

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/22

Paper 2b (European History Outlines, c.1378–c.1815),
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	22

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	22

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	22

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	22

Section 1: c. 1378–c. 1461

1 'The causes of the Great Schism were trivial, yet the Schism had profound consequences.' How far do you agree?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the Schism and its impact should not be highly rewarded. Possible causes might include: the crisis of values; the issue of church/state relations; the papacy becoming a satellite of France; the criticism of people like John of Paris; Marsiglio of Padua and William of Ockham; the building craze of the papacy as well as their bureaucratic mentality and materialism; the politics surrounding the election of Urban VI. The impact might include: the prestige of the papacy; the credibility of the Church; renewal movements such as Wyclif and Hus; secular authority v ecclesiastical authority; the possible 'democratisation' of the church; rise of national churches; ignoring the cry for reform.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Thinking about 'trivial' and 'profound' obviously deserves reward and candidates who challenge either or both clearly have a point. The focus should be on the 'extent' and stronger responses will include a real attempt to weigh up the nature and extent of both the causes and the consequences of the Schism.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

2 Why did fifteenth-century Italian city states have such different models of government?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Purely descriptive accounts of the different types of government of the city states should not be highly rewarded, although a clear account of the different types has some merit. Factors which might be considered are: geographical and economic factors, plus the inevitable rivalries; the separatist traditions; ability of specific systems to deliver prosperity-e.g. Sforza of Milan; the administrative ability of the Venetians-plus specific socio/economic factors there-the even spread of wealth-good government protecting the interests of all classes-a well organised citizenship; the way rulers in Florence adapted to the character and ideals of the citizenship; devotion to republican ideals; the ability of the Medici to develop a good relationship with citizens and play the ‘servant of the people’ role; the relationship between the great Roman families-the papacy and the cardinals; the independent traditions of places like Perugia and Bologna; the specific reasons behind the oligarchy in Siena.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The focus should be on explanation and the ability to demonstrate awareness of the very different reasons which existed for the diverse systems of government of the differing states. Ideally there should be some broader generic reasons as well as awareness of specific reasons behind individual city states and there should be analysis of at least two or three of the city states in some depth.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

3 ‘Deep-rooted failings within the Byzantine Empire, rather than Ottoman military competence, explain the fall of Constantinople.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the fall should not be rewarded, but inevitably they might contain some impolitic reasons. Possible failings within the Empire might include: territorial divisions and disputes within the empire; end of independent Bulgaria and Serbia; Greek isolation; hostility of Naples/Venice and Genoa for their own reasons; doctrinal divisions; failure of mercenary system; lack of common causes between East and West; Russia distracted by Tartars. Ottoman military factors might include: the superb feat of arms of the assaults; the quality of soldiers; the engineering feats; the quality and role of the ships used; the cannon; the leadership at all levels-the attacking skills and ruthless discipline.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A real weighing up is looked for, with the two sides of the argument being balanced against each other and a well reasoned conclusion being reached. There is obviously no ‘right’ answer, both sides have their advocates. The best responses will start with a precise analytical focus which is heading for one side or the other, while at the same time demonstrating awareness of what critics of their point of view might argue.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

4 How convincing is the claim that theological disputes were at the heart of the Hussite movement?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative/descriptive accounts of the movement and the work of Hus should not get far. There are many other ‘wider’ factors which might be considered as well as theological ones such as: the wider implications of the Avignon split; the prestige of the papacy; Wyclif had already raised issues such as – councils, depriving corrupt clergy of their jobs, secular authority’s ability to reform the church, biblical based Christianity; Hus’ ability as a preacher/inspirational figure; the immorality of the papacy and the higher clergy; ‘communism’ issues; nationalism; wider criticism of the church; he was primarily a reformer on institutions not an advocate of theological change.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An analysis of the nature of the Hussite movement and its supporters as well as the ideas, motives and career of Hus himself is looked for. There should be effective consideration of the ‘extent’ factor’ and a serious weighing up of how much it was primarily about theological matters, and what part was played by a variety of other factors such as those listed above.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

5 ‘No one really won or lost the Hundred Years War.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the War should not score highly, but the ability to demonstrate awareness that it was an intermittent struggle with only sporadic fighting and the possible misleading nature of the names should get some credit. Factors which might be raised could be: the territorial and feudal claims of the English throne; the stimulation of nationalistic feelings by Joan of Arc and Crecy and Agincourt; the French monarchy gaining territory; the French monarchy checking feudal fragmentation-barriers between the centre and Picardy/Gascony/Normandy; English territorial losses; English retention of Calais which opened up the whole wool trade of Flanders; English no longer had serious drain of wealth and implication for authority of the monarchy; war actually strengthens both monarchies and countries.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some careful thinking about ‘winning’ and ‘losing’ is called for and candidates who genuinely try to reflect on these two terms should be rewarded. The range of possible answers is vast and those who adopt a properly analytical approach which look at the ‘war’ in both the short and long term and rises above a straightforward list of battles should do well.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	22

Section 2 c.1461–c. 1516

6 Assess the significance of the death of Charles the Bold (1477) for both France and Burgundy.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign and descriptions of later events will not do well. Factors which might be considered: the long and costly wars were largely his ideas; women were left in charge- with some complications; Estates took advantage – right to self assembly – declarations of war etc.; Mary was to grant the ‘Grand Privilege’ – restricting rulers; major reaction encouraged Netherlands particularism; territorial self sufficiency was to grow; France overran parts-also the deserters to France; Mary’s Habsburg marriage; the Burgundian alliance with England and its implications; reaction against centralisation-precursor to a long constitutional crisis; Peace of Arras – great significance to France – especially as far as Flanders was concerned.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Expect some thinking on the issue of ‘turning’ point, and what might or might not constitute one. It could be argued that it was less of one for Burgundy than it was for France, but there are a variety of views which could be successfully considered. The ‘significance’ aspect always should be central to a good answer, with serious consideration of the degree of significance.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

7 ‘The primary concern of the Popes in this period was the advancement of their own families.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of papal history of the period are not required. There is lots of scope here, and while some generalisation is appropriate, some detail on individual popes is expected. Popes/factors which might be considered are: Nicholas V – the scholar of the Vatican Library-but too involved in temporal glory and art. Ignored the Turkish threat; Calixtus III – the nepotist and crusader; Pius II – the humanist-crusader and re affirmation of papal absolutism; the ‘evil genius’ – Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII and Alexander VI with their: nepotism, extortionism, territorial ambitions, inquisition in Spain and witchcraft obsessions, foolish attitude to the Turns, simony of Rodrigo di Borgia in 1492; Alexander VI – the able but totally unscrupulous one-support for his family, treatment of Savonarola, division of the new World, political dabbling in the Italian wars, ignoring growth of Gallican tendencies and demands for reform; Julius II, the nephew of Alex; the soldier Pope-the war with Venice; attacked by Erasmus; utilisation of Lateran Council for his own ends; culminating in the election of the Medici Leo X in 1513.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. This question offers lots of scope. Simple description of anti-clericalism will not score highly. The ‘primary concern’ aspect needs to be looked at closely. Analysis of papal policy should be there as well, with at least an attempt to argue that at times there were possibly ‘higher’ motives. Valid attempts at the counter argument should be rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

8 Assess the strengths and weakness of Ottoman Empire in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered as strengths are: the weakness and division of the opponents of the Ottomans; Ottoman military strength and organisation, both on land and at sea; the quality of leadership at all levels, not just the rulers themselves, but also Viziers etc.; the sensible colonial policy; their rule and issues like communications; sensible taxation and tolerance of other religions. Factors which might be considered as weaknesses are: their over ambition; the tendency to get seriously overstretched in terms of resources; dependence on one quality leader; finite resources; dependence on the weaknesses of others; dependence on subject peoples.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It is unlikely that one specific point will dominate. A range of factors is looked for and the ablest will differentiate and prioritise. Ideally a balanced argument as opposed to just a list of strengths and weaknesses will be provided, both prioritising each, as well as coming to a conclusion as to whether one outweighed the other.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

9 To what extent was war more important than marriage in explaining Habsburg expansion in the reign of Maximilian I?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign are not required. Factors which might be considered are: Italian diplomacy; the Sforza marriage; the Spanish marriages-especially. the Prince to Juana; war with France failed badly in Italy; failed in the Swiss conflict; some success in the Bavarian war; Holy League failed; yet successes in Austria.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An analysis of the primary reasons for Habsburg expansion is called for. While there is a good case to be made for the marriages, balance is needed and there are obvious ‘other factors’ which need to be weighed up. Stronger responses will give a fairly precise picture of the ‘extent’ and produce valid reasons for their answer.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

**10 ‘The conquest of Granada was the greatest achievement of Ferdinand and Isabella.’
Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign will not do well unless there is a constant focus on achievement. There are a good range of factors which can be considered, in addition to the conquest itself: the end of the Moslem conflict and the sensible treatment of the Moslems; the discovery of America; Castile becoming a world power; development of Castile as a centre of world trade; making unification a reality-creation of a Spanish state; new institutions of government; Renaissance state; power of the crown and reduction of nobles’ powers, dealing with military orders; royal administration, revival of the Hermandad; church state relations, Inquisition, Jews; excellent foreign policy.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Weighing up the implication of the conquest against the many other factors is looked for. Candidates should give evidence that they have really thought about ‘achievement’ and also thought about the short and long term impact of much of the work of the two.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

Section 3: c. 1516–c. 1559

11 What best explains the appeal of Lutheranism in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of Luther’s life are not required. There are a large number of factors which might be considered, such as: his theology and theological appeal – especially on salvation; pastoral care; social and economic factors in Germany; the printing press; his intellect – his message and his medium; university driven; groundwork of humanism; princely support; preconditions of anti-clericalism – papal actions – indulgences; debating success; German nationalism; desire to reform church-clerical marriage 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It is not necessary to just take a single factor and argue for that. What is looked for is an analysis of a range of key factors and comment on which were the most important and why.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

12 'It was not so much the message, but the ways in which it was delivered, that explains the success of Calvinism in the period 1559.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of Calvin's work are not required. Factors which might be considered are: the message itself – both its content and its clarity; learning the lessons from Bucer in Strasburg; his ability as a writer; his relationship with the secular authority – in Geneva initially and then elsewhere; his pragmatism; the structure of his church; his doctrine; Beza's academy; the mix of the preacher-scholar-theologian; adaptability of it to different regions – Scotland and the Netherlands and Scandinavia.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some thinking about what is, and what is not 'success' will feature in strong responses. There needs to be clear evidence of analysis of the message as well as the means by which it was communicated.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

13 How extensive were the achievements of Gustavus Vasa?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the creation of a united Sweden-it lacked much coherence prior to his rule; the ending of the elective monarchy and the establishment of a lasting dynasty; the ending of the Danish domination; a range of internal work, such as the termination of feudalism, a sensible system of taxation and the establishment of what can be seen as an effective bureaucracy and system of national and local government; the reformation process which of course strengthened the monarchy; a 37-year rule in troubled times; an army on which Gustavus Adolphus was later to build; ruthless autocracy.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It is unlikely that one specific point will dominate. The best will reflect on the ‘extensive’- the country was fundamentally different when he had finished- there been a major Baltic power there and Sweden was in a position to become a European player as well. It was not only the establishment of a lasting regime, but also the work inside Sweden that lends itself to be seriously considered as ‘extensive’.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

14 How significant an impact did overseas exploration and colonisation have on either Spain or Portugal in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts listing what Spain and Portugal acquired are not required. There is a substantial range of factors which might be considered: impact on warfare and technology; new markets; influx of cash/bullion; impact on crown – its status and authority; economic impact on towns – Seville, Lisbon, Porto etc.; rise of international trade – goods needed for SA came from other countries; price revolution; shift of economic centre from Mediterranean to Atlantic; intellectual impact/psychological impact/end of Europe centred world view.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Weighing up the nature and extent of the impact is what is looked for. The best will genuinely reflect on the implications of colonisation and exploration and consider the extent to which countries changed direction as a result.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

15 To what extent can it be argued that the reigns of both Francis I and Henry II brought little benefit to France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the two reigns are not required. Factors which might be considered are – Francis I: consolidation of monarchical power; administrative work; reformation/theology; repression of Protestantism; relationship with papacy; Italian fiasco; Habsburg-Valois struggle; Turks. Henry II: Metz, Toul etc.; Jesuits and repression; absolutism; repression generally; legacy-Catherine Di Medici etc.; Huguenots.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some thinking about ‘benefit’ is called for and candidates who are thinking about the ‘big picture’ should do well. Any indication of reflection about the period as a whole should be rewarded, and the focus should always be on France.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	22

Section 4: c. 1559–c. 1610

16 ‘Phillip II’s perception of what was in the best interests of the Roman Catholic Church always dominated his rule in Spain.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign of Philip II are not required. Factors which might be included when considering his motivation are: the ambition to destroy the enemies of the church; keeping France both weak and Catholic; policy against the Turks; Moriscos; policy in Italy; the empire in South America; policy in the Low Countries; policy in Portugal; his administration; the Inquisition; the comuneros; marriage to Mary Tudor; the Armada; revolt in Aragon.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Clear thinking about what might be the ‘best interests’ is expected, as is awareness that what Philip might see was in the best interests of the Church might differ from the Church itself. The range of possible answers is large, but reward those who reflect on both Spanish and Roman Catholic Church interests and carefully analyse his motivation.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	22

17 What best explains why the Dutch were able to hold out against the might of Spain for so long?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the Dutch Revolt are not required. Factors which might be considered when covering the longevity of the Revolt might be: geographical factors; social and economic factors; the role of Calvinism; English support; leadership – on both sides; the antagonism against the Inquisition; the ambition of nobles – such as Nassau; poor administration of Philip II; the Alva solution; other demands on Philip II; bankruptcy of Spain; sea power factors; role of France-Anjou 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The ability to weigh up a range of factors, including those which were primarily advantageous to the Dutch and those which damaged Spain, and a look at the interrelationship between the two, is looked for. There is no one single factor looked for, but balance and mature judgement.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

18 To what extent did the Roman Catholic Church experience more of a ‘Catholic Reformation’ than a ‘Counter Reformation’ in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts are not required. Factors which might be included are: Trent; heresy and doctrine; reform of abuses – and extent of them; papal power; the Inquisition; the Jesuits; missionary work; events in France-Holland-Scotland-the Empire; the Armada; work in the new world; Hungary.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Awareness of the main features of this well known debate is looked for. Evidence of thinking about the two terms, and also the extent to which factors can be allocated to one side or the other, is expected. Better answers will be clearly able to deal with it independently.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

19 ‘The edict of Nantes should be seen as his greatest achievement.’ Discuss this view of Henry IV of France.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign are not required. Factors which might be raised in the discussion might be: his military/leadership achievements pre Nantes; the compromise of Nantes itself – was it a botch/unsustainable?; did Nantes just postpone problems? a compromise which satisfied few?; was he just a good politician – but a poor statesman?; economic reconstruction; political reconstruction; appointment of Sully – did he do it all? heavy taxation/taille etc.; management of nobility; issue of towns/estates general/sale of offices; foreign policy/Spanish road 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The career of Henry IV needs to be weighed up carefully, considering his work both before and after Nantes and looking at it with some sense of perspective. Thinking about his abilities should be included, and the focus should not be on what he did but more on how he did it and his motivation, and how that demonstrates ability-or otherwise.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

20 ‘Suleiman the Magnificent left behind an unsustainable empire.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign of Suleiman are not required. The legacy could cover: the size of the empire-broad geographical factors; the military and administrative structure; recruitment issues with army and administration; a system built on expansion/conquest/jihad; growth of the janissary class; meeting serious obstacles – Tsar/Persia/Danube, yet geared to constant expansion; hostility of too many – as Lepanto showed; English and Dutch penetration of markets; inflation and debasement; revolt of the janissaries; flight of peasants from the 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Careful thinking about the size and nature of the empire and its sustainability is looked for. Evidence that the term ‘unsustainable’ has been thought about carefully in this context should signify a strong response. To what extent was it a one off-which simply could not continue?

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

Section 5: Themes c. 1378–c. 1610

21 Was the Papacy threatened more by heresy or by the conciliar movement in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might refer to the heretical movements of the period such as the Hussites and to the meetings of the Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basle.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may argue that the Hussites were a serious threat as they combined religious and nationalist aspirations. They were a challenge to the universality of the Church and their radical doctrines attacked central tenets and also targeted the corruption of the Church. Their success impacted on the Papacy in that it needed help to suppress them and thus had to make concessions to that end. But the Hussites were restricted largely to Bohemia and the Czechs and the execution of Hus limited their impact. They were also divided amongst themselves, with rival groups in Prague and Tabor. Communion in both kinds was their main unifying belief. The conciliar movement had the possibility of being a real threat to the Papacy. The Council of Pisa in 1409 managed to end the Schism, by the dubious expedient of appointing a third Pope, but this showed its capabilities. The Council of Constance helped the Papacy by burning Hus, but its desire to attack abuses was a threat to the Popes. It also opened up the whole issue of sovereignty in the church and where it lay and conciliar advocates claimed that a General Council outweighed the Papacy. This was a clear threat. In the end the Council was able to end the Schism, but national interests defeated the reform movement and the Papacy was safe. The Council of Basle hoped to initiate a reform programme and curb Papal powers, but became sidelined in the negotiations with the Greek Church about reunion. Division and discord followed and the conciliar movement was defeated even though Councils at Ferrara and Florence were held and Basle lingered on. The conciliar movement had the greater potential as a threat and its inability to bring about reform was instrumental in the evolution of the Reformation.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

22 How great was the contribution of both clerical and lay patrons to the development of the visual arts in the Italian Renaissance?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Purely descriptive accounts of the Renaissance will not get far and coverage should not be restricted to just a single form such as painting or sculpture. Factors which might be considered are: patrons who decided both theme and content; the urban ruling classes dominating so many aspects of ‘art’; the role of governments and institutions like the papacy; patron influence in areas such as painting/sculpture and architecture; analysis of the impact of patronage on individuals such as Leonardo, Michelangelo, Raphael; looking at wider issues where patronage is less influential such as – science, warfare, literature, mathematics, medicine, astronomy, printing, the role of universities and individuals.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Separation of lay and ecclesiastical is called for and serious analysis of the overall impact of patronage on the causes and course of the Renaissance and its ‘products’. Those who reflect carefully on the idea of ‘no patronage-no Renaissance’ and come up with some form of balanced answer or even speculate on what form it might have otherwise taken, should be rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

23 Why was the family so important to later-medieval society?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptive accounts of the role of family in the period will not get far. Factors which might be considered are: the crucial role it played in the upper classes; the importance of family/primogeniture for inheritance purposes; the vital role of the household; the shift from the multiple to the emergent nuclear family in the sixteenth century; its role in child rearing/education and as an economic and social unit; could vary considerably depending on prevailing social and above all economic conditions; family intermarriage vital of economic and social status; Louis of France ‘marriage was the cement of the state’; huge stress placed by so many on marriage; revival of Roman law changed it; impact of Puritanism on it.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some clear ideas on the role of the family in society are looked for. To what extent was the family central to the lives of people? Did it vary according to class and wealth?

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

24 What best explains the impact of Humanism in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptive accounts of humanism are not required. Factors which might be utilised to explain its impacts are: it adapted well to the political structure of Italy; the receptive papal court of Leo V; the scholars of Venice; the highly literate society in Italy; the attitude of universities like Bologna; the anti-clericalism of the age; current approaches to textual criticism/classical antiquity/Greek studies; national views – such as those of the University of Paris; the England of Colet, More and Grocin; the Burgundian court of Erasmus; the German interest and attitude; both secular and non-secular support; attitude of monarchs.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are a large number of possible answers with different focus. Any attempt to really try to explain why Europe was so receptive to this new approach should be rewarded. There is unlikely to be a single factor advocated. Ideally several ideas should be put forward hopefully including coverage of the medium as well as the message – or messages.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

25 Evaluate the factors which led to the rapid growth of overseas exploration and expansion in the fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the process are not required. There should be reasonable coverage of both exploration and expansion. Factors which might be considered are: trade; religion; technical developments – especially maritime; personality of individuals; actions of individuals like Cortes; greed and jealousy; social factors such as primogeniture – hence ambitions of younger sons; booty; power and status of monarchs; geography; economic and cultural traditions; organisational and financial skills.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A weighing up of the primary influences behind both exploration and expansion is looked for, and it could be argued that they were very different. More than a single country should be looked at, and candidates who are able to balance up factors from different countries should perform well.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

26 ‘Demographic changes had a significant impact on both sixteenth-century society and economies.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Simple descriptions of the demographic changes of the period are not required. Awareness of the main demographic factors of the period is expected, such as: life expectancy changes; young population; high age of marriage; deaths outnumbering births in area – so immigration occurring; increase post 1450 – especially in North. Impact might include: migration; overseas settlement; pressure on land use; demand led price rise; wages changes; crisis in exploitation of labour; urban population growth – generating demand and stimulating economies; increased property and rent values; benefits to bourgeois? harmful to peasant and working class generally (?).

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Focus should be on the significance (not the same as importance) on both social and economic life. The two areas are separate and should be treated separately. Expect to see a balanced case each way.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

Section 6: c. 1610–c. 1660

27 ‘Richelieu’s foreign policy was both unrealistic and unsuccessful.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the work of Richelieu are not required. Factors which might be considered for this essay are: the extent to which it was the work of Richelieu – Louis had ideas of his own; over concern with heresy and Habsburgs. There were benefits with the: Paulette; sale of offices; social changes; council reforms; mercantilist programmes; war was to damage trade; over taxation; peasant revolts; key foreign policy factors/gains; Spain; Low Countries; Thirty Years war involvement/Swedish alliance; outcome of Westphalia.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Thinking about unrealistic and unsuccessful is expected; the two should be dealt with separately. What might be seen as ‘realistic’ for France in the seventeenth century, given the condition of Europe and the resources and geographical condition of France? Success is a relative term and it should be looked at in the short as well as the longer term.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

28 How valid is the claim Olivares was a very successful minister?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the work of Olivares are not required. Factors which might be considered are: accepted war in 1621; creation of banks etc. in 1623 – all disasters; given dreadful inheritance from Lerma – did not do badly; hard-dynamic-puritan; overambitious and unrealistic ‘loves novelties’; never dealt with massive fiscal problems; devastated ship building industry; war allowed to dominate everything; totally unable to reform issues like pensions/sale of offices; failure of trading companies; failed to integrate Spain as one economic/taxpaying unit; grandiose plans for coherent development of empire; dubious tax plans did real harm; Castile still had to take full burden; failed in Portugal-revolt; Catalan disaster/civil war; responsible for disasters at Downs and Rocroi?; over reliance on bullion.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some consideration of what the criteria are for a successful minister is looked for in the best answers. Those who are able to weigh up his work in the context of early seventeenth century Spain, given its geography, traditions, monarchs etc. are likely to do well.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

29 Evaluate the impact of foreign intervention on the Thirty Years War.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the war are not required. The way it stopped being essentially an ‘internal’ German conflict to start with, and widened out to involve virtually every other country in Europe needs to be stressed. There should be an awareness of Spanish, as well as wide Habsburg involvement, and the Low Countries, Scandinavia and France and England, need to be brought in as well.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The extent to which foreign interests influenced the course, length and outcome needs consideration.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

30 Assess the achievements of Frederick William the Great Elector in the period to 1688.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign are not required, although a broad coverage which obviously has a focus on both the nature and extent is a good starting point. Factors which might be considered are: his acquisitions; the poor inheritance-low population-limited wealth; country devastated by war; the lessons learned from Gustavus Adolphus and the Dutch; the army; management of Diet and Estates; Fehrbellin; navy; attitude to Huguenots; Edict of Potsdam; sensible taxation; creation of a country/providing direction for it.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The best will think carefully about ‘nature’ as well as ‘extent’. Evidence of genuine reflection about where he started from and where Prussia ended is looked for. It need not always be praise; the path chosen by Frederick was not necessarily the one of peace and prosperity.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

31 Discuss the view that, in the period to 1650, Oldenbarnevelt played a more important role in Dutch politics than did the House of Orange.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the period of Dutch history are not required. There needs to be a clear focus on the two very different parts of the essay. Factors which might be covered could be – Oldenbarneveldt: East India Company – plus similar commercial organisations; provision of a degree of central executive authority; twelve-year truce with Spain; promotion of the Union of Utrecht; role against Leicester; supporter of the House of Orange; vital role in preventing internal division post Leicester; vital role in defence against Parma; overall contribution to retention and development of Dutch independence. Frederick Henry and Maurice: development of stadtholdership; military and naval roles; bringing lasting element of monarchy into the stage; failed to utilise power (esp. Maurice) role in religious disputes; too aggressive/ultimately failures?

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Reflection on what Oldenbarnevelt achieved as well as what the two members of the House of Orange attained is looked for. Note the important role in Dutch politics, although that can be interpreted to cover quite a variety of factors.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	22

Section 7: c.1660–c. 1715

32 How valid is the argument that Peter the Great successfully both westernised and modernised Russia?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign are not required. Factors which might be covered in both the westernisation/modernisation aspects are: education; the great embassy; suppression of noble revolts; the army; the fleet; mercantilism; administration; social change; relations with the church; St Petersburg; foreign policy; treatment of the Cossacks; acquisitions.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Clear thinking about both ‘westernise’ and ‘modernise’ is looked for. There should be some attempt at definition in the context of Russia in the eighteenth century. Consideration of ‘success’ is also very important.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. 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	22

33 ‘He did little more than try to prop up a badly crumbling edifice – Spain.’ Discuss this view of the role of Charles II.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign are not required. A focus on attempts at restoration/revival is needed. Factors which might be mentioned are: his health; the absence of an heir; economic recovery following the deflation of the 1680s; reign always dominated by succession; defended dignity of Spain and tried to preserve Spain’s territorial integrity; coped with the endless wars of Louis XIV; Treaty of Lisbon/recognition of Portuguese independence; territorial losses – e.g. Nijmegen; culture flourished; Spain remained an aristocratic and introspective society; poorly administered country; Church still too dominant.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are a variety of possible arguments but what is looked for is some thinking about the ‘crumbling edifice’ and what Charles did or did not do to prop it up. It might be possible to argue that he tried to do a great deal more than just prop it up. Strong candidates will attempt an overview of the reign and a weighing up of the nature and extent of his work in this context.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

34 How far did France benefit from the rule of Louis XIV?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign are not required. Aspects of the reign which might be considered are: social changes; the cultural impact of his reign; religious change; the nobility in France; economics – issues like the sale of offices; taxation; government; Estates General and Parlements; Absolutism; industry; military; imperial factors; the status of France in Europe.

AO2 – to 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. ‘Benefit’ offers much scope. The key to success here lies in careful analysis of what this might imply. Devout Catholics might have a different view from Huguenots, while at the same time economic implications of the Huguenot persecution might also be considered. Arguably, the benefits of war might be limited – unless prestige is seen as a benefit.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	22

35 ‘Charles XI had a much more realistic perception of what was in Sweden’s best interests than Charles XII’. Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the two reigns are not required. A clear focus on what might or might not be in the best interests of Sweden is needed. Factors which might be considered are - Charles XI: role of nobility/estates; military work; ending of military/economic unpreparedness; naval bases; standing army; finance and crown lands issues; ‘swedification’ of Baltic provinces; consolidation and defence; Dutch alliances; staying out of major wars; booming trade and industry. Charles XII: obsession with great power status, failure to realise how much depended on Russian and Polish weakness, failed to realise great legacy from father; unaware of hostility towards Sweden elsewhere/ability to make enemies; Danish war; Polish policy; advance into Saxony; Russia; Turkey; collapse of Sweden as a great power.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Evidence of clear thinking about what might or might not be ‘the best interests of Sweden’ should be expected. Once this has been established there should be a balanced analysis of the extent to which both attempted to identify and then act accordingly.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

36 To what extent did economic resources decide the outcome of the War of the Spanish Succession?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the war are not required. A very clear focus on what decided the outcome is needed. Factors which might be considered are: the resources available to the various participants; Austria-UK-Dutch against France and Spain and the Spanish Netherlands; maritime factors; diplomacy – e.g. Savoy and Portugal plus allies at end of war – especially over Spain; military factors – e.g. Eugene and Marlborough; Blenheim etc.; the French economy; the disasters of 1709; the amazing powers of resistance of France – the work of Villars 1709–10.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A balanced weighing up of the factors which decided the outcome of the war is looked for. There may well not be one key reason given, but a good attempt to prioritise factors may characterise good responses. Obviously, content needs to be considered.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

Section 8: c.1715–c. 1774

37 How effectively was France administered under Fleury and Orleans?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative/descriptive accounts of the work of the two men will not do well unless there is a very clear focus on the quality of their work and at least some implicit consideration of ‘effectiveness’. Factors which might be considered are – Orleans: Limited by Council; Degree of supremacy attained; Very difficult foreign situation cramped style; English treaty of 1716; Diplomatic success of 1719-21; Good administration in royal ‘vacuum’; Rise of parlement; Finance/Law; Role of Council. Fleury: The French ‘Walpole’; Above faction; No innovator; Avoided further Jansenism controversy; Period of repose; Supporter of legal work of d’Aguesseau and the fiscal work of Orry; Moderate foreign policy; 1738 Vienna Treaty.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Serious consideration of what might, or might not, be an ‘effective minister’ is looked for. With these criteria as a starting point a balanced analysis of the work on both men is looked for. Ideally coverage should be even, but some unevenness may feature as long the treatment shows no sign of superficiality.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

38 ‘In spite of his failings, Charles VI proved to be an able ruler.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of both reigns will not do well unless there is a very clear focus on the ability or otherwise of both monarchs. Factors which might be considered are – Charles VI: Personal establishment on the throne; Dealing with the Turkish menace; Hungary; Securing succession of daughter; War of the Polish succession; Loss of Naples and Sicily; Army work; Pragmatic Sanction; Development of Vienna; Overseas trade-failures there; Too many wars?

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Reflection on the criteria for an ‘able ruler’ is looked for. There are a variety of possible criteria, ranging from simple survival in difficult circumstances to leaving a quality legacy. Consideration of Charles’ failings is looked for, but it need not be a major part of the answer. What is looked for is a good and balanced/sympathetic overview of the work of the man in the context of his time.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

39 To what extent was Frederick William I better at identifying and pursuing the best interests of Prussia than was Frederick II?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the two reigns will not get far unless there is a very clear indication that ‘best interests’ etc. are being considered. Factors which might be covered are –Frederick William I: Totalitarian; Noble primacy; Army; Organisational skills; Income/taxation; Guilds policy; Tolerance/immigration; Central administration; Prepared for meteoric rise of son; Wars; Neglect of education and law. Frederick II: No great change to essential feature of state; Man of action/militarist; Very ambitious for himself and country; Invasion of Silesia-hostility to Austria; Seven Years War; Over centralised-lack of devolved power/authority; Attempts to foster economic life of nation; Final isolation; Cost of war.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Clear identification of what might or might not be ‘the best interests’ of Prussia is looked for followed by a balanced review of the extent to which both adhered to this ‘view’. The ideal is even coverage, but some unevenness may feature as long as the coverage of one is not superficial.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

**40 ‘Russia’s problems in the period to 1763 owed much to the legacy of Peter the Great.’
Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the period will not get far unless there is a very clear emphasis on problems arising out of the legacy of Peter the Great. Factors which might be considered are – The legacy itself; Social issues; Economic issues; Political issues; Administrative issues; Military factors; The church; The succession itself. Events: Boyar issues; Further succession problems; Individual problems of Catherine/Peter/ Anna; Faction fighting; Nationalist and German factors; Involvement of French diplomats in Russian foreign policy; The rise of Elizabeth; Highly erratic foreign policy; Financial chaos; Accession of Peter-another palace revolution.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Serious thinking about the ‘poisoned chalice’ element of the legacy is looked for. The focus should primarily be on what Peter left behind and not on what he did overall. The bulk of the essay should be looking at post – Peter events and analysing the extent to which he was responsible for what followed his death.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

41 How effectively was Spain ruled between c.1713 and 1777?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reigns in this period are not what is looked for. There should be a genuine attempt to identify what the best interests of Spain were –for example– peace and internal reform in considering how effective Spain was ruled. Factors which might be considered are – Philip V and Elizabeth Farnese; Regaining diplomatic initiative; Recovery from bankruptcy; Managing a complex social structure; Dealing with powerful/over powerful church; Work on army/fleet/income; Centralisation and reforms of Alberoni/Ripperda; Ferdinand VI- Jesuit influenced; Balance of power failures; Development of empire and good relations with Portugal; Foreign policy and wars; Excellent work of Charles III; Enlightened despot; Ministers such as Aranda and Floridablanca; Council work; Expulsion of Jesuits/church-state relations; Yet Seven Years War losses.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Ideally there will be a ‘big picture’ given of Spain in the eighteenth century and a comparison of the work of the various monarchs. There needs to be at least adequate coverage of all involved.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

Section 9: c. 1774–c. 1815

42 ‘She had enormous ability, but lacked vision.’ Discuss this view of Catherine the Great.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the reign will not get far unless there is a clear focus on Catherine’s character/ability/lack of these and what might be perceived as her vision/lack of vision for Russia. Factors which might be considered are – Serfdom issues; Foreign trade; Agrarian poverty; Charter of 1785; Personal ascendancy; Attitudes to French Revolution; Work with Senate and council; Hardworking; Legal reforms; The great communicator and great reformer; Actual seizure of power; Pugachev; Expansion-especially into Black Sea and Poland; Advantage of weak neighbours; Brilliant political operator; Took advantage of easy circumstances largely beyond her control?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Evidence of thinking about her ability or otherwise is looked for. The ‘vision’ aspect may test candidates and material normally appearing in enlightened despot essays may well be relevant.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

43 ‘A ruler of great intentions but limited achievements.’ Discuss this view of the Emperor Joseph II.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of his work and the reign will not get far unless there is a very clear focus on both intentions and achievement. Factors which might be considered are – Personality-clever-neurotic-harsh-severe and rushed decisions; Despotism and obsessed with innovation; Over-ambitious projects; Just carried on the work of Maria Theresa?; Worked to create a unitary secular state; Belief in equality; Pro-war and acquisition; Wished to rationalise and centralise – but failed; Left Belgium and Hungary in revolt; Attacked traditional institutions; Out to improve the health and wellbeing of his people; Worked on self sufficient economy, Austrian dominance, united and unified administration; Belief in the rule of law; Good on church-state relations and the role of the church; Yet problems with Turkey and Poland?

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Analysis of both intentions and achievement is looked for. One might well be criticised and the other praised. Judgement which indicates awareness of the world in which he lived and ruled should be rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

44 To what extent was Louis XVI responsible for the crisis of 1789 in France?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Simple descriptions of the causes of the French Revolution will not get far. The focus should be very much on the crisis itself and lists of causes/historiography will have to show relevance. Factors which might be considered are – War; Debt; State of society and political institutions; Flawed governmental and constitutional set up; New ideas; Inequality; Church; Ministers; Expectation of Estates General; Population increase; Inflation/food prices; Wages/Harvests; Unrealistic expectations on King; Reforming aspirations; Rural and Parisian revolts; Management of events.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The focus of the analysis should be on the monarchy – as opposed to the monarch – and also on the crisis of 1789 and not on later events or general causes of the revolution. The ability to place one factor in a broad order is looked for, with valid reasons given for its place. There should be as precise an answer as possible to the ‘extent’ element for candidates to really get to grips with the question.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

45 How valid is the view that Napoleon was an enlightened despot?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the life and work of Napoleon should not get far unless there is a clear focus on what might be deemed either ‘enlightened’ or ‘despotic’. Factors which might be considered are – Military: Tactics and generalship; Lodi etc.; Nile and Egypt; Wagram; Developments in cavalry, artillery, infantry use; Austerlitz and Ulm–yet Russia and Spain; Waterloo campaign and obsession with UK; Naval failings. France: Broad ability; Careers open to talent; Civil Code; Concordat; Legion of Honour; Bank of France; Linked in with aspirations of bourgeois; Endless support of his own family; Berlin Decrees/Continental System– impact on trade and industry; Censorship and education Police state?

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The ideal answer has real balance in it. There are a large number of possible approaches – those who look at the ‘big picture’ on both sides and also those who narrow it down into a fairly detailed study of specific actions. Surveys of the military history are unlikely to do well unless there is a real focus on the nature and extent of his military prowess. Those who take a more ‘perspective’ view should also do well.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

46 ‘The only real achievement of Alexander I of Russia was his role in the defeat of Napoleon.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his libertarian aspirations; his firming up of autocracy; his awareness of the fundamental failings of Russia; his legal codification; his attempts at constitutionalism; his ideas on education; his views on Poland and possibly his role at Vienna.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It is unlikely that one specific point will dominate. Answers may agree with the proposition, but there is a case to be made the other way if the degree of awareness of the fundamental problems which Russia faced—such as the serfs and the dominance of the ‘old’ aristocracy is considered. Some reflection on what a ‘real’ achievement might be could lead to a more sympathetic view. Given his background and the state of both Russia and Europe at the time, simply survival could be seen as real achievement.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

Section 10: Themes c.1610–c. 1815

47 How far did the slave trade change in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts are not required. Factors which might be considered are: the move from small scale private enterprise to an international business; the way it became a major factor in international relations; the growth of powerful pressure groups; its integrating into the economic life of a nation; its involvement in the ‘politics’ of Africa; numbers, destinations and national and local impact are also possible areas for consideration.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It is unlikely that one specific point will dominate. Ideally the focus will remain on the ‘trade’, who did it and why, and the nature and extent of their involvement. The best responses will reflect on whether all that changed was the scope and impact or whether the change was of much great significance.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

48 How radical were the changes in warfare in either the seventeenth or the eighteenth centuries?

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts are not required. Factors which might be considered are: (note the ‘either’ and ‘or’) tactics ranging from the use of infantry and cavalry; the rise and fall of the emergency and the growth of ‘national’ armies; logistics; leadership; grand strategy; fortifications ;leadership ranging from that of Van Tromp, Gustavus Adolphus, Suffren ,Wallenstein of Marlborough. There is much to choose from. Those who leave out naval aspects can still perform strongly, but the bigger and broader the picture, the better.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Ideally there will be a focus on the ‘radical’ aspect of the question and not just a list of changes in both tactics and strategy. If there is overlap between the centuries – such as over the War of the Spanish Succession, then that is acceptable. There is a case to be made for just seeing it as modest change over time- was there that much difference between the opening stages of the Thirty Years War and the Italian campaigns of Napoleon?

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

49 How important a contribution to political, cultural and intellectual life did women make in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present the response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptive accounts of what women did or did not do are not required. Good coverage of two of the three areas is sufficient and flexibility should be shown to those who blend cultural and intellectual.

AO2 – is 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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some idea of importance is looked for, and the greater the degree of assessment of the nature and extent of the contribution, the better.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

50 'The Institution itself changed little, but attitudes to it changed radically in the course of the eighteenth century.' Discuss this view of monarchy in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptive accounts of monarchs are unlikely to do well– the focus should be on the institution itself – broadly– and attitudes towards it. The range of possible factors which could be brought in is large – but might include – Locke; Montesquieu; Growth of absolutism; Divine right ideas and changes in them and attitudes to them; Waning influence of Bossuet; View of Encyclopaedists; Retention of roman law principles; Impact of minorities and the incompetent monarchs; French revolution; Enlightened despotism; Restorations in 1815.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Two issues need analysing. Whether the institution itself changed much and attitudes towards it. There is ample scope to debate and produce balanced arguments on both.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect 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	22

51 What best explains increasing imperial rivalries in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Straightforward descriptions of the various rivalries are unlikely to get far. The following factors might be considered – Internal factors such as industrial development; Pressure politics– the ‘sugar/slave’ merchants; Desire for income and power; Mercantilist ideas; Need for food and resources– e.g. the Newfoundland fishery; Assumed links between empire and national welfare; The ‘Pitt system’; The growth of commercial companies; Wealth gained from colonies like India/W Indies; Scope for expanding population; Monopolism; Nationalism/jingoism/rivalry; Prevention–protect one’s own; Markets; Attitudes of statesmen.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A variety of factors needs to be examined in a good answer, with clear prioritisation and valid reasons to support. Inevitably there is no one answer expected, and different factors may well apply to different countries at different times.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 56	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	22

52 Assess the view that population growth was the driving force behind economic and social change in the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Straightforward lists of statistics or causes of the industrial revolution may have some relevance, but they need to be closely related to the ‘driving’ force part of the question. Factors which may be mentioned are – The whole debate on the causes of the industrial revolution/s; Very different forces at work in different countries; Colonial stimulus; Fall in grain prices; Pre-conditions; Technological development; Impact of agricultural change; Nature and extent of demographic change; Transport revolution; Credit revolution; Commercial revolution; Unrestrained capitalism; Stimulus of war; Different social structure and social attitude to ‘trade’; Geography; Political attitudes. Population growth went from c 132 million in 1700 to 204 million in 1800.

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 importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Thinking about ‘driving force’ is needed; some may well see that as something quite different from ‘causes’. Inevitably there is scope for ‘cause and effect’ debates. Thorough coverage of both economic and social change is not to be insisted upon, but those who make a serious attempt at both and deal with the interconnection between the two should be appropriately rewarded.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, grammar and punctuation. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.