

Examiners' Report  
June 2018

GCE History 9HI0 1B

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2018

Publications Code 9HI0\_1B\_1806\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

# Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the second year of the GCE Advanced Level paper, Option 1B: England, 1509–1603: authority, nation and religion.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where Section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the Section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from the within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

## **Question 1**

Question 1 was the less popular choice with candidates in Section A. The majority of candidates were able to show their knowledge and exercise a comparative judgement on the role played by Henry's two leading ministers. Most candidates were able to include a series of relevant contrasts, with some strong answers integrating material on a range of different issues, for example in the various ways both ministers had of raising revenue or the role played in relation to the direction of religious policy. Many candidates had much to say about Cromwell's more significant role in steering legislation through Parliament, especially in the wake of the Break with Rome, whilst it was pleasing that some were able to deploy knowledge of Wolsey's and/or Cromwell's involvement in attempts to reform and reorganise the administration of government and justice. Many were able to make good use from material relating to Henry's divorce, although an ability to focus this carefully towards the demands of the question was a discriminating factor in this. Discriminating factors in performance tended to be: (i) the range of knowledge and issues covered, with less successful responses often tending to rely on knowledge of each of the ministers' actions in relation to Henry's marriage, (ii) the balance of coverage of the two ministers, and (iii) the degree to which material was focused on the conceptual demands of the question.

Plan:

advise ←

do the king's bidding.

role was to

Tudor:

Extending Power through:

a) Foreign Policy

↳ Wolsey succeeded here

⇒ Treaty of London 1518

⇒ FoCoG 1520

↳ Cromwell: Anne of Cleves.

b) Religion = evolved under Cromwell

↳ Cromwell as Vicegerent (1534)

⇒ Wolsey was less focused on religious change, more foreign policy.

c) Centralising govt.

⇒ Wolsey: Eltham (1526) / (1537)

↳ Star Chamber Cromwell

↳ 12 under Henry VII → 120

⇒ Council Marches + Wales → change in 1525 → 1534 Cromwell.

(Section A continued) The role as principle servant to the Crown remained the same under Wolsey and Cromwell, as their purpose was chiefly to advise Henry and help him to navigate through the challenges of being Monarch. Both Wolsey and Cromwell understood that their power was entirely reliant on ~~the King~~ remaining in the King's favour - as <sup>however,</sup> they both discovered to their detriment. While the role itself remained the same, the focuses and actions of each varied. Their goal was the same: to extend and sustain Tudor power. However, the ways in which they achieved this varied. Wolsey focused his actions on extending power through foreign policy, whereas Cromwell worked internally, focusing on religion and centralising government. With this in mind, it could be argued that the role of principle servant remained the same, but the actions of each advisor provided variation in approach and technique.

If we first assess how ~~of~~ each advisor's approach to foreign policy varied,



(Section A continued) we can see that Wolsey focused much more on extending Tudor power in this way. At this point in time, this approach suited Henry greatly - he had the mentality of a Renaissance prince: young, charismatic, erudite and athletic, and for him placing England on ~~its~~ the international stage was important. Wolsey served his needs in this way: he encouraged Henry to pursue peace rather than war in the 1518 Treaty of London, which was a hugely successful move and not only boosted Henry's reputation as a king, but strengthened England's reputation as <sup>a key</sup> ~~an~~ international player. As a result of the treaty, signed by 20 states including France and the Holy Roman Empire, Wolsey was able to organise The Field of the Cloth of Gold, in 1520, a huge display of wealth and power between England and France, who were rivals ~~at~~ at the time. Wolsey's recognition to ~~for~~ serve Henry by focusing on foreign policy earned him a great deal of Henry's respect. ~~and~~

(Section A continued) Foreign affairs were significant to Henry, particularly in the earlier half of his reign, and we can see this from the fact he placed himself forward as Holy Roman Emperor in 1519. Wolsey's plan to extend Tudor power internationally was, however, ceased by Cromwell. In fact, ~~a~~ a significant part of why Cromwell fell from power in 1540 was due to his dealings with German Princess, Anne of Cleves. His intentions for a marriage to take place between the princess and Henry were thwarted when Henry found her unattractive and wanted to annul the marriage. ~~to~~ Both Henry and Anne were embarrassed by this, and the cost to Henry's reputation resulted in Cromwell's execution. In essence, in the earlier part of Henry's reign, ~~for~~ extending power through foreign policy was crucial in building up the reputations of Henry as a monarch and England as a country. Wolsey realised this, and focused on strengthening it. Under Cromwell, however, foreign policy did not have such a ~~significant~~



(Section A continued) ~~role~~ ⇒ successful outcome - by that point, the role had changed to focus more internally.

This can be demonstrated with Cromwell's attentions to religious policy. Under Wolsey, Henry, a devout Catholic king, did not require any changes in religious policy. Only in the very late 1520s, when Henry could not get the annulment from the Pope, did potential changes to religion arise as a solution. It was not Wolsey who realised this however, it was Cromwell. ~~Cromwell led the Break with Rome, as a Failure to do so resulted in Wolsey's downfall, in 1529, therefore showing that at this point in Henry's reign, priorities had shifted from foreign policy to the granting of the annulment - the "King's Great Matter".~~ Cromwell's ability to capitalise on this, and his subsequent actions, such as the Act in Restraint of Appeals in 1533, gained him the title of ~~the~~ Vicegerent in Spiritual Matters in 1534. With this role, Cromwell was able to reform the religious policy of England, ~~gradually~~ <sup>rapidly</sup> taking a more Evangelical approach with

(Section A continued) the Act of 10 Articles in 1536, and the Dissolution of the Monasteries (1536-39) ~~and~~ and extending Henry's power ~~with this~~ within his own realm with policies such as the Act of Supremacy in 1534, ~~as~~ as well as the Treason Act in the same year, which when combined, illustrates the end of papal power in England. These changes, suggested by Cromwell, allowed Henry to divorce Catherine and marry Anne, thereby granting him what he wanted. Cromwell's recognition of this as ~~and~~ the solution to Henry's "Great Matter" ~~extending~~ ~~extended~~ extended Henry's power as Henry, as the head of the Church of England, now had the secular authority of the King, and the spiritual authority ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> the Pope. Henry <sup>now, in theory</sup> had total control of his people and was free of foreign intervention.

In summation, the physical role of Principle Servant remained the same throughout the period - it was to advise the monarch and serve his best interests. However, the actual way in which the two advisors sought

(Section A continued) to achieve this varied, depending on Henry's priorities at the time. Wolsey focused more on extending Henry's power through foreign policy, and making both Henry and England key figures on the international stage. Cromwell, however, served Henry's needs through religious policy. Cromwell's advice to Break with Rome increased Henry's personal power tenfold, and gave him the authority to divorce and remarry. Interestingly, each of the reasons as to why one minister failed was the cause of the other's success, demonstrating the risk ~~and~~ of serving Henry and the fact that they had to remain flexible at all times, as their power was reliant on the King.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 essay. The answer is clearly organised and focused, with a firm grasp of what the question is asking. The candidate is able to offer a range and depth of specific knowledge, and apply this to examine the role played by both principal ministers, sustaining an analysis which considers the extent to which the role remained the same. The argument is logical and reasoned, and the candidate produces a well-developed judgement. Development is coherent and lucid, showing a firm grasp of both the period, and the demands of this particular question.



## **Question 2**

This was the more popular question of the two in Section A, and produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within levels 3-5. Responses displayed a range of evidence centring on various social and economic issues, with the most common issues focusing on the impact on the previous inhabitants of the various monastic houses and the loss of support for the poor. Many referenced the loss of the administration to the spiritual need of the localities and/or the houses' cultural and educational value, and most answers had something useful to say about the Pilgrimage of Grace, although one discriminating factor within this was candidates' success in examining the links between the rebellion and the dissolution, rather than just asserting. Fewer candidates offered substantial development on the issue of monastic land, and whilst many were able to say something relevant about the admission of monks / abbots into the clerical orders, few were able to give specific examples. One particular issue worth noting in determining performance was how responses dealt with other issues. Where candidates gave consideration to other issues in order to qualify the significance of the dissolution, such as an exploration of the alternative social and educational provision offered using monastic lands and funds, or the minority who offered the argument (used by Henry and Cromwell at the time) that the monasteries were in decline and had outlived their usefulness, there was considerable success. Where candidates treated this as a comparative question and attempted to set the closure against a range of other issues, with little regard to the demands of the question, responses were less successful. Another limiting factor for a minority was attempts to analyse why the monasteries were closed. In short, the more carefully focused on the conceptual demands of the question responses were, the more successful they were in making use of the material they had to offer.

## PLAN:

~~Knowledge dump~~

→ 10000 ex-monks + nuns displaced

① Did have significant impact:

- Henry, The crown gained from the dissolution

Pos impact - £1.3 mil worth of land

- Sold  $\frac{2}{3}$  off for £800,000

- Nobility

- Could buy ex-monastic land

- E.g. The Russells + Woburn Abbey

- Abbots + Priors

- Gained pensions e.g. Abbot of Ramsey = £266p.a.

Neg impact

- Monks + Nuns

- Nuns not allowed to give up chastity vow

- 7000 ex-monks + nuns displaced

- Learning, education + Charity

- Now no longer schemes to help the poor

- Monasteries had been sanctuary = BIG IMPACT

② It wasn't as significant

- Education began to increase - wasn't only reliant on



## monasteries

- ~~There~~ Only one revolt about the closure
- POC 1536 - tried to restore 6 out of 55 monasteries

---

The Dissolution of the Monasteries, ~~from~~ starting in 1536 with the dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries in 1536, had a significant impact on society and affected the lives of not only the monks and the nuns and those reliant on the monasteries' sanctuary, but also the Crown and the nobility. Whilst the impact on these groups varied from positive to negative, each group was impacted significantly. However, to a lesser extent, it could be argued that not all aspects of society were significantly affected, ~~including~~ such as education, and there was ~~significant~~ <sup>not</sup> widespread discontent about the closure of the monasteries, which would indicate that their closure had little impact.

A significant impact was perhaps most greatly felt amongst the ex-employees of the monasteries and those who had relied on the monasteries' sanctuary for support. Around 7,000 ex-monks and nuns who had ~~resisted~~ <sup>resisted</sup> the dissolution were displaced, which significantly impacted ~~the~~ society through the increase in <sup>the</sup> unemployed and the vagrant. During the 1530s and 1540s, social disorder was

\*Nuns were also forbidden from giving up their vow of chastity and this would have significantly impacted their prospects of achieving a stable living.  
(Section A continued)

a great fear felt by the Crown and <sup>the</sup> government as evidenced through the increasingly harsh poor laws, for example the 1531 ~~Vagr~~ Vagabonds Act ordered all vagrants to be whipped. This increase in the unemployed would have certainly been felt in society, evidencing the significant impact the closures of the monasteries had. Furthermore, those that <sup>had</sup> relied on the monastery as a hospital for the weak and ill were also displaced and there was no longer any support system for the vulnerable. This would have had a significant impact particularly in the poorer sections of society, ~~and whilst the gov~~ The government had also recognised this negative consequence of the closure and promised to fund schemes to replace the lost support system, which suggests that the impact was significant enough to reach all levels of society.

On the other hand, some groups ~~of~~ of society felt the impact of the closure of the monastery in a much more positive way. The Crown was one group which felt a significant, yet positive, effect. After the closure of the monasteries, Henry VIII gained £1.3 million in ex-monastic land which would have substantially increased the Crown's funds. By 1547, Henry had sold off ~~the~~ two-thirds of the land to the nobility, bringing in a revenue of £800,000 which went towards foreign wars with Scotland and France. The more elite circles of society felt a significant impact in the ability to buy the ~~more~~ monastic land. The Russells, for example, bought Woburn

(Section A continued)

Abbey ~~to~~ as a family home in order to establish themselves, which on a much more personal level would have had a significant impact on society because many felt that they were now able to gain from the closure and advance further in society. The ~~many~~ employees of the monasteries who did not resist the dissolution felt not only a ~~big~~ significant impact with regard to the displacement ~~and~~ that they were subjected to, but they also reaped rewards from the closure of the monasteries. Many were given places in the new Church of England, saving them from potential destitution, ~~and~~ some were even given pensions. The Abbot of Romsey, for example, was given a pension of £266 per year whilst ~~normal~~ monks received a £5 pension as well as being able to seek alternative employment. These benefits given to ~~these~~ <sup>the employees</sup> who did not resist the closure of monasteries would have had a ~~massive~~ <sup>very significant</sup> impact on society by reducing the number of unemployed and vagrant poor in a ~~the~~ social climate that was already very ~~subject~~ prone to instability.

~~So~~ On the other hand, however, the closure of monasteries did not have such a large impact on certain areas of society. Education, which had been ~~a~~ very central to the monasteries' role in society, was able to survive ~~in~~ by the increase in 'petty' or 'Alphabet' schools in urban areas. This increase in these schools ~~increased~~ ~~the~~ ~~number~~ ~~of~~ ~~schools~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~number~~ ~~of~~ ~~people~~ ~~able~~ ~~to~~ ~~read~~ ~~and~~ ~~write~~ over time began to increase literacy levels.



(Section A continued)

Literacy began to dramatically increase, and by the end of Henry VIII's reign, 20% of men were literate and 5% of women were literate. This was more than the education from monastery schools had ever been able to achieve, and therefore education itself didn't ~~have~~ ~~sign~~ wasn't impacted significantly as a direct result of the closures of the monasteries.

Furthermore, there was only one widescale revolt about the closure of the monasteries. The Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536 was largely due to religious tensions, with the rebels trying to ~~sign~~ restore 6 out of the 55 suppressed monasteries. However, ~~if~~ the ~~the~~ closure of the monasteries clearly didn't significantly impact society to a large extent, ~~no~~ due to the lack of social unrest as a result, ~~although~~ However, it would be unfair to suggest that the closure of monasteries didn't cause social tension, ~~but~~ it just never escalated into further rebellions.

Overall, the closures of the monasteries did cause significant impact on society to a large extent due to the large range of both positive and negative impacts that reached all levels of society, with the poor being <sup>significantly</sup> affected by the lack of support remaining for them, and the nobility having the opportunity to buy more land. Whilst there were some areas where there was less direct impact because of the closures of the monasteries, such as education, ~~on the~~ to a large

**(Section A continued)**

extent it did significantly impact society.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 essay. The response has a clear understanding of the issues contained within the question, and offers a focused analysis of the consequences of the dissolution. A range of specific material is deployed as part of the analysis. The essay is clearly communicated, with logical argument, and whilst some aspects could be developed further, overall the essay offers clearly substantiated judgement.



### **Question 3**

This question was the more popular choice within Section B, and produced a range of responses, although in general, it tended to produce responses with more specific supporting detail than most other questions. Stronger responses were able to shape the wealth of potential material available towards the demands of the question, for example, arguing in favour of the contention in the question through consideration of the ambiguity of Edward's First Prayer Book, or Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, her 'middle way' and/or the low level of, and lukewarm enforcement of recusancy fines under Elizabeth. With regards to countering the proposition, common material included the lack of accommodation of Catholicism under Northumberland, the brevity of Edward's reign, the Marian bishops, and the role of missionary priests and the support of the Catholic nobility (especially northern) under Elizabeth. In exploring issues at the higher levels, a significant number considered the change in Elizabeth's attitude, and a not uncommon line of argument fruitfully pursued was that Elizabeth's 'tolerance' up to, say, 1570, was born of political necessity rather than desire. Similarly, many were able to point out that after 1570 Elizabeth's tolerance was in short supply, although in this case fewer were able to explore this with the same level of detail (a shift in the approach to recusants did feature more than detail on the torture and execution of Catholic priests in the 1580s). Responses in the lower levels tended to offer material on religious policy without addressing the specific question, or gave evidence for and against religious toleration - which could have been made relevant - but without developing this towards the issue of the survival of Catholicism.

## Plan.

A = really not accurate at all to Edward ~~the~~ was  
Mary's ~~doing~~ - and there was no tolerance, Elizabeth  
yes - but crackdown on recusancy. Great Catholicism could  
not survive.

## P1 - Definitely not.

1547 - Charles, Mortimer.

1549 Act of Uniformity 1552.

'Rebellion' - evil - 900 dead. Christ of King  
Why unit? - Protest in Mass + Liturgy + Ceremony important.

## P2 Elizabeth Settlement.

- Doctrine - King's sons.

+ 12d. L tolerance of both extremes Episcopal system  
Church parents.

P3 Post 1569 - lived as normally never heard gentry

1581 - 20/mth.

1584-85 - Bond, 40 days.

L 50,000 Church worth 605. L 1572 - Babington Massacre.

~~Part~~ and patch

(Section B continued) As Edward IV and his protectorate did not show tolerance to English Catholics, their Church being strictly evangelical and Protestant, it would not be accurate to credit Catholic survival to the tolerance of his government. In fact, the persecution of English Catholics which his reign suggests that they suffered because their culture was so deeply engrained within them, Edwardian reforms did nothing. On the other hand, Elizabeth, at least until the mid-1570s, did show Catholic tolerance. The Elizabethan Settlement 1559 did ensure that Church papists' could survive. However, ~~practising~~ <sup>practising</sup> an overt Catholicism became increasingly dangerous as in the latter half of her reign, Elizabeth I cracked down on recusancy. ~~The distinction~~ The distinction between overt ~~Catholicism~~ <sup>recusancy</sup> and Church ~~practising~~ <sup>papal</sup> is essential here.

With the repeal of 1539<sup>s</sup>, relatively conservative 6 Articles and the dissolution of the Chantries in 1547, the hostile attitudes of Edward's government towards Catholicism was clear. With <sup>Protestants like</sup> Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Duke of Somerset, at the head of reforms, there was no tolerance towards Catholicism. In 1547 the Pope published his Book of Homilies, an invaluable guide to learned Catholic priests on how to conduct services. ~~Over~~ Protestant governmental intervention was also increased by the Act of Uniformity, 1549,

(Section B continued) where Cranmer's *Common Book of Prayer* written in English, was enforced upon parishes. Edward also claimed the title <sup>Supreme</sup> Head of the English Church, obtained by Henry VIII in 1534. ~~They~~ With injunctions to destroy Catholic ceremonies and images, there was no legal way for Catholics to survive. Its survival must be accredited, then, to the fact that it was engrained too deeply within English tradition and culture. There was no love of the English liturgy demonstrated within Cornwall, for example, within the 1549 Western Prayerbook rebellion. These rebels demonstrated that the notion of an ~~alien~~ alien Latin liturgy of the altar was false; they revered the Latin Mass and understood it. ~~With~~ The regions already far from London and isolated, <sup>also</sup> allowed Catholicism time to breathe - the difficulties that Edward's government experienced when trying to put down ~~the~~ the Prayerbook and Kett's ~~rebellions~~ ~~since~~ simultaneous rebellions, proves how hard it was to enforce religious reforms in remote ~~area~~ regions where tradition was engrained. There was absolutely no tolerance shown by Duke Somerset's Protectorate as it was ordered that the 900 rebels captured after the Battle of Aysst. St. Mary should all be gagged and have their throats slit. ~~Another example~~



(Section B continued) Therefore, it must be understood that Catholicism survived due to the ineptitude of the rules, subversion and an engrained culture within Edward's reign.

On the other hand, it would be more accurate to say that tolerance within Elizabeth's reign allowed Catholicism to survive. The very nature of the 1559 Settlement ensured that neither the Catholic Protestants or Catholics were alienated by doctrine; the Settlement was a tolerant compromise. Elizabeth herself declared she had no intention of 'looking into men's souls.' As a result, Elizabethan doctrine remained ambiguous concerning the effects of the Exorcism: Catholics could still believe that transubstantiation had taken place. There were also times when Elizabeth used her royal prerogative to ensure the survival of dissenting Catholicism; though Convocation passed 6 Articles in 1563, she suppressed them, not allowing Article 29 to deny the Real Presence. Catholicism, therefore, was allowed to survive.

Nevertheless, it is imperative that this dissenting Catholicism be distinguished from recusancy. True dissenting Catholics under the Settlement were known to dissent as Church papists, but even Elizabeth's



(Section B continued) Merena of Catholicism was challenged when people rejected the Church of England completely. Initially, recusants were fined 12d each week for ~~not~~ not attending Sunday services. This was a nominal fee for the gentry; ~~most~~ <sup>what</sup> 75% of the gentry's ~~to~~ ~~the~~ families were Catholic and his allowed their faith to survive. Yet, following the 1569 Revolt of the Northern Earls and various Catholic plots to place Mary Queen of Scots <sup>on</sup> the throne, Elizabeth grew more suspicious of recusants. ~~The~~ In 1581 they were fined 20 each week for not attending services, and JPs were instructed to watch them closely. With the arrival of 800 ~~seventy~~ <sup>Jesuit</sup> priests in England in 1580, Elizabeth grew more and more wary. This is ~~was~~ evidenced by the ~~the~~ creation of the Bond of Association 1584-85, where members pledged to kill any suspected danger to Elizabeth; the Catholic dangers were prevalent bec. Elizabeth based ~~her~~ ~~on~~ ~~3~~ ~~facts~~, ~~from~~ ~~and~~ ~~so~~ ~~the~~ Catholic led incursions from Spain and France and Scotland. There was a complete lack of tolerance for Catholicism in 1588 when priests were given 40 days to leave the country or die; Catholicism became a much more underground movement than before, and ~~the~~ only the gentry with money and influence to protect Jesuit priests were able to

(Section B continued) remain there as family chaplains. The result of this lack of tolerance led to what constitutes a Reformation Catholicism, where the Catholic faith became a minority religion for those that could afford it.

For ordinary people, the option of being a Church papist was all that remained with the <sup>intentional</sup> persecution of Catholic martyrs, such as Margaret ~~the~~ Chero of York, 1586, there was no tolerance.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> statement is not accurate at all for the two reigns of Edward and Elizabeth were so different. ~~For~~ In 1558, Mary I had allowed overt Catholicism to exist for 5 years, so Elizabeth had a more severe situation to deal with; she ~~had to~~ <sup>had to</sup> compromise and show tolerance somehow. Edward did not show any, as 4000 rebels were killed during the Prayer Book Rebellion ~~1549~~ 1549. Thus Catholicism survived due to its significance as a tradition, as well as by subversion. Elizabeth's Catholics survived as Church Papists, of which there were 50,000 in 1603, or as persecuted recusants.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This demonstrates the qualities of a level 5 response. The answer has a strong grasp of the topic, and the conceptual demands of the question. There is clear analysis of the given factor, offering an exploration of the extent to which tolerance explains the survival of Catholicism. The response is reasoned, focused and thorough in both range and depth.

## **Question 4**

Question 4 was the less popular of the two within Section B. The vast majority of candidates attempting this question seemingly found it accessible and straightforward, and thus it was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to offer some evidence relating to a range of methods of control; as well as the given issue of Justices of the Peace, the local nobility, the Council of the North and the Marcher Council, and the Lords Lieutenant commonly featured. A minority did make use of material relating to issues such as the printing press, portraits or Elizabeth's journeys, with at times some success in relating these to the demands of the question, although in some cases this was unconvincing. On the given issue, commonly found areas of discussion included the increase in the number of JPs, how they represented a direct link between the government and the localities, and their administering and enforcing the increased range of statutes and royal proclamations. Many answers were also able to point out the limitations of the influence and thus construct an argument on this basis. The most successful were able to offer a focused and critical assessment of the relative significance of the different methods used by the monarch, e.g. through exploring the interconnection between the different means, examining the many changes across the period, or considering issues such as their geographical reach, the scope of their authority (such as in political, social terms) and the extent to which they could be relied upon by the monarch. Where responses were less successful, this tended to be limited depth of knowledge, or a failure to develop an exploration, i.e. having sound knowledge but not sufficiently exploring how this related to effectiveness in control of the kingdom.

State control was of paramount importance to the Tudor monarchs in order for them to remain on the throne. The monarchs controlled their Kingdom via the use of Lord Lieutenants, Councils and most importantly, the Justices of the Peace (JP's). The extent to which these methods were effective can be demonstrated by the range of control that they offered. Therefore, ~~the~~ the JP's ~~were~~ most certainly came to be the most effective means by which the Tudor monarchs controlled their Kingdom in the years 1504-1558?

The JP's were the most effective means by which the Tudor monarchs ~~into~~ influenced their control over England. The role of JP had existed since the 13th Century, but its true value was only discovered under the Tudor monarchs. The role of the JP's was more effective for state control than that of Councils or the Lord Lieutenants as it enjoyed a far greater reach which meant that it influenced a far greater number of people. This was due to the close proximity of the JP's to the communities they worked with, which allowed them to establish strong relationships with the English population. This meant that they were very likely to be listened to, and so they were incredibly effective at exercising control on behalf of the monarch. The importance of JP's can be shown by the fact that by 1603, there were over 200 acts of parliament that placed responsibility on JP's for control over their respective areas.



(Section B continued) For example, after the creation of the overseers of the poor in 1572, they were made to report to their local JP who would then discuss with them their strategy for poor aid in the local area, before passing it on to parliament. First Furthermore, as the Tudor period went on, JP's were given enormous powers that increased their effectiveness as a means of control for the Tudor monarchs. JP's were able to preside over local court cases, oversee local trade and hold local meetings where they would discuss grievances with the English people. This proximity meant that they were the monarch's eyes and ears in local government, showing how effective they were at controlling the local population and maintaining the peace. The lack of popular rebellions after 1570 during Elizabeth's reign can be widely attributed to her reliance on JP's in maintaining control. Therefore, we can see how JP's had an enormous reach which enabled them to control many aspects of the lives of many of the English population. It is for this reason that it is to be considered as the most important factor.

The monarch's use of councils <sup>was</sup> the second most effective <sup>means</sup> way by which they controlled their kingdom. Although they did not enjoy the same proximity as the JP's, they still enjoyed a wide range of legislative powers which meant that they were still effective at controlling the kingdom. More so than the Lord Lieutenants, whose ~~inter~~ influence was limited to the military, so they did not have as great a range as JP's or councils and so were less effective. Let us consider the Council of the North ~~was~~ (re-established by Wolsey in 1525) the

(Section B continued) as Henry felt he could no longer rely on the local nobility to maintain control as they were too personally motivated, Lord Dacre was fined £1,000 in 1523 for allowing personal motivations to influence his actions as a warden. The president of the Council was, therefore, a Garter knight, who had no personal bias over affairs in the north. However, the council's status as a legislative body rather than having the more personal and direct role of a JP meant that it was not as effective at maintaining control. For example, the Council was unable to stop the 1536 Pilgrimage of Grace, which was to be the largest Tudor rebellion, attracting nearly 30,000 rebels. Furthermore, even after it had been reformed after its failure, it was unable to stop the <sup>1569</sup> Revolt of the Northern Earls under Elizabeth, ~~then~~ Elizabeth did address his problem by appointing the Earl of Leathlydon as its president in 1572, however it is clear that it was not as effective as JPs, due to its lack of ability to be directly involved with the population as JPs were, it therefore enjoyed a lesser range of effects. Whilst legislation passed by councils the Council of the North did apply to all Northerners, the trust placed in JPs by the English population due to their proximity meant that the role of JPs was more effective. Therefore Councils such as the Council of the North were not as effective at maintaining control than JPs as not only did they fail to stop rebellions, they did not enjoy the same range due to them being legislative bodies as opposed to actual people. However, they were more effective than the Lord Lieutenants (who were actual people), as they enjoyed limited range.

(Section B continued) The role of Lord Lieutenant was created under Elizabeth to increase the effectiveness of the English military. The nobility had been ineffective at their traditional role of raising and providing troops and so Elizabeth installed seasoned military men in the Counties in order to remedy this. Although the Lord Lieutenants did have control over the local military due to them being their superior officers, the extent of their ability to control stretched no further, therefore, the Lord Lieutenants lacked the range of the Councils and (especially) the JP's. ~~Thus~~ Therefore, seeing as the Councils and the JP's of the Tudor Monarchs resulted in the controlling of far more of the English population, they can be said to be far more effective. Lord Lieutenants were able to put down local unrest as they had control over local armies, however the ~~JP's~~ JP's provided far more effective service of stopping unrest before it started due to their close relationships with the local communities. Therefore, Lord Lieutenants were not very effective as a means by which the Tudor monarchs controlled their Kingdom as they only ever affected a small number of people.

In conclusion, the JP's were ~~clearly~~ clearly the most effective means of control used by the Tudor monarchs due to their significant range. The Councils were effective in general, although they did allow rebellions to occur and ~~was~~ lacked the personal touch that made JP's so effective. The Lord Lieutenants only influenced control over the local military men and so ~~that~~ <sup>their</sup> range was very limited, diminishing their effectiveness. Finally, ~~due to~~ due to their close

(Section B continued) proximity to the English people, JP's were the most effective means of control used by the Tudor Monarchs.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 essay. The response has a clear understanding of the issues contained within the question, and offers a detailed and convincing analysis of the effectiveness of the different methods of control. A range of specific material is deployed as part of the analysis. The essay is clearly communicated, with logical argument, and whilst more extensive responses could be offered, this response is clearly critical and reasoned.



## Question 5

Most candidates appeared to understand the demands of the Section C question, and thus were able to engage with an analysis of the given views in relation to the proposition in the question. The vast majority of candidates identified Extract 1 as being in favour of the proposition, and the following points were commonly seen: how the English were largely on the front-foot against the Spanish; the undertaking of raids on Spain and Portugal; that English harassment of Spanish shipping was not a drain on resources; the second and third Armadas were unsuccessful; Elizabeth was required to assist the Protestant cause in France, but was able to prevent this being a significant risk to her own realm, with peace being achieved on this front by 1598. Extract 2 was usually used to argue against the proposition, with common points being: the significant financial costs on the realm; the risk of invasion after the escalation of war in France and the Spanish occupation of Brittany; the demands on manpower, in terms of troops being sent abroad and militias at home; the further Armadas sent, for which the English defences were not sufficiently prepared.

The strongest responses tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Whilst most candidates recognised the various areas in which the extracts covered common ground, it was those which recognised the differences in argument that tended to be more successful. Many of these appeared better able to see individual points within the wider view and the emphasis placed, such as the greater focus on the economic strain due to the war with extract 2. The most common factors limiting the success of some responses were (i) relatively limited use of the extracts, (ii) use of these in a manner not fully suited to Section C, e.g. through attempts to analyse provenance in a manner more suited to AO2, or assert an extract is 'more reliable', and (iii) limited own knowledge, or a lack of integration of this in order to examine and evaluate the arguments. With regards to these, candidates should be minded that Section C is focused around A03. Responses which made consideration of the argument and evidence within the extracts central to their responses, applying their contextual knowledge to consider the validity of the arguments offered, were more successful. One issue that did hold back some otherwise higher level responses was the lack of a strong conclusion at the end; those that did offer strong conclusions were not necessarily exhaustive in length, but offered clear and reasoned judgement, which linked back to the preceding analysis of the view, including the extracts. Less successful responses tended to use the extracts for illustrative support, with limited engagement with the views, offered little by the way of wider contextual knowledge to examine the given views.

## SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, in the last years of Elizabeth's reign (1589–1603), war with Spain was not a real threat to England?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

The Anglo-Spanish war began in 1585 after England signed the Treaty of Nonsuch, allying itself with the Netherlands. While at the time, Spain was <sup>arguably</sup> the greatest power on the earth, at no point do the arguments of Lockyer or Russell indicate that the war posed a serious threat to England. Whilst Russell raises concerns over England being threatened, <sup>the overall implicit argument of Lockyer is more convincing as</sup> at no point does the English monarchy or government (the apparatus of the State) in any imminent danger of collapse, and so at no point was England under real threat.

During the course of the Anglo-Spanish war, the Spanish never set foot on English soil, except for the "small skirmishes" referred to by Russell, in reference to the small raiding parties in Devon and Cornwall which ~~can be~~ <sup>are</sup> ~~were~~ <sup>of little consequence</sup> ~~and easily disregarded~~. The opinion of Lockyer is more convincing as he says that the Armada was "turned back by strong winds and high seas." He therefore recognizes implicitly the importance of the fact that Spaniards never set foot on English soil, meaning that the apparatus of the State was never in imminent danger of collapse. Therefore, it can be said that the war did not pose a threat to England. Whilst Russell <sup>does argue</sup> ~~arguably~~ in favour of the war posing a threat, there is a part of his argument (albeit minor) that serves to support the other side of the argument. Russell concedes that "the effectiveness of the English militia was

never put to the test." This demonstrates that England never had to engage in any real combat on its own soil, which serves to support the argument that the war never posed any threat to England. Although there is no explicit argument from either of the sources in favour of the thesis that the war did not pose any threat, the <sup>more convincing,</sup> relatively casual attitude ~~of~~ that Lockyer seemingly adopts concerning the Armada supports the argument that no real ~~the~~ threat was posed. As opposed to Passell, who claims that "they came much nearer to success" and that "the risk of invasion was greatly increased." On the other hand, Lockyer <sup>more convincingly</sup> ~~rather~~ ~~simply~~ plays <sup>down</sup> ~~off~~ the <sup>threat</sup> apparent ~~danger~~ of the Armada, saying "it was turned back by strong winds and high seas." Therefore, we can see that no real threat was posed by the Anglo-Spanish war to England as the essential machinery of the state has never in ~~an~~ imminent danger of collapse.

There is a ~~strong~~ clear advocacy in the argument of Passell that the Anglo-Spanish war was an incredibly threatening time for England. He agrees that "in 1547, there was no English fleet ready, and in 1544 the land defences had broken down." However one is able to accept the arguments of Passell while also maintaining that there was no threat posed to England at this time. The <sup>unconvincing</sup> argument of Passell is largely based on hypotheticals, whilst there may very well have been "invasion scares" and that if, as he indicates, the Spanish had been able to land, there would have been a threat to England as the Spanish were very well trained, that is not to say <sup>that</sup> a threat was posed. The fact of the matter is that, although the Spanish may have come "much nearer to success", they were never near <sup>enough</sup> ~~enough~~

to warrant more having been a real threat to England, as they were never in a significant enough position to place the essential apparatus of the English state under imminent danger of collapse. ~~In fact, the time when~~ therefore what Russell appears to be ~~not~~ advocating for, whilst it may have caused worry, especially for the gentry who "moved out of the coastal areas", did not cause a real threat to England. The interpretation of ~~Russell & Lockyer~~ is the more convincing as he does not over-exaggerate the danger posed by Spain. Admittedly, if they had landed a large force, Russell would be more than justified. In this sense, if he had been advocating for a threat to English power in Ireland, his argument would be convincing as the <sup>Spanish</sup> ~~Spanish~~ force landed a ~~force~~ <sup>force</sup> of 3,000 men in 1601. However as his argument stands, it is an <sup>unconvincing</sup> ~~unconvincing~~ justification for a real threat posed to England.

In conclusion, although the argument of Lockyer is neither <sup>explicitly</sup> ~~explicitly~~ for, nor against a threat having been posed to England by the Anglo-Spanish war, his interpretation is more convincing than that of Russell. This is because he does not over-exaggerate the hypothetical implications of the actions taken by Spain during the period. Instead, his argument concerning the Armada, albeit smaller, ~~is~~ <sup>does</sup> ~~not~~ ~~fall~~ ~~into~~ ~~the~~ ~~same~~ ~~fallacious~~ ~~speculation~~ ~~as~~ Russell does. Therefore, in the light of differing interpretations, the implicit ~~conclusive~~ conclusion of Lockyer that ~~he~~ ~~the~~ ~~war~~ ~~with~~ ~~Spain~~ did not pose a serious threat to England is more convincing, as the ~~the~~ essential apparatus of the state was never brought into imminent



*danger of collapse.*



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 essay. There is clear recognition of the different views, and the candidate offers a confident analysis of these, examining the arguments offered in the light of their own contextual knowledge. There is an overall developed comparison of the two views, and although a more extensively developed analysis could be offered, there is clearly confident handling of the extracts, considering the arguments and the material basis for the different views. The candidate is able to integrate their own contextual knowledge into a discussion of the arguments and issues raised. The essay overall offers evaluative argument, with precise focus on the specific demands of the question.

# Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice.

## Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Giving sufficient consideration to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Candidates explaining their judgements fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but rather a demonstration of their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Careful focussing on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable them to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answering a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Giving only a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Making an assertion of change/causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change/cause of the issue within the question
- Not reaching a judgement, or not explaining
- Answering with a lack of detail

## Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to

seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification

- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground

## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>



