

# History

Answers and commentaries

A-level (7042)

## **1C The Tudors: England, 1485 — 1603**

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

# Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

<a href="#">Question 1</a>	3
<a href="#">Question 2</a>	11
<a href="#">Question 3</a>	14

# Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written by the student.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level History 1C The Tudors: England, 1485 - 1603 June 2022 Question paper and inserts.

## Question 1

Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Henry VII.

**[30 marks].**

## Mark scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**

## A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042 – 1C THE TUDORS – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Student responses

### Response A

Green argues that Henry VII's reign was achieved by his frugal nature. They argue that Henry's shrewdness with money was the product of his own insensitivity and greed. Green focuses in Henry's financial aims in his suppression of the nobility. Whilst they are convincing in suggesting that Henry was incredibly frugal in his financial policy, Green is less convincing in suggesting that this was the result of his miserly character. Henry's shrewdness was mainly rooted in his desire to ensure dynastic security.

Green is unconvincing in suggesting that Henry's 'main concern' was the 'accumulation of treasure' necessary to avoid having parliament. Whilst it is true that Henry VII called parliament just a total of seven times during his reign and therefore Green is convincing in asserting that Henry intended to avoid over-reliance on power parliament, it is unfair to suggest that Henry's financial aims were rooted in a desire to avoid parliament. Instead, Henry was over-concerned with the security of his own Crown, this, rather than his personal greed led to his frugal financial policy. Green is fairly convincing in suggesting that Henry 'hoarded' money. Despite an annual pension from France of £5000 and his accumulation of crown lands at the beginning of his reign, through Acts of Attainder against the Yorkist nobility, Henry continued to seek desperate measures to increase crown finance. This can be seen in his asking for donations to Arthur's baptism (after his death in 1509) as based on traditional prerogative rights. Nevertheless, Henry's shrewd financial policy and limitation of parliament cannot be deemed the product of his 'mean' or 'jealous' character. Henry intended to ensure a strong financial position for his successor to ensure the security of the Tudor dynasty.

Green also argues that Henry 'broke the power of the magnates. This is particularly convincing at the beginning of Henry VII's reign when he was most concerned with asserting monarchical dominance. He dated his reign to the day prior to Battle of Bosworth, the 21<sup>st</sup> Aug 1485, to ensure that all Yorkist nobility involved against him could be considered traitors. He was thus able to impose the magnates with bonds and therefore extract their wealth and ensure their complicity. Whilst this did serve to improve royal finance, it was most successful in its aim to reduce noble wealth. Green is unconvincing in suggesting that 'retaining' laws against the nobility were 'enforced with the utmost severity considering the fact that Henry made changes to allow retaining when licensed.

Overall, Green is convincing in their assertion of Henry's shrewd and frugal approach to crown finance. Green over exaggerated the 'severity of Henry's actions and overestimates the role that his own greed underpinned financial policy.

Guy argues that Henry was a sensible and apt king who was both respected and powerful. He argues that Henry was able to centralise English government through his political skill and reputation. He argues that this is what earned Henry his dynastic security rather than his divine right to kinship. Guy is convincing in his assertion of Henry's governing skill, however over-exaggerates his political presence.

Guy is convincing in suggesting that Henry was neither blood thirsty or self-centred. This can be seen in his peaceable foreign policy that certainly lacked the delusion of English power evident in his son's reign. To suggest, however, that Henry led his army to France because the 'nobility admired highly chivalric Kings' is an exaggeration. Henry's invasion of France, late into the campaigning season was used to pressure the French king into a peace treaty. As Henry knew the king would be concerned with his stance in the Italian wars, Henry used his invasion for tactical foreign policy (the French king would be keen to settle the dispute). Therefore, while Guy is convincing in suggesting that Henry was a competent leader, neither self-centred or blood thirsty, he is not convincing in suggesting that Henry's policies were ever rooted in desire to pander to the nobility's admiration for kinship and chivalry.

Guy is convincing in asserting that Henry VII helped to 'centralise' English politics. He is unconvincing, however, in suggesting that this owes to a reconsideration of his appearance as a 'shadowy and remote king'. Henry VII's increased centralisation of politics was largely a response to the betrayal of Sir William Stanley, his step-uncle and trusted Lord Chamberlain. Having been exposed as a conspirator in the Warbeck plot, Stanley was tried and executed. This, Henry sought to establish the privy Chamber where only the King's most trusted advisers could gain favour, and where favour could be very easily lost. This did not owe to the diminishment of Henry's 'shadowy and remote reputation'. In fact, his investment of power in just a few royal councillors, like Empson and Dudley served to perpetuate this perception of him especially considering their incredibly unpopular financial policies. Whilst Guy is correct in stating that they 'served the throne for the Tudors', this was not the product of his 'dynamic force.' His centralised form of govt created fear rather than admiration.

In conclusion, Guy is convincing in suggesting that Henry was a competent King and that his policies helped to centralise government. He is less convincing in suggesting that Henry ever acted in the interest of the nobility (especially in his invasion of France) and his assertion that Henry gained a personable political presence.

Lockyer argues that Henry was never successful in fully asserting monarchical authority. He argues that Henry was restricted by the English formalities of power, Lockyer asserts that due to his own military weakness, Henry was dependent on English property owners. He states that Henry was ultimately dependent on the complicity of his nation. Lockyer is convincing in his suggestion that Henry was largely dependent on landowners and local government, but overestimates Henry's weakness in this policy. Henry ultimately pursued the most effective means of ensuring law and order.

To suggest that Henry was never an 'absolute monarch' is and over exaggeration. Whilst Henry was subject to multiple threats to his throne (including plots that sought to replace him like Simnel and Warbeck) he ultimately remained supreme. His victory at the Battle of Stoke in 1487 suggest that his 'standing army' were capable of defending his monarchical authority. Though he was dependent on property owners' such as the traditional northern magnates to operate on behalf of him in further regions, by the end of his reign, this method proved effective. Henry's initial ploy to impose southern nobility on northern region proved unsuccessful, during to Henry's reliance on northern property owners.

Lockyer over exaggerated Henry's devotion of power to 'men on the spot'. Whilst Henry's reliance on local government did sometimes mean impulsively recruiting men whom he did not fully trust, such as Duke of Norfolk, his aptitude in central government ensured that this did not impose too much of a difficulty. By ensuring his own centralised power (by suppressing nobility with Acts of attainder, bonds and recognizance) Henry ensured that this reliance on landowners was underpinned by his undoubted monarchical authority and centralised power.

This, whilst Lockyer is convincing in suggesting that Henry relied on the 'cooperation of the political nation' he is less convincing in suggesting that Henry was not an absolute monarch.

**This is a Level 5 response**

The understanding of the interpretations in this response is very good. The evaluation of the arguments in the extracts is strong, and the contextual own knowledge is selected and deployed convincingly to support the points made.

The response is clearly structured and identifies 'convincing' and 'unconvincing' aspects of the interpretations. The candidate distinguishes between the overall arguments and the subsidiary points. The evaluation of each extract has an overall assessment.

The response to Extract C is the weakest of the three in that the key argument is not addressed directly, but contextual knowledge is used to evaluate the supporting arguments.

## Response B

### Extract A Section A

Green's argument that Henry VII was a determined monarch who consolidated his reign through various, sometimes harsh means, due to his insecurity on the throne renders extract A extremely convincing. However, it overstated his success in consolidating his power through these legal methods and financial successes by not mentioning the barriers Henry VII faced, which at times could have jeopardised his security.

Extract A is convincing due to its clear identification of Henry VII's aims when entering his role of monarch, showing a need for control and consistency. Henry of course craved stability and authoritarian dominance, his 'character, resulted in a steady drift towards absolute royal control' which he achieved by improving his crown finance to give him autonomy from parliament (only calling them 7 times throughout his reign) and increasing his finances to £100,000 by the end of his reign. However Extract A fails to mention the threats Henry faced to his authority which powered these actions for stability and control, such as Yorkist threat. Green mentions Henry's acts in removing power from the nobility, e.g. the Earl of Oxford, in which removing the wealth of the Nobility boosted his position (which was needed due to bastard feudalism as well as the situational Yorkist threat posed to Henry after the legacy of the War of the Roses. Although, he does not mention the threats such as pretender plots – Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck 1492 backed by powerful Scotland and Ireland – as well as economic rebellions e.g. the Cornish – as a need for economic stability would have helped overcome these threats.

Extract A however, remains overall highly convincing in relation to Henry VII and his consolidation of power because it speaks of the actions he took to improve his security and total power 'absolute royal control' in the form of parliamentary autonomy, and financial prosperity, 'he was able to bequeath as hoard of two million pounds to his successors'. His financial methods both gave him more standing as a Tudor monarch which he tried to secure as an usurper, as well as regaining power whilst removing power from the overmighty nobles which could pose threats to him, eg. the pretender plots. Extract A argues convincingly his methods of consolidating power were indeed based off of financial means to gain power, as well as his attempts secure his monarchical position with longevity by modernising government, introducing and 'reviving the criminal jurisdiction of Royal council and enabling justices of the Peaces to try without juries', leading to a clear shift towards fully Henry's ideas to allow for again less power to the overmighty nobles and more to him through courts which benefitted this-the Council Learned in law and work of Star Chambers.

Overall Extract A is very convincing when considering Henry VII, as it identifies his aims and needs as monarch and ways in which he brought about them, even if Green doesn't specify the main source of his monarchical insecurity and need for control – which correctly identifies – like rebellions and their support from nobility and foreign powers.



### Extract B

Extract B is mostly convincing when looking at Henry VII, particularly in relation to his character when consolidating his power and stabilising England through shrewd, smart decision making, however, perhaps overstates his success at creating stability and doesn't mention the threats posed to him except for the legacy of the war of the Roses.

Extract B is convincing because of how Guy describes Henry's character, saying how he made smart decisions in the aim of stabilising and bettering England after the War of the Roses. He identified it brought with it, factionalism and the power of the overmighty nobility, which could cause disruption to England's stability and his ability to control this, which he dealt with calmly with a level head 'sober statesmanship' and in the name of his people, 'he was neither blood thirsty nor self-centred'. This description of Henry's character in his success at bringing about more peace between nobility and him and thus England, appeasing the overmighty nobles by 'personally leading his army to France knowing the Nobility admired highly chivalric kings', but also maintaining his authority and taming fractions through bonds and recognisances. His actions to gain peace/stabilise whilst maintaining total power is accurately described by Guy making Extract A convincing. Whilst Extract B correctly identifies Henry's character and ways he went about stabilising England in a tactful way, he overstates the stability he achieved in his reign as he faced persistent rebellions and uprisings, such as the Cornish rebellion, and pretender plots which were fuelled by nobility and oppositional Yorkist and foreign threat, challenging Guy's certainty of 'Henry's diplomacy and security measures guaranteeing the dynasty's survival', as there were moments this was in doubt. Whilst the threat was present, Henry's methods of taming these threats by removing power from overmighty nobles and increasing his own through 'recognisances' and formation of legal structures e.g. 'Council Learned in Law', (Empson and Dudley), are in line with Guy's suggestion of the securing of the Tudor throne being due to 'Henry's dynamic force', making Extract A mostly convincing.

### Extract C

Extract C is partially convincing in relation to Henry VII, as it is overly critical of Henry's ability to gain full monarchical control and doesn't consider the circumstantial barriers he faced in doing this, whilst also suggesting an insecure legacy of Tudor monarchy to his son Henry VIII. It does however, show some of the challenges he faced and how there could perhaps be evidence for some of his failures.

Lockyer argues falsely that Henry VII 'never' achieved an 'absolute monarchy' due to his lack of success in modernising government and way of rule, 'his power and authority in England were limited by custom and law'. Whilst Henry indeed faced limitations in military support having no 'standing army' or police forces, Henry made clear and decisive efforts in the pursuit of the modernisation of government and bureaucracy. Whilst Lockyer is indeed overly harsh and doesn't really acknowledge the situational variables such as the weak position Henry Tudor inherited he does account for how difficult the 'barriers' he faced in the way of England was governed at the time and how he couldn't have overcome them if 'he had wished to do so'. This shows some understanding of Henry's position in attempting to gain

control through government, and accurately depicts the struggle he indeed had 'centralising' government and unorganised, but doesn't consider the unlikelihood of anyone would have had due to the circumstances of usurping, and understates Henry's particular impressive success in this, making extract A only partially convincing.

**This is a Level 3 response**

This response demonstrates a reasonable understanding. It is stronger in relation to A and B and in identifying the convincing aspects of the interpretations.

The contextual knowledge demonstrated is fair. Some material is clearly relevant and linked to the point being made. However, there are also instances where the material appears to be included because it has been learnt, rather than being apposite to the extract under discussion. The quotes from the extract are over lengthy.

There is some evaluation, however, the challenge to the arguments is too often based on omission. The best fit for the response is Level 3.

## Question 2

'In the years 1515 to 1540, policy was decided by ministers rather than by the monarch.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

### Mark scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Student responses

### Response A

Overall, for the majority of the years 1515-40, policies were decided by the monarch rather than ministers Henry VIII took little interest in ruling initially but had significant influence on policy for most of these years.

During Wolsey's early years as chief minister – policy was decided by him rather than Henry VIII. Wolsey set up the Star Chamber in 1516 to hear cases for the poor – given Wolsey's working class background as a butcher's son it is highly likely this was his policy and not the monarch's – Henry VIII had little to no interest in dispensing justice. The Star Chamber became a victim of its own success as it became clogged with too many cases which led Wolsey to subsequently set up an additional court in 1519 to deal with overflow to tribunals. Once again Henry VIII took little interest in justice or governing and as a result it is highly likely it was Wolsey who was the driving force behind. Therefore, during Wolsey's early years as chief minister, Wolsey was the one deciding policy not Henry VIII.

However, later in Wolsey's tenure as Chief Minister, the monarch's influence over policy grew. Wolsey needed to fulfill Henry VIII's desire to be a warrior King and it was incumbent on him raise revenue for the French campaign. Wolsey called a parliament to raise a subsidy in 1523 in order to fund this campaign. However, once this extraordinary revenue from parliament proved insufficient, Wolsey utilised the Amicable Grant in 1525 – although this led to rebellion. As a result of his inability to raise sufficient revenue, the English army was only a third of its originally intended size. The monarch's influence grew further as Wolsey was tasked with resolving the 'King's Great matter' – Henry VIII's desire to divorce Catherine of Aragon in order to secure the succession with a male heir. Wolsey attempted to secure an annulment but was ultimately unsuccessful in his quest – he was charged with Praemunire and executed in 1529. Therefore, late in Wolsey's tenure as Chief Minister the monarch's influence over policy grew. The desire to invade France and secure the Break with Rome were both Henry VIII's demonstrating that in the 1520's – policy was decided by the monarch and not ministers.

During Cromwell's early years as Chief Minister, the monarch decided policy. Cromwell was tasked with succeeding where Wolsey had failed – masterminding the Break with Rome. Cromwell was able to secure this Passing the Act of Supremacy in November 1534 which ended the Pope's jurisdiction over the English Church, making the monarch supreme head. Cromwell utilised the Reformation parliament to pass a tirade of anti-Popular legislation – the Act of Annexing First fruits and tenths the crown was passed in 1534 which meant annates previously sent to the Vatican would now be paid to the King. This drew upon the Act of Annates in 1532 which ended payments to the Vatican. Therefore, during Cromwell's early years as chief minister he was tasked with securing the Break from Rome. His need to fulfill Henry's desire meant it was the monarch who was deciding policy.

Although Henry VIII's influence over policy waned slightly towards the end of Cromwell's tenure as Chief Minister – policies were still decided by the monarch for the most part. Although Cromwell's influence is evident in the 1536 royal injunctions which condemned

Catholic practices such as praying for the dead – Cromwell being a staunch opponent of such practices – this is an exception. The majority of policies in this period remains determined by the monarch. The dissolution of the monasteries was motivated by Henry's need to implore Crown finances - the first act of dissolution in 1536 dissolved monasteries with an income of under £200 a year before all monasteries were dissolved by 1540. Furthermore, elements of Catholic doctrine were reasserted. The Articles Act was introduced in 1536 restoring three sacraments at a lower level. This went further following Papal excommunication in 1538 and a conservative backlash towards previous religious reforms when in 1539 the Six Articles Act restored the remaining sacraments, albeit at a lower level. Therefore, although the monarch's influence over policy waned a little towards the end of Cromwell's tenure as Chief Minister – Henry VIII remained in control of policy. Despite Cromwell having some control – the reassertion of Catholic doctrine was primarily Henry's desire, not Cromwell's.

Therefore, for the majority of the years 1515-40, policy was decided by the monarch rather than ministers. Although Henry VIII's influence over policy was minimal in the early years of Wolsey's tenure as Chief Minister it grew considerably, especially with his desire to Break with Rome. Henry VIII's influence on policy strong during Cromwell's tenure as Chief Minister as Cromwell had some, but highly limited scope to determine policy.

**This is a Level 3 response**

This response shows a reasonable understanding of the question, and there is some attempt to link knowledge to the focus of the question, although not all material is relevant. It is more convincing on the issue of Henry VIII's role in the development of policies rather than that of Wolsey or Cromwell. The judgement is not fully convincing; there is some confusion between the responsibility for policies in the 1530s. The response has some breadth, covering the period of the question. The range demonstrated is fair, and politics, finance and religion are considered. It is effectively organised with a chronological approach.

### Question 3

‘Social and economic grievances, rather than religious discontent, were the main causes of rebellion in the years 1549 to 1569.’

Assess the validity of this view

[25 marks]

### Mark scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

## Student responses

### Response A

Social and economic grievances were mostly the causes of rebellion in the years 1549 to 1569, however religious discontent was still significant in many of the rebellions in the period. With the Western Rebellion, Kett's Rebellion, Wyatt's Rebellion and Northern Rebellion all having socio-economic and religious causes.

Rebellions under Edward VI were mostly due to social and economic grievances. The Western Rebellion in 1549 was triggered by the sheep tax enacted by Edward in the same year. Rebels were unhappy with the cost of having to keep sheep. However, the rebellion also had religious causes, with some rebels opposing the Book of Common Prayer, which had also been introduced in 1549. Those who rebelled were discontent with the Protestantism included in the new prayer book. 1549 also saw Kett's rebellion. This was caused by grievances over enclosure. Despite Somerset's enclosure commission in 1548, little was done about enclosure which led to rebellion. Kett's also had political causes with some rebels angry at local government for negligence. Therefore, rebellions under Edward VI were mostly caused by social and economic grievances, rather than religious ones.

Mary I's reign saw Wyatt's Rebellion in 1554. This was motivated by a number of reasons, religion and socio-economic discontent included. The rebellion was in opposition to the 'Spanish Marriage' between Mary and Philip II of Spain. The main motivator was xenophobia but the rebellion included Lady Jane Grey's father and ultimately led to Lady Jane Grey's execution inferring there was some Protestant discontent. Rebels were also discontent with the declining cloth trade in the area. So, the Wyatt's Rebellion under Mary I had both religious and socio-economic causes, but neither were the main factor.

However, the Northern Rebellion in 1569 under Elizabeth I had greater religious causes than social and economic. The Northern Rebellion was led by Northumberland and Westmorland due to political grievances against Elizabeth I. But the rebels that followed them were discontent about her religious reform. Shown by the fact the rebels held an illegal mass in Durham Cathedral. Social and economic grievances were not a major part of the Northern Rebellion. Although political grievance was the main cause, religion was a more significant cause than socio-economic grievance.

To conclude, the main causes of rebellion were social and economic grievances, especially in the Western and Kett's rebellions in 1549. Social and Economic grievance also was mildly involved in Wyatt's Rebellion. However religious was still as significant cause, influencing the Western Rebellion, Wyatt's Rebellion and most significantly, the Northern Rebellion. Also, political causes were influential in Wyatt's and the Northern Rebellions. Overall, social and economic grievance was a greater cause of rebellion in the period 1549-1569, religious discontent was more of a contributor rather than triggering cause.

**This is a Level 4 response**

This response shows a good understanding of the question and is effectively structured; the sequential approach is valid. Issues of social and economic concerns and religious dissent are covered, and there is a recognition that political issues also underpinned the rebellions. A good range of material is included. The answer evaluates the causes of all the rebellions of the period. There is some conceptual understanding, particularly in relation to the interplay of factors in the rebellions. The response is analytical and balanced. There is some valid judgement, although the more limited consideration of 1549 means that this is partially substantiated.



# Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at [aqa.org.uk/7042](https://aqa.org.uk/7042)

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

T: 0161 958 3865

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

