



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

A2 History 2041

HIS3B

Unit 3B

The Triumph of Elizabeth:

Britain, 1547–1603

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, candidates will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to '*think like a historian*' and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 candidates will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able candidates.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2010

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

HIS3B: The Triumph of Elizabeth: Britain, 1547–1603

Question 1

- 01** 'In the years 1547 to 1558 English government was at its most effective during the rule of Mary I.'
How valid is this assessment? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
-

L5: Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written.

38-45

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to evaluate the quality of mid-Tudor government during the rules of Somerset, Northumberland and Mary and produce balanced evaluations of the quality of the respective rulers' records.

The quotation is deliberately contentious and invites candidates to address and question the conventional wisdom about Elizabethan government.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the quotation:

- the much-maligned reign of Mary could boast some positive achievements, some of which, such as the revised Book of Rates, the naval and militia reforms and setting in motion the process of recoinage, did much to assist the succeeding Elizabethan regime. Some candidates might wish also to argue that Mary's religious policies would have succeeded had it not been for the Queen's premature death
- Somerset's rule as Protector was marked by economic and social problems and by rebellion
- the weaknesses of Northumberland's rule included his grubby attempt to interfere with the legitimate succession and his risking of financial stability by having one final debasement.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the Marian regime made many mistakes. The policy of burning heretics probably rebounded on the Crown, war against France proved a disaster and there was a continual tension between the officers of her household, whom the Queen trusted, and the Privy Council, whom often she did not trust
- the Northumberland regime had many achievements, for example restoration of conciliar decision making, restoration of law and order; stabilisation of currency and sensible foreign policy.

In conclusion, candidates may make any reasonable judgements so long as they are supported by appropriate evidence.

It is not necessary for candidates to make explicit historiographical reference in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding, but reference to, say, Hoak, Loades or Loach, properly applied to the development of sustained argument, is likely to show historical awareness of a high order.

Question 2

- 02** 'The Church of England was only a half-reformed church in the years 1559 to 1603.'
How valid is this assessment? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to evaluate this claim, made frequently at the time by those who saw the Elizabethan Settlement as an interim measure to be superseded at a later date, against the arguments which claimed that the Church was either reformed or, for that matter, completely unreformed.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the quotation:

- the hierarchical structure of the Church remained unchanged
- there was no attempt to reform canon law
- Elizabeth was sceptical about and often hostile to preaching, as demonstrated by her dispute with Archbishop Grindal
- the attitude of the Crown and some of the bishops was hostile to those who favoured further reform
- the Settlement prescribed for clergy the wearing of what some reformers regarded as 'popish' vestments, and action was taken against those who refused
- attempts at further reform were defeated
- the Erastian nature of the relationship between Church and State meant that, in the final analysis, the Queen always held the upper hand.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the doctrine of the Church, as reflected in the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion and in innumerable published sermons, was arguably Calvinist
- many of Elizabeth's ministers promoted and supported strongly Calvinist clergymen, even including some who had fallen foul of the regime
- the attack on popular Catholicism continued during the 1560s, which indicated the reforming zeal of many who were implementing policy (even if it did not reflect the attitudes of the Supreme Governor).

Furthermore, candidates may refer to the following:

- the controversies surrounding the Church
- the Queen's own view that the 1559 Settlement represented a final and complete arrangement
- the lack of understanding of some of Elizabeth's closest advisers as to her view of the finality of the Settlement.

In conclusion, candidates may decide that the Church which, whilst Calvinist in doctrine, had many characteristics which 'true reformers' found at best irritating and at worst 'superstitious' or 'idolatrous', i.e. Catholic.

It is not necessary for candidates to make explicit historiographical reference in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding, but reference especially to Collinson, properly applied to the development of sustained argument, is likely to show historical awareness of a high order. The key dates must be observed. Though it would be unreasonable to expect comprehensive coverage of the whole period in the time allowed, there must be some attempt to address the whole period.

Question 3

- 03** To what extent did Elizabethan foreign policy achieve its objectives towards Spain in the years 1585 to 1603? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to identify the objectives of Elizabethan policy towards Spain and evaluate the government's success in achieving them over the given period.

Elizabethan foreign policy had a number of long-term objectives during the period. Traditionally, it had been based on the need to avoid war, which was no longer an option:

- to ensure national security by seeking to maintain the Netherlands as an autonomous (or at least quasi-autonomous region), which necessarily involved conflict with Spain
- to withstand a possible Spanish invasion, either directly or indirectly via Ireland. (Fear of another Armada continued to shape policy during most of the 1590s)
- to make war as self-financing as possible.

Sometimes these objectives were mutually exclusive. To many military experts at the time an expensive land strategy founded on the Netherlands was both inescapable – and expensive. They also regarded naval campaigns in the Caribbean as a sideshow.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the proposition:

- national security was maintained – just – through the defeat of the Armada, though that was a closer run thing than is sometimes acknowledged in textbooks
- some naval expeditions were self-financing
- English strategy in the Netherlands during the 1590s became increasingly successful.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- other naval expeditions were financially disastrous
- Leicester's campaign in the Netherlands proved militarily and politically unsuccessful
- the Netherlands campaign, though militarily successful, was also a financial disaster
- the financial cost of foreign policy exacerbated the domestic problems of the 1590s.

It is not necessary for candidates to make explicit historiographical reference in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding, but reference, especially, to MacCaffrey and Adams properly applied to the development of sustained argument, is likely to show historical awareness of a high order.