

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS2B: The Church in England: The Struggle for Supremacy, 1529–1547



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS2B Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

## **AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers**

### **General Introduction by the Chief Examiner**

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

### **Unit 1**

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

## Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

## GCE History HIS2B: The Church in England: The Struggle for Supremacy, 1529–1547

### Responses to June 2009 Questions

#### Candidate 1

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to attitudes towards the clergy before the Reformation. (12 marks)

Before the Reformation, a certain amount of anticlerical hostility existed in England; Source B is testament to this as it is a contemporary source. However, there were varying motivations for criticising the clergy.

The sources agree to a certain extent that clergy were resented for wielding financial power – Source A cited ‘collecting tithes’ as a reason and suggests that higher clergy enjoyed ‘wealth and luxuries’. Source B concurs and states that ‘the best lords are theirs’ and it also mentions the ‘power, authority and obedience’ which is reflected in Source A’s ‘given its power...’

However, the sources differ to a greater extent. Source A is admmissive of some clerical failings but seems largely to be sympathetic and suggests that criticism of the clergy exists because people have an ‘ideal’ that is unfulfilled and that they are embarrassed to reveal their uncomfortable secrets... in confession’. On the other hand, Source B is more direct in its attack of the clergy using metaphors such as ‘hungry wolves’ to demonstrate the extent to which the clergy themselves are \*\*\*\*\* , and not people’s expectations. Fish who stresses that clerical failings threaten ‘you (Henry VIII)’ whereas Source A does not mention this. Source A does, however, deny ‘evidence of much opposition’ in contrast to Source B which does not directly discuss opposition, but this may be inferred from its irate tone.

In conclusion, the sources differ to a large extent in presenting attitudes towards the Reformation; although they agree that anticlericalism is justified from some perspectives, Source B, written as it was by an Evangelical Lawyer of the period, adapts a more accusatory stance.

#### **Principal Examiner’s Comments**

*This response is of an adequate length and refers to both sources. However, it only identifies one ‘difference’ in the views which relates to the payment of tithes and that is that Fish (Source B) is complaining about the payment of tithes whereas Source A is ‘commenting on it’. Where statements are made they are quite basic; the introductory statement uses the words of the question but fails to advance the argument. Comments such as ‘Fish is writing in 1529 when England was soon to be on the brink of a Reformation’ suggests own knowledge but do not really support analysis. Own knowledge should be used to develop a point not as a confirmation of the material included in the source as it is in this response ‘people had to pay tithes...to the Church’. The last comment based on own knowledge is interesting but doesn’t really explain the extent to which the sources agree or disagree.*

*This response identifies some differences and has some own knowledge. The answer is coherent. Level 2 – 4 marks.*

**Candidate 2**

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to attitudes towards the clergy before the Reformation. (12 marks)

Both source A and source B differ from each other on their views about the state of the clergy before the Reformation.

Fish (source B) is writing in 1529 when England was soon to be on the brink of a Reformation. He calls them “greedy, idle, holy thieves” which clearly shows his dislike towards them and as they are supposed to be helping the Icity spiritually, they are clearly not doing their job. He also mentions that “they take a tenth part of everyone’s wages” which I know from my own knowledge to be true, as people had to pay tithes (a tenth of all their earnings) to the Church.

This doesn’t contrast directly with source A, but it does show some differences. Whereas Fish was complaining about the behaviour of the clergy because he has experienced it, Rosman seems simply to be commenting on it. For example, “this resentment was directed against clergy who collected tithes” shows that paying tithes were a large part of complaint against the clergy. I know from my own knowledge that, unlike the rest of Europe, there wasn’t widespread criticism of the clergy and many people didn’t want to change their Church, driving reform protestes to campaign against it later on in the Pilgrimage of grace for example.

**Principal Examiner’s Comments**

*This response attempts to advance a developed analysis which identifies similarities and differences in the views of the two sources and to address the issue of ‘how far’. This approach is sustained throughout the answer ‘The sources agree to a certain extent...’ and ‘the sources differ to a greater extent’. The conclusion presents a synthesis of both ; it identifies a key issue that of anti-clericalism and explains why Source B is different from Source A in that it was written by a contemporary lawyer and has an ‘accusatory stance’. This response is of a similar length to that which was awarded 4 marks but is concise and uses own knowledge to underpin and develop the analysis rather than as stand alone material. This differs from some responses where own knowledge, often the views of historians, was included without really illuminating the analysis. The quotes used from the sources are brief and apposite rather than copied at length. This response was awarded mid level 4: it presents a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and applies own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate good contextual understanding. Level 4 – 11 marks.*

**Candidate 3**

- 1 (b) How far was the legislation which created the royal supremacy motivated by a desire to reform religion? (24 marks)

Legislation which created the royal supremacy was in part motivated by religion and the desire to reform. However other factors such as the king’s divorce, finance, and personal and national power were also key to the legislation.

Firstly, as Source C states ‘The royal supremacy... was based on anti-papalism’. This to some extent was true as there was significant belief that especially as an island, England should not be betrodden to a foreign pope. Also, the king was growing in dislike for Pope Clement VII as he refused to grant Henry a dispensation for his divorce from Catherine of Aragon and so wished to split from

Rome in order to marry Anne Boleyn. Henry VIII had always been interested in gaining more imperial power, hence the promotion of his close colleague Cardinal Wolsey to papal legate. This essentially made Wolsey 'pope in England' and so only very few matters had to be ratified with permission from Rome. He believed the English Monarch had always had full imperial power and so was keen to formally make himself head of the Spiritual and the temporal worlds in England. However, Henry's lack of action in this perpetual aspect of his rule up to this point suggests that his divorce was the more important factor in declaring his supremacy.

Further, a desire to reform religion was important in passing this legislation. For example, the Second Act of Annates (1534) gave Henry the power to appoint senior clergy in England and banned taxes from Rome. This could be argued to be part of a plan to reduce corruption and Simony in the church. Also, through this legislation absenteeism was banned through a fine of 25% the income of the perpetrator being taken if they were absent from their diocese for 6 months. This would suggest a response to popular resentment of the clergy as expressed in source A against clergy 'who failed to live up to people's ideal of what a priest should be'. Also apparent abuses of taxes as expressed in source B were combatted through the reduction of payments to Rome as achieved in the Act to stop Peter's Pence.

Thirdly, finance was probably one of the greatest motivating factors in this legislation. Henry wished, and was promised by Cromwell 'to become the richest prince in Christendom'. Both Acts of Annates and the Act to Stop Peter's pence removed huge payments to Rome which could then be redirected towards the crown. The Act for First Fruits and tenths in particular increased the crown revenue, this became increasingly important as it kept taxes low at a time of high inflation in Europe which further solidified Henry's power. Lastly, the king's great matter was probably the most important factor in the passing of this legislation. The Act of Supremacy (1534) gave Henry full power over the church in England, making sure he controlled the higher clergy eg. Thomas Cranmer, who would declare and implement Henry's divorce. The Act of Succession dealt with the consequences of the king's divorce at his death – 'Almost all of the major legislation passed in the years 1532-34 were centred around obtaining the king's divorce and ensuring that it could not be challenged in future. Henry's desire to marry Anne seems to have acted as a trigger for the change.

In conclusion, the royal divorce was the most instrumental reason for the passing of the legislation creating the royal supremacy. However other factors such as finance, power and religious reform all added, to a lesser extent to the change in laws. The divorce provided a method to gain money and power rather than them being integral motives.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The introduction to this essay has a clear focus on the issues of the question: the legislation to create the Royal Supremacy; the desire to reform religion and the other factors which were key to the matter, namely the divorce, finance and the extension of the king's power. Although the introduction doesn't present a clear judgement as to which was the most important factor this is dealt with in the conclusion where the divorce is identified as the most significant factor but the other reasons are linked to this.*

*The linkage of the factors is consistent throughout the response 'anti-papalism' is*

*contextualised to the divorce and it is demonstrated that whilst he had wanted to increase his power whilst Wolsey was Chancellor it was the need for the divorce which prompted the action. The Second Act of Annates is linked to the Church, to power and to the divorce. The response has real strengths in its use of the sources and detailed knowledge of the legislation. This response demonstrates an awareness of historical interpretations without reference to different historians. It is well focussed and closely argued. The response is supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge. Level 5 – 22 marks.*

#### **Candidate 4**

- 1 (b) How far was the legislation which created the royal supremacy motivated by a desire to reform religion? (24 marks)

The legislation which created Royal Supremacy was motivated by many things. Some would say religious reform as people like Cromwell who practically made and had the acts passed was know for being a believer in protestantism enacting change in England and by him making these rules it gave the chance to change England as it had broken the ties with Rome with the stopping of any money going towards Rome as Henry was not granted a divorce form Catherine of Aragon so he could marry new wife Anne Boleyn who he had become enfatuated with. Some would argue, like Source A that people wanted a reformation whether it be a Catholic reformation from within the Church or a whole new religion. Many would argue like Source C that there was no religous reform and the only reason why Henry became Head of the Church was so that he could finally control what he wanted like divorcing Catherine as Pope Clement was too scared as the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V was related to Catherine. Also in making Henry this powerful he could get acts passed that made saying Anne wasn't queen was punishable by death, but talking bad of pope was no longer Heresy. The fact that Henry could now decide his bishops and other positioning gave him many options that he would play with. Some would say it was a power trip by Henry who saw what he could do and how much power he had but then became influenced by people like Anne and he sort of lost his way, but when he had released the influence of other people he put his foot down, as he was still a devote Catholic and a very religious man, E.g. he had people praying for him everyday after his death. People like Fish would think that the acts came into place so that Henry got more money and power but also he would change the way in which the church ran and who ran it, people who cared and didn't take advantage of hard working people by taking, money and goods. I think the legislative which created Royal Supremacy and other acts that were passed were not just a desire to reform religion but a mixture of all different ideas and influences rolled into one, so Cromwell wanted religious reform, whereas Henry wanted the extra power and wealth but both got what they wanted.

#### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This response is undermined by weak expression and punctuation. Within the response there is some awareness of different reasons for passing the legislation which created the Royal Supremacy although these reasons are not linked to specific acts. The introduction introduces the motives of Cromwell and the conclusion makes a distinction between his and Henry's aims but this is not really followed through in the body of the essay. There is some reference of two of the sources but they are not really used effectively. There is an awareness of the*



*events of the period and some of the reasons for change. However, there is too much assertion often couched in rather loose terms and with limited punctuation for example the sentence 'Some would say it was a power trip by Henry....people like Anne and he sort of lost his way... everyday after his death.*

*The response does make some comment but with limited but relevant support. It displays limited understanding of differing historical interpretations and is weakly expressed. Level 2 – 8 marks.*

## **Candidate 5**

- 2 (a) Explain why the larger monasteries were dissolved in the late 1530s. (12 marks)

The larger monasteries by 1539 had all been dissolved, under the watchful eye of Thomas Cromwell. This proved to be a major turning point, and all stated under the appointment in 1539 of Cromwell. He promised to make Henry the “richest ruler in Christendom”, emphasising the reasoning effectively behind the dissolution. Henry’s extravagant lifestyle and large shows of wealth and pomp needed to be financed somehow. With finances running low, Cromwell looked to the European example of removing monastic life and reaping the rewards. He saw how much wealth lay behind the monasteries, as the 1535 ‘Valor Ecclesiasticus’; a report on monastic life showed how they owned 2/3 of English land. They were very wealthy, and Cromwell sought to exploit it.

After the act for dissolution of smaller monasteries in 1536, Thomas Cromwell and Henry saw how much money lay behind the monasteries. They did this under the guise of religious reform as the valor had shown evidence of large and widescale corruption. Conducted and headed by Leyton and Legh, much of the evidence was grossly exaggerated and falsified. However Cromwell had the sufficient evidence he needed to shut down the smaller monasteries, with the supposed intention of reforming them, moving the clergy to larger ones. After this act passed, Cromwell’s realisation of the true value pushed him to close the larger monasteries to gain more wealth and land. He did this by using bribes and planning the 1539 act for dissolution of larger monasteries achieving Henry £1.3 million overall. This shows why monetary and financial gains were the sole reason.

However, Cromwell, being a keen reformist and of Protestant ideals, did not believe in the notion of purgatory and thus monastic life was a waste of time, as they prayed for dead souls. In this way he adapted the European example and closed them down for his own religious beliefs.

### ***Principal Examiner’s Comments***

*This response makes significant reference to the Dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries which is used positively to explain the reasons why the king went on, advised by Cromwell, to dissolve the Larger monasteries. The reference to Valor Ecclesiasticus is used to explain how Cromwell wanted to ensure that Henry could achieve the extravagant lifestyle by creating more wealth from monastic land and property. A further reason is developed in linking the dissolution to Cromwell’s own religious beliefs and to the European example of dissolution. Where this response is limited is that it fails to develop the context of the late 1530s- the need for defences following the Truce of Nice, the defeat of the Pilgrimage of Grace and the continuing presence of the oppositional abbots and priors in the House of Lords.*

*The response provides relevant explanation backed by appropriately selected information although this is not full or comprehensive. Level 3 – 8 marks.*

### **Candidate 6**

- 2 (b) 'The main consequence of the dissolution of the monasteries was an increase in the power of the nobility.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

The impacts of the dissolution of the monasteries could effectively be divided into social, economic and religious consequences, within each positive and negative outcomes; the power of the nobility is an aspect of the social change that occurred and it is significant in highlighting the other changes that followed the dissolution of the monasteries.

The Nobility and laity indeed profited from the dissolution, because cheap sales of land allowed them to gain influence and the king enriched the nobility with gifts of land which permitted them to advance at court. However, the nobility effectively discredited their favour in the Pilgrimage of Grace, a revolt of the North of England which united all social demographics and was partly motivated by the dissolution. This was because monasteries had been instrumental in providing charity to the poor and was a supportive structure of moral life which was removed, and not replaced by any poor relief. 8000 monks and nuns were also displaced, with nuns in particular struggling to regain their livelihoods – in Lincoln, 60% of nuns were forced to live on less than £2 per year. However, six new dioceses were founded on the remains of monasteries and the King's position in promoting Cambridge University was reinstated.

Financially, £1.3 million was accrued from the dissolution, which was very important for the king's coffers; however, most of this was squandered on wars with France and Scotland in the 1540s. Two-thirds of the Church lands were sold by 1547, and in this the king lost an important source of recurring income because the Church no longer paid rents on the land. Many more coins were produced as a result of licensed vandalism of the Church buildings, but this led to eventual inflation, worsening the conditions. In this way, although dissolution was intended to relieve the need for heavy taxation, it in fact encouraged it in the long term.

In religious and cultural terms, it was a great con. Many buildings in the fine Gothic style were destroyed only to be vandalised and the destruction was strongly symbolic in terms of the changing state of religion. The number of candidates for religious appointments understandably diminished significantly which did in turn reduce the power of the conservative nobility who supported traditional Catholicism.

In conclusion, the increased power of the nobility is a matter of historical debate as although they gained power in land, their religious principles were undermined by the very act of dissolution. Arguably it was not the main consequence, as conversely, it was the ensuing social deprivation that was more acute in aggregate numbers.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*Many of the answers to this question followed a chronological approach which often became narrative descriptive. Whilst there is a clear chronological base, this response attempts to evaluate the judgement about failure within the context of what Henry was attempting to achieve. It also considers the judgement in both the short and long term making a distinction between the two. The candidate supports the analysis with appropriate detail and suggests that they are selecting supporting evidence from a wider knowledge base. Longer term outcomes of financial problems are contrasted with the public victory of securing Boulogne.*

*In this response, the understanding of the question was explicit and there was a balance demonstrated through the short and long term/ views of contemporaries and hindsight. There was a good range of supporting evidence and in the main it was well organised examining Scotland and France. To have got into level 5 the response would have had a greater emphasis on explanation and less description which could have highlighted the differing interpretations further. Level 4 – 20 marks.*