



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

A2 History 2041

HIS3A

Unit 3A

The Angevin Kings of England:

British Monarchy, 1154–1216

Final

Mark Scheme

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, candidates will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to '*think like a historian*' and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 candidates will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able candidates.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2011

A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

HIS3A: The Angevin Kings of England: British Monarchy, 1154–1216

Question 1

- 01** 'The conflict between King Henry II and Thomas Becket was caused more by issues of principle than by a clash of personalities.'
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates will need to assess/identify and evaluate/explain the issues of principle involved in the dispute between King Henry II and Thomas Becket and balance this against issues of personality. They may also evaluate other issues such as long term developments in the relation between Church and State.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of principles:

- the Constitutions of Clarendon
- the authority and jurisdiction of church and state in England
- issues such as benefit of clergy, criminous clerks.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the character and behaviour of Thomas Becket
- Becket's background and the reasons behind his appointment
- events such as Northampton.

Furthermore, candidates may:

- analyse the changing nature of the dispute between 1163 and 1170
- evaluate events in 1170 regarding the importance of the rights of Canterbury and the coronation of young Henry
- examine the role of leading churchmen and Rannulf de Broc in the dispute.

In conclusion, candidates may:

- show understanding of Becket's reasons for opposition on both personal and religious grounds
- expand upon Henry's views on the independent jurisdiction of the church and the issue of criminous clerks
- evaluate the long-term context through the conflict between the ancient laws and customs and ecclesiastical/canon law.

Question 2**02** How successful a King of England was Richard I? (45 marks)*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)***Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates will need to assess/identify and evaluate/explain Richard's success as King of England and balance this against the view that Richard's absence and financial demands had any damaging effect on English government. They may also analyse the nature of medieval kingship and the difference between modern and medieval expectations.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of Richard's reputation:

- Richard's duties as a medieval king and contemporary expectations
- the place of England within Richard's wider Angevin territories
- the consequence of his absence, including the role of Hubert Walter and developments in English government.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the impact of Richard's absences on England's government, especially between 1189 and 1194, e.g. Longchamps, Prince John and political instability
- the financial demands placed upon England by Richard's crusade, ransom and wars in France
- did Richard neglect England in pursuit of martial glory?

Furthermore, candidates may:

- evaluate the Anglocentric view of the impact of an absentee king
- provide detailed analysis of advances made in government under Hubert Walter; on bureaucratic systems; judicial records; plea rolls; coroners' rolls and final concords.

In conclusion, candidates may:

- provide a balanced analysis across the key periods of 1189–1194 and 1194–1199.

Question 3

- 03** 'The rise of anti-semitism between 1154 and 1216 was mainly the result of Christian crusading fervour.'
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates 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.

Candidates will need to assess/identify and evaluate/explain the impact of the Jews' role in crusading fervour as a major cause of hostility and balance this against the role played by royal finance. They may also evaluate other reasons for the growth of anti-semitism such as religious hostility. In England, antipathy grew as a result of several factors; xenophobia, economic resentment, the blood libel. The Jews were outsiders, an exposed and vulnerable minority.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of crusading fervour as an issue:

- in the aftermath of Saladin's capture of Jerusalem Jews were attacked as more accessible enemies of Christ, while their funds proved a ready source of funds for would-be crusaders
- similar episodes had taken place on the continent at the time of the First and Second Crusades
- crusading fervour in the early years of Richard's reign coincided with the most virulent of attacks on the Jews
- the events of the York pogrom in which over 150 Jews died.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- widespread hostility grew more overt with their spread through the towns of England in the period after order was restored from 1154
- the Jews were associated with the 'Angevin despotism' and the barons saw them as agents of grasping Kings
- baronial hostility – the destruction of the London Jewry in 1215 and hostile clauses in Magna Carta over baronial debts to Jewish lenders.

Furthermore, candidates may:

- argue that increasing hostility was also due to the spread of accusations of Child murder, following the first outbreak with the murder of Little St William in Norwich in 1144, episodes took place in Gloucester in 1168 and Bristol in 1183
- there was jealousy of their privileged position and legal protection by the King
- the dramatic increase in royal borrowing from the Jews after 1164 increased their visibility and this was matched by a hardening of the Church's attitude towards usury, condemned by the Third Lateran Council in 1179.

In conclusion, candidates may:

- argue that baronial hostility grew as the Angevin kings used their position as every Jew's heir to claim debts to deceased Jewish lenders as their own. Thus barons could find themselves in the King's debt for perpetuity
- the increase in hostility was marked by royal financial exploitation. After 1180, as the Angevin Kings became increasingly systematic in their exploitation of the Jewish community with tallages and the Exchequer of the Jews from 1194, so their relationship became de-personalised, the Jews became a resource to be tallaged at will, rather than a source for royal borrowing

- analyse the career of the leader of York pogrom, Richard Malebisse. He illustrates the complex mix of Christian piety, crusading zeal and greed which led to anti-semitic violence.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion