



General Certificate of Education

A2 History 2041

Unit 3: HIS3A

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

Mark Scheme

Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards
This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 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

Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards

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

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

Question 1

- 01** To what extent did the Angevin kings succeed in achieving their aims, with reference to the English Church, in the years 1154 to 1216? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- 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. **0-6**
- 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 a good 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 very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full 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 very 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.

The growing influence of the Church led to attempts by the Angevin kings to restore and retain the relationship established between Church and State by William I and Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury. Royal aims were focused around issues such as legal jurisdiction, appointments and the relationship between the English Church and Rome. Conflict developed in the 1160s with King Henry II's attempt to codify the relationship in the Constitutions of Clarendon and in 1200s over King John's right to select his choice of Archbishop of Canterbury. Analysis of success may focus on King Henry's problems with Thomas Becket as Archbishop of Canterbury and especially the period of the 1170s after Becket's death when agreement was reached with the Papacy. Material may include the Compromise of Avranches in 1172, King Henry's visit to Canterbury in 1174, his acceptance of Papal authority, appeals to Rome, and rejection of the Constitutions of Clarendon. However, in this settlement there is considerable debate over the issue of the crown's losses or victory, e.g. royal patronage and appointments – control over 'free' elections, vacancies, the fate of crimonous clerks and Church jurisdiction. King Richard's relationship with the Church is not an area of contention but material may include the gains made by his reputation as a crusader king and the role of Hubert Walter as Archbishop. Analysis of John's aims will focus on the issue of Stephen Langton's appointment with evaluation of the aftermath of John's excommunication. The settlement may be seen as an achievement for the King given his control over appointments to bishoprics – a similar issue to his father's gains in the 1170s – and also the nature of John's settlement with Pope Innocent III. John's success may be evaluated through the agreement of 1213, its financial terms, John's continuing control over appointments, the impact of papal suzerainty over England and payment of 1,000 marks per annum, papal influence and the aborted French invasion, the role of Stephen Langton as either co-ordinator of baronial demands or moderator and mediator, the role of the Papacy as a support to John during the baronial revolt.

Question 2

- 02** How far was crusading zeal the main cause of the increase in anti-Semitism in England in the years 1154 to 1216? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- 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. **0-6**
- 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 a good 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 very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full 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 very 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.

This period saw increasing hostility develop towards the Jewish community in England; this included widespread attacks in several towns between 1189 and 1190, in particular the York pogrom of 1190 in which over 150 Jews died, and also the destruction of the London Jewry in 1215 and hostile clauses in Magna Carta over baronial debts to Jewish lenders. Crusading fervour played a key role in this growth: 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. 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. 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 Jews were associated with the 'Angevin despotism' and the barons saw them as agents of grasping Kings. 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. Widespread hostility grew more overt with their spread through the towns of England in the period after order was restored from 1154. However, there was jealousy of their privileged position and legal protection by the King. Also, 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. The Jews were then treated as pariahs, aliens in a Europe which defined itself through Christianity. In England antipathy grew as a result of several factors: xenophobia, economic resentment, increasing visibility and hostility caused by a financial role forced upon the Jewish community by the Angevin Kings, the blood libel, and crusading fervour. The Jews were outsiders, an exposed and vulnerable minority. As England became heavily involved in King Richard's crusade, pogroms were launched against so-called 'Christ killers'. However, the career of the leader of York pogrom, Richard Malebisse, illustrates the complex mix of Christian piety, crusading zeal and greed which led to anti-Semitic violence.

Question 3

- 03** How far was the personality of King John responsible for the loss of Normandy in 1204?
(45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- 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. **0-6**
- 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 a good 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 very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full 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 very 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.

During the summer of 1204 Angevin rule in Normandy crumbled as French troops led by King Philip II invaded the duchy. After the successful seven-month siege of the lynchpin Chateau Gaillard succeeded in March 1204, major strongholds such as Argentan, Falaise and Caen all fell within three weeks, and the duchy's capital, Rouen, which had successfully held out against King Philip in 1193, surrendered in June 1204. During this vital military campaign John, the Duke of Normandy and King of England was absent, having fled to England in December 1203. King John was personally responsible for the loss of Normandy because he lacked the political, military and diplomatic skills of his more able predecessor, Richard. In particular, John's personality was important; in an age of personal kingship he was seen as devious and untrustworthy. With his marriage to Isabel of Angouleme, John had slighted and humiliated key Poitevin barons, the Lusignans; in the aftermath of his victory at Mirebeau in 1202, John had lost the support of Aimeri of Thouars and William des Roches, while rumours of John's murder of his nephew and rival, Arthur, led many other barons to renounce their fealty to the English king. By 1202 John's character had led to the collapse of the diplomatic network of alliances forged by his predecessor, Richard. John was unfortunate because his disputed succession in 1199 provided opportunities for his astute suzerain, King Philip II, who was able to play Arthur off against John to extort the terms of the treaty of Le Goulet, terms which Philip then exploited in the aftermath of the Angouleme marriage, when John was declared a contumacious vassal. Norman barons were increasingly war-weary after nearly a decade of conflict, while a more long-term shift in their political and cultural allegiance undermined their loyalty to the English king. John faced an able opponent in King Philip II, who had transformed the administration and finances of the Capetian domain, while John had inherited an Empire drained of cash by Richard's crusade and ransom. Above all, Normandy was lost by King John because he could not retain the allegiance of his barons; Kate Norgate wrote of his inability to trust anyone, while a contemporary, William the Marshall, warned the King, 'Sire, you have not enough friends.'