

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/53

Paper 5c (Special Subject: The Reign of Henry VIII, 1509–1547), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result, not all answers fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Question 1 (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and, possibly, as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

Question 1 (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear, there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated, but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well sustained and well grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases a ‘best-fit’ approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

Band 5: 0–6

The answer will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated, whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

- 1 (a) **How far are the grounds for opposing Henry VIII's authority as expressed in Document A corroborated by the views reported in Document B?** [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Both documents stress that these views are held as a matter of conscience. In Document **A**, Fisher is reported to understand that such views may result in his death, whereas in Document **B**, More is already condemned to death, so is explaining his views prior to his execution. The reasons for their opposition are, however, different. In Document **A**, Fisher opposes the King on the issue of the divorce; it is his belief that the marriage is legal and cannot be dissolved. In Document **B** More opposes the King on the issue of Supremacy, he makes it clear that he believes that Parliament has no jurisdiction over the issue and cites clear biblical authority underpinning the jurisdiction of the Pope. Both documents deal with the issues of the separate spheres of jurisdiction, lay and spiritual, although Document **B** does this in a more sustained manner.

As to critical evaluation, some comment might be made concerning the dating of the comments made by each man and some comment might be made concerning the attitudes of the authors recording the views of Fisher and More, and indeed the intended audiences.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that opposition to the Henrician Reformation was a serious challenge to royal authority?** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each, although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

The debate here is a lively one. Candidates may be expected to reflect on the nature of the challenge from the challenges outlined in Documents **A** and **B** which appear to be a matter of personal conscience to the physical challenge of rebellion as outlined in Documents **C** and **D**. It is possible to distinguish between legal challenge, matters of conscience, challenges to the authority of Parliament and to the integrity of the King's advisors. It is essential that there is a clear evaluation of both extent and range of opposition. Candidates might engage with the historical argument about the nature and pace of change, that the Henrician Reformation being piecemeal made it difficult to challenge the concept of the Reformation as a whole, although there is some hint of a wider perspective in Document **C** which calls for a 'Restitution of the Church'. Document **A** challenges the King's authority on a rather narrow issue of the divorce.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

The scope of Document **B** is rather wider, condemning the nature of Royal Supremacy. The tone of Document **C** appears to be loyal to the King and yet it is set within the perspective of one of the largest rebellions of the Tudor era. Candidates might reflect on the nature of the complaints made concerning the King’s advisors and on the religious tone of the oath. Document **D** provides insights into whether Henry believes that his authority has been challenged; the implication is that he does since his retribution is so overwhelming. It might be worthwhile to reflect on what is known of the Duke of Norfolk’s personal views. Document **E** appears to consider that the challenge was limited; candidates may consider why there is more positive support after 1540. There are clear parallels between Documents **A** and **B** and between Documents **C** and **D**.

2 How successful was Wolsey in extending and consolidating royal authority in England?

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on Wolsey’s actions and policies which impacted upon the King’s authority in England. It might well be noted that for substantial periods of time Wolsey was required to concentrate his efforts on foreign affairs and this might have distracted him from other duties. However, such observations need to be made in relation to his efforts to consolidate royal authority. Perhaps the most important area for examination is Wolsey’s legal reforms and his desire to push forward the role of civil law at the expense of common law. His role and vigour in the Star Chamber may well be examined as an example of this, the fact that he heard cases personally and used the court to enquire into cases of affray in the more sensitive areas of the Kingdom. He also pushed forward a policy to strengthen the King’s personal courts.

It could be argued that the emergence of Wolsey as the King’s chief advisor in itself enhanced the King’s personal authority as it eclipsed Henry VII’s old advisors and allowed Henry to further his own forward policies; that Henry could so lavishly reward his chief advisor, a man of humble birth, also made a clear statement about Henry’s authority. There are many examples of Wolsey acting against members of the nobility and gentry especially in cases where there were breaches against maintenance and affray; whilst this certainly enhanced the King’s authority it also served Wolsey’s own interests.

Reference might be made to the case against the Duke of Buckingham. The debate over Wolsey’s seeming dislike of Parliament may be referred to, perhaps with some comment on whether it was his idea to institute the subsidy. There may be some discussion as to whether the Eltham Ordinances of 1526 were a genuine attempt to reform the King’s Privy Council. Candidates might also refer to the Amicable Grant and the demonstrations against it which, it could be argued, compromised the King’s authority. In all these discussions there will almost certainly be at least some implicit consideration of the relationship between Wolsey and Henry.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

The orthodox opinion of Wolsey is that he spent his time on foreign affairs, which meant that he spent little time on aspects of domestic policy. Elton in particular has complained that Wolsey seemed to achieve very little in comparison with Cromwell, but this view has now been widely superseded. More recent historians see little need for reform in the earlier years of Henry's reign and indeed argue that contemporaries certainly would not have seen the need. It could be argued that there was little need to enhance royal authority, although it can be demonstrated that enhancing the use of civil law did extend royal authority. There were, of course, pockets and areas where the King's writ ran less effectively and his ability to collect taxation could also be seen as a test case. A convincing argument can be formed by looking at the way in which Henry emerges, with Wolsey's help, from the influence of his father's advisors.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, display clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

3 To what extent was Cromwell's fall in 1540 the result of factional politics? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, that is on the fall of Thomas Cromwell and an evaluation of the extent to which faction was responsible. The focus should be clearly on the months prior to his fall and not upon his policies and actions earlier in the 1530s. However, a case can be made for including a discussion on whether the seeds of his downfall were sown as early as 1536; having defeated the Aragonese faction, at the moment of his greatest triumph, Cromwell made permanent enemies of the more conservative members of the nobility, in particular the Duke of Norfolk.

Candidates may also consider the perspective of religious reform. Having given Henry his most treasured possession, the supremacy, Henry was certainly not prepared to countenance more religious reform, and yet Cromwell's appetite for reform was undimmed. It might be concluded that the return of Gardiner from France in 1538 was significant.

There should certainly be a clear focus on the reasons for the alliance with Cleves and Cromwell's role in this. The marriage alliance was signed in October 1539, Henry met his new wife in January 1540, by which time the international scene had changed and Henry found himself saddled with a wife and an alliance he neither wanted nor needed. Cromwell was blamed, but he was created Earl of Essex in April 1540, a sign that he still enjoyed the King's favour. Yet the introduction of Catherine Howard changed the balance of influence and when it came Cromwell's fall was very swift. Cromwell's investigation into the accusations of heresy in Calais is crucial. Candidates should be expected to reflect upon the nature of the accusations made against Cromwell and the speed of his dispatch.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

The clearest debate in favour of the role of faction comes from the ‘Court Historians’. To completely reject faction as a contributing factor may well be very difficult; the determining factor will be how effectively candidates deal with the issue of extent and the relative evaluation of other possible issues. Certainly the religious reform agenda cannot be discounted especially alongside an evaluation of the specific accusations made against Cromwell, although many historians have reflected on the implausibility of many of these accusations.

The issue of the King’s ill health and his uncertain temper certainly ought to be mentioned. Candidates might reflect on the fact that many of Cromwell’s clients remained in post after his death, and that Cranmer was the driving force behind the downfall of Catherine Howard. It could be argued that Henry would not have promoted Cromwell to be Earl of Essex only weeks before his downfall had he intended to rid himself of his chief minister. Candidates may well reflect on the general uncertainties of faction and patronage which characterise the later years of Henry’s reign.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, display clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

4 How consistent were the aims of English foreign policy in the period 1529–47? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required in terms of an evaluation of the aims of policy. It is likely that candidates might split the period into two, the 1530s and the 1540s, on the grounds that very different aims can be demonstrated in the two halves. Clearly the way in which domestic policy and in particular the divorce and the break from Rome impact on foreign affairs cannot be ignored.

Candidates might reflect that the issues of security of the regime, the settlement and the realm are the only consistent aims during a period when much of the foreign policy decisions are reactive. The period begins with the need to secure the divorce which is compromised by the position of the Pope relative to the Habsburg-Valois conflict. In 1532 Henry draws nearer to France probably as a matter of security, but the diplomacy is fraught with the two sides negotiating at cross-purposes. The aim of the 1530s was to prevent the potential threat from Charles V. Though this threat was almost certainly overstated, it did not prevent Henry seeking a range of unrealistic alliances amongst Charles’s enemies, particularly in Germany. The truce between France and Spain in 1538 perhaps made this policy seem more pressing and attractive. However, no sooner had Henry taken the plunge into an alliance with Cleves than the necessity melts away and relations with France rapidly improve.

The 1540s are dominated by Scotland and France. In 1542 England invades Scotland and makes an alliance with Charles to invade France. The battle of Solway Moss and the death of James V do not result in an invasion of Scotland but a plan to marry Prince Edward to Mary Queen of Scots is hatched. In 1544 there is a raid on Scotland and a large army is sent to France. The French expedition is hardly glorious, save the capture of Boulogne. 1545 is characterised by a French force being sent to Scotland and fighting off the Isle of Wight, with a tentative peace being brokered in 1546 with the Treaty of Camp. The end result was financially ruining and arguably set an appalling legacy for Henry’s son.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	53

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

There is considerable debate here: the 1530 issue, of how real the threat from Charles V was, given his other concerns, needs to be explored; there is some suggestion that Henry himself was never truly convinced of the threat. In the 1540s the debate is even more lively. Pollard had argued that Henry's main aim was the invasion of Scotland and war with France was necessary to accomplish this. This argument was countered by Wernham who sees Henry's policy as essentially defensive. This approach might make the entire period appear as if aims are consistent. Other historians contend that Henry is still essentially preoccupied with France and aims to revive the policies which characterised the early part of his reign.

A03 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, display clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.