1980, migrants to Britain had positive experiences.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side OR three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 18 marks, e.g. <i>There is much evidence to agree with the statement. For example, Germans migrating to Britain in the 1800s, for instance, enjoyed a high amount of success in business. For example, Johann Ellerman made a fortune by establishing a shipping firm in 1886 which exported industrial goods around the British Empire; and many others ran small businesses, like delicatessens and butchers. Their prosperity reveals their positive experience.</i> <i>Furthermore, many Asian Migrants came to Britain and improved their lives throughout this period, particularly middle and upper class Indians in the 1800s, who were able take advantage of the Empire and come to study and work in Britain. For example, Prince Ranjitsinhji came to study at Cambridge University and ended up playing cricket for Sussex County, and became their captain. This shows that for some migrants, their experience in Britain allowed them to thrive.</i> <i>However, other groups had more negative experiences. For instance, Jews fleeing persecution in the Russian Empire at the end of the 1800s were often forced to live in overcrowded lodging houses in areas such as Whitechapel in London. They struggled to find jobs and mostly ended up working in clothing sweatshops, working long hours for very low wages. So although they were safer from pogroms, they had to tolerate poor living and working conditions, which was a negative experience.</i> <i>Additionally, in the twentieth century, Black Commonwealth migrants often suffered racial discrimination on a daily basis: hotels, restaurants and dance halls quite often refused entry to Black people. They quite often experienced violence, too. For instance, in 1958, Teddy Boys attacked Caribbean people in Notting Hill using knives and petrol bombs. This level of prejudice and danger cannot be reflective of a positive experience.</i> <i>Overall, whilst poor working conditions and prejudice were negative experiences, migrants positively improved their lives when compared to the worse poverty and/or persecution in their home countries: Jews escaped pogroms in the Russian Empire; German liberals escaped state repression and Commonwealth migrants escaped poverty in their former British colonies.</i>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other) (2–1), e.g. <i>There is much evidence to agree with the statement. For example, middle and upper class Indians in the 1800s were able take advantage of the Empire and come to study and work in Britain. For example, Prince Ranjitsinhji came to study at Cambridge University and ended up playing cricket for Sussex County, and became their captain. This shows that for some migrants, their experience in Britain allowed them to thrive.</i> <i>Additionally, Irish migrants to Britain found employment because there was no shortage of work in the booming factory towns. Many found work as navvies, building canals and railways. A great number joined the British Army; at times, some English regiments had more Irish than English soldiers. In spite of the fact that Irish migrants often did the toughest and dirtiest jobs, they arguably had a 'positive experience' compared to the famine, and rising rents and food prices they were fleeing.</i> <i>However, the case of Germans in Britain during the First World War demonstrates that migrants didn't always have a positive experience. There was a great deal of anti-German sentiment right from the start of the war. For example, mobs broke the windows and looted shops owned by Germans. This intensified after the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915. This shows how even experiences which were otherwise positive were tainted by instances of negativity.</i>

Level 4 (10-12 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g. <i>Refugees arguably had a positive experience in Britain in this period. For example, African Americans who had fought for Britain during the American Revolutionary War were allowed to migrate and escape slavery; and in the First World War, nearly 250,000 Belgians escaped German occupation and lived alongside British people who chose to offer them hospitality. This shows how at different times, refugees had a positive experience because the British population offered them sanctuary.</i> <i>Furthermore, the experiences of German migrants were relatively positive in the 1800s. For instance, thinkers and political activists like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels enjoyed liberal freedoms of expression which was greater in Britain than in Germany. There were also many successful entrepreneurs such as Hugo Hirst, who founded the General Electric Company in 1888. These stories show that German nationality was not a barrier to success and progress in Britain.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1–1), e.g. <i>The experiences of German migrants were relatively positive in the 1800s. For instance, thinkers and political activists like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels enjoyed liberal freedoms of expression which was greater in Britain than in Germany. There were also many successful entrepreneurs such as Hugo Hirst, who founded the General Electric Company in 1888. These stories show that German nationality was not a barrier to success and progress in Britain.</i> <i>However, the case of Germans in Britain during the First World War demonstrates that German migrants didn't always have a positive experience. There was a great deal of anti-German sentiment right from the start of the war. For example, mobs broke the windows and looted shops owned by Germans. This intensified after the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915. This shows how even experiences which were otherwise positive were tainted by instances of negativity.</i>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument; one explained point of support (1–0), e.g. <i>I disagree with this statement because the enslaved Black people who were brought to Britain in the late eighteenth-century had a questionable legal status which meant they often lived in fear. For example, in 1771, James Somerset escaped captivity, but his master found him and sent him in chains to a ship bound for Jamaica. Although later freed, this demonstrates how the experiences of Black migrants at this point were not positive as they might be constantly looking over their shoulder.</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid claim/ argument • offer specific evidence to support the argument • show how their evidence answers the question
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Typically, identification of specific reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g. • <i>I disagree because groups like the Irish had negative experiences doing hard labour as navvies.</i> • <i>I agree because some migrants were refugees and had a positive experience escaping war and poverty, such as Italians in the industrial period.</i> 1 identifications = 4-5 marks 2 identifications = 5-6 marks 3+ identifications = 6 marks Alternatively, and typically, description of experiences of relevant migrant groups, related events. etc. e.g. • <i>Irish and German navvies worked on canals, roads and railways.</i> • <i>Refugees came to Britain, for example escaping persecution in Russia.</i> • <i>Commonwealth Migrants helped rebuild the post-war British economy.</i>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	Typically, valid but general assertion(s), e.g. • <i>I disagree because migrants suffer prejudice in Britain.</i> • <i>I agree because lots of people found employment and prospered.</i>

0 marks	

Section B: The Norman Conquest, 1065–1087

Question 6a – 3 marks

In Interpretation A, the podcaster gives us a negative impression of the role of knights in Norman culture. 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 podcaster gives us a negative impression of the role of knights in Norman culture + 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 in relation to the issue in the question.

The explanation of how the interpretation gives a negative impression of the role of knights in Norman culture may analyse the interpretation or aspects of the interpretation by using the candidate's knowledge of the historical situation portrayed and / or to the method or approach used by the website. 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, accurate explanation should also be credited:

NOTE: Typically, for three marks, candidates may either:

Start with a very specific feature (1) and then make two points of development (2) about their feature, e.g.

- *He says that Norman knights were just 'desperate for an opportunity to be violent.' (1) This suggests that they were rather brutal people who took pleasure from war and hurting others. (1) This gives a negative impression of their role because it doesn't make them sound honourable or brave, but just like hired thugs. (1)*

OR

Begin with a more general point (1), then go on to give an example of this (1), and then say how this gives a negative impression of the role of knights in Norman culture (1), e.g.

- *He gives a negative impression by making a comparison between culture in England and in Normandy. (1) For instance he says that England was 'sheltered' and the sons of noblemen were 'educated and literate', whilst the culture of Norman knights 'rested entirely on their ability to hand out violence'. (1) This makes it seem as if Norman culture is inferior to Anglo-Saxon culture. (1)*
- *A negative impression is given because he links the culture of knights to violence. (1) For example, he says that 'after fifteen or twenty years of education', knights would still 'know how to do only two things: hunt and fight'. (1) This implies they were just brutal and thuggish. (1)*
- *He described the knights as uneducated and thuggish. (1) For instance, they had 'no book learning' and says that 'education and the arts did not matter to these people'. (1) This gives impression they were uncivilised or backward. (1)*

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

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 Normandy before 1066.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 2 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO2 are equal in levels 1 and 2, AO2 carries greater weight in level 3.	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>A Answers may choose to put forward lines of investigation by framing specific enquiry questions, but it is possible to achieve full marks without doing this.</i> <i>Suggested lines of enquiry / areas for research may be into matters of specific detail or into broader themes but must involve use of second order concepts rather than mere discovery of new information if AO2 marks are to be awarded.</i> <i>Examples of areas for further research include: how important a role knights played in Norman culture (significance/ consequence); how similar/ different Norman and Anglo-Saxon cultures were (diversity); impact of the violence upon Norman peasants/women (consequence); whether there were any positive impacts of knights on Norman culture (consequence); reasons for lack of book learning/ education amongst this class in Norman society (causation).</i>
Level 3 (5 marks) The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a strong understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain clearly how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	NOTE: Q asks about an enquiry which would help to develop our understanding of Normandy before 1066, so do not allow enquiries which asks things such as: • the impact of Norman knights in England after 1066 • whether the culture of knights in Normandy changed after 1066
Level 2 (3–4 marks) The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a general understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	
Level 1 (1–2 mark) The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). It shows a basic understanding of second order historical concept(s) and attempts to link these to explanation of how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

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 Normandy before 1066.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (5 marks)	Typically, a valid line of enquiry based on second order concept with <u>clear explanation</u> of how the enquiry would improve understanding of Normandy before 1066, e.g. <i>[Significance]</i> <i>I would like to investigate how significant knights were in Norman culture. This would help us to understand how highly things like horsemanship and fighting were regarded in Norman culture, and how much the system of knights really dominated Norman culture when compared to something like religion.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a valid line of enquiry based on second order concept to compare to an <u>impression</u> given by Interpretation A. Indication of how this would improve understanding of Normandy before 1066. <i>[Diversity]</i> <i>Interpretation A gives us the impression that Norman culture was completely at odds with Anglo-Saxon culture. I would like to compare the experiences of upper-class noble boys in Normandy and England and see if there were any similarities as well as difference. This would help us to understand whether the education, training and values of the nobility in Normandy was unique in Europe.</i>
Level 2 (3-4 marks)	Typically, a valid line of enquiry based on second order concept, with <u>no clear explanation</u> of how the enquiry would increase understanding of Normandy before 1066, e.g. <i>[Consequence]</i> <i>I would like to find out whether the culture of knights had any positive effects on Normandy as well as negative ones. [3] For example, did they help Normandy to defend itself against external attack? [4]</i> <i>[Diversity]</i> <i>I would look for more information about the ways they were trained to fight. [L1] This would allow us to see how different Norman warrior culture was from Anglo-Saxon warrior culture. [L2, 4 marks]</i> <i>[Causation / Diversity]</i> <i>I would investigate why there was less emphasis on literacy and education among the sons of noblemen in Normandy than there was in England. [3]</i> <i>[Consequence]</i> <i>I would look at the impact that knights had on ordinary, local populations. [3]</i>
Level 1 (1-2 marks)	Typically, an investigation based around finding out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A – not based on second-order concept (1-2 marks), e.g. <i>I would look for more information about the ways they were trained to fight, like how long it took and which weapons they learned to use. [2]</i> Alternatively, and typically, an investigation based on identifying details from Interpretation A and finding out if they are accurate/ typical (MAX 1 mark), e.g. <i>It says that knights were only trained in hunting and fighting but I would find out if this really was the case.</i> <i>I would want to find out whether all Norman knights were as violent as this. [Different groups need identifying for L2 diversity enquiry, e.g. comparing Normans to rest of France, or Normans to Anglo-Saxons, etc.]</i> NOTE 1: Credit at L1 ONLY questions which use the language of second order concepts, but are clearly not a valid historical enquiry, e.g. <i>I want to know <u>why</u> Norman knights were going hunting.</i> NOTE 2: No credit for answers which do not identify a question or something they would like to find out, e.g. <i>I would investigate 'the fighting'.</i> (NAQ – nothing about which kinds of tactics they used, etc.)

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

0 marks	
------------	--

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on how William the Conqueror dealt with his opponents. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Levels AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers could consider:</i> • Comparison of provenance and source type alone, e.g. B is from a TV documentary; C is from a biography; B is over the top because it was written by people wanting to celebrate northern rebels but C is more balanced because it is by a modern historians who has done more research. • Individual points of similarity/difference in content: B says that the harrying has been considered an 'act of genocide' and C agrees that the harrying had 'terrible consequences'; B focuses on the Harrying of the North whereas C is about William's punishments more widely; B says that the 'North lay in ruins' and C agrees that the harrying had 'terrible consequences'. • Differences in the overall message about how William dealt with his opponents, e.g. B paints a picture of William as ruthless and excessively harsh who takes revenge in a vindictive way ('teach them a lesson'); his aim is brutal punishment (gave his soldiers permission to 'do their worst', describes his actions as an 'act of genocide'); emphasises lack of mercy ('the elderly and babies'). • However, C is more balanced/ measured and places William's actions in context (harrying was 'standard practice in medieval warfare' ... 'the eleventh century was a cruel time' ... Anglo-Saxons had themselves stoned 'disobedient' slaves to death). • Developed reasons for differences: B is trying to portray the northern rebels as heroes and martyrs, so they wouldn't want it to look like William's response was justified; B is trying to make the viewer feel sorry for the people of the North; B is only focussing on Harrying of the North as part of their series celebrating northern rebels. As the Harrying of the North is William's most notoriously harsh tactic, this is the impression we are likely to be left with. • In C, Morris is writing a biography of William I, so the conclusion is taking more into account than just the Harrying of the North. He is reflecting on William's treatment of his opponents across his whole life. <i>Marks for relevant knowledge and understanding should be awarded for the clarity and confidence with which candidates discuss features, events or issues mentioned or implied in the interpretations. Candidates who introduce extra relevant knowledge or show understanding of related historical issues can be rewarded for this, but it is not a target of the question.</i> <i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a very detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a convincing and valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a convincing and well-substantiated judgment of how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a generally valid and clear judgment about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers some valid analysis of differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and gives a reasonable explanation of at least one reason why they may differ, and a basic judgement about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Identifies some differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and makes a limited attempt to explain why they may differ. There is either no attempt to assess how far they differ, or there is an assertion about this but it is completely unsupported (AO4).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on how William the Conqueror dealt with his opponents. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 4 (10–12 marks)	Typically, a valid comparison of message/ portrayal/ impression in B and C. Difference <u>explained</u> with specific purpose/ focus of B and/or C, e.g. As L3, plus: <i>I think the reason that B emphasises William's cruelty and brutality is that the people who made the documentary are celebrating Northern rebels. [not L4 yet] So they are trying to portray them as heroes and make us feel sorry for them. [10] So they wouldn't want it to look like William's response was justified. [11]</i> <i>I think the reason that C is more nuanced is that Morris is writing a biography of William I [not L4 yet], so he is taking a lot more into account than just the Harrying of the North on its own. [10] Particularly in this concluding chapter, he is reflecting on William's treatment of his opponents across his whole life. [11]</i> NOTES: - Award 10–11 marks for candidates who use the purpose/focus of <u>one</u> interpretation to explain difference in portrayals. - Award 11–12 marks for candidates which use the purpose/focus of <u>both</u> interpretations to explain difference in portrayals. - Do NOT allow <u>undeveloped</u> comments about provenance at this level, e.g. <i>B is over the top because it was written by people wanting to celebrate northern rebels</i> OR <i>C is more balanced because it is by a modern historian who has done more research</i>.
Level 3 (7–9 marks)	Typically, comparison of the overall <u>message/ portrayal/ impression</u> of B and C (based on inference), e.g. <i>B paints a picture of William as ruthless and excessively harsh. He appears to take revenge on the North in a vindictive way, wanting to 'teach them a lesson' and giving his soldiers permission to 'do their worst'. It emphasises how he showed no mercy, listing all the people murdered in the harrying, even 'the elderly and babies'.</i> <i>However, C gives us a more measured opinion. Whilst agreeing that the Harrying of the North had 'terrible consequences', it also reminds us that harrying was 'standard practice in medieval warfare' so this suggests William wasn't doing anything unusual. It also places his actions in context, stressing that 'the eleventh century was a cruel time' and that the Anglo-Saxons had themselves stoned 'disobedient' slaves to death. [9]</i> NOTE: Answers with no support from either interpretation = 7 marks, e.g. <i>Interpretation B suggests that William was a brutal ruler who dealt with his opponents in a ruthless way. But C is a lot more balanced about his punishments.</i>
Level 2 (4–6 marks)	Typically, selects individual points of similarity or difference, e.g. <i>B says that the harrying has been considered an 'act of genocide' and C agrees that the harrying had 'terrible consequences'.</i> <i>B is all about how William burned the land as punishment for northerners whereas C talks about William's other punishments, like mutilation.</i> <i>B says that the 'North lay in ruins' and C agrees that the harrying had 'terrible consequences'.</i> Alternatively, and typically, purpose of one interpretation used to explain its portrayal – no comparison, e.g. <i>B paints a picture of William dealing with opponents in a brutal and cruel way, committing an 'act of genocide' against the North. I think this is probably because the people who made the programme are only focussing on Harrying of the North as part of their series celebrating northern rebels. As the Harrying of the North is William's most notoriously harsh tactic, this is the impression we are likely to be left with.</i>

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

Level 1 (1–3 marks)	Typically, comparison of simplistic provenance (or language, tone, etc. in isolation) e.g. • <i>B is over the top because it was written by people wanting to celebrate northern rebels but C is more balanced because it is by a modern historian who has done more research. [2]</i> • <i>B uses the word ‘genocide’ but C uses the word ‘peace’. [Does not give any indication of content of either interpretation]</i> Alternatively, and typically, summary / portrayal from one/both interpretations with no valid comparison, e.g. <i>B is about the Harrying of the North and how William was so ‘enraged’ that he wanted to ‘teach the North a lesson’.</i> <i>C says that even people at the time believed that Harrying was ‘excessive’ although the Anglo-Saxon chronicle did not describe his rule as a whole as ‘cruel’. [3]</i> Alternatively, and typically, valid but general assertions (1 mark), e.g. <i>C is more positive on William than B.</i>
0 marks	

Question 8*–20 marks The history website ‘BBC Bitesize’ argues that Harold Godwinson had the ‘strongest claim’ to the English throne after Edward the Confessor’s death in January 1066. How far do you agree with this view? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of succession crisis of 1066.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Level 5, this must involve considering both reasons to agree and reasons to disagree with the interpretation.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (reasons for Harold/ other claimants having/ not having a strong claim); and significance (relative importance of factors such as being in the family blood line, having support of the Witan, being chosen by previous king, etc.) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> Grounds for agreeing include: Harold claimed / biography of Edward wrote that Edward chose Harold to rule after him on his deathbed, which was one important factor in having a legitimate claim; the person who would take over as king needed to have the support of the Witan and the Witan did support Harold's claim as he was the most powerful noble in England (perhaps even more powerful than Edward himself); therefore, Harold was the only claimant who had the support of the Witan and all the English nobility; although he was not a blood relation like Edgar, Edgar was just a teenager when Edward died and had spent the early years of his life in exile in Hungary and was not considered politically strong enough to hold the country together. Grounds for disagreeing include: Harold did not have strong claim: It is not clear whether Edward meant to give the kingdom to Harold or just guard the country until a new king was crowned; historians are not sure whether Edward said this at all as the biography was written for Edith who was Harold's sister so spreading this story suited Harold; Harold knew his claim was actually very weak, which
Level 5 (17–20 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 4 (13–16 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
Level 2 (5–8 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).	

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

<i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	
Level 1 (1–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity. <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	was why he rushed to have himself crowned the day after Edward died (which was very unusual for this period) and why he agreed to marry Edwin and Morcar's sister, in order to secure their support; although in theory the Witan would select the next king, new kings were usually within the bloodline of the previous king, which Harold was not.
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	William of Normandy arguably had a stronger claim: he claimed/ Norman sources claim that Edward had promised the throne to William in 1051; Harold had also sworn an oath to William to support William's right to the throne whilst in Normandy in 1064/1065 (Norman sources claim that Edward actually sent Harold specifically to do this); likely that Edward had wished for crown to go to William given his close ties with Normandy (e.g. mother was Emma of Normandy) and his upbringing there; William did have a weak blood claim (but better than Harold's) – he was a second cousin. NOTE: Allow the Pope lending his support/ banner to William. Edgar had stronger claim: Edgar was the only claimant in the direct bloodline of the previous king – he was the great-nephew of Edward the Confessor and was the last surviving member of the House of Wessex; this was important as usually new kings were directly related to the previous one. Harald Hardrada had a stronger claim: had succeeded Magnus I of Norway in 1046. Magnus had made a mutual succession agreement with Harthacnut (King of Denmark and later England), stating that whichever of them died first would inherit the other's kingdom. When Harthacnut died in 1042, Magnus claimed the English throne based on that agreement. Harald later inherited Magnus's claim to England as part of his legacy.

Question 8*–20 marks	
The history website ‘BBC Bitesize’ argues that Harold Godwinson had the ‘strongest claim’ to the English throne after Edward the Confessor’s death in January 1066. How far do you agree with this view? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (17-20 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side OR three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 20 marks, e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, Harold claimed that as he was dying, King Edward reached out to him and said that he commended ‘all the kingdom’ to Harold’s protection. This was very important because ideally, kings of England at this time were supposed to have been chosen by the previous king, and this shows that Harold was basing his claim on solid ground.</i> <i>Furthermore, Harold Godwinson was the Earl of Wessex and the richest and most powerful man in the kingdom. His sister was married to Edward and by 1065, he had more power than Edward did. This political reality meant that he managed to persuade the Witan that Edward had granted him the throne and they therefore supported his claim. This was significant as new kings had to be chosen to by the Witan to succeed to the throne.</i> <i>However, there is also evidence to challenge this view. There is no corroboration to Harold’s claim that Edward granted him the throne on his deathbed. Spreading this story certainly bolstered Harold’s claim, which was arguably very weak as he had no blood link to Edward whatsoever. The fact that Harold rushed to have himself crowned the day after Edward died (which was very unusual) reveals that he knew his claim was not a strong one.</i> <i>Furthermore, it could be said that William of Normandy’s claim was stronger. Norman sources record that Edward had previously promised William the throne in 1051, which seems likely given Edward had grown up in Normandy and some of his closest advisors were Norman. Whilst Harold had no direct blood link to Edward at all, William did have a weak link as he was his second cousin. This shows how William fulfilled two criteria and therefore had a sound claim.</i> <i>Overall, I would say that in theory, Harold actually only had a very weak claim to the throne, and that William’s claim was just as good, if not stronger. However, the one area where William’s claim did not stand up was having the support of the Witan, which was arguably the most important part, because as well as having a technical claim, he would have needed the support of the Witan to take it up (without war), and he did not have this. The only claimant who enjoyed this support was Harold, so on this basis, his claim was the most realistic, if not the ‘strongest’.</i>
Level 4 (13-16 marks)	Typically, a balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support (2–1 or 3–0), e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, Harold claimed that as he was dying, King Edward reached out to him and said that he commended ‘all the kingdom’ to Harold’s protection. This was very important because ideally, kings of England at this time were supposed to have been chosen by the previous king, and this shows that Harold was basing his claim on solid ground.</i> <i>Furthermore, Harold Godwinson was the Earl of Wessex and the richest and most powerful man in the kingdom. His sister was married to Edward and by 1065, he had more power than Edward did. This political reality meant that he managed to persuade the Witan that Edward had granted him the throne and they therefore supported his claim. This was significant as new kings had to be chosen to by the Witan to succeed to the throne.</i> <i>However, it could be said that William of Normandy’s claim was stronger. Norman sources record that Edward had previously promised William the throne in 1051, which seems likely given Edward had grown up in Normandy and some of his closest advisors were Norman. Whilst Harold had no direct blood link to Edward at all, William did have a weak link as he was his second cousin. This shows how William fulfilled two criteria and therefore had a sound claim.</i>

Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g. <i>I agree. Firstly, Harold claimed that as he was dying, King Edward reached out to him and said that he commended 'all the kingdom' to Harold's protection. This was very important because ideally, kings of England at this time were supposed to have been chosen by the previous king, and this shows that Harold was basing his claim on solid ground.</i> <i>Furthermore, Harold Godwinson was the Earl of Wessex and the richest and most powerful man in the kingdom. His sister was married to Edward and by 1065, he had more power than Edward did. This political reality meant that he managed to persuade the Witan that Edward had granted him the throne and they therefore supported his claim. This was significant as new kings had to be chosen to by the Witan to succeed to the throne.</i> Alternatively, and typically, a balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1–1), e.g. <i>There is plenty of evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, Harold claimed that as he was dying, King Edward reached out to him and said that he commended 'all the kingdom' to Harold's protection. This was very important because ideally, kings of England at this time were supposed to have been chosen by the previous king, and this shows that Harold was basing his claim on solid ground.</i> <i>However, it could be said that William of Normandy's claim was stronger. Norman sources record that Edward had previously promised William the throne in 1051, which seems likely given Edward had grown up in Normandy and some of his closest advisors were Norman. Whilst Harold had no direct blood link to Edward at all, William did have a weak link as he was his second cousin. This shows how William fulfilled two criteria and therefore had a sound claim.</i>
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument; one explained point of support (1–0), e.g. <i>I agree because Harold claimed that as he was dying, King Edward reached out to him and said that he commended 'all the kingdom' to Harold's protection. This was very important because ideally, kings of England at this time were supposed to have been chosen by the previous king, and this shows that Harold was basing his claim on solid ground.</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid claim/ argument • offer specific evidence to support the argument • show how their evidence answers the question
Level 1 (1-4 marks)	Typically, identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation (2–4 marks), e.g. • Yes, I agree because Edward granted Harold the throne on his deathbed. (2) • No, Edgar had a stronger claim because he was related directly to the previous king. Also, we only have Harold's word for it that Edward appointed him as the next king. (3) 1 identifications = 2-3 marks 2 identifications = 3-4 marks 3+ identifications = 4 marks Alternatively, and typically, description of succession crisis/ related events (2–4 marks), e.g. <i>In January 1066, Edward the Confessor died leaving no clear heir. (2) Harold Godwinson rushed to claim the throne but William of Normandy believed the crown should have been passed to him. (3) He immediately began planning an invasion. (4)</i> Alternatively, and typically, valid but general assertions (Max 1 mark), e.g. <i>I agree because he was really strong.</i>
0 marks	

Question 9*–20 marks In describing early Norman castles as ‘rather weak and primitive’, the website ‘www.worldhistory.biz’ suggests that they were not very effective. How far do you agree with this view of Norman castles in England between 1066 and 1087? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set <i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of early Norman castles.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Level 5, this must involve considering both reasons to agree and reasons to disagree with the interpretation.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of consequence (impact / effectiveness of early Norman castles in Anglo-Saxon England) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> Grounds for agreeing include: • The castles at Pevensey and Hastings utilised old Roman/ Iron Age forts which were in ruins, so this could be considered ‘primitive’ or makeshift. • Up to a quarter of the early castles may have been ringworks – simple enclosures of earth and timber – could be considered ‘primitive’. e.g. Elmley Castle. • After 1071, the majority of Norman castles were built in the countryside and had more to do with settlement than defence, so some were weaker. e.g. Castle Acre was merely a two-storeyed house built in the centre of a ringwork. • Revisionist historians have argued that castles were more about showing off than serious defence. They say their features were quite weak. • The gatehouse at Exeter was built facing inwards, towards the city, suggesting that it was more like the hall of an Anglo Saxon thegn, designed to show off status, rather than prevent attack.
Level 5 (17–20 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 4 (13–16 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
Level 2 (5–8 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).	

J411/17

Mark Scheme

June 2025

<i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	Grounds for disagreeing include:
Level 1 (1–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity. <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	• <i>The castle built at Pevensey when William landed provided a useful defence for the Norman army. They erected an earth bank and palisade in one corner of a Roman fort to create a smaller, but stronger, fortress. This helped to secure their initial position so was very effective in this way.</i> • <i>During the autumn of 1066, castles clearly played a vital role in the Norman invasion and conquest of England as William marched his army in a wide arc around London. Castles were therefore effective in securing the south-east.</i> • <i>In the months following the BOH, Norman soldiers used their castles as a base, riding out to commit plunder and violence. So effective in terms of controlling Anglo-Saxon population.</i> • <i>Castles built in places where there had been rebellions and these were used effectively to crush resistance and keep an eye on local population, e.g. no further rebellion in Exeter after William built a castle there.</i> • <i>Motte and bailey castles / ringworks were not necessarily weak, despite their materials. e.g. Goltho had a motte 5 metres high and 23m wide; a watchtower at least 9m high; ramparts which were 18m thick; etc. This was a highly fortified site.</i> • <i>The King protected the road to the north by building castles at Lincoln, Cambridge and Huntingdon. They reminded the local population of the King's power following attempted uprisings.</i> • <i>A small number of the early castles, e.g. Tower of London and William FitzOsbern's castle at Chepstow, were built in stone and therefore very strong and advanced for the time. e.g. TOL had entrance above ground level and a wooden staircase which could be removed if under attack. It had a 'fake' upper floor where Norman soldiers patrolled.</i> • <i>Castles which were designed to show off status (e.g. Exeter gatehouse; Castle Acre) were not necessarily ineffective but in fact very effective in terms of psychological control of the population. Often built right next to Saxon churches or burh-geats which had belonged to thegns.</i>
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 9*–20 marks	
In describing early Norman castles as ‘rather weak and primitive’, the website ‘www.worldhistory.biz’ suggests that they were not very effective. How far do you agree with this view of Norman castles in England between 1066 and 1087? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (17-20 marks)	Typically, a balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 20 marks, e.g. <i>There is some evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, up to a quarter of the early Norman castles built in England, such as Elmley Castle in Worcestershire, may have been ringworks. These were very simple (usually oval) enclosures of earth and timber. Soil from a ditch was used to make an inner bank which was then topped with a timber palisade. So this could be considered ‘primitive’ in the sense that it was more makeshift and not as complex as a building up a motte.</i> <i>Furthermore, after 1071, the majority of Norman castles were built in the countryside and had more to do with settlement than defence. Therefore, there were some castles built by Norman lords in their new lands which were weaker than the Royal castles, which were built in major towns or at the sites of rebellions. For example, Castle Acre in Norfolk was merely a two-storeyed house built in the centre of a ringwork. It was designed more to look impressive than as a strong defence.</i> <i>However, building a motte and bailey castle was a complex operation which would take weeks or months and require building up alternating layers of different materials. The resulting structure was highly impressive. For example, Goltho in Lincolnshire had a motte which was 5 metres high and 23 metres wide, as well as a 9 metre high watchtower and ramparts which were 18m thick. This was therefore a highly fortified site which could not be described as weak or primitive.</i> <i>Finally, a small number of the early castles, were built in stone and therefore very strong and advanced for the time. The Tower of London was an astounding building, standing at over 27 metres high. It had an entrance above ground level and a wooden staircase which could be removed if under attack, and ‘fake’ upper floor where Norman soldiers patrolled. This was far from primitive – construction on this scale would not have been seen in England since the Romans.</i> <i>Overall, I disagree with the statement. It would be wrong to equate timber with being ‘primitive’ – timber castles continued to be built well into the 1200s. Neither were they ‘weak’; they were in fact a fundamental way the Normans put down rebellions and asserted their authority. And finally, although they did have a function of showing off as well as a military function, this in itself was often highly effective as a means of psychological control.</i>
Level 4 (13-16 marks)	Typically, a balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support (2–1 or 3–0), e.g. <i>There is some evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, up to a quarter of the early Norman castles built in England, such as Elmley Castle in Worcestershire, may have been ringworks. These were very simple (usually oval) enclosures of earth and timber. Soil from a ditch was used to make an inner bank which was then topped with a timber palisade. So this could be considered ‘primitive’ in the sense that it was more makeshift and not as complex as a building up a motte.</i> <i>However, building a motte and bailey castle was a complex operation which would take weeks or months and require building up alternating layers of different materials. The resulting structure was highly impressive. For example, Goltho in Lincolnshire had a motte which was 5 metres high and 23 metres wide, as well as a 9 metre high watchtower and ramparts which were 18m thick. This was therefore a highly fortified site which could not be described as weak or primitive.</i> <i>Finally, a small number of the early castles, were built in stone and therefore very strong and advanced for the time. The Tower of London was an astounding building, standing at over 27 metres high. It had an entrance above ground level and a wooden staircase which could be removed if under attack, and ‘fake’ upper floor where Norman soldiers patrolled. This was far from primitive – construction on this scale would not have been seen in England since the Romans.</i>

Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g. <i>I agree. Firstly, up to a quarter of the early Norman castles built in England, such as Elmley Castle in Worcestershire, may have been ringworks. These were very simple (usually oval) enclosures of earth and timber. Soil from a ditch was used to make an inner bank which was then topped with a timber palisade. So this could be considered 'primitive' in the sense that it was more makeshift and not as complex as a building up a motte.</i> <i>Furthermore, after 1071, the majority of Norman castles were built in the countryside and had more to do with settlement than defence. Therefore, there were some castles built by Norman lords in their new lands which were weaker than the Royal castles, which were built in major towns or at the sites of rebellions. For example, Castle Acre in Norfolk was merely a two-storeyed house built in the centre of a ringwork. It was designed more to look impressive than as a strong defence</i> Alternatively, and typically, a balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1–1), e.g. <i>There is some evidence to support this interpretation. Firstly, up to a quarter of the early Norman castles built in England, such as Elmley Castle in Worcestershire, may have been ringworks. These were very simple (usually oval) enclosures of earth and timber. Soil from a ditch was used to make an inner bank which was then topped with a timber palisade. So this could be considered 'primitive' in the sense that it was more makeshift and not as complex as a building up a motte.</i> <i>However, building a motte and bailey castle was a complex operation which would take weeks or months and require building up alternating layers of different materials. The resulting structure was highly impressive. For example, Goltho in Lincolnshire had a motte which was 5 metres high and 23 metres wide, as well as a 9 metre high watchtower and ramparts which were 18m thick. This was therefore a highly fortified site which could not be described as weak or primitive.</i>
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Typically, a one-sided argument; one explained point of support (1–0), e.g. <i>I agree. Firstly, up to a quarter of the early Norman castles built in England, such as Elmley Castle in Worcestershire, may have been ringworks. These were very simple (usually oval) enclosures of earth and timber. Soil from a ditch was used to make an inner bank which was then topped with a timber palisade. So this could be considered 'primitive' in the sense that it was more makeshift and not as complex as a building up a motte.</i> Explained points must: • identify a valid claim/ argument • offer specific evidence to support the argument • show how their evidence answers the question
Level 1 (1-4 marks)	Typically, identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation (2–4 marks), e.g. • Yes, I agree because they were mainly motte and bailey castles which were built from wood, which could be burned. (2) • No, some were really strong, like the Tower of London, which was built out of stone. (3) 1 identifications = 2-3 marks 2 identifications = 3-4 marks 3+ identifications = 4 marks Alternatively, and typically, description of castles/ related events (2–4 marks), e.g. • In the autumn of 1066, William marched his army in a wide arc around London. (2) He built many castles, such as at Dover, Wallingford and Newbury. (3) • The early Norman castles had a man-made mound known as the motte. (2) There was also an enclosure called a 'bailey'. (3) This would be surrounded by a ditch and an earthwork bank, which was topped by a wooden palisade. (4) Alternatively, and typically, valid but general assertions (Max 1 mark), e.g. <i>I agree because lots of them were just ringworks.</i>
0 marks	

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2025 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.