

---

# A-level **HISTORY**

Paper 1C The Tudors: England, 1485–1603

---

**Mark scheme**

---

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 1C The Tudors: England, 1485–1603

#### Section A

- |   |   |   |                   |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the threats to Henry VII's position in the years 1485 to 1509. | <b>[30 marks]</b> |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

*Target: AO3*

*Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.*

#### Generic Mark Scheme

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context.   | <b>25-30</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context.   | <b>19-24</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context.   | <b>13-18</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context.   | <b>7-12</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | <b>Either</b> shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only <b>or</b> addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | <b>1-6</b>   |

---

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.**

**Extract A**

In their identification of Guy's arguments, students could identify the following:

- the extract argues that there was no significant dynastic threat and that any threat must not be exaggerated
- it argues that there were no serious foci of political discontent or rivalry
- it suggests that the threats from Simnel and Warbeck were not really dynastic, merely that they 'dressed their ambitions in dynastic clothes'
- it notes that the most serious threat to Henry came from the Cornish Rebellion which was not caused by dynastic issues, but by taxation for the war with Scotland.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students could refer to the following:

- deploying knowledge of context to assess whether there were serious dynastic rivals
- corroborating, through the deployment of knowledge, the extent to which the description of Simnel and Warbeck is wholly accurate and whether their threats can be so easily minimised
- corroborate, or not, through own knowledge whether the Cornish Rebellion is as portrayed
- use knowledge of context to assess the overall conclusions of the extract, that the dynastic threats were limited.

**Extract B**

In their identification of Mackie's arguments, students could identify the following:

- the extract suggests that Henry feared a far reaching conspiracy from the established nobility
- that there may have been some deliberate exaggeration by Henry's agents, but that it is 'hard to avoid the conclusion that there was a spirit of disaffection amongst the old families'
- that after the death of Henry VII' sons dynastic ambitions were aroused
- that there was, anyway, 'wavering support' for Henry amongst the established nobility.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students could refer to the following:

- use their knowledge of context to assess how far the executions were the result of dynastic concerns only
- corroborating, through own knowledge, whether Henry was so convinced of a conspiracy
- corroborating, or not, the extent to which the deaths of Henry's sons were so significant

- 
- use own knowledge of context to assess the overall conclusions of the Extract, that serious threats continued during Henry's reign.

### **Extract C**

In their identification of Pollard's arguments, students could identify the following:

- the extract argues that building up his own power was at least as important to Henry VII as reducing the pretensions of the 'mighty subjects'
- that royal finances was the key to this strengthening and that the retention of Crown Lands was particularly important in asserting power in the localities
- that Henry was never fully secure, despite an initial impression and that he faced serious revolts and survived by a policy of divide and rule that left problems for his successor
- that Henry, through his 'ceaseless vigilance and unrelenting pressure' did make himself respected and feared, if not secure.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students could refer to the following:

- use their knowledge of context to assess whether Royal Finance was as centrally important as suggested
- corroborating, through own knowledge, as to whether Henry was never fully secure
- corroborating, or not, the extent to which Henry's policies did leave problems for his successor
- use own knowledge of context to assess the overall conclusions of the extract, that a balanced assessment suggests that Henry did indeed face threats but did die respected and feared.

**Section B**

- |          |          |
|----------|----------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>2</b> |
|----------|----------|
- 'The foreign policy of Henry VIII failed to achieve its objectives in the years 1509 to 1547.'

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**

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

---

**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 that may be used to support the premise of failure:**

- Henry lacked the finance and manpower necessary for a foreign policy borne of strength
- the desire to reclaim the title King of France was unrealistic and borne more of the Renaissance Prince than of any reality based in international affairs
- the Ladies' Peace of 1529 effectively isolated England and confirmed Charles' victory over Henry
- domestic policy and especially action against Catherine of Aragon further limited the direction that policy might take. In this sense, the attempt to encourage the Pope to nullify the marriage might be counted as failure, although in these efforts he did receive the help of Francis. The reality of this friendship being formally recognised at Calais in 1532
- in the 1530s Henry seemed to step back from foreign policy, possibly fearful of a foreign coalition being formed against him
- students might also draw conclusions from the policy towards Scotland and Ireland. Certainly Flodden in 1513 set the direction of Scottish policy and the hopes of controlling the subsequent regency in Scotland
- Henry faced the threat of war on two fronts by 1544
- foreign policy in the 1540s was a costly failure. Here Henry's glory seeking and desire to revisit his youth led to failure. The desire to reignite hostilities in 1542 seems particularly misguided.

**Arguments that may be used to disagree with the premise of failure:**

- Irish policy sought to bring Ireland closer to control from London and to this end it did achieve its objectives
- the Peace of London 1518, Field of the Cloth of Gold 1520, Treaty of Bruges 1521, might all be considered limited successes
- the Battle of Pavia, 1525, marked an improvement in Anglo-Scottish relations. Subsequent improvement in relations with France had a positive effect on relations with Scotland
- Cromwell brought the Irish Parliament back to the fore in order to serve his own legislative purposes. The granting of the title King of Ireland to Henry in 1541 proved the extent to which this policy towards the Irish Parliament worked
- it should be remembered how stretched the King's military resources in fact were in 1545 – the fact that from this such a successful truce came in 1546 with France is testament to the success, at least in a limited manner, of Henry's foreign policy.



**0 3** 'Rebellions in the years 1549 to 1571 stemmed from the weakness of central government.'

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

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

---

**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 which support the view that rebellions in the years 1549 to 1571 stemmed from the weakness of central government might include:**

- local and regional loyalties were stronger than national feeling/loyalty to a central government
- central government was dependent on local nobles and JPs to carry out orders; this was often inoperable
- central government had no control over local economic problems (although blamed for them)
- in 1549 both Ket's and Western Rebellion escalated because of inability/sympathies of local nobility
- in 1569 revolt of the Northern Earls the nobility turned against central authority.

**Arguments that may be used to counter the premise of opposition to religious change as a factor:**

- some of the rebellions were clearly motivated by religious discontent which any weakness in the central government allowed but did not motivate: the Western Rebellion of 1549; Wyatt's Rebellion against Mary and, in part, the Rising of the Northern Earls
- political discontent was also evident as a motivational factor in relation to the Rising of the Northern Earls
- the importance of factors such as economic distress (Ket) and ambition (the Northern Earls) can also be seen
- students should demonstrate an understanding that weakness of central government allowed, but often did not promote, rebellions.

**0 4** 'Throughout her reign, Elizabeth I controlled her ministers with masterly political skill.'

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

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit  | <b>0</b>     |

---

**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 that may be used to support the premise set in the question:**

- Elizabeth plainly extended her favour to a range of new men such as Cecil and Dudley and in so doing made them dependent upon her good will, especially in contrast to the northern magnates
- the promotion of Dudley was done with consideration for the nobles – entry to the Privy Council for example being granted to Norfolk at the same time as for Dudley
- most active members of the Privy Council might be considered ministers and as such she proved a consummate manager. However, the attempt to discredit Neale's Puritan Choir thesis and the dominance of parliament has led to suggestion that the Privy Council controlled parliament in a much more effective manner than previously believed, and indeed that Elizabeth stood at the centre of such control of her ministers
- Cecil remained Elizabeth's faithful servant throughout his period, and as such became a trusted lieutenant and advisor to the queen
- Elizabeth's refusal to make a decision on certain matters of state may have infuriated Cecil but it kept him and other ministers firmly in check
- Dudley proved manageable by means of the promise of marriage, and this seemed to be kept under control and away from faction until the late 1560s.

**Arguments that may be used to challenge the premise:**

- despite being elevated and maintained by the Queen, Cecil seemed to lack much political skill at times, lacking vision but almost always acting upon his own advice – thus keeping Elizabeth away from decision making
- by the 1560s observers and foreign ambassadors suggested that Cecil was the real power behind the throne, and as such students might infer the lack of control from Elizabeth. The 1559 armed intervention in Scotland is a good example of how Cecil was able to steer policy at court
- the attempt to define the succession was increasingly orchestrated by a combination of Privy Councillors and also MPs – Elizabeth lacked the means to stop or to stifle talk of the succession.



