



AS HISTORY 7041/2A

Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216
Component 2A The Reign of Henry II, 1154–1189

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 1 / 2 A / M S

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

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

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why the Great Rebellion was unsuccessful?

[25 marks]*Target: AO2*

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and having little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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 address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- Roger was well placed to comment on events as he worked at Henry's court – thus he had access to high level insiders and relevant documentation
- Roger worked for Henry II and so, presumably, would take Henry's side over that of the rebels: it is especially important to remember that Roger was writing with hindsight – he knew that the rebellion would fail and that the Scots would be subdued in the Treaty of Falaise
- the tone of this source is rather sensational, Roger is clearly trying to create an image of the Scots as 'dreadful' and inflicting 'horror'. This helps to reinforce the idea of Henry II being in the 'right' and the rebels being in the 'wrong'.

Content and argument

- Roger focuses on the horrific crimes committed by the Scottish troops under the direction of the King of Scots. He is implying that they got no help from the English within the areas that they invaded – that this was a violent attempt to seize control. Whilst Roger is probably exaggerating the scale of the violence, it is true that the Scots gained little support in the North of England, which resisted their attempts to invade and take land. There was no 'popular' uprising against Henry II, which was a key reason for the failure of the rebellion
- Roger suggests that the Scottish tactics were simply to 'lay waste' – this implies a serious lack of joined-up thinking from the various rebels involved in 1173/74. This was a key reason for the rebellion's failure, as each member of the rebellion was pursuing his/her own agenda and there was no major central organising body
- Roger points out that key loyalists (Earl Reginald and Richard de Lucy) were important in dealing with the rebels in England. This was certainly the case, as Henry II himself did not even feel the need to come to England in 1173: he could focus his attention on the rebels on the continent
- Roger focuses his account on what was happening in England (unsurprising given that this is where he was based) – when the rebellion was much larger than this, and so he is only giving us a snapshot of part of the bigger problem.

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

Provenance and tone

- William was a close associate of one of the key rebels (Young Henry) and anyone writing about his life in an official capacity will have had access to insider information
- however, the author was writing in order to commemorate William's long (and successful) career and will not have wanted to tarnish his name by emphasising any involvement with the rebels. The author also had hindsight – he knew that the rebellion would fail and that Henry II would successfully reign for many more years – hence he might skip over some of the details
- the tone of the source is quite scathing towards the rebels, pointing out their obvious flaws.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that the rebels lacked resources. This would certainly seem to be true, bearing in mind that one of Young Henry's motives in rebelling in the first place was his lack of resources/debts he owed to the Jews
- the source also highlights that Henry II had lots of resources and could use these to bribe certain barons over to his side. Barons in the border regions of Henry's lands were notoriously easy to sway and would often follow the side they thought might win. Henry was also able to use his massive resources to hire fierce Brabantine mercenaries
- the source suggests that Louis of France began to question his own involvement. This was a key reason for failure as it was via Louis that Young Henry had any resources to press his rebellion (Louis seems to have been instrumental in causing it in the first place)
- the focus is clearly on what an unreliable ally Louis is for the rebel sons of Henry – this is a neat way of the author blaming the French for what was, essentially, a rebellion of Henry's sons – thus there are some limitations.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source B encompasses a wider range of issues and reasons, whereas Source A takes a narrow view of events in the North of England. However, they might decide that the provenance of Source A puts the author in a better position to be able to comment from a position of some authority. Any supported judgement will be rewarded.

Section B

0 2 'Henry II was in a strong position at the time of his accession to the throne in 1154.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 supporting the view that Henry II was in a strong position at the time of his accession to the throne in 1154 might include:

- Henry was designated as Stephen's heir thanks to the Treaty of Winchester and he had the support of the Church – Theobald agreed to crown him
- key barons who had supported Stephen during the civil war had died recently – including the Earl of Chester. Added to this, Scotland was quite weak following the death of King David, and Henry would be able to exploit this situation to regain lands in England for the Crown
- Henry was already married with a son – he offered security. Key barons supported him as they preferred the idea of a reunification of England and Normandy to another bout of civil war
- Henry had experience and resources thanks to the extensive French territories that he controlled.

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II was in a strong position at the time of his accession to the throne in 1154 might include:

- Crown authority was extremely tenuous in 1154, as many barons had pleased themselves during the civil war, ruling their lands virtually independent of the Crown. Henry would need to show strength to get these men under control, but without alienating them entirely
- the Exchequer had ceased to function, Stephen had alienated huge parts of the royal demesne and the justice system was functioning on a localised level only. All of this meant that the treasury was in dire straits by the time of Henry's accession
- potential alternative claimants were present in England (eg William of Blois) who could become a focal point for any rebellions. Henry was also partly distracted by the activities of Louis VII which could affect his control in Normandy/Anjou.

Students might argue that, whilst the situation appeared to be very serious, Henry was actually in a strong position. There was not a lot of appetite for a continuation of war (which is why Stephen had been railroaded into the 1153 Treaty of Winchester) and Henry could play on this. However, it is entirely possible to argue that Henry was in a weak position and that we should be careful of allowing hindsight of what did happen to cloud our judgement of the situation in 1154. Any supported argument will be rewarded.

0 3 'Henry II's intervention in Ireland was motivated by his relationship with the Papacy.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 supporting the view that Henry II's intervention in Ireland was motivated by his relationship with the Papacy might include:

- the timing of Henry's personal involvement in Ireland would seem to support the argument that he was seeking to repair his relationship with the Papacy in the aftermath of Becket's death. Henry departed for Ireland in 1171, after Becket had been murdered in December 1170. The situation in Europe had deteriorated – Henry's continental lands had been placed under an Interdict and he was keen to avoid an excommunication/England being placed under Interdict
- when Henry heard that the Papal Legates were willing to discuss the terms of his reconciliation in 1172, he left Ireland and headed straight for Avranches. He did not return, despite the fact that there was much still to be done. This might indicate that he was merely using the expedition as a way of appealing to the Papacy
- one of the actions taken by Henry in 1172 was to hold a Church Synod at Cashel, which began to implement various church reforms – this gained him praise from the Papacy – which then became less willing to punish him for the death of Becket. Contemporary accounts spoke of the corruption within the Irish Church – practices such as incest and divorce were allowed, and there was a desire for reform from Rome which Henry may have tapped into.

Arguments challenging the view that Henry II's intervention in Ireland was motivated by his relationship with the Papacy might include:

- Henry may have involved himself in Ireland for dynastic reasons, eg to provide an inheritance for John who was made Lord of Ireland in 1185. This might explain why Henry left matters unfinished – he was leaving something for John to do
- the initial English intervention in Ireland was prompted by a request for help from Dermot Macmurrough – Henry was not actually that interested in involving himself and merely gave his agreement to relatively independent actions from certain Anglo-Norman barons from South Wales
- Henry may have been interested in building a larger 'empire' for himself and enhancing his own reputation – this is perhaps explained by the fact that he was not bothered about direct control over much of Ireland – he was happy with nominal overlordship (eg Treaty of Windsor).

Students may argue that, whilst Ireland held some wider interest for Henry in dynastic and economic terms, it was the death of Becket which explains his personal intervention there in 1171 to 1172. Once the Papacy was willing to negotiate, then Ireland was placed onto more of a back-burner. However, any supported judgement will be rewarded.