



A-level History

7042/2A-Component 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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 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

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.

Component 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the conflict between Richard I and Philip II. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- 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.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a French historian and chronicler from the Royal monastery at St Denis, Rigord was well-placed to know about events involving Philip, which might make him valuable as a source for showing why the French thought the two Kings fell out
- however, value may be limited as Rigord has a clear agenda in his writing – he will be clearly likely to emphasize the fault of the English King and to downplay any blame from Philip, as the French King himself may hear of what has been written in this chronicle
- Rigord's tone is highly critical of Richard's actions ('flatly refused') and very sympathetic towards Philip ('tearfully committed himself'). This is valuable in providing us with the French viewpoint, but should also alert us to possible overemphasis of Richard's role in creating the conflict.

Content and argument

- Rigord shows that the conflict began at an early stage, before they had even reached the Holy Land, and that Richard was to blame for rejecting Alice. This is valuable as it is clearly supported by the historical events – despite his betrothal to Alice since 1169, Richard married Berengaria and yet refused to hand back Alice's dowry (the Vexin). As they were going on Crusade Philip's hands were effectively tied and it is clear to see that this would cause ongoing tension between the two men
- Rigord says that Philip played a greater role in the capture of Acre than Richard, who refused to assist. He then says that Philip captured the city. This is valuable in a number of ways as it is not entirely accurate. Whilst Philip did a lot of work to help aid the successful siege of Acre, so did Richard and it was Richard who negotiated the truce with the garrison. However, this is still valuable as it reflects the French opinion of Richard and there is the clear sense that they object to Richard being accorded with all of the glory of the Crusade, when Philip's role is often downplayed. This is valuable as it helps to illustrate why Philip had this growing dislike of Richard
- Rigord says that Richard was plotting against Philip. Again, this could be valuable as it shows the French opinion on the conflict, but is also a limitation in terms of value as it cannot be supported by any specific evidence. This might be a reflection of Rigord's attempts to portray some of Philip's less glorious actions in a justifiable way
- Rigord shows that Philip returned home reluctantly and blamed Richard for this. However, in studying the conflict this has limited value for historians. Using wider knowledge they could point to the fact that Philip undermined Richard's position by returning home and plotting with Prince John and so they would need other materials to build a balanced view of why the conflict continued and escalated after 1191.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a monastic chronicler, based in the North, William of Newburgh was reliant upon second-hand information when constructing his account. Whilst this might be a limitation in terms of value, there is also the possible strength in that he will have been able to construct an account without personal involvement, possibly using several sources of information
- William, as a Churchman, is unlikely to write negatively about a crusader King, whose lands were attacked whilst he was supposedly under the protection of the Church. This might lead to a heavily one-sided account and might limit the value somewhat. However, in giving us the English opinion on why there was conflict, this bias could make the source valuable
- the tone of the source is highly critical of both Philip and John ('joyfully seized', 'forgot any loyalty') and this might limit value as there is a clear agenda to blame them entirely for the conflict and to deflect any blame from Richard at all.

Content and argument

- William says that Philip fabricated tales of Richard planning his own assassination as an excuse to begin plotting against Richard even though Richard was protected by the Church as a crusader. William even suggests that this policy was not supported by all of Philip's men and that they had to restrain him from acting initially. That William is entirely convinced that Philip was lying might reduce the value of this as a source, as he could not possibly know either way whether it was true or not. However, in showing the English view of Philip as devious and scheming, it is valuable in showing why people in Richard's lands thought the two had fallen out
- William shows that it was the news of Richard's imprisonment that led Philip to decide to act against Richard. This is true as it was from 1193 onwards that Philip and John began to enact their previous plans and John was granted Richard's lands in France in return for surrendering certain territories and swearing fealty. This is valuable as it shows accurately how the dispute escalated from hostility into more open conflict in the future
- William also blames John for his role and, again, this is valuable. The conflict between Richard and Philip become so bad as Richard had to spend his reign from 1194–99 trying to recapture territory from Philip. This conflict only became so bad as a result of John joining with Philip in his plans in 1193–4 and so William is valuable in illustrating this turning point
- when William describes Philip and John as malicious and having 'no regards for what is honourable' he is obscuring the full truth – there is no mention of Richard's own inflammatory actions which had led to this point and this might limit his value as he is so keen to deflect any blame from Richard.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a former royal clerk Roger would have probably had contacts at court who could keep him informed of important events, such as he is describing here. Roger would also have understood the importance of document-based evidence for his chronicle and thus we could assume that he is quite valuable in giving us some reasons for the conflict between Richard and Philip
- Roger was a contemporary to the events he was describing, although does not seem to be an eyewitness. This is especially true for the events he describes in Normandy and there could be some exaggeration here, thus limiting value
- Roger takes a clearly critical and negative view of both the French King and of John. It is clear that he wishes to highlight their actions against Richard in 1193 and place them in a negative light – which might limit his value in his placing blame. It is unlikely that an English churchman would be overly critical of a king whose lands were under attack whilst he was travelling home from Crusade.

Content and argument

- Roger highlights the plotting of Philip and John whilst Richard was in captivity as key in the conflict between the two kings. This is very valuable as the root cause of the prolonged war between Richard and Philip (1194–99) was Philip's encroachment into Normandy during this critical period. Roger is correct in showing that Philip accepted John's oaths of homage, despite the fact that this was against the spirit of many promises made to Richard that he would not undermine him at home until he returned
- Roger is also valuable in showing how Philip managed to persuade John to act – by offering him an attractive package of lands, marriage to Alice and the prospect of French help to secure the English throne. Indeed, this did precipitate a serious attempt by John to declare himself King of England and it seems that Philip was planning to launch a cross-Channel expedition
- Roger is less valuable when it is considered that he is keen to blame Philip and John entirely for the loss of Richard's continental lands. In reality, a number of the Norman barons, not just the castellan at Gisors, surrendered fairly readily to Philip. This might suggest that there was less loyalty to Richard than Roger suggests and that he might be partially to blame for the subsequent events. This means that the source is more limited as it only provides a partial view
- Roger fails to mention that Richard is on his way home from Crusade and is considered by many in Europe to have behaved in a manner which alienated many – Philip was merely one of many who took the opportunity to act. This might limit value as Roger does not mention Richard's own role in breaking his promises to Philip and publicly repudiating Alice in the first place.

Section B

- 02** To what extent was Henry II's desire to reduce the power of the Church more important than his personality in causing the dispute with Thomas Becket? **[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting it was Henry II's desire to reduce the power of the Church that was more important than his personality in causing the dispute with Thomas Becket might include:

- Henry's appointment of Becket in the first place, despite his obvious unsuitability for the role, is indicative of his desire to use his loyal chancellor to help curtail the powers of the Church. This explains why he did not choose someone like Gilbert Foliot who might have been more likely to block him, as a reforming bishop
- the Church had extended its powers under the reign of Stephen and Henry wanted to restore the status quo as it had been in the reign of Henry I. He claimed that his Constitutions of Clarendon were simply 'ancient customs'. The document included various clauses which would curtail certain elements to do with the Church and defined how it would fit into the political system
- one of the key causes of the dispute was over the punishment of 'criminous clerks'. Henry felt that the Church was allowing 'benefit of clergy' to be abused and was using this loophole to interfere in secular cases which had only loose connections to the Church or canon law. He argued a lot with Becket over this and the disagreement in October 1163 is what helped to develop the dispute further in 1164
- the agreement which Henry concluded with the Papacy in 1172 shows that he was trying to reduce the power of the Church in certain areas, but shows that he was not unreasonable. Thus he allowed appeals to Rome if they did not damage the 'King or the Kingdom', for example.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that it was Henry II's desire to reduce the power of the Church that was more important than his personality in causing the dispute with Thomas Becket might include:

- Henry only wrote down the Constitutions of Clarendon and made the Bishops append their seals as a direct response to Becket's intransigence at the Council of Westminster. He was angry and thus escalated his demands on the Archbishop
- Henry often retaliated in an angry manner, e.g. stripping Becket of lands and the tutorship of Young Henry the day after they had argued over criminous clerks
- Becket's trial at Northampton can be seen as evidence of Henry's anger and desire to ruin the Archbishop. The charge of embezzlement was clearly fabricated at the last minute when it seemed that Henry might be losing ground in the squabble
- Henry often reacted angrily towards any possible supporters of Becket – threatening the Pope with support of the anti-Pope and threatening the Cistercians in England
- the events which led to Becket's death were started by Henry's own angry outburst in Normandy. It was these 'unguarded words' which caused the knights to travel to England in the first place.

Students are likely to conclude that Henry's desire to reduce the power of the Church might have initiated the quarrel with Becket, but that it was his angry personality which allowed the dispute to escalate so quickly and end in the way that it did with Becket's murder. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.

03 'A haphazard collection of territories that could not be called an Empire.'

Assess the validity of this view of Henry II's possessions in 1166.

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting that Henry II's possessions in 1166 were a haphazard collection of territories that could not be called an Empire might include:

- Henry was a vassal to the French King for his continental territories – this makes it unlikely that he could be viewed as an Emperor
- Henry never styled himself 'Emperor' and contemporaries would have expected an empire to be linked to Rome in some way
- the lands were ruled very differently, with only some similarities between England and Normandy that were simply a legacy of the 1066 Conquest
- Henry does not seem to have desired to keep all of his territories together and, indeed, he made a number of promises to divide them between his sons. These plans were thwarted by dynastic greed and genealogical accident.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Henry II's possessions in 1166 were a haphazard collection of territories that could not be called an Empire might include:

- geographically Henry's lands formed a conceptual whole, with clear boundaries around the edge and trading links throughout
- Henry had worked to deliberately build upon the lands given to him by his father. Through a mix of diplomacy, marriage and warfare he had created a vast network of lands
- there are some examples of administrative unity, e.g. Becket performed as his sole chancellor across his dominions
- Henry was sole ruler over his territories, adopting an itinerant style of rule.

Students are likely to conclude that Henry did not really rule over an 'Empire' in the strictest sense and that this would have been nonsensical to contemporaries. However, they may choose to argue the opposite and any supported judgement should be rewarded.

04 'Magna Carta was primarily the result of the unpopular financial policies of King John.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting that Magna Carta was primarily the result of the unpopular financial policies of King John might include:

- a number of clauses tried to limit the amounts of money which John could extract from his vassals on such occasions as inheritance and the marriage of their daughters/knighting of their sons
- Clauses 10 and 11 specifically mentioned debts owed to the Jews and the implication is that John was calling in these debts as forcefully as he could
- scutage, and John's right to levy it from the barons, was an ongoing problem throughout his reign and was probably an important contributing factor
- a number of the barons opposed to John in 1215 were either currently in great debt to the King, or had previously owed him huge sums (e.g. the Stutevilles).

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Magna Carta was primarily the result of the unpopular financial policies of King John might include:

- in some ways the rebellion was against long-term 'Angevin Despotism' which had begun under Henry (e.g. his treatment of the barons) and continued under Richard (absentee kingship, excessive financial demands) rather than any specific complaint against John and his financial policies
- John was a military failure and it could be seen that the shift into open rebellion came as a direct result of the failure of John's much vaunted 1214 campaign to recover the continental territories
- some of the barons involved (e.g. fitzWalter and de Vesci) had personal complaints about John's behaviour concerning their daughters and wives
- many of the clauses attempt to put an end to perceived arbitrary rule by John, especially in the realm of justice
- John was unpopular and many of the clauses of the charter refer to his reliance on foreigners in important positions, e.g. Peter des Roches.

Students may conclude that, whilst money and specifically that owed to the King, was an important factor, there were a wide range of possible causes of Magna Carta. For example, they might convincingly argue that John's personality alienated a number of the baronage or that his arbitrary style of rule was the real cause. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.