

AS HISTORY 7041/2B

The Wars of the Roses, 1450–1499

Component 2B The Fall of the House of Lancaster, 1450–1471

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final



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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

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 the uneasy peace in England in the years 1455 to 1459?

[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 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 having 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

- the source was written with a pro-Yorkist bias which is valuable in understanding how far they perceived and/or wanted to claim the kingdom was stable during 1455–59
- the source was compiled during the period when Edward IV was king, which may limit value as its purpose may be to justify his claim/why the Lancastrians were undeserving of the Crown
- the tone of the source is highly critical of Margaret of Anjou and the Lancastrians – this may hold value in proving that the kingdom was divided and therefore not at peace. This matches with the provenance, increasing the value as it is representative of Yorkist views at the time
- students may also suggest the highly critical tone should be treated with caution as it might exaggerate the lack of peace and reputation of Margaret to support its aims.

Content and argument

- the source identifies the increasing power and influence of Margaret of Anjou in this period and suggests the impact of this is negative for peace. Students might argue this increases the value as the period 1455–59 saw Margaret of Anjou take an increasingly overt role in Lancastrian leadership, eg ordering of weaponry, calls for conscription
- the source also identifies that rumours persisted that Prince Edward was illegitimate. This again suggests instability and could therefore be valuable. However, students might also argue that this was not a core reason for the uneasy peace and thus misleading
- the source could be argued as valuable for its overall argument which suggests England was not at peace in the years 1455 to 1459. The source identifies the raising of troops which is valuable as in 1459 there were further bouts of conflict at Blore Heath and Ludford Bridge
- students could argue the source lacks value as Wiltshire is accused of desiring to enrich himself, suggesting he did not help to secure peace. This is arguably not the case as in 1455 he was seen to be part of the 'Middle Party' who worked towards reconciliation after the First Battle of St Albans.

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

Provenance and tone

- the source's purpose is to commemorate Love Day – a key event in the period 1455–59 and may therefore be deemed of some value for being written at the time, reflecting what people hoped without hindsight clouding their view
- the source is written in the style of a ballad and therefore the tone is romanticised and could be argued to be misleading
- the author was believed to be present and could therefore be deemed valuable as they are recording events that they had witnessed
- the source could be deemed as valuable as the author was probably from London – a usually pro-Yorkist area and it seems to be equally positive about the involvement of the Yorkists and Lancastrians on Love Day.

Content and argument

- the source identifies the event of Love Day. This is valuable as, after the First Battle of St Albans, there was arguably a series of attempts of reconciliation, suggesting this was not an anomaly for the period, eg crown wearing ceremony, council of reconciliation
- the source could be argued as limited in its value as the overall suggestion is that England is peaceful and unified. Arguably, by 1458 this was not the case. Warwick had accused Margaret of trying to kill him and Margaret had called for Warwick's arrest
- the source could be deemed valuable for understanding Love Day – that the lords were willing to meet in London at the King's request and take part in the ceremony
- students could also counter-argue that the source is misleading as it omits significant details, eg that Warwick and York arrived with armed retainers.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might suggest that whilst Source B is valuable for demonstrating there were attempts towards peace and stability in the period 1455–59, ultimately its suggestion that England was at peace cannot be corroborated. Source A does exaggerate the wrongs of the Lancastrian party due to the significant pro-Yorkist bias, however, it is much more suggestive of the military and political rivalries that continued to exist and develop in the period 1455–59 and might therefore be considered of greater value.

Section B

- 0 2** 'In the years 1455 to 1460, Richard, Duke of York, was solely concerned with good governance in England.'

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.

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1455 to 1460, Richard, Duke of York, was solely concerned with good governance in England might include:

- Richard had been arguing for the removal of corrupt advisors, such as the Duke of Somerset, for many years. Following the death of Somerset in May, Richard continued to support the King and government
- during Richard's Second Protectorate, he submitted another Act of Resumption to restore crownlands, which would have been unpopular with other nobles but useful to stabilise the government and Crown
- during 1455–59, Richard worked with Lancastrians, such as the Tudors, to secure lands in Wales and was involved in a range of reconciliation activities, following the First Battle of St Albans
- Richard also personally dealt with feuds between the nobility, for example the Bonville and Courtenay families, to re-establish law and order and good governance.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1455 to 1460, Richard, Duke of York, was solely concerned with good governance in England might include:

- by 1460, it could be argued Richard was concerned with an ambition for the Crown. The Act of Accord suggests Richard was concerned with his own status and power. The Act altered the line of succession so that Richard became Heir Apparent, removing the claim of Prince Edward of Westminster
- it could be argued he was more concerned with advancing the political status of Yorkists. For example, during his Second Protectorate he promoted a number of Yorkists to high ranking positions, which arguably caused problems in governance
- it could be argued he was more concerned with fear of the Lancastrian faction. After the Parliament of Devils, Richard lost all power and took extreme measures to regain his status. Additionally, the number of battles which took place in the years 1459–60 suggested the scale and severity of the threat he faced
- Richard's actions could also suggest that he was concerned with improving the economy for self-serving reasons. The Crown owed Richard money and so the Acts of Resumption may have been motivated by this. Equally, the Act of Accord had monetary value to Richard.

Students might conclude that Richard, Duke of York's, concerns had changed over time in response to the severity of the threat he faced from the Lancastrians. Equally, they could argue that his core motive had remained the same – the removal of political opponents by whatever means required, rather than purely being concerned with good governance.

0 3 'Edward IV was able to regain the throne in 1471 due to support from the nobility.'

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.

Arguments supporting the view that Edward IV was able to regain the throne in 1471 due to support from the nobility might include:

- safe passage: Edward relied on the support of the Percy family. He marched his men through lands that belonged to the Percys, as the Earl of Northumberland was indebted to Edward who returned his title and lands. He allowed Edward to march on unopposed which allowed Edward to both increase his army and advance towards London – both of which were necessary for him to retake the throne
- military support: Gloucester was an excellent commander in the Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury and so Edward needed nobles, such as Gloucester and Hastings, to command troops to secure victories and therefore regain the throne. Clarence returned to Edward and brought with him an army, as well as infuriating Warwick and limiting the chances of the Lancastrians to maintain control
- communication and intelligence: Hastings received letters from Edward and readied support which gave Edward information on where he could aim to land and which regions he may expect support from, which improved his chances of recovering the throne
- the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk were ordered to attend Court to prevent them from assisting Edward – proving Warwick feared they would defect to Edward and that the nobility would be vital in allowing him to regain the throne.

Arguments challenging the view that Edward IV was able to regain the throne in 1471 due to support from the nobility might include:

- it was not the nobility but rather that Edward relied on foreign support in 1471. Edward needed Charles of Burgundy to supply troops and a fleet to enable him to return and to form a basis for support to build from
- the military and political prowess of Edward IV could be argued as more important than the nobility. At the Battle of Barnet, Edward used the cover of fog to move troops towards the Lancastrians and at Tewkesbury used the bushes to hide a group of spearmen. Without these victories the Lancastrian figureheads/key supporters would still be at large. Also, on arrival in England he claimed to be recovering his title of Duke of York, an astute move as it allowed people to join his forces without immediate fear of treason charges. As a result, Montagu, who was monitoring Edward's march, could not convince his men to move against Edward
- it could also be argued Edward regained the throne due to failures of Lancastrian leaders. For example, the return of Henry VI was a failure, as there were outbreaks of lawlessness. In addition, confusion and perceived treachery on the battlefield lead to defeat at both battles
- finally, students may wish to argue it was not only the support of nobility but a wider support that allowed Edward to regain the throne, as demonstrated by how quickly he built up his army. In addition, Edward had the support of London. This gave Edward safe passage and allowed him to retake London and obtain possession of Henry VI who was held in the Tower.

Students might conclude that Edward needed the foreign support to launch his campaign, however, without the noble support once he landed back in England, his attempt may have failed. They could also argue that there were more important factors which aided Edward's success, such as the broader support he had amongst the gentry, commonweal and London which increased his army and gave him a strong base as well as control of Henry VI. They could also argue that Edward's successes at Barnet and Tewkesbury were vital in Edward regaining the throne, though these may not have been possible without the support of Hastings, Gloucester and Clarence, amongst others.