

A-level **History**

7042/2A Royal Authority and the Angevin Kings, 1154–1216
Report on the Examination

June 2017

Version: 1.0

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2017 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

General Comments

It was pleasing to see that the vast majority of students had revised well for this exam and the level of contextual own knowledge was very impressive indeed. Time was generally well managed and most students attempted 3 answers in some detail. A minority had poor written communication skills (including grammar and legibility).

01

The vast majority understood the content and arguments within these three sources. This was clear as the supporting own knowledge was generally appropriate and quite detailed in some cases. The best students considered how their own knowledge might highlight the value of the source, or indeed show the limitations within it. However, there were some students who wasted time by paraphrasing the entire source and then simply said 'I know this is true'- this 'fact checking' approach does not garner many marks. Provenance and tone were generally commented upon, but often this was not done well. Students really need to go beyond the generic, 'this source is biased and so is not valuable' or 'this was written at the time and so is accurate' and become more nuanced in their assessments. For example, good answers to Source A might have said that Ralph, as a Cistercian, was angry at John's financial exactions upon his order and that this might make him predisposed to write more negatively about John. This would be backed up by the tone deployed by Ralph. Some students do not really understand what 'tone' is and very few managed to make effective links to value. A large number of students disappointingly made very few references to 'value' at all- conflating this with validity, reliability and accuracy. It is vital that regular links to the question are made. Some students wasted time by trying to compare the sources- there are no marks available for this and so students would be best treating each source individually and concluding at the end of each section about value.

02

This was the most popular essay question and students showed some very good knowledge. Most could talk in detail about the motives of Young Henry, although Richard and Geoffrey were less well covered. Detail about Henry's baronial policies was good, but often these were described and not clearly linked to the motives of the specific rebels in 1173- men like High Bigod or William Ferrers. It is important with this style of comparative question that students don't lose focus and start bringing in 'other' factors- such as Louis VII's motives. This question simply wanted an assessment of whether the treatment of the sons or the barons was more to blame. William of Scotland could be included as a baron (due to the Earldom of Huntingdon) but this link did need to be established. Explanations of how Henry defeated the rebellion were mostly irrelevant, although some students correctly identified that the vast majority of English barons remained either loyal or neutral and so this could have been used in the analysis. Good examples might be the Earl of Arundel or Earl of Cornwall (Richard de Lucy is not a baron!).

03

This was the least popular essay question and was the least confidently answered, suggesting less precision in terms of knowledge of this period, which is more detailed than on the previous specification. Students generally understood the chronology of Henry's struggles with his sons and Philip in France but were much less happy in dealing with Henry's position in England, which was relatively stable in the 1180s. This made an analytical and balanced argument difficult.

04

There was some very good knowledge shown on the situation in England during this period, which is pleasing as it can be quite complicated! Where marks were dropped was in the concept of

'suffering' as many students were considering positives and negatives or stability which aren't the same thing - the material being used was usually appropriate but full analytical links were often missing. It is important that students avoid using a pre-prepared response and that they focus on the specific question wording. Dates are obviously important, especially on this depth paper, and so lengthy discussions of Hubert Walter's activities whilst Richard was fighting in France were irrelevant. Some students attempted to achieve balance by suggesting that it was not Richard who caused suffering but that it was someone else, for example John or Longchamps. Credit was given in these cases, but this tended to not be argued very effectively and students became muddled and contradictory.

Use of statistics

Statistics used in this report may be taken from incomplete processing data. However, this data still gives a true account on how students have performed for each question.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.