
AS HISTORY

Paper 2B The Wars of the Roses, 1450–1471

Mark scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2B The Wars of the Roses, 1450–1471

Section A

0	1	With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why there was instability in England in the years to 1461?	[25 marks]
----------	----------	--	-------------------

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

L5:	Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.	21-25
L4:	Answers will provide a range of relevant of well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context.	16-20
L3:	The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.	11-15
L2:	The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.	6-10
L1:	The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context.	1-5
	Nothing worthy of credit.	0

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: In assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- Gregory's Chronicle was not written by a historian, but rather by a member of the City of London who may well have had a vested interest in exaggerating the role of London in national events
- a mayor was hardly likely to criticise the role of London or of Londoners
- the tone is authoritative with clear opinions which suggest an author with a strong point of view
- the contemporary nature of the source, written by someone of whom it might be expected, had some insight into the events of the Wars of the Roses, perhaps makes the source more valid as a reflection of actual events.

Content and argument

- the King is portrayed as weak and unable to even maintain his hold on the throne, having been forced to leave London. This is reinforced by the inference that the King lacks political acumen as his Queen was 'more intelligent', and perhaps therefore she was the real instigator of the instability of the period
- the treatment of the Queen is used as an indication of the general level of banditry of the period and sense of lack of control and order which further fed discontent
- the lords are accused of sending forged orders to the Queen with a clear suggestion that they were acting far beyond their competences and powers, thus contributing to the instability
- Somerset and Devon are encouraged to come to the aid of the Queen with their armies in full armour – a suggestion not only that the Queen is instigating civil unrest, but that the nobles serve as power brokers within the realm.
- nobles are referred to as acting as much out of self-interest and the expectation of personal gain, as out of any sense of loyalty or of duty.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the accuracy of the reasons suggested for opposition to the Queen
- the accuracy of the assessment of the King
- the extent to which nobles were actually motivated by the reasons stated in the extract

Source B: In assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- the English Chronicle was written sometime after the events described and is a more general account of the breadth of English History across several reigns
- the fact it was written during the rapidly changing factionalism of the Wars of the Roses might be considered relevant when explaining the rather neutral and objective manner by which the events are described
- the tone is clear and descriptive, but unsympathetic opinions are advanced.

Content and argument

- there is a clear reference to the weakness of the King and the poor leadership that had existed for some time. This is reinforced by reference to bad advisors which undoubtedly also implies those out for self-gain and profit
- economic crisis is emphasised but is reinforced by suggesting that the King had no means with which to repay his debts. Moreover, patronage had dried up due to the King having given all of the gifts that were in his power to give
- the burden placed upon the 'common people' is directly referred to but also the resentment that the collection of tallage seemed not to be linked to any specific royal expenditure such as defence of the kingdom
- the Queen is viewed as a force deliberately seeking to undermine the King and to place her own son in his place.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the extent to which Henry VI was as weak as portrayed
- the extent to which the degree of financial exactions were as severe as suggested
- the actions and character of the Queen and their accuracy or validity

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.) Source A has limited scope around a narrow event whilst Source B describes a broader aspect of Henry's reign, but is more emotive in tone which limits its value. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

- 0 2** 'Richard, Duke of York, failed in his duty as Protector in the years 1453 to 1455.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Factors that may be used in support of the premise of the question:

- if a protector's role is to ensure the stability of government then superficially at least it would appear that Richard failed, and more than that was the reason for his own failure
- the Battle of St Albans may represent a short-term success for Richard but it also made it clear that York could count on very little noble support, except from the Nevilles
- the fact that Somerset was blamed for St Albans was more an indication of York attempting to shift responsibility rather than any inherent failure on his part
- it was the King's apparent recovery in Christmas 1454 that resulted in the end of the protectorate early in 1455 followed by an immediate policy of repression against York and his followers. This was not an indication of failure on the part of York
- York may well have had little choice but to take up arms against a faction-riven court
- he remembered the fate of Gloucester and was therefore reluctant to attend the Great Council at Leicester.

Factors that may be used to counter the premise of the question:

- the manoeuvrings of Margaret and also Somerset go some way to explaining the Battle of St Albans
- factionalism at court was hardly within the scope of York's authority
- Richard as protector had fulfilled a policy of moderation and tried to balance competing factions
- St Albans can be blamed upon the extremism of the Somerset faction, but apart from that there was little reprisal or immediate reaction and therefore it might be argued that Richard had not failed in his duty
- that Richard embarked on the second protectorate might be used as indication of the success of the first.

- 0 3** 'It was the weakness of Henry VI as king that explains the successful usurpation of the throne by Edward IV in 1461.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Factors that may be used to support the premise of the question:

- the weakness of Henry VI, not only in character but also health, is a central factor in the political instability of the period
- even before the breakdown from 1453, Henry struggled to maintain authority within the realm
- Henry's extraordinary piety and extravagance did little to elevate his reputation amongst contemporaries
- the loss of France can be attributed mainly to the actions of Henry himself, and by replacing York with Beaufort, he further weakened the war effort.

Factors that may be used to challenge the premise of the question:

- Henry's weaknesses did not exist in a political vacuum
- failure in France was not entirely Henry VI's fault, especially considering the nature of the possessions on the death of Henry V
- the ambition of York and his frequent inability to achieve what he considered to be his dynastic due led inevitably to conflict
- the Mortimer claim was a strong one, and hence Henry VI and the broader Lancastrian dynasty were always vulnerable to the politically ambitious
- Margaret's own attempt to marginalise York proves just how dangerous a threat she considered him to be
- Warwick was also plainly crucial in the elevation of Edward and this may well have been the first example of his 'kingmaking'
- Henry may have been a weak character plagued by ill-health but he was also a victim of misfortune and the intrigues of the dynastically ambitious.

