



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme January 2003

---

## GCE

### History

## Alternative B: Units 1 and 4

---

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334  
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ  
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

[www.theallpapers.com](http://www.theallpapers.com)

## General Guidance for Examiners: AS and A2 examination papers

### A: Introduction

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

**B: Exemplification of AS Level descriptors****Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

**Level 2:**

*Either*

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

*Or*

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

**Level 5:**

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**C: Exemplification of A Level (A2) descriptors**

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

**Level 1:***Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

*Or*

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

**Level 2:***Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

*Or*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

**Level 3:**

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

**Level 4:**

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

**Level 5:**

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

**D: Deciding on marks within a level**

**These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.**

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
  - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
  - well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

**Alternative B: Europe in Transition 1470-1610****AS Unit 1: Religious Change and its Consequences in Sixteenth Century Europe****Question 1**

- (a) **Explain, briefly, the importance of “annates” in the context of Luther’s attack on the Catholic Church in Germany.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. understands that annates were payments to the Pope/Catholic Church; this was money taken out of the state which had often been collected from the people living in the see. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. annates were symbolic of the interference of Rome in the affairs of state and the emphasis on money-making which characterised the Catholic Church and the Papacy in this period. **2-3**

- (b) **Explain how Source C challenges the views expressed in Source B on the reasons for the spread of Lutheranism in Germany.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context. E.g., B suggests the princes and authorities were mainly responsible for the spread of Lutheranism whereas C suggests that other social groups were also involved. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. both agree that princes were involved. B indicates that some princes were motivated both by personal gain (the acquisition of Church property) and others by a real desire for reform; C agrees that they were important in explaining the speed of the spread of the Reformation. Once princes had converted then it was likely that their people would follow. They also had political influence and were able to defy the Emperor. However, C suggests that educated lay people and some workers in towns were also enthusiastic. Answers may quote e.g.s of imperial cities such as Strasbourg and Nuremberg which were independent of the princes. C also implies that preaching, printing and personal gain were also important influences. **3-5**
- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions e.g. as above and concludes e.g. that the two are interlinked and that princely support may also have encouraged towns to make the change, although it was the princes who were able to bring military pressure to bear on the Emperor to sustain Lutheranism. **6-7**

- (c) **Explain the importance, in relation to other factors, of the existence of abuses in the Catholic Church, to the success of the Reformation in Germany.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time/and or place, based on either own knowledge or the sources. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description, but will have valid links.
- Or*  
Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from source *and* own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

The existence of abuses gave everyone a grievance against the Catholic Church, e.g. loss of revenue and control of secular affairs (A), lack of moral and spiritual guidance from uneducated and idle clergy. However, there had to be a willingness to change the situation as evidenced by the attitude of some of the princes (B) and the towns (C) and an alternative to Catholicism (Lutheranism). Additionally, the Reformation was successful because of the influence of the renaissance scholars and their criticisms of the scholarship of the Church. The work of Erasmus was also important in creating a climate in which the Church was questioned.

Level 1 responses will focus on abuses or a single factor in a generalised manner. At L2, there will be awareness of a number of factors leading to success although development will be limited. A more structured approach with supporting detail will be typical of L3. L4 answers will have links to importance and provide range. At L5 reasoned conclusions will be drawn about the relative contribution of the issue of abuses in comparison with other factors.

**Question 2**

- (a) **Explain briefly what was meant by the term “predestination” in the context of Calvin’s religious ideas.**

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. understanding that predestination is the belief that an individual’s destination after death is predetermined by God. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the terms, linked to the context, e.g. Calvin believed in double predestination which meant that man’s future would be decided by God either in heaven or hell: this meant that individuals could not work their way to heaven. It became a distinctive feature of Calvinism and a significant focus of *The Institutes*. Many Calvinists regarded themselves as ‘the elect’. **2-3**

- (b) **Explain why Geneva had accepted Calvin as its leading minister of religion by 1541.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Calvin was a famous theologian and/or Geneva was in need of leadership and reform. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Geneva was anxious to assert its freedom from Berne and Savoy; a leader was needed to reform the church and strengthen the city; Farel invited Calvin and had worked in partnership with him to 1538; Calvin was well known as the author of *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*; the city had not fared well after Calvin’s initial expulsion in 1538; Calvin presented a plan, the Ecclesiastical Ordinances, for reform of the Church. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as in L2 and shows understanding of the link between politics and religion and Geneva’s need for a strong individual. **6-7**

- (c) “Calvinism brought about revolutionary change in Geneva.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### Indicative content

Calvin is often credited with having established a theocratic state in Geneva. He did reorganise the Church through the Ecclesiastical Ordinances and the government was restructured. Laymen were involved in the Church (elders) and morals were supervised through the Consistory. Pastors were significant in society as well as religious life and were subject to both the Consistory and the *grabeau*. Additionally an Academy was set up to educate future politicians and ministers. Political opposition was eventually removed and heresy rooted out. In some respects, therefore, Calvin left behind on his death a very different state. However, control of morals was not complete – an attempt to close down taverns failed – and Calvin could only advise the Council.

Answers at L1 are likely to make simple assertions about change. By L2 answers should provide some examples of change with some limited supporting information. For the award of L3 this information should cover a range of different aspects, e.g. religious and political, and be developed. At L4, there will be links to ‘revolutionary’ and discussion of social and political developments and at L5 reasoned conclusions drawn about the ‘revolutionary’ nature of Geneva under Calvin.

**Question 3**

- (a) **Explain briefly what was meant by the term “the Church hierarchy” in the context of the Council of Trent.**

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. this refers to the bishops who attended the Council and to the Pope, and/or to the condition of the higher clergy and the expectation that reform would be made via Trent. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. understands the unrepresentative nature of the groups attending Trent in terms of numbers in total and the over-representation of Italians; understands that these were people charged with review of doctrine and church organisation for all Catholics. **2-3**

- (b) **Explain why the Council of Trent did not meet until 1545.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the Popes were reluctant to summon a council, many clergy were more concerned with their own power than the reform of the church. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the rivalry between Charles V and Francis I meant that little agreement was reached about the need for a Council; there were disputes about the agenda and about the meeting place; Popes had to be convinced that reform was necessary and that the Council would not usurp his powers; popes were more interested in international diplomacy, the Italian wars and the income that abuses such as indulgences brought in to the Church. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. as L2 and concludes that the attitude of the popes was the deciding factor as they alone had the authority to summon a council although the support of the Emperor was also important. **6-7**

- (c) “The Council of Trent had only limited success in reforming the Catholic Church by 1600.”  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view?

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answers is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or*  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4 but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### Indicative content

The Council was successful in producing a series of decrees for reform of the Catholic Church by 1563 in relation to both doctrine and discipline. However, it took time to implement discipline and the Church was dependent on the co operation of the Catholic monarchs. Only Philip II of Spain accepted the decrees immediately on condition that they did not limit his own authority; southern Germany and Poland were slower and France never officially registered them although they were honoured in spirit. It also took time for the establishment of seminaries in which priests could be trained for their new responsibilities. The Pope did take immediate action to publish a new Breviary, Missal and Catechism and did reform the Curia by the end of the century. Much of the work of the Council was to provide a starting point and approval for reform. It was through other activities which had been set in motion before Trent, e.g. new orders, the work of the Jesuits etc that the Catholic Church probably demonstrated most change by 1600. Some answers might say that the Council had limited success but other methods of reforming the Church were more successful, e.g. Jesuits. Some may argue that the extent of reform depended upon the individual circumstances of Catholic rulers.

L1 answers will possibly describe the work of the council or make general assertions about reform. At L2, there will be some identification of aspects of reform and this will be ordered and substantiated at L3. For L4, answers should provide a balanced response showing awareness of success and failure. L5 will address the issue of ‘limited’ success.

## A2 Unit 4: The State, Authority and Conflict

### Question 1

**(a) Use Source A and your own knowledge.**

**Explain what is meant by “the crisis of tolerance” in the context of the political and religious issues of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Basic definition with limited explanation, e.g. increasingly poor relations between Christians and Jews had reached a point where some action had to be taken to resolve the situation. **1**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn from either the sources and/or from own knowledge, e.g. by the 1480s and 1490s tension between Christians and Jews was high, even conversos were resented because they had not entirely given up their Jewish traditions; the desire for uniformity and conformity was accentuated by the work of the Inquisition even though it potentially conflicted with the longer term economic needs/development of Spain. Using own knowledge, answers might reflect on e.g. past policies and attempts to assimilate, the need to assert the power of the crown in religious and political terms, the work of the Inquisition etc. **2-3**

L3: As Level 2, with developed references to both the source and own knowledge e.g. as for L3 with some understanding of outcomes, e.g. the need for consolidation of the work of Ferdinand and Isabella as rulers of ‘Spain’ and as Catholic monarchs; the need to take command of the situation and regularise what was happening in local communities **4-5**

**(b) Use Sources A and B and your own knowledge.**

**How fully does Source B support the view put forward in Source A of the consequences of Ferdinand and Isabella’s policies towards the Jews?**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**

L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both source and to own knowledge. **6-8**

L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency etc in relation to the issue. **9-10**

**Indicative content**

Answers at L1 may focus on one aspect only, e.g. that Source A suggests that expulsions made the crown and country wealthier but Source B notes that the Inquisition lost income because it could no longer confiscate the property and goods of those accused of practising as Jews. Answers at L2 may show awareness that not all Jews left; own knowledge may suggest that many held only lowly positions and stayed in the country; others continued their professional role e.g. as medics. Source B's suggestion that 'zealous work' had vastly reduced the numbers of Jews was mistaken. Answers at L3 may note that A takes a broader and more balanced view of the consequences whereas B considers only the reaction of the inquisition. However, both sources suggest that the religious problem of the Jews was resolved as a result of expulsion whereas knowledge would suggest it was not; e.g. many Jews converted so that they could remain in Spain and were subsequently persecuted by the Inquisition. Answers at L4 may therefore, on the basis of a range of evidence, judge that B supports A in that it demonstrates that the policies of the government towards the Jews did have some impact although own knowledge suggests that the nature and extent of the impact varied.

- (c) **Use Sources A, B, C and D and your own knowledge.**  
**“The work of the Inquisition had a greater impact on the social and economic development of Spain in the sixteenth century than on its religious unity.”**  
**Assess the validity of this view.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-4**
- L2: *Either*  
 Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance.
- Or*  
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **14-15**

**Indicative content**

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over the period of at least 100 years as detailed in the specification for this alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content.

The founding of the inquisition in 1478 was for the purpose of investigating heresy, i.e. to maintain the religious unity of Spain. Source A suggests that it was instrumental in the pressure to expel the Jews in 1492, and B suggests that it had been successful in rooting out Jews before then. Source C also states its involvement in the rooting out of Protestants in the 1550s, although other commentators suggest that numbers were small. Source D makes reference to the Inquisition's enforcement of the Index and thus attempts to maintain purity of the faith and unity. Own knowledge might suggest that the maintenance of religious unity in Spain was more effective in Spain than in most other European states at this time, although the Moriscos remained a problem throughout and were not expelled until 1609; how much unity was a result of the work of the Inquisition and how much the result of the support given by the monarchy, or the appointed clerics e.g. Cisneros and religious orders such as the Jesuits, could be discussed briefly; however, this should not be the main focus of the answer. The impact of the Inquisition on the social development of Spain might be accessed through the effects of their religious activities, e.g. the Index (D) and the scrutiny of literature, the imposition of censorship and limitations on study abroad – all of which kept Spain out of the mainstream of European cultural developments although it did not inhibit development per se. Answers might also discuss the issues of social discrimination and the concept of *limpieza de sangre* which was consolidated by the Inquisition in 1484. The impact of the Inquisition on economic development is less certain and more indirect but the expulsion of the Jews has often been quoted as damaging the economy as many were businessmen and traders. This was also linked to the enforcement of the concept of 'purity of the blood' which the Inquisition extended to descendants of those condemned as heretics. The later removal of Moriscos from Granada to other parts of Spain which severely disrupted the economy and the influx of conversos from Portugal into Spain after 1580 highlighted these difficulties. Evidence suggests, however, that much of Spain's economic difficulties also arose from lack of knowledge and misunderstanding of the workings of the economy combined with rigid and traditional social structures.

Answers at L1 are likely to be unbalanced, brief and located either in the sources or own knowledge. At L2 there should be some understanding of the impact of the Inquisition on either or both aspects (social and economic development/religious unity) but this may be confined to the earlier or later parts of the period. By L3 there should be more developed understanding of both aspects. Answers should also reflect more of the time-scale and attempt some comparison between social and economic/religious issues, although this may not be developed. To reach L4, more sustained comparison should be evident with evidence of greater selection across the period. At L5, coherent conclusions will be drawn which support sustained judgement regarding the greater impact of the Inquisition.

**Section B**

Candidates answer one question from the following. Note: these questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of the candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in each specific mark scheme for each question.

**Standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)**

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

*Or*

Answers implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

*Or*

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

**Option A: The Netherlands 1565-1609****Question 2**

**“Spanish tyranny rather than Dutch religious concerns generated the conflict.” To what extent is this an acceptable explanation for the outbreak of the revolt of the Netherlands?**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

Answers would be expected to debate these two perspectives and not attempt to introduce other factors. Spanish tyranny might be exemplified through e.g. Philip II was an absentee monarch but the Dutch nobility were excluded from government through reliance on a small number of councillors selected by Philip II; Margaret of Parma could not make decisions without reference to Philip II; heavy taxes had been imposed to pay for the Habsburg-Valois wars; Spanish soldiers had been garrisoned in the Netherlands at Dutch expense and although disbanded in 1561 resentment remained; when opposition did break out in 1561, the duke of Alva was sent to deal with it, resulting in the Council of Troubles, the imposition of the Tenth Penny etc. Religious issues might be explored through an analysis of the religious divisions in the Netherlands, the more tolerant view of religious dissent held by the Dutch nobility, the furore created by the bishoprics' plan and the emergence of the Confederates demanding the heresy laws be relaxed (the Compromise) resulting in the Iconoclast Fury and the appeal by Margaret for help from Philip which contributed to the arrival of Alva. Good answers will see the links between these two issues, in that one fed the other. They will also appreciate that the Dutch nobles were as concerned at the prospect of religious turmoil as were the Spaniards and were prepared to, and did, help Margaret of Parma to suppress the Calvinists by 1567. Philip II was not, however, prepared to see his authority challenged; thus political factors might be said to have been most influential.

Answers at L1 may offer a brief account of events with no comment or make general assertions with little support. At L2, there may be more depth but limited range, whereas answers at L3 will seek some balance and arrive at a limited conclusion. To achieve L4 some understanding of the interconnections may be appreciated and L5 responses will draw well argued conclusions from this.

**Question 3**

**Compare the political and military contributions of Alva and Parma as Spanish leaders during the revolt of the Netherlands.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

Both Alva and Parma were the political representatives of Philip II from 1567-73 and 1577-1592; both were also expected to restore order and this involved extensive campaigning. For Alva his main opponents were the Sea Beggars supported by William of Orange who had become Calvinist; progress was slow through a series of sieges and Alva was recalled to Spain, a failure. Parma faced a different situation supported initially by the Walloon provinces but facing the challenge of William of Orange's leadership. Good strategy and leadership meant Parma steadily regained the south and looked set to succeed until William of Orange was assassinated in 1584; at this point lack of money caused mutinies, diversions as a result of the Armada and events in France, lack of cash and the emergence of Maurice of Nassau resulted in the division of the Netherlands in all but name. In political terms, Alva may bear the blame for the hardening of attitudes through his stern political rule and Parma seen as the man who saved the south for Spain and Catholicism. Both were good soldiers hampered by lack of money and the fact that the Netherlands was not always Philip II's major concern.

Answers at L1 are unlikely to encompass more than brief assertions about each leader, some of which may be an attempt at comparison. Level 2 responses may be descriptive or offer some brief analysis; focus could be on either Parma or Alva. By L3 answers will focus more on contribution although there may be more emphasis on political rather than on military achievements or vice versa. By L4 comparisons should be more structured and balanced, with good coverage of the time scale and some conclusions drawn. At L5, sound comparative analysis of carefully selected material will support a reasoned assessment of contributions.

**Question 4**

**To what extent did the political and religious features of the United Provinces indicate the emergence of a nation state by 1609?**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

Answers will need to isolate the characteristics of a nation state to respond fully to the question; in political terms, issues such as the extent of independence and unity, the form of government, the internal distribution of power, freedom of action in relation to the Spanish Netherlands could be explored. The extent of religious unity, existence of other faiths and attitudes/policies towards other faiths could also shape criteria for the existence of a nation state. In political terms, answers could argue e.g. that the provinces were still rebels as 1609 marked only a truce rather than a final peace treaty recognising the sovereignty of the states. However, the existence of the States General in which the advocates of the seven states presented their views suggests unity; similarly the predominance of Oldenbaarneveldt would generate coherence and stability. Key decisions were taken by majority vote and the range of areas in which the States General took decisions increased beyond taxation, defence and foreign policy to regulation of trade, the church and flood defences. The role of the Stadholder suggests some local independence and responsibility for the defence of his province; possibly the only truly national institution was the House of Orange. In religious terms, the provinces remained quite divided; there were Calvinists, Armenians and strict Calvinists wanted their views to dominate. However this tension was not resolved until 1619 but it did not bring about a return to rule by Spain. No other state chose to challenge the existence of the United Provinces and its independence was finally fully recognised in 1648.

Answers at L1 are likely to make general and assertive statements about the United Provinces whereas at L2 greater relevance should be expected. However, it is possible that the focus will be on limited aspects and conceptual understanding will be weak. At L3, better balance between political and religious aspects could be achieved and controlled analysis should encourage some comparison between these aspects, leading to well supported judgement at L5. Answers at Level 5 should demonstrate good range, depth and focus on characteristics.

**Option B: Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire 1519-1566****Question 5**

**“The Imperial election of 1519 raised political and administrative issues in the Holy Roman Empire which were never fully resolved until the end of Charles V’s reign.” To what extent do you agree with this view.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

The focus of the question is on the internal affairs of the Holy Roman Empire and raises political issues such as the relationship between Charles and the princes, and administrative matters relating to the specifics of government as a result of the election of a man who was also King of Spain and ruler of the Netherlands. These issues were reflected in the Capitulation in which Charles, in order to keep the support of the princes, agreed to consult the Electors and the Reichstag on all imperial matters, respect the rights and privileges of the princes, not to appoint foreigners to office etc. In addition Charles was faced with a large geographical area, subdivided into 300+ states of varying size and power and no effective centralised government. Answers will be expected to consider whether and how Charles attempted to deal with these issues and judge whether he did or did not succeed in resolving them by his abdication. The fact of Charles’ abdication could be seen as evidence that he had not resolved these issues; he had fought a lengthy battle against Protestant princes which resulted only in compromise; the Regency Council had become a cipher with no power to enforce any decisions; no real reform had taken place and Charles was increasingly in debt etc. However, he had secured the succession for the Habsburgs and maintained the integrity of the Empire if not its absolute unity; briefly in 1548 he generated some reforms e.g. strengthening of the supreme court, a new regency council without princes. However, in neither area, did Charles regard himself as having been successful although most historians recognise that absolute success was impossible in view of the many differing interests to be reconciled.

L1 responses may be brief and lacking in depth and detail; any focus is likely to be on the struggle with the princes. Level 2 answers should identify a wider range of issues and depth of understanding, although the princes may still be the main issue. These answers may be constructed narratively with some summative comment. For L3, some understanding of outcome should be evident. By L4, the comparative aspect should be a strength and at L5, assessment should reflect the extent to which any resolution was reached.

**Question 6**

**How far do you agree with the view that the rebellion of the peasants in 1524-1525 was a serious challenge to the social and political structure of the Holy Roman Empire?**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

The Peasants' Revolts(s) brought together religious, social and economic grievances; much of their anger was directed at ecclesiastical landlords, but the peasants may have seen, e.g. 'the priesthood of all believers' as a move toward greater social equality. Most frequently demanded was a return to previous customs and mutual obligation, i.e. more equal perspective on the relationship between landlords and their tenants. Heavy taxes were a frequent complaint.

In political terms the Twelve Articles reflected a demand for greater freedom; some local groups looked for the election of village priests; others wanted the creation of a republic and as a minimum, challenged existing law on property etc. Many of the leaders were not peasants and minor nobles who considered the formation of people's parliament. They achieved a change in government in some towns, e.g. Erfurt, although this was often only temporary. The gathering of armies and the battle of Frankenhausen also represent a political challenge. The princes clearly saw the peasant rebels as a political challenge and formed Leagues to defeat them; their victory resulted in greater power for the princes, forming a stronger threat to the Holy Roman Empire. The demands of the peasants were discussed at an Imperial Diet in 1526 demonstrating how seriously the state perceived the event. The widespread nature of events in 1525 (only Bavaria did not experience revolt in central and southern Germany) may have made them appear a serious challenge. However, the scattered nature of the revolts, made them relatively easy to suppress; they may have appeared to be more serious than they really were. Many individual reformers including Luther condemned them.

Answers at L1 may offer brief descriptions of the rebellions or some limited comment. Level 2 responses are likely to be more developed and may recognise some social and political issues. To achieve L3, answers should identify a range of issues with some links to 'social' and 'political'. Sustained analysis with an awareness of the limitations of the movement could qualify for L4: balance and well supported judgement should characterise L5.

**Question 7**

**To what extent was the Ottoman threat responsible for Charles V's failure to resolve the challenge of the princes?**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

Charles V saw infidel Turks as both a threat to his sovereignty and the target of a crusade. The princes were also a challenge to his authority and where the two coincided, Charles had to make significant decisions. The Ottoman threat diverted Charles' forces physically, e.g. in 1529, when they marched to Vienna, in 1531 and again in 1534 when he lost Wurttemberg because he was getting ready to attack the Turks in the Mediterranean. In 1539 he agreed to the Interim of Frankfurt in order to gain assistance for his campaign against the Turks. In 1541 the Turkish invasion of Hungary diverted Charles from the Diet of Regensburg where he had hoped to establish some compromise with the protestant princes and it was 1546-7 before he was able to defeat them at Muhlberg. However, the situation deteriorated again after 1551 with further attacks by the Turks combined with French support from Henry II for the Protestants.

However, other factors may also explain his failure to deal effectively with the princes, e.g. the constitutional situation which gave the princes significant authority through the Diet, the fact that he spent the 1520s mostly in Spain and it was in this time that some princes became firmly Lutheran, that he was at war with France in Italy for lengthy periods, lack of support from the Pope particularly in the calling of a General Council to deal with Protestantism, the dispute over the succession in 1550-1 and his failure at Metz which led to his eventual abdication.

Answers at L1 will show only limited awareness of the Turkish threat and its connections with the struggle against the princes. L2 should offer more developed links probably in a largely narrative manner. At Level 3 the significance of the links should be recognised but will also recognise other factors. Level 4 answers should offer more balanced responses, whilst those at L5 will offer sustained and well supported, balanced analyses which address the issue of 'extent'.

**Option C: Suleiman the Magnificent, 1520-66****Question 8**

**“The domestic success of Suleiman the Magnificent rested more upon his achievements in the military field than upon the religious unity of the state.”**

**How far do you agree with this opinion?**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

Suleiman, like all Sultans, was commander-in-chief of the army and head of the religious institution as well as lawgiver, administrator etc. Suleiman’s military achievements, backed by the concept of Holy War, were significant, e.g. in 1520 he captured Belgrade, the battle of Mohacs 1526 led to Hungary becoming a vassal state; in 1529, Suleiman threatened Vienna; in the 1530s he attacked northern Italy and Iran and Iraq. Following victory, Suleiman exacted tribute, secured trade routes and strengthened his frontiers. This provided him with finance and security. Those captured in war became recruits to the Janissaries and both strengthened the Sultan’s authority as a standing army but also generated the need for more conquest to maintain loyalty. Hence Suleiman was often on campaign, losing only the siege of Malta in 1565. Further troops raised through the timar system ensured there was no landed aristocracy to challenge the Sultan as long as the fighting continued and the troops had to earn their landholdings – in this sense there was a direct link between military success and domestic success. The religious unity of the state was also important. Shiite Muslims were not tolerated. It was also the duty of Muslims and therefore of the Sultan to convert non-Muslims, although there were never to be forced conversions. Under the system known as the millet, non Muslims created self governing communities; the status of these communities and their members was inferior to that of the Muslim community but they were tolerated. However, only Moslem-born men could participate in the bureaucracy or be scholars, teachers, lawyers and judges; it was the people who advised the Sultan and applied in the law. Religious unity could therefore be perceived to be important theoretically, but in practice did not always bring the material gains of military conquest.

Answers at L1 will be brief and generalised with focus possibly on one factor only. L2 responses may be characterised by descriptions of military campaigns or of the religious condition of the Empire or assertions about their importance. L3 responses should offer a more selective approach with effective links to the question leading to a relevant conclusion. At L4, analysis should be sustained and the balance between aspects reasonably even. L5 answers will additionally be distinguished by an understanding of the links between the two facets and offer sustained judgement on relative importance.

**Question 9**

**To what extent do you agree with the view that the economic strength of the Ottoman state rather than its political structure ensured stability in the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent?**

*Target AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

The length of Suleiman's reign alone might be said to have provided some stability; alternatively, other factors must have been at play to ensure that Suleiman remained the head of state. The political structure revolved around the Sultan's role as the head of state, but possibly his Grand Vizier, chosen from his slaves, wielded more day to day authority than any other member of the government. However, he could easily be removed from office; many did not survive more than a year and were often killed on the Sultan's orders, and thus were no guarantee of stability. Other potentially more stable organs of government were the Divan, which was a council of justice and also a cabinet, which worked with the sultan to make political decisions, supported by an extensive civil service; the ulema which advised on the application of religious law and supplied scholars, teachers etc; the provincial and military governors who collected taxes and carried out the orders of the central government. However, the growing importance of favourites undermined the system. The economic strength of the Ottoman state came from both internal and external trade; the regulation and control of production, fixing of food prices, the work of trade guilds and the expansion of external markets and trade with Europe and the east. However, ultimately some of this strength was lost as the guilds began to stifle innovation, war with Europe interrupted the flow of trade and over-reliance on western products meant a lack of internal development. Both factors are important to stability, but economic issues might be regarded as less within the control of the Sultan than the political structure.

Answers at L1 may offer limited and general information on either or each of these facets of the Ottoman Empire. To achieve L2, more specific information should be given with some reference to each aspect. By L3, more detailed analysis should lead to some linkage to stability. L4 answers will be both comparative and comment on stability. At L5, the comparison will give rise to considered judgement on the relative contributions of economic strength and political structure to the stability of the Ottoman Empire.

**Question 10**

**“Suleiman the Magnificent was a greater threat to the west on land than at sea.” Assess the validity of this statement by reference to his military and naval campaigns in the period 1520-66.**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

**L1: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

Answers would be expected to refer to land campaigns in the Balkans and against Hungary and the Holy Roman Empire, and to the Mediterranean conflict for naval campaigns. The concept of threat must be related to the west and not to the east. Land campaigns might be expected to include the capture of Belgrade in 1521, the conquest of Hungary 1526/8 which resulted in the establishment of a garrison and the payment of tribute, the siege of Vienna 1529, the campaigns in Hungary and the Balkans in the 1540s through to 1566. The siege of Vienna etc and subsequent border attacks threatened Charles V at a vulnerable point in his dispute with the princes over religion, and the campaigns in Hungary (after the death of King Louis) twice coincided with succession crises which divided European resistance. After 1562 and the construction by Ferdinand of good fortifications along the frontier, the struggle became a stalemate. The Franco-Ottoman alliance meant that the Valois-Habsburg conflict continued through the period and the fear that the west had of the Ottoman army created psychological barriers to dealing with the Turks. Campaigns at sea were also very successful for the Turks (except Malta 1565), establishing dominance at Prevesa in 1538; bases were established in Algiers, and with the support of the French a base was briefly established at Toulon. Much of this was the work of Barbarossa, a pirate given Governor status by Suleiman. Persistent activity in the Mediterranean severely disrupted European trade and was a constant diversion, using up finance, from the land struggle. Answers could compare the extent of threat on land and at sea from a number of different perspectives e.g. politically the threat on land was greater for the Holy Roman Empire than any other power whereas in economic terms the threat by sea was greater because it damaged trade and income; the threat on land was possibly greater because the European powers themselves were disunited either politically or religiously whereas Malta demonstrated some strengths and was a psychological setback for the Ottoman Empire.

Answers at L1 may offer general and limited material that is assertive; at L2 expect more depth and selection of material. Focus may be on land issues or sea but not necessarily both. Responses at L3 should offer more balanced material and draw some conclusions; by L4 the analysis should be well directed and wide ranging in both areas with direct comparisons. At L5, look for sustained comparison and clear focus on threat to support the judgement offered.