

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

HISTORY A

H505

For first teaching in 2015

Y102/01 Summer 2024 series

Contents

Introduction

Paper Y102 series overview

Section A overview

Question 1

Section B overview

Question 2*

Question 3*

3

4

5

5

13

13

18

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers is also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper Y102 series overview

Y102 is one of thirteen units in Paper 1 for the A Level examination for GCE History. This unit tests an extended period of History of about fifty years through an Enquiries or source-based question and a traditional essay question. The paper is divided into two sections. In Section A, candidates have to answer a compulsory source question based on four written primary sources. The question requires them to use all four sources to assess the validity of a view. In Section B, candidates are required to answer one essay question from a choice of two.

To do well on Section A, candidates need to be able to consider both provenance of the sources and apply contextual knowledge to them in order to reach a judgement about the sources in relation to the issue in the question. The judgement should be based on an evaluation of the reliability of the evidence given, not on the topic or contextual knowledge. To reach Level 6, a judgement should be made at the end of the analysis of each source, with an overall judgement in the conclusion.

To do well on Section B, candidates need to address the issue in the question, using detailed supporting knowledge. In order to reach the higher levels, candidates will need to assess the issues they discuss and reach a supported judgement at least in the conclusion. To reach Level 6 candidates should also make an overall judgement as well as interim judgements when assessing each factor.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> considered the provenance of the source(s) and used relevant contextual knowledge clearly linked the contextual knowledge to the source being discussed to show whether the view of the source was valid or not reached an overall judgement as to the extent to which the sources supported the view in the question discussed at least two issues in depth in answering the essay question gave supporting detail that was both accurate and relevant to the question set, not just the topic reached a supported judgement about the issue in the question made a series of interim judgements about the issues discussed in relation to the question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not consider both the provenance and use contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources wrote an unbalanced response in their treatment of the sources, with very little consideration of one of the sources reached a judgement based on their knowledge rather than the sources showed a poor understanding of the major issues relevant to the essay were unable to support their response with relevant material did not focus on the precise wording of the question made unsupported comments about issues which were assertions.

Section A overview

There is one compulsory question in this section. This question requires candidates to critically assess evidence and reach judgements. The critical evaluation of sources is the central theme in this section with all marks given against AO2.

The Enquiry section in Paper Y102 is focused on the role of Ranulf Flambard in William II's government.

Question 1

Norman England 1087–1107

1 'Ranulf Flambard played the key role in William II's government.'

Use the **four** sources in their historical context to assess how far they support this view. [30]

Candidates in general demonstrated an ability to link each source to the issue in the question. Source A was interpreted as evidence of William II's deep involvement in the governance of the kingdom, whereas Source C was seen as evidence of the centrality of Ranulf's position, in support of the view in the question. Source B made the point that others – such as William of Saint-Calais, bishop of Durham, and even Odo, bishop of Bayeux – held (or expected to hold) prominent governmental positions, but only some candidates recognised this, with others making a more general point about Ranulf's absence from the text. In relation to D, some candidates noted that however powerful Ranulf might have been in secular affairs at one point, his ability to interfere in ecclesiastical matters, despite holding the episcopal office at Durham from 1099, would always be circumscribed by the authority of the archbishop of Canterbury. Some candidates even drew out the broader significance of Eadmer's view as evidence of the need for a partnership between the king and archbishop in effective governance.

Knowledge cited usually focused on the more sensational elements of Ranulf's biography (for example, his exploitative tax measures and his eventual imprisonment by Henry I – even his escape from the Tower of London), as well as his purchase of the see of Durham. Other knowledge included examples of the ecclesiastical positions sold by Rufus, his need for funds to secure Normandy from Robert Curthose, and his turbulent relationship with Anselm. Knowledge tended to be less developed and in a few cases Rufus was confused with his father.

Provenance tended to be handled less effectively. Eadmer in Source D was well known as a confidant of Anselm and so someone who would be likely to express partisan views in the archbishop's favour. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (A) was known reasonably well, although some candidates confused the origin and identity of the version (E, the longest maintained one, written at Peterborough from a Canterbury exemplar). Attempts at evaluation of the provenance of William of Malmesbury (B) and Simeon of Durham (C) were often less developed, restricted to general comments about the authors' monastic identity and the comparatively late date of the writing of each source. Simeon's view is particularly interesting in this context, since, as some candidates noted, he was a member of the Benedictine community at Durham, was associated with William of Saint-Calais, and he almost certainly had personal experience of dealing with Flambard. However, few candidates raised these issues in their assessments of the source.

There is some evidence of the evaluation of provenance in Exemplar 1. Its mark is reflective of the balanced use of knowledge and provenance, as well as the inclusion of a judgement based on the provenance of the sources. This may be seen in the final paragraph.

Exemplar 1

1	(a).	As a group, the 4 sources only support the view that Ranulf Flambard played a key role in William II's government ^(to a very limited extent) . While Source C attributes a large role to Ranulf in exploiting the finances of England, and Source D does not mention this merely illustrates an exchange between Anselm and Ranulf, not really demonstrating how big "key" his role in government was. Sources A and B go even further and do not mention Ranulf's role in the government, and focusing on William himself instead. Thus, with only Source C truly supporting the view, and with ^{with} limited convincingness from its provenance, the sources only support the view very little.
		To begin with, Source A does not mention the role of Ranulf Flambard at all, only perhaps alluding to his role by mentioning the "unjust taxes", which was the job of Flambard, thus does not support the view to the least extent. B Source A instead focuses on "William" who was "harsh" and "own greed".
		To begin with, Source B doesn't support the view at all, for he does not mention Ranulf at any point, thus supporting it the least out of all 4. William of Malmesbury focuses on the rebellion of 1088 and the role of "Odo" instead, amounting him to the "plundering".

of "the king's revenues in Kent"; and at no point mentions Ranulf Flambard, ~~what the~~ context instead mentions his predecessor bishop of Durham instead. Contextually, source B is supported, as indeed Odo had rebelled against William Rufus along with ~~Robert~~ 5 other influential Norman barons. ~~how however~~ ~~lacks support in it~~ and correctly suggests that William of St Calais ~~was~~ joined in for he ~~informed~~ deserted Rufus on his way to get reinforcements in Durham. William of Malmesbury, ~~also~~ as a monk, it is unsurprising that would present the rebellion of 1088 as so severe, for he detested disorder brought by rebels. His reputation as the "greatest historian since Bede", ~~also~~ alongside the contextual support also adds to the overall convincingness. However, although accurate in regarding, this information is not relevant to the title view for Flambard is not mentioned, let alone his role in the government, thus supporting the view the least.

Source A, while doesn't explicitly mention Flambard supports it very slightly by alluding to his role - mentioning William to be influenced by "evil men" who encouraged him to exact "unjust taxes" which was Flambard's role in government. However, the source focuses more on "William himself in the role of the government."

~~calling him~~ saying he "either sold or held in his own hands" bishoprics.

This is accurate insofar as Rufus' government did see the archbishopric of Canterbury empty twice, first after Lanfranc's death and secondly after Anselm left in 1097, as the source suggested. It is also right in saying the ~~the~~ incomes were expropriated from these vacant sees, but it is perhaps unbalanced for attributing all of this to William himself, for it was really Ranulf's doing. ~~This is also~~ It is unsurprising that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle would directly point their finger to William instead of Flambard though, for their main role is to advise kings to act in accordance to English benefits, being the only English chronicle left. It is also unsurprising that the Chronicle would be so ruthless and directly condemn Rufus for he had died already by the time the same was written. While he was alive, the Chronicle may have had to hold back, for the other 2 editions were already shut off by the king, but now that they could finally criticise openly the king, ~~hence~~ it is therefore likely that the monks overexaggerated the extent to which William was responsible to all of this. Therefore, ~~at~~ Source A only

The unjust expropriation of the vacant sees

supports the view ^{to a} very limited extent, for it diminishes Ranulf's role by not only not mentioning him but only focusing on William's role perhaps with too much emphasis, thus losing its convincingness as well.

Source D supports the view more than A and B, but still not ~~too much~~ to a great extent for while it suggests Flambard had a role in the ~~choosing~~ of archbishops, ~~the~~ the source concentrating focuses mainly on his exchange with Anselm and also loses convincingness when considering the author of the source who was inherently biased.

~~Source~~ Eadmer ~~also~~ suggested Ranulf had a role as he "proposed to consecrate Thurgod at York" although the prospective archbishop of York had not been consecrated himself.

This shows that Flambard had a ~~great~~ role big enough to have the audacity to challenge the archbishop of Canterbury, primate, on church issues. ~~Contextually~~ However, the source is highly unconvincing as ~~firstly, Ranulf to Eadmer had at the~~ ~~reasons to exaggerate~~ wrote a companion, admirer of Anselm, would have written to elevate the status of Anselm, so had to diminish the role of Flambard by ~~saying~~ ^{showing} Anselm's solid ~~re~~ assigned reply in

Saying "I positively forbid it to be done"

Also, the Eadmer may have written to juxtapose the canonicus Ranulf, who purchased the ~~bishopric~~ of Durham for 1099 for £1000 to Anselm, and who had been imprisoned briefly by Henry I in the Tower of London against Anselm who was well known for his work at Beato do so. ~~That, I suspect~~ ~~that the source may actually have diminished~~ the role of Hambarad instead of ~~enhancing~~ this, in ~~what~~ ~~fact~~ the source may have actually diminished ~~Hambarad~~ Attributing this large role to Hambarad also looks very bad upon Ruric, again another purpose of Eadmer's writing, for Ruric had treated Anselm very badly, e.g. not letting him have all of Lanfranc's lands, as well as the Cornet of Rockingham which saw heavy dispute. Thus for all these reasons Anselm ^{Eadmer} may actually have overemphasised Ranulf's role to make it seem very outrageous that he would overstep his role like that. With the biased context, ~~it is therefore~~ therefore gives the view that Ranulf played a key role to an even smaller extent.

Lastly, some C supports the view to the greatest extent, ~~as~~ albeit not so convincingly. Thus Simon says suggested Ranulf

had so great of a role that ~~he~~ as a "tax collector and "administrator" that he seized their property and lands everywhere throughout England". While he did exploit the finances of Canterbury and Worcester after Wulfstan's death in 1095, giving the source some support, "everywhere throughout England" was most definitely an exaggeration, for ~~most bishoprics~~ many remained under as they were under the Conqueror and Peter's penne was allowed to continue under Rufus, showing that the exploitation of church wealth was not as great as Simeon is suggesting. This is expected of Simeon, for he, as being of Durham, saw how Ranulf had disrupted the peace by purchasing the bishopric in 1099 with £1000 and tarnishing the reputation of Simeon's ~~as~~ Durham further by being imprisoned by them in 1100 when he ascended. Consequently, it is unsurprising that he exaggerated the malice of Flambard, ~~as~~ rendering this source unconvincing contextually and in terms of provenance, despite the level of support given to the view, as the key role" is seen in his ability to exert so much control over church finances.

		<p>In conclusion, the sources all varied in level of support to the view. While Sources A and B place almost no significance on the role of Ranulf in William II's government, Source C suggested he did, in that he was able to challenge the primate and source C goes even further in suggesting he ex exploited finances, but both with a large extra as largely uncommittal just as Eadmer and Simeon were loyal to Anselm and Durham, both offended by either Rufus or Ranulf so had clear motives to write against Ranulf, therefore overall the sources undermine the commingness of both sources. This overall, the 4 sources only support the view that Ranulf Flambard played the key role in William II's government to a very limited extent.</p>
--	--	--

Exemplar 1 is a Level 5 response, with some use of provenance and relevant knowledge of the historical context relating to each source. However, comments are less developed. There is some judgement in the final paragraph which refers to the provenance of C and D (Simeon of Durham and Eadmer). This judgement is sufficient to push the response into Level 5.

Assessment for learning



Candidates should focus on how far the sources support the view in the question rather than simply explaining each source in light of the issue.

Assessment for learning



Judgements need to reference the provenance of each source if they are to be developed fully, rather than simply noting whether each source supports the view or not.

Section B overview

Candidates are required to answer one essay from a choice of two. Each question is taken from a different Key Topic and requires candidates to weigh up the importance of a range of factors or issues.

Question 2*

Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman Conquest 1035–1087

- 2* 'Disputes over the succession were the main reason for instability in England during the period from 1035 to 1042.'

How far do you agree?

[20]

This question was not as popular as Question 3. Candidates in general had some knowledge of the succession arrangements made by Cnut, as seen in Exemplar 2. Complications occurred because the king had sons by different unions: Harold Harefoot by Ælfgifu of Northampton and Harthacnut by Emma of Normandy. Matters were complicated further because Emma had sons from her first marriage to Æthelred, king of England, who eventually laid claim to the throne: Alfred and Edward (the Confessor).

More candidates focused on the rival claims of Harold Harefoot and Harthacnut, as well as the scheming of Emma to secure the throne for her son (Harthacnut). Indeed, the involvement in the succession dispute of individuals like Emma and Earl Godwin was presented by some candidates as another reason for instability. Godwin's changing of sides and his participation in the brutal murder of Edward's brother, Alfred, probably at the behest of Harold Harefoot, was surprisingly overlooked by some candidates.

Another reason often mentioned was the relatively unsuccessful rule of first Harold Harefoot and then Harthacnut. Tax riots were often cited as evidence of the latter. In support of stability, some candidates made good use of numismatic evidence.

Exemplar 2 addresses these factors with relatively detailed knowledge. A judgement is attempted, although it is less developed, and so the response only just falls into Level 5. For a mark higher in the level, more detailed discussion of the factors is needed, as well as a more developed judgement. At Level 6, the response would have needed a final judgement, as well as further judgement throughout the essay.

Exemplar 2

2		<p>'Disputes over the succession were the main reason for instability in England during period from 1035 to 1062?'</p> <p>Following the death of Canute in 1035 the followed a long period of instability within England. The main reason was the dispute of over succession due to the two marriages Canute had. However all factors effected the & threatened stability within the country as well such as the actions of Emma of Normandy & secondly the policies Harthacnut implemented once king.</p> <p>The dispute over succession was the most important contribution to instability within England from 1035-42. This was put into motion by the fact Canute had two marriages to Aelfgifu of Northampton & Emma of Normandy. of which both produced heirs to the throne. The initial cause of instability was the agreement Canute made with Emma which was that if she produced an heir he'd be the successor to the throne. This meant Harold Godwinson had essentially been cut off from succession. However, despite this regents & leading nobility in England Elected him to be regent in 1037 due to the growing absence of Harthacnut in Denmark caused by claims of Norway. This caused outrage among Emma's supporters & Harthacnut as she saw this as a direct challenge to her sons claim which was bound to cause political unrest. This can be seen in the fact that nobility in Wessex.</p>
---	--	--

including Earl Godwin, opposed this decision & allowed Emma to take all vessels in hopes she could protect and keep alive her sons claim. Further more she protected this claim with a body of huscarls. This created unrest & animosity within England presently possibly for unrest to ~~then~~ start. This animosity came to a head late in the year when Harold Harefoot drove Emma from her seat at Winchester where she sat on the treasury. Later on within the period another potential dispute over succession arose when Harthecnut recognised Edward as his heir at court in 1042. This threatened stability further as in doing so Harthecnut had broken agreement he made with Magnus which allowed ^{Harthecnut} ~~him~~ to secure the throne. In conclusion it is evident that succession posed the most real threat to stability as this was the root cause of unrest at the beginning of the period that kickstarted the instability.

Another factor that opposes the views of the question is the actions Emma of Normandy took and how it threatened stability significantly. This can first be seen in how Emma of Normandy started a propaganda campaign against Harold 'Harefoot'. This propaganda entailed her telling people & sending out letters that Harold was an illegitimate son of Canute due to the fact Belegise was unable to conceive children. Emma went as far to suggest he'd been struck in the back whilst he was asleep. This had massive impacts on stability as it made the people of England oppose Harold succeeding even more than they already did and his presence was sure to antagonise the people of England. Its effects can also be seen in the fact that Pope

Pious IX refused to handover Harold the coronation regalia on account of such rumours giving the desired effect Emma wanted. Emma took further actions in 1036 which threatened England's political stability by calling on the sons of her first marriage to Athelred, Edward & Alfred to invade England in hopes of securing claim of Harthecnut for him. Edward landed at Southampton & was forced to abandon his campaign however he did range east coast before leaving which created further unrest. Alfred however was caught on arrival at Dover and his threat to instability was limited although he dealt & Rodwina's implication in it posed threat to stability in 1043 when Edward came to the throne. Overall Emma's actions did seriously threaten stability although not as significant as succession.

Lastly the actions of Harthecnut also threatened stability within the & period from 1035 to 42. This was distinctively the case when he came to throne in 1040 as his trip from Denmark via Bruges to ~~Harthecnut~~ England had cost him 32,000 pounds. Upon his coronation he implemented a harsh tax on the people in order to pay for the expense. This caused anger throughout England. This instability was further increased by the fact that 2 tax collectors were killed in Worcester which resulted in Harthecnut ordering the Ealdormen to pay waste to towns/city. Athelred looked & eyes and showed ruthless style of governing. He also created further unrest in his betrayal of Eadwulf who he had promised safe

		passage. This two events placed mistrust in
		Harthecnut & caused people throughout England to
		resent his rule. overall his contribution was the
		important however the dispute of over succession
		was of far greater importance.
		In conclusion the dispute over succession
		threatened stability the most as it was the root
		cause of all other factors that followed and
		was present throughout. Even the Harthecnut's actions were
		also prompted by issues of succession.

Exemplar 2 is a Level 5 response which sets out (with a tendency to list) some relevant factors and reaches a less developed but substantiated judgement. There is generally detailed knowledge, but it is the judgement which is sufficient to push this response into Level 5.

Assessment for learning



Candidates should provide a judgement in response to the question which is focused on the key issue and substantiated with a convincing explanation.

Question 3*

- 3* How seriously was William I's consolidation of his power in England threatened by the rebellions of 1067–1070? [20]

Candidates had reasonable knowledge of the main rebellions that took place during this period, including at Exeter in 1068, the revolt of Eadric the Wild at a similar time, the northern rebellion, usually dated 1069 to 1070, and the initial stages of the rebellion associated with Hereward the Wake. Some candidates also referred to the attack on Dover by Eustace II of Boulogne in 1067 and the separate attacks on south-west England by Harold's sons based in Ireland, while in a few responses the local revolt centred on the castle of Montacute, usually dated to 1069, was mentioned, an uprising swiftly dealt with by Geoffrey de Montbray, bishop of Coutances. Knowledge of each rebellion varied.

Some candidates confused different rebellions, with Eadric, for example, appearing at Exeter. The role of Gytha, Harold's mother, in the Exeter rebellion was not always well known, while the albeit complex sequence of events in the north was sometimes confused. Nevertheless, the role of external influences was often commented on, particularly the supporting role of Swein Estrithson in the 1069 rebellion. Candidates usually noted the seriousness of the northern rebellion, as reflected in the drastic actions taken by the king in the following year, the so-called 'harrying of the north'.

Other measures taken by the king were also mentioned by candidates who played down the seriousness of the rebellions, such as the use of castles. This point was often less effectively supported. It had greater impact when candidates cited specific examples of the castles built by the king, such as those like Warwick and Nottingham associated with the earliest stages of the Conquest. Other candidates highlighted the localised nature of each rebellion, which worked against their chances of success. Those candidates who attempted to argue that the defeated Anglo-Saxons lacked a suitable figurehead to rally around neglected to mention Edgar Ætheling and the strength of his claim to the throne.

In Exemplar 3, there is explanation of the rebellions with reasonably detailed knowledge. It includes a less developed judgement which allows for a mark in the lower end of Level 5.

Exemplar 3

3	<p>William I's consolidation of power in England was only mildly threatened by the rebellions in 1067 and 1068 as well as the rebellions ^{rebellian} of Edwin, Morcar and Hereward the Wake in 1070 however however especially in comparison to the ^{threat of the 1075 rebellion or the} much larger threat of 1085 from Cnut, son of Swein of Denmark. However, one could argue that he was quite his consolidation of power was more seriously threatened in 1069 due to his harsh response with the banning of the North. Thus the rebellions of 1067-1070 were not a completely unseasoned threat. //</p> <p>One could certainly argue that William's consolidation of power was only mildly threatened by the early rebellions in his reign of 1067 and 1068. This can be seen in the success of William's regents (Odo of Bayeux and William Fitz Osbern) successfully putting down the rebellions in both Kent, invited his brother of Boulogne's attack on Dover, and the Midlands by Godwin 'the wild'. The fact that William's aid was not required ^{required} in putting down these rebellions highlights their relatively only mild threat to his power. This is further confirmed in the rebellion ^{rebellion} of Godwin 'the wild' after the rebellion - if he had been a more serious threat, he would not have been allowed</p>
---	---

to ramp up. The success of William's response to the rebellions of 1068 can be taken as evidence for the lack of serious threat. William successfully besieged Breteuil for 18 days in 1068 ~~and~~ and thus subdued the rebels there. Similarly, William was able to rely on the levying of English support against the threat from the three illegitimate sons of Harold on the south coast - further highlighting the lack of threat there as ~~the~~ ~~most~~ most Englishmen remained in support of him. William's swift and agile response to the northern threat of 1068 can be seen through his strategic use of castle building at Nottingham, Warwick, York, Lincoln, Cambridge and Huntingdon in order to suppress the rebels. These early threats ~~were~~ were thus clearly a relatively mild threat. This is especially clear when comparing them to the threat of 1085 from Cnut of Denmark. The imminence of this threat can be seen in William's panicked calling of a war council in Gloucester as well as his bringing of 'a larger force than ever before into the country', according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

The mild threat of the early rebellions in comparison to the much more serious threat

in 1085 can be likened to the similarly mild threat of 1070. Although Mercor, Hereward the Wake and Swein caused some issues to William's power in that they made Bly their base and ravaged the lands around, the seriousness of the threat is diminished by the fact that William was able to pay off Swein of Denmark in 1070 as well as the fact that Hereward the Wake simply disappeared into the Fens after William's successful siege of Bly. Again, in comparison to the threat of 1085, the rebellion of 1070 is negligible. When comparing both the early threats of 1067-8 and the threat of 1070 ~~to the~~ to the ~~threat~~ rebellion of 1075, ~~one can also see that this threat~~ one can also see that their threat is less significant as in 1075, William's own barons, led by Roger de Breteuil were in revolt, not just English forces.

However, one could argue that the rebellion of 1069 was ~~quite~~ a very considerable threat to William I's consolidation of power as seen in his response to the rebellion through the Hanging of the North (1069-70). This threat was especially serious due to the combined threat of Edwin, Mercor, Malcolm^(of the Scots), Godwyn (of the Welsh) and Swein of Denmark, who all contributed in

some famine the rebellion. The magnitude of the threat would certainly have been a great issue for William. ~~the~~ The seriousness of the threat of rebellion can be seen in ~~the~~ the immense devastation of William's Harrying of the North from York. As a consequence of the harrying which was carried out over the winter of 1069 to 1070, 100,000 people died of famine and the population of York was ~~halved halved halved~~ reduced by half. The Domesday Book also records that ~~the land was that~~ 80% of the land was still wasteland by 1086, again underlining the devastation caused by William, who ~~even~~ was even supposedly recorded saying that he felt guilty about the harrying later in life. ~~he~~ described himself as a "ravaging war". William's immense response to the rebellion of 1069, paired with his construction of castles at Chester and Sheffield on the way to York convey the magnitude of the perceived threat of the rebellion.

In conclusion, ~~although~~ the early rebellions ~~of~~ of 1067 and 1068 ~~as well as~~ as well as those of 1070 did not seriously threaten William's consolidation of power, as showcased by his swift and successful responses as well as in comparing them to the later and more serious threats of 1085 and 1075. However, the

		rebellions of 1067-1070 were not a completely
		unserious threat to William I's consolidation
		of power as they shown by the ^{severity} seriousness
		of William's response to the more
		serious the rebellion of 1069.

Exemplar 3 is a Level 5 response which has generally detailed knowledge and a substantiated judgement. Some elements of the knowledge are weaker, but there is reasonable understanding of the rebellions themselves and the issue in the question. Its judgement is reflective of a Level 5 response.

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

Access to Scripts

We've made it easier for Exams Officers to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts'. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular professional development courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

[ExamBuilder](#) is a free test-building platform, providing unlimited users exclusively for staff at OCR centres with an [Interchange](#) account.

Choose from a large bank of questions to build personalised tests and custom mark schemes, with the option to add custom cover pages to simulate real examinations. You can also edit and download complete past papers.

[Find out more](#).

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals (examined units only).

[Find out more](#).

You will need an Interchange account to access our digital products. If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Online courses

Enhance your skills and confidence in internal assessment

What are our online courses?

Our online courses are self-paced eLearning courses designed to help you deliver, mark and administer internal assessment for our qualifications. They are suitable for both new and experienced teachers who want to refresh their knowledge and practice.

Why should you use our online courses?

With these online courses you will:

- learn about the key principles and processes of internal assessment and standardisation
- gain a deeper understanding of the marking criteria and how to apply them consistently and accurately
- see examples of student work with commentary and feedback from OCR moderators
- have the opportunity to practise marking and compare your judgements with those of OCR moderators
- receive instant feedback and guidance on your marking and standardisation skills
- be able to track your progress and achievements through the courses.

How can you access our online courses?

Access courses from [Teach Cambridge](#). Teach Cambridge is our secure teacher website, where you'll find all teacher support for your subject.

If you already have a Teach Cambridge account, you'll find available courses for your subject under Assessment - NEA/Coursework - Online courses. Click on the blue arrow to start the course.

If you don't have a Teach Cambridge account yet, ask your exams officer to set you up – just send them this [link](#) and ask them to add you as a Teacher.

Access the courses **anytime, anywhere and at your own pace**. You can also revisit the courses as many times as you need.

Which courses are available?

There are **two types** of online course: an **introductory module** and **subject-specific** courses.

The introductory module, Building your Confidence in Internal Assessment, is designed for all teachers who are involved in internal assessment for our qualifications. It covers the following topics:

- the purpose and benefits of internal assessment
- the roles and responsibilities of teachers, assessors, internal verifiers and moderators
- the principles and methods of standardisation
- the best practices for collecting, storing and submitting evidence
- the common issues and challenges in internal assessment and how to avoid them.

The subject-specific courses are tailored for each qualification that has non-exam assessment (NEA) units, except for AS Level and Entry Level. They cover the following topics:

- the structure and content of the NEA units
- the assessment objectives and marking criteria for the NEA units
- examples of student work with commentary and feedback for the NEA units
- interactive marking practice and feedback for the NEA units.

We are also developing courses for some of the examined units, which will be available soon.

How can you get support and feedback?

If you have any queries, please contact our Customer Support Centre on 01223 553998 or email support@ocr.org.uk.

We welcome your feedback and suggestions on how to improve the online courses and make them more useful and relevant for you. You can share your views by completing the evaluation form at the end of each course.

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**

 **facebook.com/ocrexams**

 **twitter.com/ocrexams**

 **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**

 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**

 **youtube.com/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



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 2024 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](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource in your centre, in line with any specific restrictions detailed in the resource. Resources intended for teacher use should not be shared with students. Resources should not be published on social media platforms or other websites.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

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.