



## Cambridge Pre-U

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/53**

Paper 5c The Reign of Henry VIII, 1509–1547

**October/November 2020**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Published**

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Special Subject: Source-based Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

**Introduction**

- (a) This question is designed 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.
- (b) Examiners will 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.
- (c) 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will 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 3: 8–10 marks**

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 marks**

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus 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 1: 1–3 marks**

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.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Question (b)****Band 4: 16–20 marks**

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.

**Band 3: 11–15 marks**

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 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.

**Band 2: 6–10 marks**

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 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.

**Band 1: 1–5 marks**

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 be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Special Subject: Essay Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

**Introduction**

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

Examiners will 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 will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind 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 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 4 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will 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 5: 25–30 marks**

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to 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.

**Band 4: 19–24 marks**

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.

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 marks**

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

**Band 2: 7–12 marks**

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 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.

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

**Band 1: 1–6 marks**

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; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. 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 are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.



## Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>To what extent does Document D challenge the evidence in Document C about the plan to take an English force to Scotland?</b></p> <p>Similarities – Both agree on the need for invasion. Document C ‘if war is to be made...’ and D’ his opinion that the enterprise to be made’ Document C thinks the Scots may not be ready ‘if the forces of Scotland are not assembled’ and speaks of an ‘unprepared enemy’ and Document D the Scots will not be able to bring up opposing forces. Both see the prospect of victory. Both agree that it is important for success that the Scottish forces not be permitted to unite. Both implicitly agree that 8000 men may not be enough to defeat the Scots if they are able to fight as one.</p> <p>Differences – The proposed strategies are different Document C is for ‘ as big an army’ as entered Scotland before, while Document D thinks that a sudden attack will mean that the Scots will not be able to bring up opposing forces against a smaller force. Document C thinks 8000 horsemen will not be able to burn Edinburgh, but Document D suggests that 8000 men should be sufficient to conquest Scotland. The key is with deception and surprise; Document D sees a sudden attack as key; Document C sees the need for larger forces and a steadier plan with a march in two formations linked to strengthening the garrisons.</p> <p>Provenance – Document C is from a commander with previous experience and likely to suffer the consequences ‘if the whole of Scotland turns against’ his forces. Document D is much more removed from the immediate dangers and difficulties and urges a bold and rapid campaign, much less careful about possible Scottish action. Document C may be typical of a commander wanting as many resources as possible; Document D is from a government eager to reduce costs and casualties and wanting to use surprise as a weapon which conflicts with the realities seen by ‘the man on the spot’.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Henry VIII's policy to Scotland in the 1540s depended more on force than on statesmanship? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge, as well as to all the documents in this set (A-E)</b></p> <p>After the defeat of Solway Moss in 1542 the death of James V and the accession of the baby girl Mary offered Henry VIII the opportunity to dominate Scotland by a marriage alliance. This 'rough wooing' had its origin in military victory and was not popular in Scotland. The nobility accepted reluctantly and the English diplomat in Scotland was given the impression that there was popular resistance to the idea of a future English king. The Earl of Arran though installed as governor did his best to delay the marriage. Internal resistance was led by the Douglas and Lennox factions in Scotland and the Scottish parliament rejected the Treaty of Greenwich. This infuriated Henry who had released some Scottish noble prisoners taken at Solway Moss – war was declared in December 1543 and Edinburgh was attacked in 1544.</p> <p>Document A: The thrust is towards force with the great army invading and Lisle being left to continue to harass the Scots with naval support and the defeat of the Scots in November, but the death of James V did not lead to invasion as Lisle was ordered not to take further action but Henry considered a marriage alliance with the statesmanlike intention of pleasing France – though as everyone thinks this might happen this may be because of the military superiority. The Imperial ambassador might be too eager to see the danger of links between England and France but offers a balanced assessment, recognising the King's ambitions but also his restraint.</p> <p>The document has to be seen in the context of a revival of Henry's ambitious and expansionist policies in France and Scotland in 1541 in alliance with the Emperor. The marriage alliance plan for a link with Mary of Guise gave way to the rough wooing so this does not reflect the eventual more ambitious policy to take advantage of the military victory.</p> <p>Document B: The emphasis here is on statesmanship with the proposed marriage alliance between Edward and Mary. Force is to be employed only to stop Mary being taken to France. There has been some effort to win political support with 'good and reasonable gentlemen'. The situation was not as favourable as the royal agent made out, however and the source has to be read in context. The Regent was dragging his feet, the bulk of Scotland both nobles and commoners opposed the idea of English domination and the eventual rejection of the Treaty of Greenwich led to a violent invasion.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>Document C: By September 1544 things have moved on in Anglo Scottish relations and both this document and document D are considering a substantial military invasion even if they disagree about the scale and methods. Suffolk as the commander on the spot is eager for a more substantial force but by this time there is less emphasis on negotiation. Both sources need to be seen in the context of the changed situation by 1544 with the rejection of the Treaty, the opposition by noble forces and the fury of Henry VIII that nobles whom he released after Solway Moss have broken their word and turned against him. Some may be aware of his violent tirades against Scotland and his desire to destroy Edinburgh</p> <p>Document E: Suggests that Henry has pursued a statesmanlike policy of avoiding war, listening to the Scots nobles and proposing a marriage treaty. Henry blames the Scots for the breakdown of relations and argues that the use of force is necessary 'where words and writing will not be enough' in the light of Scottish 'misconduct' This view of Henry as responsible statesman driven to force is open to challenge and the nature of the source – instructions to an envoy who is to accompany the royal forces is really guidance on how Browne should present the situation rather than dispassionate analysis. Also the whole 'rough wooing' could be seen part of an ambitious plan to extend English control rather than moderate statesmanship. The violence of the burning of Edinburgh and its plunder and the raids into the Lowlands does not indicate a strong commitment to statesmanlike policies.</p>	

## Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>How important was the role of parliament in the break with Rome in the years 1529 to 1539?</b></p> <p>AO1: Parliament was opened on 3 November 1529. The Chancellor, More, was disparaging about Wolsey and spoke about the King as a shepherd. The Commons expressed discontent with the state of the Church and here were clashes with the Church hierarchy with Fisher being critical of parliament. The first session in 1529 produced acts against pluralism and the second in 1531 pardoned the clergy for offending against the statute of praemunire. This and the disgrace of Wolsey sent a clear message of the unrest that might be unleashed against the church but from 1532 there was an increase in the pace and significance of legislation. In 1532 the clergy submitted to the King's authority and there was the Act of Conditional Restraint of Annates. The Act of Appeals produced a remarkable statement of the jurisdictional self-sufficiency of England enshrined in statute. The 1534 Act of Succession removed Mary from the succession and in 1534 the Clerical Submission of 1532 was given force of parliamentary statute. In 1534 the Act of Succession required an oath to recognise Anne's offspring as heirs. The Treason Act equated failure to conform with treason. The Monasteries were dissolved by Acts of Parliament in 1536 and 1539. An Act of 1536 extinguished the authority of the Pope or Bishop of Rome. As well as matters of overall authority legislative authority was given to doctrine in the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Six Articles of 1539.</p> <p>AO2: The role could be seen as means of pressuring the Pope in the initial sessions of 1529 and 1531 with the King allowing criticisms of the church and reasserting control over the Church. However, from 1532 parliament became the means of introducing change as the highest expression of royal will. The force of statute was given to major changes such as the Dissolution but also to the overarching justification of England's legal status as an Empire, jurisdictionally self-sufficient and not subject to the international laws of Rome. The use of parliament by Cromwell was of considerable significance to the role of the Commons but also to the binding nature of the religious changes which required acts of parliament to reverse in Mary's reign. The feeling for the need for reform was an important element in Parliament's role but the key element may have been that it was a highly effective instrument for change. The reformation could be seen as a national development not merely the act of a tyrannical king eager to safeguard his dynasty or marry his mistress. The precedent for religious affairs being determined by the monarch in parliament was established. Some may question the significance of the range of statutes as merely reinforcing previous practice; others may see the hand of the king and his minister as heavy and regard this as the guiding element rather than parliament per se. Others may see the impact of a groundswell of demand for reform putting as more of a key than parliament itself.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>How protestant a nation was England by 1547?</b></p> <p>AO1/2: Much depend on the definition of ‘protestant’. Reform and organisational change had produced a church that had some key protestant features. The monarch was the head of the church and the authority of the Pope had been ended in law. The outward expressions of key catholic ideas had been undermined by the dissolution of the monasteries and by suppression of shrines. The central doctrine of salvation by faith had been strengthened by the end of monasteries whose existence tended to be a manifestation of the doctrine of salvation by works. Similarly, the despoliation of shrines played down the mechanistic elements of religious life where doing good works – for example pilgrimages – could be seen as a way of salvation. The importance of the Word had been stressed by the provision of the English Bibles. The Acts restricting payments to Rome and the Appeals Act confirmed the restrictions on papal authority. But was this Catholicism without the Pope? The authority of the monarch over the Church was not in itself new and did not immediately challenge doctrine. Earlier monarchs had suppressed some monasteries. The main justification had been practical not theological. Though changes in the church had implications for doctrine, the official position was far from being totally reformist. The Act of Six Articles marked an attempt to arrest change in doctrine. Cromwell was accused of undermining doctrine in 1540. Reformers and Catholics were executed. Kate Parr nearly met her death when accused of heresy. In terms of how much impact new reformist ideas had had on the country as a whole, there is some doubt about how widespread and accepted religious reform was. There was a distinction between hostility to clerical abuse – excessive payments, supposed corruption, poor standards of education and pluralism – and more positive enthusiasm for the reformed doctrines of the European protestants. The widespread opposition of the Pilgrims of Grace might be used by some to suggest resentment at the pace of change. It would be legitimate to use evidence of catholic opposition in 1549 and the relative ease with which Mary was accepted and her changes adopted. The reaffirmation of Transubstantiation, the affirmation of Confession and clerical celibacy in 1539 may have been made with one eye to overseas opinion but also suggest that the King was anxious to respond to the continuing religious conservatism. The Eucharist remained through the reign. On the other hand the access to the vernacular bible, the ongoing anti-clericalism, the spread of protestant ideas and English reformist traditions going back to Wycliffe and the implications of the anti-papal legislation and the ending of monasticism might suggest that there was a distinct move towards Protestantism. No set answer is expected here but a balanced analysis is called for.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>‘Individual opposition to the Henrician reformation had greater impact than did organised rebellion’ Do you agree?</b></p> <p>AO1 – The main opposition in terms of numbers, military threat and geographical area was the Pilgrimage of Grace. With 35,000 participants the rebellion was the largest faced by the Tudors, but its aims were diffuse, and the movement fell apart after concessions. Prestigious individual opposition came from Thomas More’s refusal to accept the Act of Supremacy and from some individual churchmen notably some from the religious houses and Fisher. There were also isolated threats such as from Mary Barton and from small acts of criticism and dissent reported to the Council and ruthlessly repressed.</p> <p>AO2 – The executions of More and Fisher who were figures of international standing could be argued to have had a greater impact on European opinion than the much larger opposition which could be seen as a revolt dominated by dissenting noble factions or regional malcontents. Though Elizabeth Barton lacked a popular following her execution together with the deaths of More, Fisher and the London Observants brought home the difference between papal and royal supremacy in terms of control and the use of violence – the reformation was enforced with 300 executions including some Heads of Houses who provided a heroic example for those who later accepted the return to Catholicism under Mary. The question could allow some discussion of individuals leading factions against elements of the Reformation like Norfolk who brought down the leading organiser of the Reformation, Cromwell, and perhaps the protestants who suffered execution as theological opponents and offered martyrs for later protestant enthusiasts to praise. Many will consider that the obvious larger scale opposition which led Henry VIII to have enough anxiety as to modify his immediate rage and in the longer term to reign in religious change was more significant and no set answer is expected</p>	30