

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

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

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

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

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reasons why there was conflict between John and English barons in 1215. | [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.

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

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

Provenance

- Roger of Wendover was particularly hostile to John throughout his work, even more than other contemporary chroniclers.
- As a monk of St Albans that had been affected negatively by the years in which England was under interdict his attitude needs to be placed in context.
- There is some doubt as to his credibility as some of the events he ascribes to John are demonstrably fantastical.

Content and argument

- The source has a clear focus on the attempts of the earls and barons of England to put pressure on John to agree to an extensive set of liberties.
- The date places these events in the context of John's recent failed expedition to France. John blamed a lack of commitment from his English barons, especially the so-called 'Northerners' who had previously refused scutage.
- It is clear that the earls and barons were acting in a secretive manner.
- It is implied that Stephen Langton, the archbishop of Canterbury was a facilitator, if not an active participant, in the actions of the English earls and barons.
- A charter from Henry I's reign is used to demonstrate how tyrannical John was.
- The argument presented is one of a united baronage working together to constrain the power of King John, who, by implication, was tyrannical.
- It is clear that the barons were willing to use force against the king if necessary.

Tone and emphasis

- The source is presented in the manner of a factual, even chronological, account of events but by presenting the barons demands as a merely a restoration of the charter of Henry I there is an implied criticism of John's actions and those of his father and brother.

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

Provenance

- The contemporary writer of the 'Barnwell Chronicle' was generally more positive about John than many other surviving contemporary accounts.
- The source provides contextual background to the events described in Source A.
- The context is highly significant as John was in a weak position after his recent defeats in France at the hands of Philip II.

Content and argument

- The source presents a conflict between John and some of his barons, especially northern barons.
- The source makes clear that the real issue between John and some of the barons was about scutage, payment in lieu of military service owed.
- John had been denied scutage by some of the barons including the so-called 'Northerners' and that this had hindered his progress in his unsuccessful 1214 campaign to recover his lost French territories.
- John is presented as somewhat of an aggrieved and injured party. He has, from his perspective, been wronged and is only seeking that which his brother, Richard I and father, Henry II had demanded and received.

Tone and emphasis

- The tone is generally sympathetic to John in that he is presented as wronged, making reasonable demands and being threatened.

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

Provenance

- This is a series of extracts from the first version of Magna Carta that was agreed to in June 1215. Copies of the original document still exist and the authenticity of its content can be easily established. Much of the rest is similar in content.
- The first version of Magna Carta referenced here did not ever come into force. It was agreed to by John but was annulled by Pope Innocent III.
- It was written at a point when John was especially vulnerable in 1215 and the threat of an imminent French invasion hung over John's relations with his barons.

Content and argument

- The content presented is about scutage and other feudal duties, especially 'relief'.
- Two articles both contain measures designed to limit the power of the king by regulating the payments made by the baronage.
- The charter requires that the king secure 'common counsel' meaning a degree of assent from the barons.
- The reference to fixed payments which were designed to reassert traditional payments agreed many years previously in reality represented an attempt by barons to pay less than their predecessors as John's reign was one of significant inflation meaning that £100 was worth less to John than it would have been previously.

- Although the articles represented are by necessity only a very limited selection of the entirety of Magna Carta they are, in many ways, representative of the document as a whole regarding its focus on limiting royal authority over the barons in their interest.
- There is a suggestion that John's use of foreign forces and favourites was a bone of contention.

Tone and emphasis

- As to be expected from an official document the source is presented in the manner of a factual account without commentary of an explicitly positive or negative nature.
- As a royal charter it is written in the name of John himself and in his 'voice'. John's weak position does mean that his 'voice' is presented in a conciliatory manner.

Section B

0 2 'English interventions in Ireland between 1167 and 1177 were the consequence of Henry II's desire to establish an inheritance for his family.'

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.

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

- Henry II's earliest active support for English intervention in Ireland was given in 1167 shortly after the birth of his youngest son, John. He had previously considered Ireland as a possible inheritance for his youngest brother William
- John was Henry II's favourite son but he did not have lands to bequeath to him. The patrimony of Greater Anjou as well as England had already been assigned to Young Henry. The lands of Henry's wife, Eleanor, had been assigned to Richard and Geoffrey had been betrothed to the heiress of Brittany
- Henry II's personal intervention in 1171-72 was to ensure that both Irish kings and English barons recognised and acknowledged his overlordship. Without this there could be no unified inheritance for his youngest son
- John was proclaimed Lord of Ireland by Henry II in 1177.

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

- the justification for English intervention in Ireland dated back to long before John's birth. The papal bull *Laudabiliter* (1155) by Adrian IV had given Henry II the authority
- English intervention began as a consequence of the Diarmait Mac Murchada's desire to regain his position in Leinster
- Richard FitzGilbert was motivated by the offer of Diarmait's daughter and the succession to Leinster
- the initial English forces recruited by Diarmait, with Henry II's permission expected to be rewarded with lands in Ireland
- the initial ad hoc nature of English involvement is demonstrated by Henry II's attempts to recall the English adventurers in 1171 and his embargo on shipping to support them
- Henry II presented himself as the pious reformer of the Irish Church and, in the context of the death of Becket in 1170, this was important to him in his attempts to mollify the papacy and limit the political damage
- Henry II's ambitions for direct holdings in Ireland appear initially both in 1172 and again in the 1175 Treaty of Windsor to have been limited to important towns (and later Leinster). The treaty left most of Ireland in the hands of a native Irish king with only a relatively small tribute to Henry II.

Students may consider that Henry II's attitude to Ireland was initially rather opportunistic and that it was only when he feared that his barons with possessions there were becoming too powerful that he felt compelled to think of longer term solutions.

0 3	How far did England's economy change between 1154 and 1189?	[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.

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

- driven in part by the innovations of monastic orders, especially the Cistercians, there was a development of industry away from urban centres. The clothing industry for example began to move from centres where it had previously flourished like York to rural areas like the West Riding of Yorkshire, the Lake District, and Cornwall
- mining flourished in Henry II's reign. The Forest of Dean was the most important source of iron and there was a growth in iron tools and pewter dishes
- English towns shifted from industrial production to become centres of trade
- the acquisition of Gascony stimulated trade in the south west of England and the industrial centres of Flanders were dependent on English wool, production accelerated partly due to the Cistercians and their sheep runs
- increased trade led to the growth and development of the 'merchant guilds'
- some individuals became extremely wealthy, including William Cade and Aaron of Lincoln. The wealth of Aaron was so significant that a separate exchequer was established upon his death so that the crown could recover all the money owed
- borrowing from the Jews spread to every social level during Henry II's reign. Famous borrowers included the earl of Chester, Richard fitz Gilbert and Thomas Becket (while he was chancellor). The growing economic importance of Jews is evidenced in the business and judicial documents known as 'starrs'.

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

- the agricultural organisation of England had not changed very much since the Norman Conquest
- Manorial economic demands placed by landlords on peasants including the merchet and heriot remained. Writs requiring officials to return runaway peasants demonstrate the limits of economic change in rural society
- the importance of sheep and the wool trade was not new and it reflected a continuity from long before the reign
- the development of the monasteries, and the accompanying economic developments, although accelerating in Henry II's reign had begun in the reign of Stephen
- the number of Jews in England during Henry II's reign was always low. Probably less than five thousand at their peak by the end of the reign. Therefore their impact on the economy could be exaggerated
- some significant guilds such as the weavers had already developed in many towns by the beginning of Henry II's reign.

Students may conclude that the reign of Henry II marked a significant development in aspects of England's economy. This was especially the case with regard to finance and the stimulation of production and trade. However, there were clear limitations to the scale and spread of the change. Several of the trends had begun earlier with the spread of the new monasticism. Other aspects of the English rural economy changed at a much slower pace and in many ways had not changed significantly by the end of the period.

0 4 'John was the greatest threat to Richard I's control of Angevin France.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1192 to 1199.

[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.

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

- John held substantial lands in Normandy as the Count of Mortain. This increased his ability to intrigue with Philip II of France
- in 1192 John was invited to Paris to scheme with Philip II of France, intended to go and was only restrained from doing so with difficulty
- in 1193, after hearing of Richard I's captivity, John made an alliance with Philip II and promised to hand over the vital Norman Vexin
- John intrigued with Philip II to pay for Richard I to remain in captivity
- John attempted to make a deal that would allow him to marry Alice, Philip II's sister
- in January 1194 John agreed to a treaty with Philip II in which he surrendered much of Normandy (including several vital fortresses) and he accepted that Angouleme was independent of Aquitaine. John also agreed to surrender the vital city of Tours.

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

- it was Richard I who had made John powerful enough to pose a threat, as the Count of Mortain, to the stability of his Norman possessions
- John's treaty with Philip II was never properly implemented and Richard I had no intention to abide by it
- after Richard I's return from captivity John was scrupulously loyal. His recapture of Evreux demonstrated this
- Richard's decision to crusade had left the empire in a dangerous position. His decision to remain in the Holy Land after Philip II's return, the arrogance of his conduct and reckless means of his attempted return had led to his captivity
- Richard's willingness to sell possessions, offices and demesne lands to fund the crusade had endangered the long term interests of the dynasty
- Philip II was the real threat to Richard. It was he who had encouraged John to rebel and then supported him. His actions in Normandy posed the greatest threat, especially his capture of Gisors. The remainder of Richard's reign from 1194 to 1199 was spent fighting Philip or his supporters
- Richard's recklessness endangered the empire, his lack of an heir and the carefree attitude that led to his avoidable death at Chalus-Chabrol in 1199.

Students may well acknowledge that John was an early threat to Richard I's control of Angevin France but that this was largely due to the situation. It was Richard who had decided to undertake the Third Crusade and that had empowered his brother and it was Philip II who was the real threat after his early return from the crusade. Without Philip's support it is doubtful that John would have posed a sustained danger and his subsequent loyalty to Richard after the latter's return in 1194 demonstrates the limitations of him as a threat.