

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 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 2013 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 2013	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 demonstrated.

Question (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 2013	9769	53

Question (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 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 2013	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 demonstrated.

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 2013	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 2013	9769	53

Band 5: 0–6

The answers 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 2013	9769	53

Nominated topic: The politics of the ‘Divorce’, the Break from Rome, the role of Parliament, faction and politics 1529–1536

- 1 (a) Compare Documents B and C as evidence for the nature of discontent with the Roman Catholic Church in the period 1529–34. [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 discuss reasons for discontent with the Roman Catholic Church; however they tend to emphasise rather different reasons. In Document B Hall focuses on anti-clericalism within Parliament, emphasising the power and corruption of the clergy, in particular the bishops. In Document C Melville concentrates on the King’s anti-Papal attitude. The documents are quite different. However, candidates might comment that the anti-clericalism alluded to by Hall has now been given free reign, and is being allowed to be voiced by the King, so it might be concluded that in both cases, whilst the nature of the discontent is different, it serves the purpose of the King. Hall explains that the Commons believe that they have been oppressed by the Church in part because the bishops held sway over the King. Melville emphasises the personal discontent of the King that the Pope has failed to grant a divorce. Both documents mention the greed of the Church, Melville comments on Peter’s Pence whilst Hall alludes to the greed of the bishops. Both of these issues could be tested by the use of contextual knowledge. Candidates might mention that these documents deal with different phases in the break from Rome; hence Hall deals with a more general complaint against the Church, whilst Melville deals with the cause of the break from Rome itself. In terms of critical evaluation, it is clear that Hall tends to be sympathetic towards these criticisms and was present in Parliament at the time. Melville appears to be less sympathetic, citing the influence of Lutheran Reformers and is writing some time after the event. Candidates might evaluate the implied criticism here.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	53

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Henry consistently relied on Parliament to achieve his divorce?**

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [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. Candidates may well conclude that Henry relied very heavily on Parliament to achieve his divorce; however, the measure of success here relies on the evaluation of the issue of consistency. The collection of documents taken as a whole display a range of responses to the problem of obtaining a divorce and to an extent chart the development of the policy. Document A recalls attempts made prior to the calling of the Reformation Parliament; candidates might indicate how this exemplifies the early efforts to gain a divorce, however it has something in common with Document B in that they both represent an attempt to put pressure on the Church. By 1529 the focus has switched to Parliament; however, there is no suggestion of legislation in this Document, but in a sense a wider arena in which the Church is to be criticised. There is, however, perhaps a hint that the Church has acted against the common law in the past. Documents C, D and E all demonstrate the use of Parliament in gaining the divorce. The ‘strict command’(Document C) refers to the laws passed in Parliament in order to effect the Break from Rome. There is a good deal of material in Document D to illustrate the nature of Parliamentary Statute in ensuring the Break from Rome; not only does it explain the nature of Supremacy, it also demonstrates the finality of the Divorce, in that Catherine of Aragon is to be denied any appeal to Rome by law. Links could be made to the nature of the complaints in Document B here and how they have now been addressed by Statute. Clearly there is not only consistency, but development here. Document E takes the view that the Divorce is achieved by a ‘raft of legislation’; some contextual knowledge of this would be appropriate; it also identifies the Act of Supremacy here, and some comment on this might be expected. Clearly Henry does not use Parliament consistently; candidates might reflect on the way in which policy and use of Parliament changes and develops over the period. However, there are common themes to be found, in terms of the legal standing and role of the Church and the role of the Pope. The focus of each document is rather different. However, when used as a collection, a clearer picture emerges.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	53

2 How influential was the role of faction on politics during the reign of Henry VIII? [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 faction existed in Henry’s reign is not open to debate, quite clearly there are times when Henry actively encourages it and makes extensive use of it. The debate ranges over how influential it was and whether the extent of its influence changes and develops during the reign and impacts on politics. There is a very lively historical debate on the issue, especially when concerning the bringing down of individuals such as Wolsey, Anne Boleyn and Cromwell. Faction can also be closely associated with religion in this period. It could be argued that Henry goes some way to encourage faction in order to preside over it. Certainly there is evidence of faction amongst the men of the Chamber in the early years, and a debate could be had over the role of faction in the fall of Wolsey. Certainly there is evidence of a rise of reformers during the attempts to gain a divorce and the break from Rome, with a reversal in fortunes after 1538 when more conservative attitudes come to the fore, culminating in the fall of Cromwell. The role of the Howards, especially in the King’s marital adventures, could be considered and this also has a bearing on foreign policy. The struggle between reformers and conservatives towards the end of the reign, particularly concerning attacks on Catherine Parr and Cranmer, needs to be considered, particularly the view that by this stage Henry was not really in control of faction. The issue of why Henry finally sides with the reformers should be evaluated, given that he must have known what this would mean for religion in the reign of his son. Candidates should not just chart the ebb and flow of faction but the impact that it had on policy and politics.

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. It could be argued that faction only has the impact on politics that Henry wishes it to have, promoting or felling those who do not support his chosen policy, after all Henry is prepared to rid himself of both Wolsey and Cromwell when he perceives that they are no longer of use to him. On the other hand, it could be argued that Henry is at the mercy of faction, particularly in the later years, and especially faction led by Norfolk. It is more likely that candidates will comment on individual circumstances rather than making a blanket decision. The historiography here is very lively and it is to be hoped that candidates will engage with it.

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.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	53

3 ‘Neither Protestant nor Catholic, and satisfying to few people.’ Discuss this view of the Henrician Church 1534–47. [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, that is on the nature of the English Church during this period, the changes and developments and the nature of the reaction to those developments. However, this not simply a question about opposition to the Church during the period, the answer also requires an evaluation of the type of religious settlement achieved. Clearly the situation is very fluid; broadly it is acceptable to see a period of reform to 1538, followed by a reversal of policy and the entrenchment of more traditional orthodoxy thereafter. It is important for responses to reflect the changes and developments during this period. Candidates may well broadly agree with the premise of the question; the key to success is how effectively the issues in the question are evaluated. A consideration of Henry’s views could be helpful; it is clear that he wished to retain some semblance of orthodoxy, but without the Pope. Arguably the Church could certainly not be considered to be Catholic whilst the notion of Henry’s supremacy was maintained. Moreover, the dissolution of the monasteries, attacks on relics and pilgrimages and the issues raised by the 10 Articles demonstrate an institution that had moved some way from the main tenets of the Catholic faith. The role of Cromwell and Cranmer might be considered here. Neither does the Church look very Protestant even in the period 1534 – 38, despite the English Bible; there was little else that could be seen as blatantly reformist. A consideration of the limitations placed on the reformers after 1538, restrictions on bible reading, the Act of Six Articles, the lack of an English liturgy and prosecutions for heresy clearly limit the extent to which the Church can be regarded as reformed, let alone Protestant. A consideration of how satisfied people were with the Church will certainly include such issues as the Pilgrimage of Grace and other acts of opposition; it could also consider the position of particular factions and groups and the changes and developments in these. The debate might also include some evaluation of regional differences. It might also note the stringent efforts made to require conformity, which might have some impact upon how the role of opposition at both extremes is viewed.

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. Some knowledge of the debate over whether the Henrician Reformation was a ‘popular’ Reformation might be expected; although it is reasonably acknowledged that this is not the case, the debate can be used to evaluate the question posed. Haigh’s thesis of a ‘piecemeal reformation’ could also be referred to in terms of assessing what the English were being required to accept; this can be particularly useful when evaluating the nature and extent of opposition. Some knowledge and understanding of the theological issues can be expected, but this should not form the predominant thrust of the argument.

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.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	53

4 How successful was English foreign policy in the period 1513–29?

[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; it is fair to expect some assessment of what constitutes success. An evaluation of Henry’s aims in foreign policy and some discussion of whether the policy is consistent may be expected. Candidates may also consider the argument of whether this was Henry’s policy or Wolsey’s. In terms of Henry’s aims it could be argued that foreign policy in this period is largely a failure, the French campaigns are ruinously expensive and largely inglorious with very slight gains, the Spanish/Habsburg alliances fail at crucial moments and Henry is left with very little to show for his efforts. On the other hand, it could be argued that in many ways the English were out of their depth and fall prey to the ambitions of far more powerful forces – France, the Habsburgs and the Papacy. On several occasions Wolsey was able to pull off diplomatic coups and involve England on the European stage. Candidates should be able to trace and evaluate changes, developments and reversals in policy. In 1513 Henry had minor success at the Battle of the Spurs but there was no real attempt to capitalise on this, the real success being the Battle of Flodden in Henry’s absence. There was the failure of Henry’s alliances in 1514; a worthwhile peace was concluded with France, but diplomatic isolation was to follow with the failure of Wolsey’s mission to build a league against France. Wolsey did, however, manage a diplomatic coup with the Treaty of London in 1518 and in the following two years Henry was courted by both Francis and Charles, culminating in the Field of the Cloth of Gold. Henry was still at the centre of the diplomatic stage in 1521 with the Conference of Calais, but he finally sided with Charles. Military action in 1522 and 1523 was expensive and a failure. The attempt to capitalise on Charles’s victory at Pavia was also a failure, largely due to a lack of money and a failure of support from Charles. After this foreign policy was largely geared to the attempts to gain a divorce, which could also be deemed a failure.

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. The debate here is quite controversial and candidates might be expected to reflect on a variety of ways in which success might be evaluated. There is little debate over Henry’s true aims, but much more controversy can be found when discussing Wolsey’s aims. Debate ranges over whether Wolsey was doing the bidding of the Pope, or his master, or saw himself more as an arbiter of peace.

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.