



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

A2 History 2041

HIS3C

Unit 3C

The Emergence of a Great Power?

Spain, 1492–1556

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 © 2011 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 2011

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

HIS3C: The Emergence of a Great Power? Spain, 1492–1556

Question 1

01 'By 1516, the expulsion of the Jews and the Moors had proved to be a disaster for Spain.'

Assess the validity of this view.

(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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**

L5: Answers will show a very good 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 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 and explain the circumstances of the expulsions in view of the growth of anti-Semitism and anti-Muslim feeling (and the establishment of the Inquisition). Many answers are likely to concentrate heavily on the issue of the Jews, with rather less evidence about the Moors, perhaps arguing that the intensity of measures against the Jews was greater and had more harmful effects than in the case of the Moors. This is an acceptable approach but the Muslim issue must be adequately addressed to produce a balanced answer.

There may be different approaches to the selection and deployment of evidence. Some candidates will start in the beginning and follow through the narrative of the expulsions and their consequences, providing appropriate relevant comment and assessment on the way. Others may focus directly on the key words 'by 1516', giving a retrospective assessment of the cumulative consequences of the expulsions. Either approach is valid, depending on the effectiveness with which evidence is selected and deployed to support an argument in response to the question.

N.B. The end date of the question is 1516 and this should be the focus of effective answers. Some candidates may use their knowledge of later developments to explain the extent of the 'disaster'. Such an approach could indeed be valid but post-1516 material must be *used* to support a relevant argument in response to this question; it should not be deployed for its own sake and should not unbalance the answer. Nor is such an approach a requirement for the higher levels – many excellent answers will not go beyond 1516 at all. Similarly, the start date is 1492. Earlier material on the Inquisition could be made relevant but should not imbalance the answer.

In respect of the Jews, candidates should consider the extent of the immediate impact of the 1492 expulsion (approximately 150,000 left Castile and 1500 left Aragon) and balance it against the contribution which the Jews had previously made to Spain to assess how far, in the longer term, this action continued to affect society, the economy and religious issues in Spain. In respect of the pressures against Moors and Moriscos from 1499 posing a choice between baptism and exile, answers may differentiate their definitions of 'expulsion' – and may distinguish between the more fervent religious ideals of Isabella in Castile, compared with the more pragmatic policies of Ferdinand of Aragon.

Candidates may refer to some of the following in support of the concept of 'disaster for Spain':

- loss of revenue from taxation
- loss of the expertise of doctors, lawyers, bankers and financiers
- the radicalisation of those who remained and became more confirmed in their beliefs
- the criticism of the Inquisition – *auto da fes* increased (on one occasion 130 people were burned on charges of Judaism) leading to demands that the Inquisition be reformed
- the encouragement of antagonism to other minorities, e.g. Moors/Moriscos
- the weakening of the idea that Spain was a society of *convivencia* where all faiths and races lived peacefully together, in the face of the continued policy of persecution.

Evidence to support the view that the impact was not 'disastrous' might include:

- expulsion did lead to some demand for the reform of the Inquisition

- at least half of the Jewish population converted rather than leave Spain and many continued to practice their religion in secret – thus lessening the impact
- new research suggests that some expelled Jews returned later as *conversos* and continued to contribute to the economy and to intellectual life and political life; figures suggest as many as 40,000; but this still meant that 2/3 of professionals did not return
- Ferdinand subsequently recognised the contribution of the Jews and positively encouraged their return (although the response was slow)
- Moors/Muslims were less likely to be forced to leave despite being regarded very much as infidels; they were thought to be more easily persuaded to convert than the Jewish population and thus their expertise continued to make a positive contribution
- not all Catholics were antagonistic towards Jews; Jews continued to be involved in society; persecution could be spasmodic; Spain was a large country, only newly 'unified' and Jews and Muslims were only about 10% of the population as a whole.

As part of a balanced response, candidates may suggest:

- that the expulsions were a disaster on economic grounds but other immigrants arrived to replace them (although Mulgan suggests that the newcomers 'exploited' Spain, whereas those expelled had 'enriched' it)
- that the values of the time promoted religious unity and that, for Ferdinand and Isabella, preventing disunity was a key aspect of their authority overall
- that the process was as much politically driven as by religion and that this created a dual motive for the expulsions which most of the Christian population accepted
- one feature of good answers may be differentiation between developments in Aragon as opposed to Castile.

Question 2

02 'The Cortes played a significant role in the government of Spain in the years 1492 to 1529.'

Assess the validity of this view.

(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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good 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 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 importance of the Cortes in government in the period 1492–1529 and balance this against other factors. They may also need to be aware that during this period, each Spanish state had its own Cortes, although those of Castile and Aragon were the most important.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the Cortes played a significant role in government:

- approval by the Cortes were required for laws to be valid; in Aragon there were 3 separate Cortes and each one had to give its approval for its own region. However, the Cortes could not make laws but had to present petitions to the King
- if the monarch wanted money, he/she/they often had to promise to 'redress grievances' raised by the Cortes first
- the Cortes of Aragon met 7 times between 1498 and 1506, which was more than in earlier years; the Cortes of Castile met 16 times in the same period – this suggests the role of the Cortes had grown in importance (and possibly had wide-ranging support),
- towns tended to be well-presented in the Cortes and could present an obstacle to the monarch in discussion/agreement on issues
- the independence of the Aragonese Cortes when in session is shown in challenges to the monarchy, e.g. it did initially refuse to recognise Charles I as king but eventually agreed to him as the co-ruler with his brother Ferdinand
- the Cortes overall became more important and were summoned more regularly after 1516 as they were necessary to finance Charles' wars; they met 15 times in Castile during his reign.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider in terms of the significance of the Cortes to the government:

- in Castile, the monarchs had significant authority and were not required to use the Cortes, but they could summon it at will; therefore it was not in regular session throughout the reign and its power varied, although it increased gradually over time
- the Aragonese Cortes could not refuse to grant 'extraordinary revenue' – on one occasion they had to agree to taxation of 300,000 ducats over a 3 year term without any 'redress'
- no specific group of the population of Aragon or Castile had an automatic right to attend the Cortes but, usually, there was representation of nobles, the church and some towns, although the numbers of representatives in these groups might vary at different times
- nobles and clergy were not often summoned to the Cortes because they usually refused to sanction money. However, the representatives of the towns were more willing to do so but they had limited power
- the imposition of the 'servicio' tax on Charles' arrival in Spain contributed to the outbreak of the Comuneros revolt
- by 1523, Charles was in a more favourable position following the defeat of the Comuneros and when the Cortes demanded redress of grievances he successfully opposed them
- other institutions of government could be argued to be equally, or more, important in Charles' government, such as the reformed Royal Council which was also a court of law;

the Council of Castile, the Council of Aragon which had a similar role; and a range of other councils, e.g. for War, the Indies, Finance etc

- the support of his royal secretaries such as los Cobos, and administrators such as Gattinara.

In conclusion, candidates may put forward differentiated assessments suggesting:

- although the Cortes were significant initially, they were not always compliant, e.g. when Charles asked for the *sis* in 1538, a new tax, they refused; the Cortes of Castile was the most compliant although they pleaded for reprieve when asked for money in 1544
- they were not truly representative and were frequently dismissed rather peremptorily
- the growth of new Councils, under the control of Cobos, was a significant development, rivalling the influence of the Cortes
- the increase in bureaucracy was important – such as the viceroys appointed to govern parts of the burgeoning empire; another was the increasing number of *letrados*. Although there were similarities with previous reigns, the size of the government and the growing expertise of the bureaucracy might be seen as the most important issue.

Question 3

- 03** 'Spain became a stronger nation under the rule of Charles I in the years 1529 to 1556.'
Assess the validity of this view. (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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good 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 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 assess and identify the strengths and weaknesses of Spain in these years and explain how far the nation benefited (or not) from the rule of the absentee monarch, Charles I. There should be a clear focus on the key dates, 1529 to 1556, measuring the extent to which the nation was strengthened (if at all) during that time.

Many, perhaps most, candidates will argue strongly against the proposition that Spain was strengthened under the rule of Charles I. Evidence to support such negative assessments might include:

- Charles I was frequently absent from Spain
- his main preoccupations were with his role as ruler of the Holy Roman Empire, using up Spain's military and financial resources in foreign wars
- many historians regard Charles I's economic and financial policies as having failed badly
- extensive imports of gold and silver came from the New World but did not always benefit Spain's economy – it increased price inflation and it led to extensive royal debt (the government continued to raise loans which carried continuously increasing interest as high as 65% – and much of the money coming in to Spain went straight out again as payment for imports and loans)
- the fact Charles abdicated and withdrew to a monastery in Yuste was proof that he had failed and that he knew it.

Nevertheless, there are a number of factors that could be used to support the claim that Spain was indeed stronger by 1556 and that the legacy left to Philip II laid the foundations for a century of Spanish dominance. Spain was transformed from a disparate collection of states into a more centralised state with an overseas empire and a growing influence in the rest of Europe:

- by splitting his inheritance in 1554–56, Charles made the Spanish kingdom more coherent and more unified (and easier to govern)
- the power of the nobles was tamed as royal power was consolidated between 1529 and 1556. There were no significant revolts against the monarchy
- Prince Philip was a highly effective ruler as regent from 1543
- religious unity had been protected and extended
- the population grew (although not in all parts of Spain) – the population of Seville almost tripled between 1534–1556, from 33,000 to 90,000
- although often misspent, the wealth resulting from the vast expansion of the American empire between 1529 and 1550, gave Spain huge economic potential
- Spanish military strength increased greatly, both in organisation and technology.

Furthermore, candidates may make differentiated assessments such as:

- Charles I was not in Spain for much of this period to direct policy, but was engaged with religious wars in the Empire; although his son Philip as Regent was supported by his mother, many decisions had to be taken without consultation with his father
- migration from Spain to the Americas (and the long-term effects of the expulsions of Jews and Muslims) depleted the work force and had an adverse economic impact – overall, there was a fall in the standard of living of the people – but there was greater social mobility and economic diversity had developed

- although religious conformity had been enforced, problems for the future had been stored up, especially in the Spanish Netherlands.

N.B. Many effective answers will focus their attention on the state of the nation by 1556, perhaps going on to buttress their arguments with reference to later developments under Philip II. Such an approach is indeed valid and can be appropriately rewarded – but it should not unbalance the answer and it is by no means an essential requirement. One feature of high-quality answers may be conceptual depth in handling the key words of the question – ‘became a stronger nation’. Such answers may argue, for example, that Spain grew stronger in spite of Charles, not because of him.

Some answers may pay great attention to Spain’s strength and/or weakness as a result of the growth of the American Empire. Such an approach is indeed valid and should be appropriately rewarded – but it is **not** essential.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion