

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/13

Paper 1c (British History Outlines, 1689–2000),
maximum raw mark 90

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

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

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

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.

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.

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.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

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.

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.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 1: 1689–1760

1 Why was Britain so frequently at war in the years 1689–1714?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British foreign and diplomatic policy in the reigns of William III and Anne. The focus will be on the years of war, 1689-97 and 1702-13. Candidates should have knowledge of the War of the Grand Alliance, of the campaigns in Ireland in 1690-91 and of the War of the Spanish Succession. The emphasis, however, should not be primarily on military events but on the causes of the wars and on the key issues which were of importance to monarch and politicians. Briefly, candidates should have knowledge of: William III's conflict with Louis XIV at the time he became King of England; of James II's attempts to regain his throne, particularly via Ireland; and the Treaty with the Holy Roman Emperor and the Netherlands in 1701. They may also have knowledge of England's growing commercial influence and of the need to preserve and expand its trade routes.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the causes of Britain's frequent involvement in war. Candidates might well identify the Revolution of 1688, and especially its outcome, as an important cause of the War since James II attempted to regain his throne by his campaign in Ireland. There should also be concentration on the balance of power in Europe and, perhaps particularly, on William III's perception that France represented a threat not only to the Netherlands but to Protestant Europe and also to the balance of power. In terms of longevity of the wars (a counterpart to the 'frequency' focus of the question), candidates may argue that the regular, and sometimes convoluted, attempts to set up alliance systems helped to prolong matters, not least by stopping Louis's troops from rapidly achieving their objectives. Some candidates might argue that Britain was at war for so long in the first decade of the 18th century because the alliance systems ensured that the combatants were fairly evenly matched. Good candidates might refer to the role of the Whigs in advocating war as a means not only of checking Louis XIV but also of advancing the country's commercial interest. Also, with a genuinely 'European' monarch on the throne from 1689 to 1702 many at court were encouraged to think much more in European than in isolationist, terms. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work on the importance of the navy and also of work which stresses the geographical extent of the Spanish Succession war, which can be readily linked to the frequency and longevity of the wars.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

2 Assess the nature, and the extent, of links between the Tory party and Jacobitism in the first half of the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British political history in the first half of the eighteenth century and particularly about the strength of support for Jacobite beliefs. There should be knowledge of the plots against the Hanoverian regime, including the Atterbury Plot, as well as the full-scale rebellions of 1715 and 1745-46. Candidates should also know about the composition of the Tory party, with reference to the amount of support for the revival of a Stuart monarchy. The party contained many landowners who thought the Hanoverian regime in general - and Walpole's use of power in particular – corrupt and corrupting. There was interchange between some Tory families and the alternative Stuart court-in-exile.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about links between Toryism and Jacobitism. Good candidates should produce a balanced treatment which examines the Tory party as well as Jacobitism. On 'nature', candidates should argue about the extent of support within the Tory party and whether this increased as the Hanoverian dynasty consolidated its rule. On Jacobitism, candidates should assess the relationship with pro-Stuart elements within the Tory party. On 'extent' candidates should reach a judgement based on selection of evidence both about Tory attitudes and beliefs and the support the Jacobite cause could tap, especially when planning to unseat the Hanoverian monarchy and defeat the Whig party. Jacobite support for Britain's enemies during the War of Austrian Succession can be used to link with Tory resentment at having to pay for a war having (for them) few benefits. On the other hand, what held many Tories back from closer links with the Pretenders was their Catholicism. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate on at least partly narrative accounts of Jacobite plots accompanied by little or no analysis on the nature of the Tory party in early eighteenth-century Britain. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work which has argued that historians have underplayed the extent of at least covert Jacobitism within the Tory party, especially before the outbreak of the '15.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

3 'Walpole's domestic policy was motivated by nothing more than the desire to stay in office.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Walpole's domestic policy. Candidates should know about the key elements of his economic policy which turned on sorting out the mess created by the South Sea Bubble and then sustaining a policy of peace (which held until 1739) as a means of restoring national finances. Candidates are also likely to know about the importance of 'faction'. His policy also aimed at keeping the Tories out of office and in maintaining close political and personal relations with the courts of both George I and George II. Candidates will know that Walpole's policies were widely criticised as self-serving and designed to reward those who were, above all, uncritically loyal to him. Candidates might also make use of Walpole's preference for reducing the burden of taxation on landowners – as a means of gaining support for the Whigs. Candidates might note that Walpole's policies were increasingly criticised and that his Excise Scheme of 1734 went badly wrong, greatly increasing his unpopularity.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the aims of Walpole's domestic policy. Many candidates may argue that Walpole was self-serving and did indeed create (as intended) a 'Robinocracy'. On the other hand, his economic policy was designed to re-fill the national coffers. Walpole undoubtedly wanted approval from his fellow property-owners but candidates might argue that his policies were less solipsistic than the quotation implies. Weak students are likely to concentrate on basic statements about economic policy and to offer generalised statements, perhaps in narrative form, about Walpole's prime ministership. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of debates over the extent to which Walpole perceived policy in narrow party-political terms or whether (as he asserted) he saw party divisions as both divisive and anachronistic.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

4 How is the rapid expansion of Methodism in the years c.1740–c.1760 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the growth of Methodism during its first twenty years. Candidates should know about: the personal role of John Wesley and also of his brother Charles; Methodist doctrine and especially the role of lay, itinerant preaching; the social groups at which the Methodist ‘mission’ was pitched; the state of the Anglican church in the mid-eighteenth century.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the various factors which explain why Methodism grew so quickly. Candidates are likely to concentrate on John Wesley as a leader and on his mission to convert groups either excluded by, or neglected by, the Church of England. Other factors likely to be mentioned include: the conversion experience; the effectiveness of lay preaching; the ‘support role’ of Methodist prayer and discussion groups; the limited effectiveness of the Church of England especially in areas undergoing rapid social change, such as the new towns and the mining areas. Weaker candidates are likely to have a limited hold on specific chronology and may also neglect the negative factors, such as Anglican weaknesses. They may also give a descriptive account of Wesley’s career. This may spread well beyond c.1760. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware that although relatively little scholarly work has recently been done on the Wesleys (though popular treatments have been offered by Roy Hattersley & Ralph Waller), research on the Church of England has generally argued that it maintained a fair degree of pastoral effectiveness. This may lead candidates to argue that Wesley’s successes derived more from Methodism’s popular appeal with the urban lower orders rather than to a weak challenge from a moribund Established Church.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

5 To what extent was the Elder Pitt personally responsible for Britain’s successes in the Seven Years War?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the Seven Years War and of Britain’s role, especially in the conflict with France. The focus should be on Pitt’s personal contribution and here candidates are likely to concentrate on Pitt’s vision, especially of the need to defeat France in the colonies and especially Canada & India. Candidates should also know about the ‘diplomatic revolution’ which saw Britain closely allied to Prussia, which enabled Britain to concentrate on the war outside Europe and especially on its naval strategy.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about Pitt’s contribution to British victory. Good candidates will see that this question requires them to debate the relative importance of several linked factors. Here the relevant factors (in addition to Pitt’s personality, drive and vision) include: the strength and effectiveness of Britain’s navy, including the contribution of individual commanders; the role of Prussia in tying up France and Austria in Europe; Britain’s military campaigns in Canada & India, including Wolfe and the capture of Quebec and Clive in India. Weaker candidates are likely to produce a predominantly descriptive account either of Pitt as prime minister or of Britain’s achievements in the Seven Years War. Detail may be hazy and argument scant. Good candidates will need to consider a range of factors and adduce evidence to support statements of relative importance. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of the recent biography of Pitt the Elder by Edward Pearce and use Pearce’s generally unfavourable judgement on Pitt to argue that other factors were more important than was the Prime Minister’s direct leadership. They might also know that Peters has presented a ‘warts and all’ picture.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 2: 1760–1815

6 How effective a monarch was George III in the years 1760–84?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the early phase of George’s reign. The focus will be on effectiveness, so candidates should be expected to show understanding of: George’s use of patronage and his, probably precipitate, promotion of Bute as First Lord of the Treasury; the ministerial instability of the 1760s and George’s responsibility for this; the King’s handling of the growing conflict with the American colonies; the King’s support for the North ministry; his role in responding to the increasing discontent with the government from c.1778. Throughout, the predominant emphasis should be on the King’s constitutional role and how he interpreted this – as the first British-born Hanoverian monarch who was also determined to ‘be a king’.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the effectiveness of George III. Candidates are likely to be divided: making use of the evidence indicated in AO1 above, some will argue that the King was inexperienced, rash and evinced too strong a perception of the monarch’s role in the second half of the eighteenth century. Such candidates will argue that George’s ham-fistedness contributed substantially to the ministerial instability of the 1760s and, in so doing, was at least in part responsible for the increasingly crisis-ridden relationship with the North American colonies. It is possible that the same candidates will argue that the King chose the wrong man as prime minister in 1770 and, having done so, demonstrated characteristic Hanoverian obstinacy in keeping him in office as North’s ministry became increasingly unpopular and ineffective. On the other side of the argument, candidates might argue that George was legitimately invoking monarchical powers which remained after the Glorious Revolution and that he showed good judgement in trying to head off ‘government by faction’ or, indeed, by exceedingly posh, wealthy and – in many instances – corrupt Whig magnates. On this reading, George was a force for stability and showed increasingly good judgement. The middle way for other candidates may be the argument that George was an inexperienced monarchy in the 1760s but he learned from his mistakes. North proved a sound choice, at least in the first seven or eight years of his ministry and the relationship between First Lord and monarch showed how stability and even a legitimate ‘separation of powers’ which the American colonists were learning from Enlightenment tutors, could be sustained in Britain. Weaker candidates may offer a rather generalised and/or descriptive account which fails to engage sufficiently with issues relating to George’s competence to rule or to his objectives. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of the rather higher reputation which George III now has and might use the reinterpretation of North’s role as prime minister to argue the most positive case for royal effectiveness.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

7 Assess the view that Britain’s strategy and tactics during the war against the American colonies were ‘fundamentally flawed’.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the American Revolution and, in particular, British strategy and tactics during the war. Candidates are likely to have knowledge of the circumstances in which the war began, including the extent to which Britain was able to prevent armed hostilities. They should also know about: the British government’s strategy; the key conflicts (particularly, perhaps, Lexington, Trenton, Saratoga and the Yorktown surrender), the role of military commanders (Howe, Burgoyne, Clinton and, on the American side, Washington) and about the significance of French & Spanish intervention

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about Britain’s strategy and tactics during the War for Independence. Candidates are likely to discuss factors such as: Britain’s naval strategy & the problems of linking naval and military efforts across what were, in effect, 3000 miles of disputed territory; whether Britain made enough of the goodwill which continued to exist in many of the southern states and whether Britain over-estimated the extent of loyalism, especially in the North; Britain’s employment of mercenaries, which inflamed the colonists; the competence, or otherwise of British commanders and especially their response to the colonists’ guerrilla tactics; whether isolated military victories could have been worked into a conventional military strategy to defeat colonists who had been buoyed by victories such as those at Trenton (Dec 1776 & Jan 1777); whether large British forces in Canada could have been used more effectively further south. Most are likely to agree with the assessment in the question, although with some reservations, it remains possible to argue that, once the French entered the war, British victory against a tenacious foe fighting on its own soil would have been difficult, however effective strategy and tactics. Weaker candidates are likely to produce unbalanced and partial answers, perhaps with no distinction drawn between strategy and tactics. They may also concentrate excessively on key battles with little or no consideration of wider strategic issues. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of revisionist work which suggests that British military commanders were not as incompetent as used to be thought and that more weight might be given to the implications of the British government’s over-confidence about the outcome of the war and the over-estimation of Loyalist strength and ability to fight in support of British rule.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 12 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

8 How is Britain's 'national revival' in the years 1783–93 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain in the first decade of Pitt's prime ministership. Good candidates should recognise the significance of the phrase 'national revival' and realise that this involves both political and economic factors. They are likely to know about: the younger Pitt's leadership, his political abilities and the securing a majority in the Commons from 1784 onwards; two more or less coherent party groupings (Pittite and Foxite) vying for supremacy, rather than confused, and often temporary, faction and family groupings; Pitt's administrative and fiscal reforms; the reduction of Britain's debt; the growth of the British economy and the impact of the growth of the textile industries. It is acceptable to see this question as one concerned with British domestic affairs, though material on Britain's foreign policy, if securely linked to the issue of stability and growing national prestige is acceptable.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of several linked causes of Britain's revival from both political turmoil and military defeat in America. Candidates will make use of the factors indicated under AO1. They might give more attention to political factors, including Pitt's steady leadership, than to economic ones but good candidates should see that there is an economic dimension to the 'revival' since Britain was in the process of establishing itself as the world's leading industrial power. Weaker candidates may produce answers which lack both balance and precision (e.g. about political developments and the performance of economy. Some may present an answer more or less totally concerned with an evaluation of Pitt's leadership. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may use recent work on the Younger Pitt, not least by William Hague, which continues to give emphasis to his political abilities and to his generally effective administrative and fiscal reforms.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 13 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

9 Assess the political importance of Edmund Burke.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Burke both as a Whig politician and as a political thinker. Candidates should know that Burke’s writings, especially on America and on the impact of the French Revolution, have been seen as seminal contributions to the development of modern Conservatism. Key works are *Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontents* (1770) and *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790). He also believed in the importance of government in the hands of men of property. Candidates should know about Burke’s political role, especially in: supporting the American colonists’ struggle for independence; as a Foxite Whig; and latterly in breaking with Fox over the French Revolution. He produced articulate answers to the growing pressure for democratic reforms. Candidates may also know about his role in attacking the East India Company and in pursuing the impeachment of Warren Hastings and his attack on the Pitt government for trying to agree peace terms with France in 1796.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about Burke’s political importance. Candidates are likely to concentrate on: his contribution to the debate on America and its independence; his challenge to the power of the King in the late 1760s and early 1770s, which he considered unconstitutional; and, perhaps especially, his role in attacking the French Revolutionaries (and in denying that 1789 was a French re-run of England’s ‘Glorious Revolution’), which led to his break with France and the split in the Whig party, which gave Pitt an unassailable majority in the Commons from 1794. Good candidates will use a selection of evidence along these lines to assess Burke’s importance both as a thinker and as a politician. Most will argue that Burke’s writings and speeches did alter contemporary perceptions, despite the fact that Burke never held high office. Those who argue ‘against the grain’ might suggest that, although Burke was articulate and persuasive, most of the developments with which he was associated would have happened anyway and that his ideas about government remaining in the hands of a small, socially select minority, came under increasing challenge. Weaker candidates are likely to produce either a limited biography of Burke or a chronological skewed treatment, possibly with excessive concentration on the 1770s or, more likely, on the impact of the French Revolution. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent writings (not least by Boyd Hilton) which suggest that Burke’s thoughts, though influential, were not novel and that others were more effective than Burke in ensuring that support for loyalism against ‘republicanism and democracy’ grew rapidly after 1789.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 14 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

10 'Britain was in much greater danger of defeat by the French in the Revolutionary War of the 1790s than it was during the Napoleonic War of 1803–15.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the two wars Britain fought against France in the period specified. Candidates should know about the key stages of the two wars, including awareness of the importance of both naval and landed conflict in both wars. Candidates should also be aware of Britain's role in forming and sustaining anti-French alliances. It is also relevant to mention French attempts to mount an invasion of the British Isles, particularly in the 1790s but also in the period 1803–05.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about which of the two wars against France in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries presented the greater threat to Britain. Good candidates will see that they need to identify the factors which presented greater peril to Britain. Thus, Napoleon might be entirely dominant on mainland Europe (as he was in 1806–08) without offering a direct short-term threat to Britain, since after Trafalgar he had no realistic prospect of transporting and invasion army to Britain's shores. Candidates could also stress the economic dimension. Britain might have been in greater peril in the 1790s because of a financial crisis caused, in significant part, by wartime interruption to the country's lucrative trade routes. Also, France had developed invasion plans, via both Ireland and Wales, in the mid-late 1790s. It could be argued that Ireland's new status as part of the United Kingdom lessened the invasion threat. On the other hand, candidates might argue that Napoleon's sheer power at the height of his influence could have over-ridden other disadvantages. Britain might have been starved out of war by the Continental System had it not been for Wellington's ability to create a 'Spanish ulcer' for Napoleon during the Peninsular Wars and thus help to keep some commercial activities going. Weaker candidates may default to narratives of key battles. Alternatively, they may offer significantly unbalanced treatments with more on Napoleon, for example, than on the Revolutionary war of 1793-1802. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work of recent work by Charles Esdaile on the French wars, which offers new perspectives on the reasons for the fragility of anti-French coalitions before c.1813.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 15 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 3: Themes 1689–c.1815

11 Why was opposition to British rule in Ireland so much greater in the period c.1770 to c.1815 than in the period 1689 to c.1770?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the relationship between Britain and Ireland over the course of the eighteenth century. They should have knowledge of William III's 'Protestant' success over James II's forces and its implications for Protestant domination over Catholics in Ireland. They should also know about how Britain ruled Ireland. After 1770, candidates may refer to the inspiration taken by nationalists from the American colonists' success over Britain and they should know that Ireland was regarded as a base from which France, and other hostile powers, might launch an invasion. Candidates should know about nationalist and 'terrorist' activity, with French help, in the 1790s. Irish hostility to the passing of an Act of Union is likely to be a key element in many answers.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for the greater intensity of opposition to British rule in Ireland in the latter selected period than in the former. Drawing on information under AO1, good candidates should attempt a treatment which is chronologically balanced and which concentrates on the reasons for hostility. Candidates are likely to note that, although the Protestant Ascendancy was a constant feature throughout the eighteenth century, Britain exerted tighter controls over Ireland when its own security was threatened, as happened in the 1790s. Britain's security was hardly threatened in the first period. In the second, the limitations of Grattan's parliament are an important feature, as attempts at invasion of Britain. The Act of Union provided a sharp focus for nationalist challenge, since few Catholics accepted it. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the nature of the Protestant Ascendancy and on regional variations in support for nationalism in Ireland.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 16 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

12 To what extent did Britain experience an ‘agricultural revolution’ during the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain’s agricultural development in the eighteenth century. The focus will be on making a judgement on the extent of agricultural progress. Candidates are likely to have information on the following areas: the development of ‘new’ crops; agricultural reorganisation via enclosure; in predominantly pastoral areas, experiments with breeds and the development of more specialist markets; in predominantly arable areas, new crop rotations, reductions in the extent of fallow land; the links between scientific and agricultural experiments; parliamentary enclosure; the dissemination of new ideas via specialist magazines and societies. Some candidates may concentrate on ‘improvers’ such as Tull, Townshend, Marshall and Young

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about whether the changes referred to in AO1 above deserve, as a package, to be called revolutionary. Good candidates must – at least implicitly – make clear how they would justify (or challenge) the description ‘revolutionary’. Most are likely to argue that they were. Britain was able to feed a population which doubled in the eighteenth century and moves towards greater efficiency and productivity involving substantial innovation. On the other side of the coin, candidates may note that agricultural machinery made only a very limited contribution to eighteenth century agricultural developments and so contrasted with the main forces behind the so-called ‘industrial revolution’. Some may argue that continuity, albeit affected by innovation, was more important than change. By 1800, more than 70% of Britain’s working population remained on the land. Weaker candidates are likely to avoid offering any criteria for ‘revolutionary’ and to provide predominantly descriptive accounts either of new developments or key ‘improvers’ or both. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on agricultural developments which tend to stress impressive regional performance rather than any kind of ‘take-off’ into a nationally acknowledged revolution in agricultural productivity.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 17 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

13 How far was eighteenth-century British society dominated by its aristocracy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British society in the eighteenth century. They should know that it remained predominantly rural and that disproportionate wealth was held by a small number of great landowners – almost all of whom had titles. Candidates should have knowledge of: the social role of the aristocracy and its relationship with smaller landowners and tenants; the judicial role of the aristocracy, particularly as Justices of the Peace; the political role of aristocracy, including use of patronage and nepotism to fill key political and administrative posts; the aristocracy as holders and developers of urban land.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the extent of aristocratic dominance. Most are likely to argue that the aristocracy was a dominant social and political force and candidates will need to select information (see AO1 above) which demonstrates that dominance. On the other hand, it is possible (just about!) to argue that aristocratic dominance can be exaggerated. In some new or rapidly expanding industrial and mining towns, great landowners remained the key urban developers. In most others, initiatives were increasingly taken by a successful & entrepreneurial bourgeoisie. Some of the most effective and assiduous members of the House of Commons were lawyers and professionals rather than the relatives of the aristocracy, who dominated numerically throughout the eighteenth century. Some candidates may argue that the social role of the established gentry is easily under-estimated. Weaker candidates are likely to offer a generalised treatment which concentrates on some aspects of the aristocracy's role rather than on a discussion of social 'dominance' grounded in selection of precise evidence. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by social and political historians, especially on how the aristocracy came to be involved in the expansion of mining and of urban development. The British aristocracy was never a closed caste.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 18 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

14 How is the rapid growth of British population in the eighteenth century best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the growth of Britain’s population in the eighteenth century. The focus will be on making a judgement about the relative importance of several linked factors. Well-informed candidates should know about: a substantial rise in the birth rate; a decline in the death rate; the role of immigration and emigration; changes in health provision – especially the foundation of hospitals; factors affecting the age of marriage; increased levels of illegitimacy especially in the rapidly growing ‘new’ towns. Candidates might also be aware that population growth rates were much higher in the second half of the century than the first and strong candidates will probably need to use this information in their explanations.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for British population growth and especially on determining which factors are most important. Good candidates should go beyond straightforward explanations of the reasons for birth-rate increase and death-rate decline to produce explanations which note, for example, why birth-rates are particularly high in certain areas – particularly the new towns which were experiencing high levels of in-migration of young (and therefore disproportionately fertile) adults in search of work. Similarly, they may wish to argue that ‘birth-rate’ explanations are more important than ‘death-rate’ ones. They may also know that population hardly increased in the first thirty years of the eighteenth century (the 1720s almost certainly witnessed a decrease) before much more rapid growth from c.1750. Strong candidates are likely to link population increase to increases in economic activity since these tend to lower the age of first marriage of women – especially in urban areas. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate, usually in a rather general way, on birth-rate and death-rate changes. Their accounts may include some descriptive material as, for example, on the development of hospitals in urban areas, when abler candidates might query the efficacy of hospitals given their extremely limited strategies for containing the spread of infectious disease among already ill patients. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by the so-called ‘Cambridge School’ whose development of ‘family reconstruction’ has given much sharper insights into factors determining population change.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 19 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

15 How much did the early phase of Britain’s industrial revolution (c.1750–c.1815) owe to the expansion of British overseas trade?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain’s industrial growth in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The focus will be on making a judgement about the relative importance of several linked causes. On the expansion of overseas trade, candidates should have knowledge about: long-established trade routes to northern Europe for wool and timber; the growth of trade with southern Europe and North Africa; the substantial expansion of trade with the American colonies, including Canada and the West Indies; the growth of trade with India and the attempt, not always successful, to open up the Far East to British trade. Other relevant factors are: the growth of the internal market, including a wealthy upper middle and aristocratic class keen to consume; a growing population as a platform for economic growth; the spread of learning, especially of economics; the impact of ingenuity in terms of the development of new machinery, especially in the textile industry.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its relatively broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of one selected factor – the expansion of overseas trade - in explaining industrial growth. Good candidates will understand that they should weigh the importance of this factor against others, although it is legitimate and appropriate to investigate the selected factor in greatest detail. Drawing on some of the factors mentioned in AO1, they need to reach a conclusion about the importance of overseas trade. Most will argue that it was very important, although strong candidates are likely to make caveats. Overseas trade (both imports and exports) expanded rapidly, especially in the Americas, but there was volatility. On this, they might note that the growing conflict with the north American colonies affected trade in the later 1770s. Similarly, some overseas trade – particularly with the Far East - was speculative until after 1815. Candidates might argue that the expansion of domestic demand in a society characterised by growing prosperity was a more secure and, overall, a more important factor than was overseas trade, not least since it was easier for manufacturers to make calculations about risk and expansion on the basis of generally secure domestic demand. On the other hand, the cotton textile industry was more or less wholly dependent on overseas trade from the southern colonial states of America and from India for its raw materials. Weaker candidates may produce answers which attempt to explain why Britain had an industrial revolution but with only limited detail. Some may ignore the ‘relative importance’ element to the question altogether. Alternatively, they may essay a sketchy overseas trade *tour d’horizon* which makes only occasional references to the connection between trade and industrial growth. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work which has argued that the role of domestic demand has, until recently, been underplayed and that overseas trade has received excessive attention in explaining early industrial growth because it was more pioneering and eye-catching.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 20 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 21 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

16 What best explains developments in *either* architecture or the novel during this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of either architecture or the novel. The focus will be on making a judgement on the relative importance of different factors in explaining key developments. In architecture, the relevant factors are likely to include: the impact of classicism and the impact of Roman and Greek styles; the ‘discovery’ of Palladio; greater economic prosperity; the desire of the aristocracy for eye-catching and status-defining building; urban architecture with town houses for the aristocracy and upper middle classes; the development from austere classicism into more exotic forms, such as the Gothic revival and oriental architecture, from the late eighteenth century. Candidates are likely to know something about Kent, Adam and Nash among others. In explaining developments in the novel, the relevant factors are likely to include: the emergence of a disciplined form of story-telling from previously long narratives; greater emphasis on character and character development; the emergence of a larger, literate middle class; the role of pioneers such as Defoe, Richardson, Fielding and Stern before the emergence of Austen, Scott and the Brontes. Given the phrasing of the question, it is acceptable for candidates to offer treatment which concentrates either on the eighteenth century or the early nineteenth. 1815 should not be seen as a rigid cut-off point.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology, although some chronological concentration is acceptable. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about relevant factors affecting one or other of two important social and cultural developments. Good candidates will investigate a range of factors and make a reasoned case about relative importance. Some will argue the importance of individual genius than will others, who might concentrate more on the social context. Weaker candidates are likely to produce largely descriptive accounts of developments, perhaps concentrating excessively on what particular architects built or novelists wrote. Some weaker candidates will write, for example, about plots and plot development in a way which is much more appropriate on an English paper than a History one. The distinguishing factors between good and less good work are likely to be the range of factors adduced and the security of the historical context presented. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by cultural historians many of whom give a much greater emphasis to text than to context. It is important that answers so informed focus on the historical dimension rather than on architectural technique or literary criticism.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 22 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 4: 1815–1868

17 Why was Lord Liverpool prime minister for so long?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the 2nd Earl of Liverpool and of his ministry. Candidates should know about: how Liverpool became prime minister; his abilities and his defects; how he handled an able but fractious cabinet; the nature of the Tory party; Whig difficulties and the Grenvillite defection. Since the focus will be on the longevity of the ministry, candidates should therefore be aware that it survived until 1827 and was only ended by the prime minister's illness. Candidates should be aware of key phases in the ministry, particularly the period from 1815-20 which was characterised by economic retrenchment after the French Wars and by widespread radical activity. Candidates may well call the last four-five years of the ministry as a period of 'Liberal Toryism', when Peel, Huskisson and Robinson come to the fore, instituting a number of economic and administrative reforms and when Canning takes over as foreign secretary from Castlereagh. Candidates should also know how Liverpool's ministry handled the increasingly divisive issue of Catholic Emancipation.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of a number of linked factors in explaining why Liverpool's ministry lasted so long. Some candidates may argue that the injection of 'new blood' in 1822–23 was critical. Others may lay the stress on improved economic circumstances which took the pressure off the ministry. Some might argue that one important reason was the ineptitude of George IV who wished to get rid of Liverpool over the Queen Caroline divorce issue but who was successfully faced down by what was, in effect, a united Cabinet. Good candidates are likely to pay attention to the travails of the Whigs and the unpopularity with a propertied electorate with the kind of even mild radical policies espoused by the likes of Grey and Brougham. Some might argue that long ministries were the norm rather than the exception in late c18th and early c19th politics. That line of reasoning might lead to analogies with North (twelve years as prime minister) and Pitt, who was prime minister continuously for more than seventeen. Weaker answers are likely to be excessively biographical and/or to rely more on general observations about Liverpool than on discussing specific issues such as the nature of his leadership. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of attempts to rescue Liverpool from Disraeli's famous 'arch mediocrity' put-down. On the other hand, Boyd Hilton has pointed to substantial flaws in Liverpool's political make-up in looking to external factors to explain the length of his prime ministership.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 23 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

18 To what extent do the 1830s deserve to be considered ‘a decade of reform’?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the political history of the 1830s, with special emphasis on issues relating to change and reform. Candidates should have knowledge of at least some of: the reform crisis and the nature of the 1832 Reform Act; the Factory Act of 1833; poor law reform; administrative reform, including municipal corporations; the beginning of state involvement in education provision; reform of many of the abuses of the Church of England.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the extent of reform enacted in the 1830s. Some candidates may argue that the range of reform justified the phrase used in the question; others may concentrate more on political reform and reach a judgement about how radically central and local government were reformed. Good candidates are likely to reflect on how important reform legislation was and may argue about its short-term and perhaps also its longer-term impact. Some may argue against validity of ‘a decade of reform’. Such an approach is likely to include discussion of: the limited changes brought about by the 1832 Reform Act; more continuity than change in the existing power structure, especially at national level. Good candidates might also argue that the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act introduced a radical reappraisal of poor relief provision, by imposing cost-effective criteria which adversely affected many working people. Similarly, the limited range of the 1833 Factory Act might suggest that reform was restricted, cautious and anyway poorly implemented in many areas. Weaker answers are likely to provide a predominantly descriptive approach with few, if any, criteria provided by which to judge whether the 1830s was characterised primarily by radical reform. A number of weaker answers are also likely to be limited in range, concentrating more or less exclusively on the impact of the First Reform Act. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent attempts to argue that, despite many weaknesses (especially, perhaps, in economic management) the Whig ministries of 1830-41 were effective and radical at least in their determination to tackle big topics which their predecessors had either neglected or ignored.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 24 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

19 How well did the foreign policies of Palmerston and Aberdeen serve Britain’s interests in the 1830s and 1840s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British foreign policy in the 1830s and 1840s. Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of at least some of the following: establishment of Greek and Belgian independence; Quadruple Alliance 1834; Turkey, the Mehemet Ali affair and the Convention of the Straits; imperial developments; the first Anglo-Chinese war and the Treaty of Nanking, 1842; the Webster-Ashburton Treaty and the agreed frontier between USA and Canada; the Oregon Treaty, 1846.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the alignment of British foreign policy with the national interest. Good candidates are likely to offer some discussion of what constituted British national interests by discussing the importance of securing peace and stability in Europe and preventing any one nation from becoming excessively powerful; conditions which favoured the expansion of British trade and markets for raw materials and British manufactured goods. Critics of foreign policy may argue that developments which proved to be outside British control saw Europe increasingly divided into an autocratic East and a liberal-constitutional West and that Britain needed to react to developments rather than take a clear lead. Other may argue that the settlement of the Greek and Belgian independence accorded well with Britain’s national interests. Similarly, the settlement of border disputes with the USA ushered in a period usually characterised by increasing awareness of mutual interests. Some candidates might argue that Palmerston’s ‘deft and boorish pragmatism’ produced short-term results but increased the wariness with which the European powers viewed Britain. It could be argued that neither Palmerston nor Aberdeen was able to do much to check the increasing influence of Russia in South-East Europe. There is scope for a wide variety of treatments and it is unrealistic to expect detailed coverage of all areas. Good candidates will concentrate on identifying ‘national interests’ and on determining how well they were safeguarded. Weaker candidates may produce unbalanced answers with much more on Palmerston than on Aberdeen and a concentration on description and on personality rather than an unravelling of the key issues relating to British power and influence. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work stressing the centrality of Britain’s imperial concerns in this period. There is little recent work on traditional ‘foreign policy’ issues unlinked to Britain’s imperial and ‘world role’.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 25 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

20 To what extent may Chartism be considered as a successful movement?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the Chartist movement. Candidates should have knowledge of: the origins of the Chartist movement; the nature and objectives of the Charter; the Chartist petitions and their fate; ‘physical force’ and ‘moral force’ Chartism; Chartist leadership; wider Chartist objectives – social, religious and educational.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the extent of Chartist success as a movement, if any. Many candidates will argue that the Chartist movement was not successful because none of its six points were achieved while the movement was active. This approach can be strengthened by stressing that the six points were all specific and, in particular, all political. Thus, the movement deserves to be judged by its own objectives. On this criterion, it failed and its failure was the greater because too many of its leaders (and especially O’Connor, perhaps) were guilty of raising working-class aspirations a long way beyond the immediately practicable. There is, of course, a broader approach and one which is likely to be disproportionately attractive to abler candidates able to encompass the wider context. This approach is likely to note: the strength and enduring legacy of Chartist organisation; its role in giving working people a social and cultural focus; Chartism’s success in keeping political representation at, or near, the core of contemporary political debate; Chartism’s role as an educator; its longer-term impact on working-class organisation; the close relationship between Chartism and increasingly numerous and self-confident religious nonconformity. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent attempts to rehabilitate O’Connor as a successful even (for some) a visionary leader and to emphasise Chartism’s contribution to raising the political awareness of working-class women. Either emphasis is likely to produce answers which argue against the proposition that Chartism was a complete failure.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 26 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

21 What best explains why Conservatives were so rarely in office in the 1850s and 1860s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the Conservative party in the 1850s and 1860s. Candidates are likely to have knowledge of: the split of 1846 and the loss of a disproportionate amount of its up-and-coming talent; the ‘Peelite’ phenomenon and the only limited rapprochement with the Conservative party; the ‘rump’ of Conservatism as predominantly rural and Anglican at a time when Britain was becoming increasingly urban and also nonconformist in religious allegiance; the growing strength of the Liberal party and the ability of its leaders especially, perhaps, Palmerston and, from 1859, Gladstone; general election results in 1847, 1852, 1857, 1859, 1865 and 1868 confirmed the Tories as the consistently minority party – despite the near thing in 1859; the weakness of Conservative party organisation and Derby’s somewhat superior and disdainful attitude to it; party free-trade and *laissez-faire* as predominantly ‘Liberal’ policies in this period.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on the relative importance of several linked factors relating to the Conservative party in the 1850s and 1860s. Many candidates will identify two or three of the factors identified in AO1 in order to explain which they consider the most important. Some may argue that this period shows that coalition (Aberdeen’s) and even minority (Derby’s and, very briefly, Disraeli’s) governments could chalk up significant achievements and parliamentary arithmetic ensured that conservative interests would be in a minority in coalition governments. Some good candidates may argue that the base of the party’s support (rural, English and Anglican) in these decades was too narrow. Others will see the failure of the Peelites to agree on a programme to reunite the Tory Party as the critical factor. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent two-volume biography of Derby by Angus Hawkins, which casts fresh light on the Conservatives’ problems in this period. Those familiar with Hawkins’s conclusions are less likely to argue that lack of competence and ability was the key disadvantage for the Conservatives at this time.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 27 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 5: 1868–1914

22 Assess the claims of Gladstone’s first ministry (1868–74) to be considered ‘a great reforming administration’.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Gladstone’s first ministry. The focus will be on its achievements and (under AO2) candidates will be expected to judge the administration’s effectiveness. To do this, they should have knowledge of the key points of legislation, including: the disestablishment of the Irish Church and the subsequent Irish Land Act; Cardwell’s army reforms; Forster’s Education Act; the ending of imprisonment for debt; the abolition of religious tests for entrance to Oxford and Cambridge Universities; the establishment of the Local Government Board; the Public Health Act; legal recognition of trade unions (although under considerable restriction, including continued liability to prosecution and no right to picket peacefully); the Licensing Act.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about whether this should be considered a great reforming administration. Drawing on the kind of evidence indicated in AO1, most candidates are likely to argue that the administration passed a great deal of legislation, the main direction of which was reformist, albeit within an economy characterised by free markets and *laissez-faire*. For some, the absence of much in the way of ‘collectivist’ legislation will be sufficient to deny Gladstone’s ministry the title ‘great’. On the other hand, the legislation of the ministry ranged widely and did attempt to make local government, for example, more efficient, more consistent and more ‘rational’. Strong candidates will see that passing legislation which proved controversial and electorally unpopular – as with the Licensing Act – does not necessarily provide evidence that this was less than a ‘great reforming ministry’, though some candidates may well argue that moderating tensions between ‘Whig’, landowning, elements and ‘radical’ urban ones presented Gladstone with a substantial challenge. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on Gladstone which emphasises his political shrewdness, not to say duplicity, at least as much as his Peelite adherence to rational reform.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 28 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

23 'In the years 1874–85, the objectives of Conservative and Liberal foreign and imperial policies were characterised more by similarity than by difference.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British foreign and imperial policy in the period 1874-85. The focus will be on a comparison between Gladstone and Disraeli and (under AO2) candidates will be expected to make a judgement between similarity and difference. Candidates should have knowledge of: the scope of the British empire; the key objectives of British foreign policy, especially, perhaps, in South-East Europe; checking Russian expansion in the Balkans; British policy in India; southern Africa, including the Zulu and First Boer Wars; the Sudan; policy in Egypt, including the purchase of Suez Canal shares; the Scramble for Africa.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about whether Conservative and Liberal foreign policies were more similar than different. Good candidates are likely to see, and probably explain, why a superficial study of the two prime ministers might suggest difference. They had very different styles and views about what constituted 'moral' foreign policy in the national interest. Disraeli's creation of an 'Empress of India' had more symbolic than practical effect and it is likely that the idea would not have crossed Gladstone's mind. On the face of it, too, Disraeli's foreign policy is more overtly warlike and bombastic and almost came to war over Russia in the Balkans. However, it is possible to argue that, style and presentation apart, there is more similarity than difference in the core objectives: both ministries had similar imperial aims – to exploit the empire more as a commercial and colonial resource than as territory *per se*; both ministries fought wars in southern Africa; arguably Gladstone's policy in Egypt was as direct and expansionist as anything embraced by Disraeli; beneath the rhetoric, Gladstone's ministry was no less concerned about Russian expansionism than Disraeli's had been although his second ministry coincided with a period of relative tranquillity in the Balkans; both prime ministers were suspicious of French motives in North Africa and both intervened to check France's becoming dominant in the area. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the Empire which tends to play down any significant difference between Gladstone and Disraeli in this area.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 29 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

24 Explain why trade unionism became such a substantial force in Britain in the years c.1880–1914.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the development of British trade unionism in the selected period. The focus will be an explanation of the increasing influence of trade unions and (under AO2) candidates will be expected to judge the reasons why this happened. Candidates should have knowledge of: the legal battles over the status of unions & the rights of trade unionists and how these were resolved; the growing membership of trade unions, especially after 1888 (membership doubled in the 1890s and doubled again in the period c.1900–14); the growth of ‘unskilled unions’; the generally supportive relationship between the Liberal party and the Unions; the increasing influence of mining, metals and transport-based unions.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for increased trade union power and influence in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Using themes identified in AO1, good candidates are likely to argue that economic and legal circumstances worked in the favour of trade unions, whose powers increased over the period. Economic expansion in the new metals industries presented unions with greater bargaining power while economic conditions enabled trade union leaders to test out their strength in strikes during periods when labour was much in demand. Although the Liberal party did not go out of its way to select working men as candidates, the election of a Liberal majority in 1906 worked in Unions’ favour. The creation of a Labour Representation Committee (Labour party from 1906) gave unions much more direct representation in Westminster. Good candidates will weigh factors such as these and explain which they considered the most important. Some candidates might argue that the desire of a predominantly anti-trade union Conservative party to win the votes of unskilled workers helped the Unions to see off a raft of anti-Union measures and legal judgements. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate on a descriptive account of ‘new unions’ with limited reference to causal factors and probably no consideration of the relative importance of any causes identified. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on political culture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries which explains why trade union leaderships generally eschewed socialism and worked with Labour party leaders to secure greater legal protection and rights, via ‘contracting out’ over the use of funds were used.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 30 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

25 Which do you consider the greater achievement of the Liberal governments of 1905–14: social reforms or constitutional change?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of social and constitutional reforms in the selected years. The focus will be on a comparison between social reform and constitutional change and (under AO2) candidates will be expected to judge the relative importance of Liberal achievements in these two areas. Candidates should have knowledge of the key issues: a) *the constitution* – the role of the House of Lords and its use of the veto over Commons majorities; ‘Peers v People’ and the role of Lloyd George in his ‘People’s Budget’; the role of the monarch during the constitutional crisis and the changes brought about by the Parliament Act. b) *social reforms* – candidates will need to select from a large number but most will see the most important as being – school medical inspections; free school meals; Old Age Pensions; Labour Exchanges; National Insurance against sickness and unemployment.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of social reforms and constitutional change. Drawing on the kind of evidence indicated in AO1, candidates need to select evidence in support of their reasoned choice. On the face of it, most are likely to select social reforms, since they seem the most radical and make greatest impact on the lives of ordinary people. Good candidates might also note that these reforms derive from a newly dominant social perspective embraced by Liberal radicals: the changing role of the state and the side-lining of *laissez-faire*. The Liberals also embraced redistributive taxation as a means of raising money to fund welfare schemes. It is, of course, possible to take a different view. Without a Parliament Act of the kind eventually passed by the Liberals, little of this social legislation and none of the redistributive taxation would have reached the statute book. Liberals also argued, with some justice, that the Lords (which tended to nod through Conservative legislation and which used to be somewhat more ‘party-blind’ when both parties favoured local legislation and low taxation) was abusing its powers by vetoing legislation on party-political grounds. Constitutional reform was, therefore, a necessary pre-requisite of welfare legislation and an expanded social role for the government. Weaker candidates will not get this far. Most will stick to their knowledge of constitutional and social reforms, which may be generalised and/or unbalanced in focus, and present what they know in predominantly descriptive mode. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the changing political culture which affected perceptions of the proper role of the state in the early twentieth century. Much of this work examines the scope and nature of, and the motivation for, the opposition which the Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith governments faced.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 31 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

26 What best explains why Britain went to war in 1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the origins of Britain’s involvement in the First World War. The focus will be on the factors which led to Britain’s declaration of war and (under AO2) candidates will be expected to judge the relative importance of several linked factors. Candidates should have knowledge of the key issues and developments, including: growing rivalry with Germany; increased British naval expenditure in response to German naval laws (1899); naval rivalry as a cause of deteriorating Anglo-German relations; the Kaiser’s hostility to British supremacy; the development of alliance systems, including the Anglo-French *ententes*; their (largely unintended) development into armed camps by 1914; fragility of the situation in South-East Europe; implications of the Sarajevo assassinations on the reaction of Great Powers locked into alliance systems; British treaty obligations, especially towards Belgium in the face of German attack.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about whether the relative importance of several linked factors. Drawing on the kind of evidence indicated in AO1, candidates need to give weight to the different factors involved. Many good candidates will wish to deal separately with long-term and short-term factors and some will argue that the short-term factors were more important, since few leading diplomats and rulers considered Europe on the brink of a major war at the beginning of 1914. Furthermore, earlier conflicts in the Balkans from 1908 had all been contained in their scope. On the other hand, the combination of militarization and the development of alliance systems provided a potent backdrop to conflict. Good candidates will select precise material in order to reach a clear conclusion about which factors were more, and which less, important. Weaker candidates are likely not to distinguish between long and short-term factors, reveal important gaps in explanation and may also produce generalised and unbalanced answers which concentrate on causation only intermittently. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware that, after many scholarly vicissitudes, recent work has tended once more to put the bulk of blame for the outbreak of a European War on Germany and particularly on its military culture and the headstrong nature of its Kaiser.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 32 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 6: Themes, c.1815–c.1914

27 How important was the impact of the Irish potato famine in changing relations between Britain and Ireland from 1815 to 1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of relations between Britain and Ireland during the selected period. The focus will be on making a judgement on the importance of one selected factor which influenced relations between the two countries. Candidates should have broad knowledge about these relations, with specific knowledge about the impact of the potato famine, including: Irish opposition to the formation of a United Kingdom in 1801 and to how power was exercised; the growth of nationalism from O’Connell onwards; the severity of the Irish famine and the widespread belief that its impact could have been mitigated by more enlightened and sympathetic treatment from Britain; the impact of large-scale emigration from Ireland; anti-Irish hostility within Britain; the growth of violent opposition to the Union – Fenians and the Irish Republican Brotherhood; Gladstone’s attempts to achieve Home Rule for Ireland to reduce hostility and its failure. Underpinning this is the perception that Anglo-Irish relations became more fractious, especially after c.1850.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its relatively broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the importance of the Potato Famine to relations between British and Ireland. Good candidates should be able to construct arguments which enable them to make a judgement. Most will argue that the Potato Famine was very important, since so many nationalists saw it as compelling evidence that Britain, faced with a crisis in its ‘other island’ did less than it could or should have done to mitigate suffering and to minimize emigration. Candidates may make a link with emigration and the rise of violence with much support for the Catholic Nationalist cause coming from Irish emigrants to the USA. These factors need to be weighed against others, such as those identified in AO1 above. Some candidates might argue that Britain’s handling of the Famine was a specific instance of a wider phenomenon: hostility between Protestant and Catholic and the Catholic perception that, largely because of patterns of landownership, Protestants in Ireland were more prosperous and less vulnerable than were Catholics. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on Irish nationalism and cultural identity from which candidates might infer that the concept of a United Kingdom never had much purchase in Ireland, except in the capital and predominantly Protestant Ulster.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 33 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

28 'Britain's economic growth in the first half of the nineteenth century was too uneven to be considered truly impressive.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain's economic development in the first half of the nineteenth century. The focus will be on making a judgement on how impressive economic growth was. Candidates should have broad knowledge about the performance of the economy and will be able to provide some precise information about economic growth, perhaps relating to the growth of manufacturing industry under the impetus of mechanised production. Emphasis may fall on the performance of the textile industry, especially cotton and woollens and on mines and metals, though any aspect of British economic growth, including that relating to agriculture is relevant. On 'uneven', candidates should be aware of fluctuations in the economy. They are likely to note that, while economic growth was impressive, it was punctuated by significant dips in performance, leading to high levels of unemployment. Candidates may know of the economic downswing in the period 1815-20 or in the late 1830s and early 1840s. Those sectors which saw most rapid economic growth were also most prone to volatility.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its relatively broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the nature, and consistency, of British economic growth at this time. Drawing on specific evidence of economic performance across a range of sectors, good candidates should be able to construct arguments which enable them to make a judgement. Most will argue that, using conventional indicators such as growth of towns, rates of growth in particular sectors, economic performance was indeed impressive although not consistent. On volatility, candidates may select periods when manufacturing industry slumped. Most will agree that there was volatility although it is perfectly possible to argue that the upswings and downswings are relatively unimportant in the context of substantial overall economic growth and don't deserve to be judged as evidence of overall volatility. Some candidates may wish to turn this question into one on standards of living. While such material might be made relevant, the main focus should be on the economy itself rather than on the impact of economic performance on workers, families etc. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on economic performance which argues that the first half of the nineteenth century did not see such spectacular change as historians of the 'industrial revolution' have conventionally suggested. They may also note that truly impressive growth in the 'heavy' industries was much more in evidence in the second half of the nineteenth century than in the first.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 34 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

29 How effective were government education policies in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the government’s policies on education during this period. The focus will be on making a judgement on the effectiveness of these policies. Candidates should have broad knowledge about education policies as they related to England, including: state grants to support Church education from 1833; the appointment of inspectors (1839); a pupil-teacher scheme (1846); the Revised Code (1862) designed to save money; Elementary Education Act (1870) – establishment of School Boards; the Sandon Act (1876); compulsory elementary education (1881); free elementary education (1891); developments in secondary education provision, including the Education Act (1902) and the creation of Local Education Authorities. Material on Scottish education, under a different regime, should be credited when offered.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the effectiveness of state interventions in education. Good candidates will wish to establish their criteria for effectiveness, which in turn requires an understanding of what governments were trying to achieve. Candidates may argue that the objective was not so much a minimum standard of educational attainment for all citizens but to provide education which the upper classes deemed appropriate for the lower classes. They may argue nevertheless that literacy levels increased significantly after 1870 and that the pupil-teacher scheme did produce a modest quantum of social mobility, especially for women pupil-teachers. Against this, they may argue that much education was highly divisive and that this limited its effectiveness. For example, elementary education after 1870 became a political football, with the Liberal nonconformist element attempting to remove advantages which they believed went to Church of England schools, while Conservatives felt that successful Board schools were offering an unwelcome, and unwarranted, challenge to education provided by the Church of England ‘as by law established’. Good candidates might argue that controversy was a more regular attendant of educational legislation than was effectiveness, although many will argue that the 1902 Act led to more rational and uniform provision via LEAs. Weaker candidates will tend to restrict themselves to offering information about what some of the key pieces of legislation did, without any sustained attempt to evaluate effectiveness. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the expansion of educational opportunity which argues that government policies intended to restrict opportunity to secondary education and above to those for whom it was deemed appropriate were broadly successful. However, it is far from clear that governments got value for money for the sums allocated to education.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 35 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

30 Explain why the evangelical movement played such a controversial role in the development of the Church of England during the nineteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of developments in the Church of England during the nineteenth century. The focus will be on making a judgement on the significance of the Evangelical Movement within the Established Church. Candidates should have broad knowledge about developments in the Church and will be able to offer some precise information about evangelicalism, including: evangelical doctrine; the power of ‘the word’ as revealed in scripture; for many evangelicals the literal truth of the Bible; the centrality of the conversion experience; the need for moral reform and the impetus to do ‘good works’ as, for example, in charitable activity. Candidates are likely to have knowledge of key evangelicals, such as William Wilberforce and his campaign to end slavery. Candidates should also have broad understanding of the divisions in the Church of England between ‘High’ (emphasis on ritual, use of incense) and ‘Low’ (emphasis on scripture, moralistic sermons, emotional message etc). They are also likely to know about the Oxford Movement, in part a reaction against the emotional ‘excess’ of evangelicalism, which led to defections to Roman Catholicism, not least that of John Henry Newman (who had ‘converted’ to evangelicalism in his youth but who later renounced evangelicalism as underplaying the role of the Church in transmitting ‘revealed truth’ to believers.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the controversial role of evangelicalism within the Church of England. Good candidates will show understanding of tensions within the Church, with most Bishops tending towards ‘High Anglicanism’ and considering evangelicalism too ‘emotional’. Some considered evangelicalism disruptive, since it seemed to push the Church of England too far in the direction of nonconformity. Other opponents of evangelicalism believed that it threatened the Church’s unique status as ‘the established church’. The success of evangelical nonconformity helped to give evangelicalism more purchase within the Church, which led to doctrinal and other conflicts. Appointments to high office within the Church frequently invited close scrutiny and political analysis, since nominations revealed whether a diocese seemed to be moving in a ‘high church’ or ‘low church’ direction. Some candidates will argue that evangelicalism was so controversial because Victorian society was so outwardly religious. On this analysis, evangelicalism represented a threat to good order in, and the authority of, the Established Church within a society overwhelmingly comprising Christian believers. Weaker candidates are likely to provide predominantly descriptive accounts of the evangelical movement perhaps with excessive concentration on specific campaigns, rather than on the movement’s overall significance. Material on offer may also be generalised or imprecise. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on evangelicalism by David Bebbington and others who stress the importance in evangelical doctrine of ‘God made man’ and of the sacrifice of the Church.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 36 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 37 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

31 How important were the suffrage campaigns to the wider movement to change women's role in British society?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of pressure in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century society to improve the status and role of women in British society. The focus will be on making a judgement on the importance of the suffrage campaigns. Candidates should have knowledge of: the range of campaigns (including access to higher education, admission to university and the professions; legal status and rights over property and within marriage as well as for the vote). On Suffragettes, candidates should have knowledge of the aims of the movement and of its tactics, including a variety of forms of 'direct action' designed to sustain a high profile for the women's campaign.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its relatively broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of one selected factor in the context of the movement to change women's role in British society. Good candidates will therefore place 'votes for women' within the appropriately wider context suggested by the question (see AO1 above). They will also need to argue on how successfully suffragette campaigns sustained a high profile for the women's cause and (which is not necessarily the same thing) whether that high profile aided, or helped to undermine, their cause. Strong candidates may offer comment on the extent to which 'getting the vote' really was at the core of the women's campaign since women increasingly had a political role on school boards, in local government and the like. Strong candidates may also discuss the 'class' element, noting that the Pankhursts and many other leading suffragettes were from middle-class backgrounds. Weaker candidates are likely to ignore, or downplay, broader factors and offer descriptive material on the Suffragette movement with some limited comment on whether its tactics persuaded more than they deterred. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the movement for increased women's rights and role which concentrates more on cultural issues and on domestic and workplace contexts rather than specifically on 'votes for women'.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 38 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

32 How deep-seated were the problems faced by the British economy in the years 1880–1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain’s economic development in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The focus will be on making a judgement on the performance of the British economy during a period which some have considered to be one of depression. Thus, candidates should have broad knowledge about economic developments and will be able to provide some precise information about the ‘problems’ referred to in the question. Candidates are likely to discuss: agriculture (during a period when prices, especially for arable produce, were generally falling; manufacturing industry; the growth of transport; coal mining; the balance of trade between imports and exports; Britain’s share of world trade (which was declining); the growth of the financial sector and the increasing importance of London as a financial hub; rates of economic growth (which were slackening off from the 1870s).

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its relatively broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the deep-seatedness of Britain’s economic problems in the thirty years or so before the First World War. There is plenty of evidence from which candidates can reach different, valid, conclusions about ‘how deep-seated’. Good candidates are likely to see this as an opportunity to discuss economic performance against the strong contemporary perception that Britain was ‘in decline’ and being increasingly outpaced by Germany and the United States. They are likely to identify problems in the economy, not least for arable farmers forced to compete with US wheat, and some will argue that investment in innovation and the economic infrastructure was less extensive than it might have been. On the other hand, living standards for working people were rising (thanks largely to cheaper food prices), levels of unemployment were never unduly high and most economic historians argue that Britain was recovering from its so-called ‘Depression’ during the early part of the twentieth century. Also, the transport industry was booming and London was becoming a key centre for finance and business. Some will see problems here, however, since much investment, brokered through London, was going to support economic activity outside the UK. Those who argue that problems were ‘deep-seated’ may concentrate on the loss of Britain’s industrial lead, perhaps the costs of maintaining an ever-growing empire and on the real problems experienced by arable farmers. Weaker candidates are likely to make general statements about depression, probably supported by limited evidence about arable farmer and the effectiveness of foreign competition. They will only probe the surface of issues relating to ‘deep-seated’ problems. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on economic performance in this period which generally argues against the perception that there was a ‘Great Depression’ and notes that increasing industrialization in competitor nations was bound to have an adverse effect on Britain’s established supremacy about which they could do little.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 39 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 40 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 7: 1914–1951

33 Assess the effectiveness of David Lloyd George as prime minister in the years 1916–22.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Lloyd George’s premiership. The focus will be on the nature of his leadership, both in wartime and in peace. Good candidates should have information about Lloyd George’s leadership in wartime. Some will contrast this with that of Asquith. In peacetime, candidates should have information about: Lloyd George’s role in the peace negotiations of 1919-20; on his handling of the Irish question, leading up to agreement on independence for 26 of Ireland’s 32 counties under the terms of the Government of Ireland Act. They should also have knowledge of the programme for building fit homes for ‘heroes’ to dwell in and of the wider context of economic crisis and industrial unrest developing from 1920. Candidates should also have knowledge that Lloyd George, as a Liberal, headed a coalition government which was dominated by his political opponents.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the effectiveness of Lloyd George as prime minister. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, most are likely to argue that Lloyd George was a dynamic war leader and that the impression that the war was being pursued vigorously and in effective co-operation with Britain’s allies gained credibility after Lloyd George took over from Asquith. Others may argue that Lloyd George did little to change what was, overall, an attritional strategy. Lloyd George’s hard-line in the peace negotiations might be criticised, although some candidates might point out that criticism is more easily articulated with the benefits of hindsight. Many candidates will note that Lloyd George showed considerable tenacity in seeking to resolve the Irish crisis and that the settlement, though far from perfect, was one which considerably reduced problems from Ireland in Britain (although it led to civil war across the Irish sea). Many stronger candidates will note that any judgement of the prime minister’s effectiveness after 1918 must take into account the fact that he did not have a majority for his policies and was forced into compromises which may have weakened the impact of policy, especially in the economic and industrial fields. Candidates will have different views on whether Lloyd George deserved to be ditched by the Tories in October 1922. Some may try to argue that his effectiveness was limited by circumstances beyond his control. Others might argue that he was far too much of a ‘short-term’ operator, concerned to make attention-seeking short-term gains, perhaps at the expense of a longer-term strategy which might have kept the Conservatives onside for longer, thus giving Lloyd George more time to bring his policies to fruition. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of attempts at partial rehabilitation of Lloyd George which play down the short-term aspects of his leadership and present a man with a consistent vision which promised a bigger role for the state in tackling large problems of social deprivation and regional imbalance.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 41 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

34 How are the advances made by the Labour party in the period 1918–29 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the history of the Labour Party in this period. The focus will be on the ‘advances’ made, as indicated by the question. Candidates should have knowledge of: the new Labour Constitution of 1918; Clause 4 and the commitment to socialism; General Election performances 1918-29, which mostly show advance; Labour’s relationship with the trade unions & its sources of funding; new opportunities for Labour as a result of Liberal weaknesses and splits

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of the several factors (see AO1 above) which help to explain Labour’s advance in these years. Good candidates should be aware that, during these years, that advance was dramatic and (on perceptions down to 1914) unexpected. Labour’s status increased considerably, first as the official opposition and then as a minority government in 1924 and 1929. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, good candidates should argue which factors deserve prominence. Some good candidates will emphasise a clear ideological difference from the other two parties – a new direction for a new age. Others may concentrate on Labour leadership under MacDonald. Others again may give pride of place to Liberal troubles, noting how difficult it normally is for a third party to make significant advances in first-past-the-post elections. Some may argue that the key factor is trade union support since, in effect, it was bank-rolling a new party entering uncharted territory. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate on a descriptive account of Labour’s changing fortunes but most will lack specific detailed knowledge to make the narrative convincing. Some candidates will list relevant factors without arguing why some may deserve more prominence than others. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work on Labour organisation and on the nature of its relationship with Trade Unions, especially in the run-up to the General Strike in 1926.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 42 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

35 How successful were British imperial policies in the years 1922–39?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain and its empire in the specific period. The focus will be on the success, or otherwise, of British policies in respect of its empire. Candidates should know about: *relations with India*, including tariffs to support new Indian industry (1923); measures to cope with growth of nationalism under leadership of Gandhi – civil disobedience; the Round Table Conferences (1930–31); Government of India Act (1935) and proposed federal solution to government problem; greater powers in international diplomacy to *Dominions* (1923). Beginning of gentle retreat from Empire with independence of Egypt (1922) and limited self-government for S.Rhodesia (1922); *Ireland* has ‘Free State status’ from 1921 but relations with Britain never close and new Constitution in 1937 signals greater distance from UK. New status for Dominions and development of *imperial economic policy* – Empire Marketing Board & Imperial Conference giving dominions equal status (1926); Colonial Development Act (1929); disagreements within Dominions re British defence policies involving them (1937), though all Dominions declare war alongside Britain (Sep 1939).

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the success of British imperial policies. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, good candidates are likely to argue that, overall, the success of British policy was qualified at best. India remained under British rule but the negotiations and constitutional initiatives designed to block Congress pressure for full independence had little success. The Indian issue was not solved by the outbreak of the Second World War. Some might argue that Britain was unsure how to solve the conundrum relating to differences between treatment of ‘black’ and ‘white’ colonies/dominions. Initiatives designed to use the Empire more systematically as a mutually beneficial economic resource have some success and are generally popular within the UK. Different views within the Dominions surface on rearmament, although Dominions remain ‘onside’ in declaring war on Germany in 1939. Weaker candidates may say little about the economic dimension and concentrate excessively on relations with India and, particularly, on accounts of Gandhi’s policies. Such candidates will offer only limited discussion of ‘how successful’ if any, and there might be some *ex post facto* rationalisation about inevitable ‘defeat’ and therefore lack of success. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by Niall Ferguson which attempts to reinterpret British imperial policy in a more favourable light and notes the economic importance of the Empire in the inter-war period.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 43 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

36 Does Winston Churchill deserve his reputation as a great wartime leader?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Winston Churchill as a wartime leader. The focus will, therefore, be on the nature of his leadership, in both wars, although it is reasonable to expect much more concentration on the Second World War. In World War I he was First Lord of the Admiralty and, under Lloyd George, Minister of Munitions, Candidates might note his successes and failures. On World War II Candidates should know about Churchill as Prime Minister from May 1940: the role of his broadcasts in sustaining morale; his leadership style – including ‘British Bulldog’ imagery; his grasp of strategy and relations with commanders; his visits to the Front; Churchill as a diplomat, involved in negotiations with Roosevelt and Stalin – the Yalta Conference.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the validity of the view that Churchill was a great wartime leader. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, good candidates should examine both ‘pros’ and ‘cons’. It is difficult to deny that Churchill’s broadcasts and other contributions to building morale on the Home Front had a substantial impact. Most will argue that they saw Churchill at his best – using language artfully and effectively. Others might concentrate on the impact of Churchill’s ‘no surrender’ message. Candidates might be less appreciative of his role as a strategist. It has become clear that his relations with several commanders were less than cordial. Some regarded him as a meddler who thought he knew everything about war because he had seen service himself. Others thought his objectives ambitious but often impractical. His determination to put himself in positions of danger also irritated those responsible for his safety. There were tensions in the wartime cabinet where Churchill’s style of direct management could ride roughshod over alternative – and sometimes better – plans. Weaker candidates will concentrate on offering a biography of Churchill with emphasis on what he did during the war. Evaluation will be limited. Candidates may legitimately make use of, and be credited for, work on Churchill’s role in World War I but should be permitted to reach the highest marks via exclusive concentration on the Second World War. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of a number of attacks on Churchill’s war record and reputation by historians anxious to challenge the adulation with which his war record was greeted for many years after the war ended. Some candidates might wonder whether revisionism has gone too far.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 44 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

37 How radical were the economic and social policies of the Labour Governments of 1945–51?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the domestic record of the Attlee governments of 1945-51. The focus will be on judging how radical and, by implication, far-reaching these were. Candidates should have knowledge of *social policies*, including: expansion of the National Insurance Scheme (1946); the creation of a National Health Service (1948); the implementation of the Butler Education Act, increasing opportunities for many working-class children; abolition of the poor law with the passing of the National Assistance Act (1948); house building & the beginning of post-war reconstruction. They should also have knowledge of the key *economic policies*: embracing Keynesian policies, especially in attempting to stop the impact of slumps and minimising unemployment; extensive policy of nationalisation of industry – Bank of England (1946), Coal (1946), Railways and Canals (1947), Gas (1948) Iron and Steel (1949). Overall, economic policy characterised by greater emphasis on ownership and state planning. To pay for state ownership and state intervention to create jobs etc, overall levels of income tax rose (though standard rate decreased from wartime 50% to 40%). Super-tax rates on highest earners increased to 85% and 90%. By 1948, income tax was providing about 45% of all government revenue.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the radicalism of the Labour governments' record in economic and social matters. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, most strong candidates are likely to argue that the policies were indeed radical, deriving as they did from a determination to avoid the mistakes made in attempting to 'get back to normal' after 1918. Labour saw that the rules of 'normal' had changed. The emphasis given to state ownership and to vigorous intervention in social and economic policies was new. On the other hand, much of what the Labour government did was, in effect, following the blueprint of the Beveridge Report (1942) and Beveridge was a Liberal. Similarly, Labour continued with the wartime coalition policies for expansion, and radical reorganisation, of the state education system. Nevertheless, Beveridge recommended; Labour acted – and in a way which most will consider very radical – a health service initially free at point of use. On radicalism of nationalisation, it's clearly radical on one level. On another, however, nationalisation was introduced as a kind of safety net for industries which had been in trouble. Few long-term profitable industries were taken into national ownership. Strong candidates will produce well-informed answers which make a judgement on both social and economic policies. Weaker candidates may default to descriptive and partial accounts, perhaps with biographical information on Aneurin Bevan. Few weaker candidates will offer any convincing material on economic policy and many answers will be skewed towards evaluation of social, rather than economic, policies. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Recent work has tended to confirm the radicalism of Labour's policies, though not all considered the radicalism wise!

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 45 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 8: 1951–2005

38 To what extent, during the years 1945–90, did Britain have a ‘special relationship’ with the United States of America’?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Anglo-American foreign policy. The focus will be on how close the allies were over the period. Candidates should have knowledge of: Anglo-American co-operation in the immediate post-war period, perhaps especially over Berlin; co-operation over nuclear weapons policy, with US nuclear submarines lodged in Scotland from 1961 and US supplying Polaris missiles for British submarines; Britain and US agreement on a range of contentious issues, including Palestine/Israel and Korea. However, the US does not support Britain and France over the Suez crisis (1956). Candidates may discuss Anglo-American co-operation within the United Nations (both were members of the Security Council). Candidates should also know about US policy in respect of the Falklands War in 1982. They should also know about personal relations between President and Prime Minister, perhaps particularly Kennedy & Macmillan over the Cuban missiles crisis and between Thatcher & Reagan on right-wing economic policies and other matters during the 1980s.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the closeness of relations between the United States and Britain. Stronger candidates may argue that the relationship was ‘special’ because of a shared language and usually shared cultural reference points. Both powers saw the USSR as dangerous and expansionist after 1945 and they co-operated on a range of policy matters, particularly defence. It is also worth mentioning that Britain and the United States remained allies, albeit with varying degrees of warmth (Macmillan was closer to Kennedy over Cuba, for example, than was Wilson to Johnson and Nixon over Vietnam) throughout the period. Some good candidates may argue that the relationship was not ‘special’ because it seemed increasingly unequal. They may refer to Acheson’s famous observation (1962) that Britain had not found a role and to evidence that the USA rarely, if ever, changed its policy because of a British stance on policy. Some candidates will conclude that there was a relationship of ‘special dependency’ rather than a ‘special relationship’ and could suggest that Britain’s relations with Europe were not warm in part because Thatcher seemed so often in thrall to the United States but mostly because Britain looked to the United States when its more immediate interests, including its markets, were across the Channel rather than across the Atlantic Ocean. Weaker candidates are likely to have less specific information and also to default to descriptive accounts, perhaps about relations between a US President and a UK Prime Minister. They will largely ignore the ‘extent’ element in the question and may make over-confident, generalised statements. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of the views of political scientists over Anglo-American relations and may want to argue that the relationship was much more special to Britain than it was to the United States.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 46 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

39 What best explains why the Conservatives were able to win three successive general elections during the 1950s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the political fortunes of the major parties in the 1950s. The focus will be on making a judgement on why the Conservatives were electorally successful. Candidates should have information about the three election victories with increasing majorities (17 in 1951; 78 in 1955 and 100 in 1959). They are likely to have knowledge of the following: Labour by 1951 associated more with austerity than with radical welfare reforms; after 1951, the apparent return of stability and growing prosperity; Labour divided over nuclear weapons in 1955 and the Conservative message relating to economic growth and the end of rationing touched an electoral chord, as did rising living standards; by 1959, the Conservatives had established a reputation for economic competence and there was a general belief that they had presided over a period of greater prosperity; Macmillan's political style was popular, especially when projected on to television screens that an increasing number of voters now possessed. 'Never had it so good' resonated. General factors in play include: a predominantly pro-Conservative press; accentuated divisions in the Labour party after Gaitskell succeeded Attlee in Dec 1955.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of several linked factors in explaining Tory victories. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, good candidates are likely to debate whether the Conservatives' victories owed more to their abilities or to Labour's difficulties in opposition. Most will probably give greatest emphasis to a combination of growing prosperity and the image of Conservative competence. It is equally valid, however, to argue that the dominant factors were Labour divisions and a loss of confidence in the party. Weaker candidates will offer more generalised treatments, perhaps identifying important factors without arguing an evidence-based case on why these factors were more important than others. Thus the 'best explain' element is either ignored or undeveloped. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by David Kynaston which attempts to show the importance of social change for, among other things, shifts in political allegiance.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 47 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

40 Why did the trade union movement exercise so much political influence in the 1960s and 1970s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the trade union movement in the two specified decades. The focus will be on an explanation of why organisations which had been established to improve the working conditions and income of their members were able to exercise political influence. Good candidates should have information on a range of relevant factors: growing trade union membership (almost 10m in 1960, 13.5m in 1979); the impact of the long boom in increasing employer demand for well-organised labour; growing evidence that unions had political muscle – as exemplified by the effectiveness of strike weapon which, opponents argued, was increasingly used politically to protest at unpalatable government policy (such as Labour’s Prices & Incomes Strategy in 1968 and the Miners’ strike against the Conservative Industrial Relations Act in 1972); the Miners’ Strike of 1974 which caused Heath to call a general election which he lost; Labour was in office for more than half of the twenty years under discussion, giving the trade union movement more purchase – ‘beer and sandwiches at No 10’.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of several linked factors in explaining the political influence of the trade unions. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, good candidates will probably argue that growing evidence of real union ‘muscle’ was a key factor, especially when linked to Labour governments (notionally pro-Union, although in reality increasingly frustrated by what many ministers thought ‘bully-boy’ tactics and the exercise of unconstitutional powers. Some will argue the economic case: trade unions only have political influence when their bargaining power is high – i.e. in times of high employment and labour shortage. Weaker candidates are likely to offer predominantly descriptive answers which concentrate on the most important strikes and their outcome linked, perhaps, to brief accounts of the activities of iconic trade unions leaders like Frank Chapple, Jack Jones and Joe Gormley. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent social and cultural history studies which emphasise the growing significance of organised labour and which debate the influence of trade union leaders with strong Communist connections (present or past) such as Frank Chapple of the electricians and Mick McGahey of the miners’ union.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 48 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

41 Why were relations between Britain and its partners in the European Economic Community (EU) frequently so strained during the 1980s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of relations between Britain and the EU. The focus will be on reasons for strained relations. Candidates should have knowledge of: the legacy of Britain’s refusal to join the EEC on its inception in 1957 – a generous agricultural policy (favouring French smallholders) and the feeling that Britain had come into Europe in 1973 both as a supplicant and to an organisation which had already established its common identity without Britain’s aid; disagreements over agriculture; Thatcher’s general suspicion of Europe; the policy (agreed in 1980) to demand a rebate from the EU on an excessively high subscription (rebate agreed in 1984); Thatcher’s direct ‘best for Britain’ approach, which grated with many European political and bureaucratic leaders and was characterised as coarse and unsophisticated; Thatcher’s side-lining of the Foreign Office, which she considered too complaisant with ‘foreigners’; her objection to closer political engagement between member states; suspicion of the development of a ‘Federal Europe’; the Single Market, monetary union and Thatcher’s Bruges speech (Sep 1988) opposing the development of ‘a “superstate”, some sort of European identikit personality’.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for strained relations between Britain and the EU. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, candidates are likely to argue that Britain’s refusal to join the EEC in 1957 engendered long-term problems. Most are likely to argue that Thatcher’s insistent style made harmonious relations difficult, though it is open to candidates to argue that leading European politicians were equally to blame since they resented what they saw as Thatcher’s crudity and unwillingness to enter negotiations except on her own terms. Good candidates will see that they need to make a judgement on whether it was intractable, and long-noted, differences of approach between the core European partners and Britain which explain on-going difficulties throughout the decade or whether it was primarily a problem of personality (probably Thatcher’s personality rather than Schmidt’s or Delors’). Weak candidates may show understanding of the key differences but are likely to produce rather generalised responses which include some descriptive material which fails to connect with the analytical requirements of the question. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work, some of which argues that Thatcher placed Britain on the side-lines of European development and some of which credits her with identifying structural weaknesses and grandiosity in the European ideal which have become much clearer in the early twenty-first century.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 49 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

42 ‘Labour’s massive election victory in 1997 owed much more to Conservative infighting and incompetence than it did to Labour popularity.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the party politics of the 1990s, with special reference to the general election of 1997. The focus will be on the reasons for such a large Labour victory. Good candidates should have information on the Conservatives: the long legacy of the collapse of sterling and the withdrawal from the exchange rate mechanism in 1992; Conservative reputation for economic competence shattered; continued infighting between those who believed Thatcher had been removed from office prematurely and inappropriately and those who believed change was necessary to win the next election; John Major’s leadership, which was widely considered weak; the leadership challenge of 1995 which Major won against ‘the bastards’ but at the cost of revealing that deep divisions still existed. On Labour: reaction to a fourth successive election defeat in 1992; the emergence of ‘New Labour’ as a sanitised business-friendly, trade union-sceptical – party; increased attention paid to effective presentation of policy; the leadership of John Smith and the significance of his premature death which resulted in the election of Tony Blair; Blair’s mastery of the media; continued party divisions kept under wraps and the left wing marginalised.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about whether Conservative weakness or Labour strength was more responsible for the outcome of the 1997 general election. Drawing on evidence identified in AO1, well-informed candidates can argue either way. Clearly, Major was popularly seen as a weak leader and Blair both charismatic and projecting a new Labour ‘image’. Candidates who think that Blair’s strengths won it might point to his almost equally emphatic subsequent win in 2001, followed by a still perfectly secure third majority in 2005. Those arguing the opposite case are likely to emphasise the deep, long-term damage done to the party by its open, and widely publicised, wounds and rancorous in-fighting. Some will see the disjunction between a booming economy and a Conservative (and normally business-friendly) government losing an election to a Labour majority in excess of 160 as compelling evidence that dramatic, almost unprecedented, Conservative weakness must have been the major reason for the 1997 debacle. It is possible to argue a kind of middle-way which puts the emphasis on an electorate which felt that, whatever the specific arguments, one party had been in power (by 1997, eighteen years) more than long enough. Weaker candidates are likely to avoid explanations involving detailed consideration of both Labour and Conservative parties. The treatment may be largely, or significantly, descriptive rather than a response to a question requiring judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of retrospective insights into the travails of the Tories in the 90s. These generally provide useful, and sometimes lurid, detail about poisonous Tory in-fighting but very few have yet suggested that John Major’s abilities as prime minister have been undervalued.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 50 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

Section 9: Themes: c.1914–2000

43 Why, over this period, did manufacturing exports make a generally diminishing contribution to the British economy?

Candidates should

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the key elements in the make-up of the British economy. The focus will be on export markets. Candidates should know that British exports often faced an uphill struggle, as during the period 1925-39, because of a substantially over-valued pound. They should also know about: foreign competition, not least from countries in the old Empire which were producing more manufactured goods at lower cost; the emergence and expansion of the service industries; continued expansion of banking and financial services; increasing political view after c.1970 that it was misguided to shore up old-fashioned primary and manufacturing sectors of the economy; British coal was increasingly uncompetitive in world markets; a new emphasis on the service sector and on light industries (particularly electronics) seen as essential elements of a modern, flexible economy.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here candidates might note how important mining and shipbuilding were to Britain's export performance on the outbreak of the First World War, while both were in rampant retreat (in part because of British government economic policy) by the end of the twentieth century. The focus of this question is on explaining why manufacturing industry became relatively less important to the British economy over the course of the twentieth century. Most candidates, using material referred to in AO1, will stress: the increasing diversity of the economy; keen foreign competition; changing perceptions of what constituted an effective modern economy; ideological, free-market, anti-subsidy considerations. Some may also argue that the move away from manufacturing reflected a political concern that it was in the older manufacturing and extractive industries that trade unions were most prominent and that Conservative governments (dominant for most of the period) tended to view unions as anti-competitive and as a contributory factor in Britain's increasingly uncompetitive economy. Weaker answers will be generally descriptive and may concentrate excessively on one or two areas and/or forms of production rather than making reference to a range of different manufacturing industries. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work which argues that manufacturing industry had been unduly neglected in government policy while others argue that emphasis on the larger manufacturing industries obscures the contribution made by smaller, or niche, British manufactures – as, for example, the contribution made by the fashion industry.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 51 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

44 What best explains the expansion of leisure opportunities in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of leisure activities and opportunities in 20th century Britain. The focus will be on making a judgement about reasons for the expansion of such opportunities. Candidates should have broad knowledge about changing leisure opportunities: domestically the electronics revolution is central, with development of radio, television then video and e-games. Trips to the cinema revolutionised leisure opportunities between the wars. From the late 1950s, mass ownership of cars expanded both opportunities and horizons, enabling more journeys to see friends and relations and to visit areas of natural beauty. Outside the home: opportunities increased via expanded holiday entitlement and the development of paid holidays. Trips to the seaside, on average, became longer than in the late nineteenth century and, from the 1950s, air travel to European holiday destinations and thereafter worldwide. The public house remained a focus for leisure, although attracting more men than women and eventually suffering because of more sophisticated games available in the home and also because of changing patterns of social engagement before the abolition of smoking in public places caused many pubs to close their doors. Opportunities to participate in, and spectate at, sporting events also grew. Sport became more diverse and also more professional, encouraging supporters to travel longer distances to watch matches. Some candidates might note an apparent gender division with women’s sporting activities in general rather fewer and attracting fewer spectators. Some candidates might note the importance of class divisions with rugby union, for example, generally attracting more middle-class involvement and support, especially in the south of England, whereas rugby league flourished in northern industrial towns and developed as a professional sport much earlier than did rugby union.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of many linked factors in explaining changing leisure preferences. Drawing on examples identified in AO1 (though the list is indicative rather than exhaustive) good candidates are likely to find reasons for change in terms of increased leisure time linked to: economic factors, including rising living standards; technological change, particularly in transport and electronics; changing social conventions and expectations, linked in many cases to greater opportunities, and pressure, for families to spend time as a social unit since leisure freed up time. Weaker answers are likely to provide lists of changes without much in the way of explanation or judgement about the relative importance of the factors involved. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware that much work on leisure and leisure preference has been done by social historians, sociologists, economists and psychologists, such that understanding of human group behaviour has been enhanced by inter-disciplinary study.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 52 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

45 'By 1945, female enfranchisement had brought women the vote but little else.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the role of Women in British politics and society. The focus will be on making a judgement on the extent of social change and improvement. British women had experienced by the end of the Second World War. Candidates should have broad knowledge about how their women's political status had influenced their role in society. In particular, they should know about women over the age of 30 getting the vote in 1918 and qualifying for the vote on the same terms as men in 1928. They should also have knowledge of important changes to divorce laws in 1923 (on grounds of husband's adultery alone) & 1937 (divorces easier and cheaper to obtain). In 1922, the age of sexual consent was raised from 13 to 16. Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act (1919) removed restrictions on women entering the professions, although the 'marriage bar' remained in many. Candidates should also know about the limited impact of women in Parliament: no women cabinet minister until 1929 (Margaret Bondfield); very few candidates (Labour 4 out of 361 in 1918 & rising only to 41 out of 603 in 1945; Conservatives 1 out of 445 in 1918; 14 out of 618 in 1945). Only 16 women were elected to the Commons in 1929. Change in status and opportunity for working-class women was very limited by 1945.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the impact of political enfranchisement on women's role and influence. Good candidates will appreciate that their analyses should sustain links to the issue of political enfranchisement. Did those women who benefited from social change do so because women now had the vote? Using information from AO1 above, they will note the extent to which women influenced political decisions in Parliament, either by direct representation (limited) or as voters. They are also likely to note that, while improvements in opportunity and status for middle-class women could be substantial, they stood in considerable contrast to those for working-class women, who were generally lower paid and did less skilled work. Similarly, changes in divorce laws were used much more by the middle than the working classes. Arguably, women's domestic role changed little in this period. Weaker candidates are likely to make little of the question's explicit link to the practical effects of franchise reform in 1918 & 1928. They are likely to present general material on changing opportunities for women, and/or to offer material which presents women as stereotypes rather than attempting to make distinctions socially or regionally. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the role of women which attempts to explain that legal changes to women's rights as voters brought only limited social changes

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 53 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

46 What best explains why educational policies caused such political controversy in the period 1944 to c.2000?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of change and development in Britain’s educational policies in the selected period. The focus will be on making a judgement on why educational change was so often accompanied by political controversy. Candidates should have broad knowledge about the key changes: Butler’s Education Act; the expansion of comprehensive education in the 1960s & 1970s; Direct Grant Schools and their demise; Kenneth Baker, the development of a National Curriculum and the Education Reform Act, 1988; measures of educational achievement: GCE, GCSE and league tables; the expansion of higher education – Colleges of Advanced Technology, University status etc.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about why educational policies were so often controversial. Using information as indicated in AO1 above, good candidates may argue that the extent of controversy derives from the high stakes involved. On both sides of the conventional political fence, a widespread perception existed that a good education provides (or provided) a route to secure, well-paid employment. Thus, they may suggest, there was some consensus about desirable ends but furious contention about means: how was the greatest educational happiness of the greatest number to be best secured? In general, the political left tended to argue that opportunities for educational advancement were limited to those who had wealth and/or an educated family background. They saw education as a means of achieving social change and greater equality. The political right increasingly argued that the expansion of opportunity was vitiated by generally lower national standards of literacy and numeracy. They also argued that the abolition of grammar schools (offering after 1944, in particular, a route to success and economic security for those from unprivileged backgrounds) was an act of spiteful educational vandalism. Similarly, many on the right viewed the expansion of higher education from the 1960s onwards with suspicion since they believed that ‘more will mean worse’. Weaker candidates will say little about the reasons for controversy over education, concentrating rather on legislative ‘highlights’, such as the Butler Act, the coming of comprehensive education and the establishment of league tables as a measure of performance. Knowledge is also likely to be general and partial. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the performance of comprehensive schools and on the operation of league tables as measures of performance, although almost all aspects of state education are under continuous scrutiny both for greater understanding and in order to score political points, so a wide range of critically informed responses is likely.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 54 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

47 Assess the impact of popular newspapers on British culture in the later late-twentieth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the work and influence of the popular press in the second half of the twentieth century. The focus will be on making a judgement on the extent of the impact which popular newspapers had on popular culture in Britain. Candidates should have broad knowledge about: the tactics used by the popular press to gain readers’ attention; perception that publicity for popular culture would gain readers in the struggle for competitive advantage; the changing nature of coverage – crudely, less politics (apart from sex scandals & corruption), much more on TV and ‘celebrity’; how soap operas and talent shows became front-page ‘news’; popular newspapers as celebrity magazines; newspapers’ ability to ‘make’ or ‘break stars by their coverage.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its relatively broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the impact of Britain’s popular press in the later twentieth century, although it is acceptable for candidates to concentrate on the period from c.1980. Most candidates are likely to argue that the popular press has had a significant impact; helping to create stars; taking ‘sides’ in talent shows and soap operas; providing more ‘background news’ on celebrities – not all of it honestly acquired; how newspapers sell popular culture. However, it is possible to argue that the impact on popular culture as such has been limited. Some candidates might argue that TV, other electronic media (You-Tube etc.) have had greater impact in defining and supporting popular culture, newspapers merely following in the slip-stream. Weaker candidates are likely to produce predominantly descriptive material about popular culture and the popular press with only very limited attempts to judge the links between the two. Specific knowledge about the role of the popular press may be limited. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by social and cultural historians which stresses major changes in consumption of popular culture by young people and also on the marginalisation of orthodox politics by the popular press.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 55 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2013 | 9769 | 13 |

48 'In the second half of the twentieth century, the welfare state created more problems than it solved.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the development of the welfare state in the second half of the twentieth century. The focus will be on making a judgement about the extent of its success. Candidates should have broad knowledge about key features of the welfare state, which includes appreciation that the phrase covers much more than the NHS, since it includes pensions, the benefits system, family support structures etc. Candidates should know: about the range of the NHS, including the pressures generated by changing social structures and increased longevity; the extent to which the NHS was free at the point of use; the increasing cost of the NHS; the changing role of GPs and nurses under new management structures; the benefits system, including how the state has defined who should receive benefits; the range of basic support given to those who cannot support themselves and/or their families; how the range of, and criteria for, benefits changed over the period.

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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching an overall judgement on how successful the welfare state has been in the second half of the twentieth century. Some good candidates might make judgements on the basis of how far the 'welfare state' has matched up to the ideals of the Beveridge Report. Good candidates will reach an overall judgement on the success of the Welfare State, which involves an appraisal of key successes and failures. They might argue on the basis of: knowledge about rising costs and increasing political pressures; the controversial nature of much of the benefits system; the extent of political involvement and how far this constituted interference on the basis of insufficient professional knowledge; how effectively the NHS coped with the rising numbers of the elderly (whose need for medical support would, on average, be greater than that of other age groups); the difficulties of establishing consensus over what constituted an appropriate 'benefits regime'. Candidates are likely to argue that a welfare state remained in place in 2000 but that the pressures on it were revealing strains which were neither there nor contemplated in its earlier years. Some good candidates may argue that the system has worked poorly and wastefully. Weaker candidates are likely to lack the requisite range of specific knowledge and to offer excessive generalisation. Judgement may be more assertive than on the basis of precise knowledge. Some will write exclusively about the NHS. Some candidates will use either political or polemical criteria in their responses rather than evidence-based historical ones. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the increasingly politicised nature of debate about welfare provision in general and the NHS in particular. Such knowledge is likely to inform the conclusions they reach about both successes and failures.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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 effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.