

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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, while 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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	54

1 (a) How far does Document B corroborate the views expressed in Document A about the plight of the peasants?

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 on who is to blame, clergy and nobles in E and princes and bishops in A. They agree the poor are being exploited, cheated and robbed in A and burdened with unaccustomed demands in E. They agree the church is particularly at fault, the bishops have hardened their hearts in A and should have acted in E.

Differences A suggests that Luther's teaching is being blamed, incorrectly, for the revolt, while E indicates that Lutheran preachers had played a role and even that Luther had cunningly planned this. Luther in A is more vigorous in his criticism, especially of bishops, while E is quite measured.

Provenance: Both have sympathy with the rebels, A more vehemently than E. Both are accounts generated by the immediate moment, although E has a better perspective than A. Candidates may be aware that A is not representative of Luther's more considered and later views after he turned against the peasants.

(b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Peasants' Wars were more religious than economic in origin?

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 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 and understanding and evaluation of different historical interpretations is to be expected.

The central issue here is how far resistance to unjust rulers can be defended. A and C argue that the peasants had right on their side while B and D take the view that they did not. E has a more balanced judgement.

A and C indicate that the oppression the peasants suffered was sufficient reason for them to rebel. Both make it clear that undue exactions have been demanded from the peasants and they can bear no more. C emphasises that it is the lords who are the thieves, although this was an allegation made against the peasants. C also argues, in direct contrast with B, that the Bible supports resistance to tyrannical rulers.

B and D take what became the standard Lutheran view: that resistance to authority is contrary to God's commands. In B the peasants have been deceived by the devil and denied the truth of the gospel, while in D they have misunderstood what the preachers told them. E even asserts that despite the unfairness of some demands, the peasants should leave God

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	54

to sort it out. C is at pains to explain justification by faith alone in terms which mean the doctrine will not threaten established authority. Both B and C have some feeling for the peasants even though they are wrong, or at least deluded. B urges the princes to be lenient with the innocent and to make some concessions, which indicates that Melanchthon felt the peasants had some kind of case. E takes the view that the peasants had been oppressed and so were justified, but also believes that the preaching of justification by faith had encouraged them to see freedom as the loss of their burdens, which C contradicts specifically.

Candidates may suggest that the Lutherans were concerned that they would be blamed for disorder and challenges to the ruling powers and so lined up with the princes in the last resort. As Lutheranism depended on princely backing they could not act otherwise. For the princes the doctrine of non-resistance was very useful. Property owners were very alarmed by the violence of the war and Luther certainly took this line by the end of 1525. Candidates may well feel that the Lutheran arguments lack some conviction, especially as C challenges their Biblical base. But C could be dismissed as a mere popular pamphlet and posturizing.

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, punctuations 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.

2 Was Charles V's main aim the extension of his family fortunes or the preservation of his empire? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an 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 well-known dynastic policy of the Habsburgs and their perceived desire to extend their influence throughout Europe by marriage and conquest. Against this they could outline the many wars which Charles fought to preserve his Empire in the Mediterranean and in Germany and eastern Europe.

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 Charles inherited Habsburg ambitions along with the Habsburg jaw. He was a vigorous defender of the rights of his aunt and cousin in England. He used members of his family as regents in the Netherlands. His letters to his son, Philip, reflect these priorities and his attitude to Italy and the Empire, where he upheld his family position as far as he could all support the view.

Alternatively, Charles was determined to defend his inheritance. His wars against the Turks illustrate this most clearly as they were his most powerful territorial foe. But he was equally tenacious of the Burgundian inheritance against French claims and fought in Italy to preserve and even extend his rights there.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	54

The issue of the Empire, where Charles finally withdrew personally to keep the lands within his family could be seen as a clinching argument, although candidates might feel this was a solution imposed on Charles and not one he sought.

Candidates might suggest that, to Charles, the distinction would have been meaningless as his family and his empire were so closely linked in his mind.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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, punctuations 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 Assess the view that the Papacy was incapable of solving the problems it faced in this period. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the problems the Papacy faced. These are likely to be twofold – the need for internal reform and the external threat from Protestantism. The period includes the pontificates of Leo X, Adrian VI, Clement VII, Paul III, Julius III, Marcellus II and Paul IV. Candidates may argue that these were all different popes with different priorities.

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 Papacy was blighted by its interest in Italian politics and, in some cases, by its preoccupation with family interests. Many popes were quite elderly when elected and so had little opportunity to solve the problems. Adrian VI was a case in point. Popes could become pawns in the Italian Wars and the impact of the sack of Rome in 1527 illustrates this well, as it led to the breakaway of England from the Papal fold.

Alternatively, the popes showed some relish for tackling the problems. Adrian VI was a short-lived pope, but he recognised the need for internal reform. Paul III defied expectations by living to be over 80 and set up the Reform Commission of six cardinals which produced a wide-ranging report in 1536, although he was reluctant to accept its recommendations. He re-established the Inquisition after negotiation with the Protestants proved fruitless and he patronised reformed religious orders, notably the Jesuits and the Ursulines. He finally got the Council of Trent going. Paul IV reduced the size of the Papal court and enforced clerical discipline sharply. These examples show that individual popes could deal with the problems. Paul III is the key figure here; his rule marking the transition from Renaissance to Counter-Reformation Papacy.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	54

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, punctuations and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

4 What best explains Zwingli's success in establishing a reformed church in Zurich?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may discuss exactly what Charles V's aims were. They may conclude that he wished firstly to be elected as Emperor, secondly to maintain Habsburg power there and thirdly to limit the growth of Lutheranism.

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 suggest that the relative independence of Zurich from the rule of the bishop of Constance and the consequent power of the city council allowed Zwingli to become established there. There was resentment at clerical privileges and corruption as elsewhere, but democratic discussion within the Council was very influential. In addition, Zwingli's theology attracted the people of Zurich and he was appointed as their priest. His challenges to practices like fasting in Lent and clerical celibacy began his reforms in a gradual way and led on to his proclamation of his belief that the Scriptures alone were the source of authority in the church. He defended himself ably in debates in public in 1523. His popularity was enhanced by his exposition of a moral message which encompassed aid to the poor and educational advances and these initiatives won support.

The prime factor, however, is likely to be seen as the consistent backing he enjoyed from the Council, which arose from his belief that religion should be subject to the state. Candidates could point out that his influence declined after the Colloquy of Marburg and that the aggressive policy of Zurich culminated in disaster at Keppel, although Zwinglianism did survive in a number of Swiss cantons, including Zurich under Bullinger.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under

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, punctuations 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.