

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/54

Paper 5d (Special Subject: Reformation Europe, 1516–1559), 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	54

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	54

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	54

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	54

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	54

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 2014	9769	54

1 (a) How far does Document E corroborate Charles V's aims as expressed in Document A? [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. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities – They agree that his main aim is to seek peace.
They agree that his aims may be difficult to achieve.
They agree that he sees his role in terms of obligations and duty.
They agree that his armies have suffered considerably.

Differences – **A** suggests that Charles is in a weak position, while **E** has a more optimistic note and expects that Charles can make improvements to the lives of his subjects. **A** is more focused on the need for money and allies, which does not seem to be an issue in **E**.

Provenance – Both are by Charles V so are an accurate reflection of his views. Dates are likely to be a source of comment. In 1523 Charles was at a low ebb after the failure of his planned French invasion and the inability of Henry VIII to offer aid. His situation was later transformed by Pavia, and the comments in **E** indicate the greater level of success he had enjoyed in Italy after that. By 1528 he hoped that a lasting peace could be negotiated and candidates may comment that the Peace of Cambrai of 1529 was the outcome.

(b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Habsburg-Valois rivalry was made worse by Francis I in the period from 1523 to 1528? [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each, although, depending on 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 and 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 documents offer a variety of views on how the rivalry worsened. Document **A** implies Francis I was to blame by saying peace depends on co-operation from the enemy. Document **B** suggests Francis was eager to fight to justify his reputation, but there is little concerned with detail. In Document **C** Francis is ready to renew the war but blames Charles for the way in which he was treated which justifies his attitude in his view. Document **D** blames the Pope for absolving Francis from his promises, leading to the situation outlined in **C**, while Document **E** shows Charles V eager for peace, thus implying that it was Francis who was prolonging the war.

Evaluation of the documents may lead some of these initial judgements to be modified. In Document **A** Charles is in a self-pitying mood and ready to blame circumstances and false friends for his problems. He had been very prepared to use the dissatisfaction of the Duke of Bourbon against Francis I. He is probably right in arguing that his enemies felt he was too powerful and candidates could feel that Francis was justified in his resistance to Habsburg

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	54

encirclement. Document **B** certainly shows Francis in a less flattering light in a history written some time later. Here Francis is set on attacking Pavia and hopes to starve out Charles V's army. In Document **C** Francis is desperate to portray himself as much put upon and to show that his promises were extorted from him and so need not be kept. But even so, candidates may argue that the renewal of the war was down to Francis. Document **D** is propaganda for Charles V, aiming to prove that it was the Pope who exploited the situation and absolved Francis from his promises. Candidates might find this a specious defence, largely originating from the criticisms of Charles after the Sack of Rome in 1527. In Document **E** Charles V stresses his commitment to peace and his intention to intervene personally, leaving Spain to go to Italy. He saw the situation developing as having prospects for peace, and events proved that he was right.

From these documents the evidence against Francis I is not all that convincing, and Charles emerges as rather too ready to present himself as a reluctant warrior.

2 How far were the princes responsible for the problems Charles V faced in ruling Germany? [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. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates could refer to the powers of the princes and their exploitation of these. They could also mention Charles V's commitments elsewhere and the structure of the government of the Empire which prevented the Emperor from having total control.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates are likely to argue that the princes were a major problem. Charles needed to conciliate them in order to be elected in the first place. Many controlled justice in their territories and held quasi-monarchical courts. Their power had increased in the fifteenth century. Individuals such as Frederick, Maurice and John Frederick of Saxony and Philip of Hesse caused him real difficulties, notably when they embraced Protestantism and formed the Schmalkaldic League. Even the victory at Muhlberg backfired on Charles.

Alternatively, Charles rarely had the time to deal with German problems effectively. He was in Spain for much of the 1520s after the Diet of Worms and also spent time in Italy and the Netherlands. There were more pressing problems facing him in his other dominions and he left much in Germany to his brother, Ferdinand, although this delegation in itself led to difficulties when the succession issue occurred.

Moreover, the governmental structure of the Empire did not favour him. The Imperial Diet and the Imperial Chamber Court were either weak or riven by divisions. Raising taxes in Germany was very difficult. The Regency Council was ineffective. Charles relied on bodies like the Swabian League, but these, too, were affected by religious rifts. The towns were also trying to obtain greater independence.

Candidates may conclude that circumstances were so unfavourable to Charles that the princes were just an additional complication.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	54

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying 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 ‘The main aim of the Catholic Reformation was the reform of abuses within the Church.’
Assess this view. [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.

Candidates could refer to the actions of the Popes and of the Council of Trent to eradicate abuses which had been the cause of much anti-clericalism. Other aims of the Reformation could be the need to redefine doctrine in the face of Protestantism and to promote a much more positive view of the Church.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may suggest that the early reforms of the Church, although recognising there were abuses, were more concerned with maintaining papal power, or were the work of individuals, such as those in the Oratory of Divine Love. The real reform may have begun with the *Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia* and its report. The Council of Trent did eventually draw up decrees aimed at reforming the lives of bishops and priests and tightening up monastic rules. Training of priests became a priority. But this was not viewed as essentially urgent.

Alternatively, the Church was preoccupied with the Protestant threat and much reform was aimed at reducing this major danger. The new orders were often set up to reconvert lapsed Catholics. The Inquisition and the Index also had the aim of keeping the faithful within the Church. The first sessions of the Council of Trent dealt with doctrinal matters after the failure of the Colloquy of Ratisbon. The tone of life in Rome changed as much because of the Sack of Rome as because of the Reformation in the Church.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying 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 2014	9769	54

4 How important to the spread of Lutheranism to 1529 was the ineffectiveness of its opponents?

[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. Candidates may refer to the 95 Theses and the reception they received, the slow response of both Emperor and Pope to these events and the amount of support Luther was given within Germany.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates can argue that the ineffectiveness of its opponents allowed Lutheranism to take root and that it then proved very difficult to eradicate. Luther enjoyed the backing of Frederick of Saxony, who was a fierce defender of his position as the ruler of Saxony, and this made papal intervention problematic at first. The Pope underestimated the impact of Luther's actions. The Imperial election further hampered the Pope, who hoped for Frederick's vote to be cast against Charles. Hence all the church did was to organise debates and try persuasion. The eventual excommunication only came in 1520. Similarly, the Emperor was not elected until 1519 and it was not until the Diet of Worms in 1521 that Luther was unequivocally condemned. Charles V was then absent from Germany until 1529 and so Lutheranism could grow unhindered. He wanted princely support in his war against the Turks and so could not prevent the turn to Lutheranism. His attempt to enforce the verdict of Worms at Speyer in 1529 simply led to the emergence of the Protestants.

Alternatively, there were other factors aiding the spread of Lutheranism. The use of the printing press to spread Luther's ideas was one such factor. His publications of 1520 enhanced his appeal to a wide audience. Luther's doctrines were taken up by princes, towns and peasants. Papal exactions were universally disliked in Germany. Humanists also rallied to Luther's cause at first. By 1529 Prussia, Hesse, parts of Saxony, Mansfeld and many Imperial cities had become Lutheran.

Hence candidates could conclude that the slow realisation of the authorities that they needed to stamp out the movement was not necessarily the main reason for their eventual failure.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying 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.