

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/12

Paper 1b (British History Outlines, 1399–1815),
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 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

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

Introduction

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

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

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

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

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 2014	9769	12

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 answer 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 2014	9769	12

Section 1: 1399–1461

1 How effectively did Henry IV overcome the challenges facing him?

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. The question requires analysis and assessment, a narrative of the rebellions, conspiracies and problems facing him will not score well. Although the unpopularity of Richard II was of some advantage to Henry, there was still some support for the former King, for example in the north and midlands and amongst the Franciscans. Rebellion and conspiracy against Henry IV should also be seen against the background of his usurpation and the existence of other possible claimants. Wales and Glyndwr’s rebellion presented a threat to the King in the Marches and the long lasting nature of it was especially difficult. Henry’s other major problem in terms of opposition came from the Percies whose grievances and discontent made them persistent rebels. Candidates may be expected to deal with the issue of Hotspur and his defeat at Shrewsbury, the rebellion and conspiracy of Northumberland and Scrope which produced a Northern rising in 1405 and resulted in Scrope’s execution and the defeat of Northumberland in 1408.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Challenges to Henry were serious but there is real debate over how effective he was in meeting these challenges. The issue of Glyndwr was particularly difficult. Henry was beset with other issues that meant he was unable to give his whole attention to containing conspiracy, especially in terms of foreign policy and finances.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

2 What best explains Henry V's success in his campaigns 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. A good balance should be struck between English strengths and French weaknesses. Chronological narratives of the military campaigns should be avoided. The incapacity of Charles VI and the connected rivalries of the nobility could be pointed up. Henry's successes in the period 1417-1419 owed a great deal to those rivalries and faction and to what amounted to civil war in France, which meant that he could occupy Normandy almost unopposed. On the other hand Henry's generalship, powers of military organisation and diplomacy need to be explored, as well as his ruthlessness. Candidates might well make clear points about Agincourt, but the answer needs to be more wide-ranging than that. Some candidates might explore the role and effectiveness of the long bow, there might be some comment about his effectiveness at home which allowed him to fight in France, finance and the use of Parliament may well be a significant part of this.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. There should be a real attempt at relative evaluation and a clear sense of the best explanation, although no particular view is being sought. Differing emphasis on factors can be expected, it could be argued that despite Henry's undoubted abilities he could not have been so successful without the weakness of the French monarchy.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

3 'Owain Glyndwr's rebellions failed because of his military mistakes.' 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. It is expected that candidates should cover the whole period of the uprising in order to evaluate the extent of the military mistakes and indeed successes; this should be set against other possible reasons for failure. Candidates might well take a chronological view, which, so long as it is not descriptive may well work. Owain Glyndwr declared himself Prince of Wales in 1400 and rules Wales for nearly 10 years. Candidates might reflect upon his early successes in his dealings with France and the Papacy and the marriage of his daughter to Edmund Earl of March. It could be argued that he was successful in this period in part because of the other problems suffered by Henry IV. Glyndwr's dealings with the English nobility especially the Earl of March should be evaluated. Henry's problems should be evaluated, including his problems with his own accession, issues with Scotland and the challenges of the Percies. For 10 years Wales and the Marches were a battleground with economic, social and political consequences. The ultimate defeat of Owain and the future Henry V's role in that should also be considered. In the short term, his military mistakes were largely to blame for his fall, although it could be argued that Henry was more able to deal with him in 1409. The fact that he simply disappeared could also be reflected upon.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Although the achievements of Owain may seem impressive, their significance in terms of their longevity should be considered. The issues of the person and circumstances of Henry IV are also important. But there should be a clear focus on the issue of military mistakes and a relative evaluation of how far those contributed to his downfall.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

4 Did the failures of the minority of Henry VI outweigh its successes?

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. Whilst Henry VI presided over perhaps one of the most unstable periods in English history, as a minor the kingdom was governed well by his uncle the Duke of Gloucester despite the strain that was placed on the realm due to the dual monarchy. The position in France for his uncle the Duke of Bedford was always more difficult, especially given the resurgence of the French and the lack of money. The make up of the council could be evaluated as it contained many remarkable able men who had a long history of able service. The Council and Gloucester kept government ticking over, although there was always an air of impermanence and there were notable tensions particularly between Gloucester and Cardinal Beaufort. Some comparison with his period of majority might be expected but again the focus should be predominantly on the period of minority. Some sense of understanding of the role of the king in the fifteenth century might be expected in relation to the lack of an adult king. Candidates might also reflect on the calamity of the loss of Henry V at such a young age.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A sense of perspective of the role of monarchy might well be expected, candidates might well argue that the minority was remarkably successful given the enormous issues to be dealt with and the legacy left by Henry V. Some evaluation of the tensions below the surface might well be employed by way of a counter argument, although candidates will probably conclude that this period saw more success than failure. But that it was always blighted by the sense of impermanence.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

5 'Henry VI had no one but himself to blame for the loss of his throne. 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. One view may well be that Henry was very much to blame, his favourites; he lack of military prowess; his poor guardianship of royal finances and his unstable mental health. On the other hand candidates might argue that others might shoulder some of the blame, chief amongst these, York and Warwick, although perhaps Somerset and Margaret of Anjou might also be implicated. It could be argued however, that the Kingdom was better governed during the time of the protectorates than at any other time and that after Henry was removed from London and Anjou allowed to take her revenge on the Yorkists, it could only be a matter of time before Henry was deposed. Candidates might turn to key turning points including the First Battle of St. Albans; the Parliament of Devils; the Battle of Wakefield and Anjou's failure to take London. Candidates might also differentiate between the longer and shorter term causes.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. It would be difficult to see Henry as entirely blameless for the situation, even before his breakdown he engineered a situation where the royal favourites were deeply resented and others such as York sidelined. After his breakdown, the responsibility might lie with Anjou, but candidates might well ascribe some blame on York, this will tend to depend upon their assessment of the point at which York began to aim for the throne. The key to success will be a relative evaluation of these factors.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

Section 2: 1461–1547

6 How valid is the view that the Yorkist rule (1471–85) was both innovative and effective?

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. A Chronological approach might work here so long as candidates do not simply recount the events of this period, there should be coverage of the whole period. Following Edward IV's return to the throne England seemed to be settled and the Yorkists could embark on the business of governing the realm. It is worth pointing out that Richard of Gloucester was substantially involved with the governance of the realm during his brother's reign. There is something to be said for the premise of the question, both Edward and Richard were skilled administrators and Edward in particular presided over an able and hardworking council. The chief area of innovation lies in the crown finances and use of the Chamber, a more peaceful foreign policy; attacks on retaining and innovative solutions for the provinces. Where effectiveness can be questions tend to lie in personal relationships, Edward was prepared to break the law when rewarding his brothers only to be damagingly let down by Clarence. Edward presided over a dangerously faction ridden court and made no provision for a minority in the event of his death, arguably he depended on too narrow powerbase. The effectiveness of Richard's governance is fairly well established, but arguably he never emerged from the circumstances of his accession.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The Yorkist Kings have their apologists, with substantial claims to establishing sound government, whether this amounted to real innovation is an issue that candidates should address. It could be debated that a dynasty so reliant on faction and torturous family connection could not be regarded as innovative and that Edward should have addressed these issues if he was ever to merit the accolade of an effective king.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

7 How successful was Henry VII's relationship with the nobility?

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. Narratives of the reign will not be well rewarded; there should be a clear focus on the issue of the nobility. Answers should show a good understanding of the role of the nobility in fifteenth century England as local magnates responsible for law and order in the localities and raising and commanding armies and as counsellors. Kings needed not only to demonstrate their authority over the nobles, but also to win trust and good will and answers should deal with this issue. Exploration and analysis of the following policies might be expected: acts of attainder and reversals of attainder; bonds and recognisances; methods to deal with bastard feudalism and retaining; wardship; the role of the court; the granting of titles; promotions and lands; appointments to the council; the Council Learned in the Law and a reduction of the reliance on the nobility in the provinces. Specific examples do need to be used.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. There is considerable debate here, the traditional view that Henry was anti-noble, more recent revisions suggest that his aim was to re-establish the proper relationship between nobility and monarchy following the wars of the Roses and more recently still a view that Henry displayed all the hallmarks of a tyrant over his dealings with the nobility. Candidates might point to the fact that Henry was an unknown before his accession, with few natural supporters and an even smaller family, which could be viewed as both advantage and disadvantage. One great test of success might be that Henry faced no noble rebellions after the first year of his reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

8 To what extent did James IV and James V of Scotland achieve their ambitions in Scotland?

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. The chronological focus should be on the period from the accession of James IV (1488) to the death of James V (1542), although some reference might be made to the situation James IV inherited. Broad themes could be explored, certainly the issue of internal order should be addressed, and the issue of eroding power bases within the country, the prestige of the court and the relations of Scotland to other countries, especially England and France. James IV was energetic and pious, he achieved an excellent marriage with Margaret Tudor and built a glittering renaissance court, he was also able to extend his influence over the Church. Some comment on the minority of James V might be expected; once he took personal control, he was able to extend his father's programme over the Church, restore royal finances and make excellent marriage alliances.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The verdict on both kings is generally favourable, but both died prematurely so some evaluation of this will be required. Some critical evaluation of their relationships with the nobility might be expected and candidates might reflect that policy was too dependent on the French alliance. The verdict on Church relationships and culture should not be ignored however.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines.]

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

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

9 'Its aims were invariably unrealistic.' Consider this view of foreign policy in the reign of Henry VIII.

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. The focus of this question should be the aims of Henrican foreign policy and how realistic these were, there should be good coverage of the whole reign. A chronological approach might well be taken and this could work so long as there is substantial evaluation as opposed to narrative. The reign can be divided into three eras, the period during which Wolsey presided over Henry's dreams of a French victory; the period of the Reformation which was generally concerned with security and the renewal of war towards the end of the reign. In general candidates might reflect that the dream of success in France was always unrealistic given the size and power of England as compared to her continental rivals and the duplicity of Henry's chosen allies.

The issue of finance, or lack thereof was a constant problem. However, Henry was not to be ignored and whilst he never came close to achieving his aims, there were notable successes such as the treaty of London. Less glorious was the mid period, the alliance with German Protestants gained nothing and was unpalatable to Henry. The policy against Scotland and France at the end of his reign was ruinously expensive and ultimately doomed.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates might well agree with the statement to a very large degree, not least to criticise Henry for his lack of appreciation of political reality. Policy was ultimately very expensive and achieved very little tangible benefit. However, England was not invaded and Henry was from time to time sought out as a balance to the two European super powers.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

10 How far were both the causes and the course of the Henrician Reformation, c.1529 to c.1540, dictated by Henry VIII's personal concerns?

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. Henry was certainly motivated by the need for a male heir and he feared for the future of his dynasty. It could also be argued that once Henry had been convinced of supremacy, he wanted to maintain this extension to his own powers. This largely underpins his search for a divorce and the break from Rome, further reform in the 1530s might also be seen as stemming from the need for security. Even after the conservative backlash in 1540, Henry was still concerned to maintain his newly won powers. Other motivations can also be seen, these include: the reforming tendencies of Cromwell and the Boleyn circle; the issue of anti clericalism; finance and wealth, although it could be argued that this was motivated by personal greed; the need for security in removing the monasteries. Candidates will need to comment on both the causes and the course of the Reformation.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. There is a great deal of debate here, whilst it is unlikely that candidates will argue for a bottom-up reformation, some consideration of the Church and reforming tendencies might be expected. Candidates might well reflect that the causes of the Reformation were indeed almost entirely personal, but that the later course of the reforms might well owe more to a wider range of issues. Candidates might be expected to set this in the context of a personal monarchy where most issues of state were very closely associated with the personal concerns of the monarch.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

Section 3: 1547–1603

11 'A time of continuous and profound crisis.' Discuss this view of the reign of Edward VI.

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. There is a lively debate to be had here; Edward's reign is often portrayed as consistently troubled, but a closer analysis is called for. The reign began with war against France and Scotland, neither of which succeeded in their aims and put the regime under intolerable financial stress for the rest of the reign. Religion is also an important area. The picture is mixed here, and certainly there was opposition to the religious policies, but not in all areas of the country, although some mention needs to be made of the Western Rebellion. The issue of the economy is also important, both in terms of government policy such as the debasement of the coinage and in terms of economic events such as poor harvests. It could be argued that under Somerset there was a breakdown in councillor government and that governance, broke down completely in the summer of 1549. Yet it was possible to reassert governance and the second half of the reign did witness better administration and administrative reform. Clearly the last months of his reign can also be seen as a time of crisis. Candidates may well compare the abilities of Somerset and Northumberland. Candidates may also reflect upon the nature of a minority administration.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The emphasis must be on an evaluation of 'continuous and profound crisis; it is not sufficient to relate the events of Edward's reign. The best answers will identify the varying nature of crisis and will perhaps highlight the summer of 1549 and the final months of the reign. There is considerable debate on these issues, especially in rehabilitating Northumberland and viewing at least the second part of the reign as far more settled.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

12 How well judged were the domestic and foreign policies of Mary 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. The question requires treatment of both domestic and foreign policy and good answers may well reflect on the interdependence of these two issues. There may be some evaluation of how far the policies were Mary's own. Candidates may be expected to deal with the following issues: success in establishing the regime; the restoration of Papal authority; the resolution of the Church lands question; the revival of the heresy laws; the Spanish marriage and responses to it; war with France; relationships with Parliament; the argument over the composition of the Council; administrative and naval reforms and the restoration of the currency.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. A sharp sense of evaluation of 'well judged' is required. Candidates might well be expected to evaluate the success of policies. Candidates might well point to the issue of the Spanish marriage and the persecution. There may well be mitigating circumstances, such as bad harvests, famine, inflation and disease and ultimately the brevity of the reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines.]

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

Page 17	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

13 Consider the view that Elizabeth I was ‘a superb manager of Parliament’.

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. Narratives of the relationship between Queen and Parliament will not take candidates very far. Candidates will need to show a clear understanding of the role and functions of Parliament – to vote taxation; to pass legislation; to receive petitions; to give advice and to act as a law court. Some distinction between Lords and Commons might be made. The infrequency of Parliaments might be mentioned and some understanding that Parliament was not the primary organ of government. Management methods may include the selection of the speaker; packing, though infrequent; the use of councillors in Parliament, especially the role of Cecil; drafting of legislation; methods for dealing with a backlog of business; the Queen’s use of speeches and propaganda. On the other hand, issues such as reluctance to grant supply, though only one Parliament did not grant taxation; issues of freedom of speech; forbidden topics such as marriage and succession; issues of religious policy may be considered.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. There were issues about which Parliament felt strongly, often the issues Elizabeth did not want to be discussed, it might be argued that this often came down to unresolved issues in the Council. Candidates might suggest that Elizabeth did not much like Parliament and it was a constant struggle between her wish to dissolve Parliament as soon as she got what she wanted and allowing other business to be transacted. Candidates might argue that the relationships changed and developed throughout the reign and especially in the later years with the stresses of war. No set answer is expected and candidates might explore the traditional view of opposition in Parliament set against a reappraisal of issues to see far more accord.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 18	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

14 'English Puritans rather than English Catholics posed the greater threat to Elizabeth and her government.' 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. Here the focus should be on the comparison of the threat, although candidates might conclude that the nature of the threat of Puritans as compared to Catholics was very different and that the nature and intensity of the threat does change over time. Generally speaking, the Catholics are seen as more menacing. Candidates are likely to refer to Mary, Queen of Scots; the various plots; foreign intervention; the Revolt of the Northern Earls; the Armada and Seminary priests and Jesuits. It could be contended that the threat really materialises after the publication of the Papal Bull of Excommunication. Candidates might reflect on whether the majority of Catholics remained loyal subjects. The Puritan threat revolves around the problems it caused Elizabeth in the governance of her realm. The following issues may well be included: control of the churches in the localities; rights of advowson; the threat posed to supremacy by the Presbyterians and the nuisance factor caused by some Puritans in Parliament. It could be argued that although the Puritans don't go away, they are prepared to throw their weight behind the government as the Catholics become a real threat. Moreover, candidates might argue that the Puritans, never a united force with no figurehead, unlike the Catholics, could never cause anything more than irritation value to the Queen. But they did question some of the fundamental issues of state, in particular supremacy and uniformity.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. This is very much an issue of evaluation of threat. It might be argued that as the Catholics owed their allegiance to a foreign power, they were always likely to be more of a threat, yet this is only really the case later in the reign; many Catholics did remain loyal. On the other hand, Puritans took it upon themselves to question the settlement and tried to work from within to effect change to the religious settlement on which Elizabeth believed she had the final word. The historical debate on this issue is very lively and candidates could make good use of it.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

15 Assess the success of English rule in Ireland in the period 1547–1603.

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. The coverage of the whole period should be reasonably balanced, although there may be some gaps. The main thrust is an evaluation of success, so aims, policies and outcomes will need to be assessed and explained. In dealing with the issues of Ireland, candidates might be expected to refer to some of the following: political, tribal and social structures; Gaelic and Old English communities; the limited area of effective control in 1547; religious complications as England moved towards Protestantism; the background of Irish resistance; limited resources available and the huge cost involved. The policy followed was largely one of coercion. Candidates may refer to the following strands of policy: the use of garrisons, for example, by Somerset and by Mary; plantation or colonisation used more or less throughout the period; divide and rule and the use of Anglo-Irish nobility such as O’Neill; provincial councils modelled on the Council of the North; the appointment of English Lord Deputies; use of the Irish Parliament, but only four in the whole period; the suppression of rebellion, for example, Kildare; the activities of Essex and the prevention of Spanish invasion in the 1590s.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates may wish to consider whether English aims and policies went beyond subjugation and exploitation. How important were strategic considerations? How far was plantation a response to the growing English population? What was the importance of religion? Would better results have been achieved with greater resources and to what extent had the situation changed by 1603?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

Section 4: Themes c.1399–c.1603

16 'Corrupt and worldly.' How accurate a view is this of the fifteenth-century Church in England?

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. The chronology of the fifteenth century can certainly be stretched here, however, this is not a question about the causes of the reformation and there needs to be significant reference to the fifteenth century itself with robust examples. A chronological approach is unlikely, but purely descriptive accounts will not score well. There is certainly a case to be made for the question with plenty of examples of worldly prelates such as Beaufort and Wolsey; yet vocation was still strong there were an increasing number of graduates amongst the secular clergy although monastic life did seem to falter despite their wealth. Candidates might refer to various attempts at genuine reform. Some reference to Lollardy might well be made. Popular piety was generally strong with enthusiasm for pilgrimage and lay guilds in particular. The links between lay literacy and printing of religious works might well be made. The flurry in Church building and the refurbishment of parish churches should be mentioned. Candidates might well debate whether there was a change in religious feeling and whether anti-clericalism was any greater or prompted by increased corruption is debatable.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. There is real debate about the nature and extent of corruption in the Church and candidates may well engage in the historical controversy. Candidates might reflect on the problems with some of the sources. No set answer is expected, there is considerable evidence to argue both ways.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

17 Should we accept the view that fifteenth-century England enjoyed growing prosperity?

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. Answers might be expected to address the following set of issues: demographic change, the levelling out of the effects of plague and results; static prices and rising wages. Candidates might well reflect on whether this was the case for all sections of society. Other areas to be considered might include the decline of the wool trade but the expansion of the cloth trade and industry; growth in other industries such as building; salt production; tin mining; evidence of the growth of merchant shipping; the rising wealth of London and some provincial towns; the rise of substantial tenant farmers and the yeomanry. Commutation of labour services became universal; consolidation of holdings by landlords and peasants and enclosure could be considered. Candidates might consider changes over the period and perhaps the impact that civil war had on these issues.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. One obvious area to explore is the issue of whether this was a golden age of the labourer, the debate surrounding enclosure and sheep farming. The debate over the relative growth of some towns and industries against the relative decline of others.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 22	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

18 To what extent and why did the role of women in society change during the fifteenth 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. Candidates may well point out that despite changes society remain overwhelmingly patricidal and advances in the role of women often depended on social or marital status. There is evidence of women being members of craft guilds and running workshops and businesses, but these did tend to be single or widowed women. There is some evidence that there was real change, though temporary in the fifteenth century. There is also evidence of women being influential in the Church as abbesses for example or mystics such as Julian or Norwich. Candidates might refer to influential individuals such as Cecily Neville, Margaret Beaufort or Margaret of Anjou. Candidates will need to fully engage with the issue of ‘why’ to access the full range of marks, this could be set in the wider context of greater prosperity or greater lay piety.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. One area of debate might concern the nature of the evidence which is patchy and more accessible at the higher reaches of society. How far did demographic changes effect the role and influence of the *femmes seules* in the fifteenth century?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

19 To what extent were developments in art and architecture in sixteenth-century England influenced by developments in continental Europe?

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. The influence of the continental renaissance was disseminated by a number of means: returning English visitors to continental Europe, especially to France and Italy; patronage of continental artists, architects and craftsmen by the nobility and monarchs; by the printed word and illustrations. Architecture demonstrates a mixture of styles – Italian, French and Flemish and discussion of use of materials and internal decoration may well be relevant. Sculpture and painting were largely confined to portraiture and examples of foreign artists such as Holbein and Gheeraerts can be given. There should be a good range of specific examples, but pure description will not be well rewarded.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. One area of debate is the extent of continental influence and the balance between continental styles and English styles. Candidates might well consider what was unique about English Gothic. How far did great houses, for example, embrace a mixture of styles and how far had a distinctly English style emerged by the end of the century? What was the contribution of English architects and painters?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

20 How serious were the consequences of population growth on sixteenth-century society and the economy?

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. Answers will need to spend some time on the scale of population change, but the bulk of the debate should be directed towards evaluating the consequences and their severity. The safest estimates are a population of 2.8m at the start of the period and 4m by 1603. Among the most important effects are those upon land utilisation and reorganisation and new farming methods; a rise in prices especially of food; a fall in real wages for most of the century; the impact on provision for the poor and the issue of vagabondage.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. There is clear debate about when the population began to rise and why. There were regional variations and intermittent checks to growth caused by epidemic disease and a run of bad harvests. Reliable evidence can be an issue. Candidates might offer other explanations for price inflation and evaluate the relative importance of population growth alongside this.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 25	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

21 Why did some towns prosper, and others decline, in the sixteenth 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. Whilst population distribution in this period remained overwhelmingly rural, there was significant growth in urban population, with London taking the lead. The picture, however, is far more mixed; whilst many towns grew in both size and importance, some declined significantly. In the north, towns such as York, Hull and Newcastle remained important, though York declined in relative terms. Some northern towns such as Leeds and Manchester grew significantly. Traditional centres such as Lincoln and Salisbury declined, although their population increased. In some places plague and dearth were to blame; in others the shifts in the wool trade were responsible. Centres of pilgrimage suffered after the Reformation, whilst the university towns of Oxford and Cambridge flourished. Changed patterns of internal trade were important as was external trade; Bristol grew as did ports which were associated with the Navy. In some places such as Newcastle the flourishing of new industry was important.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The key here is to recognise that the picture is very mixed; whilst the south east generally flourished the pattern was not uniform, neither is the speed of change throughout the century. Wider influences were also at work. Whilst the population of the country increased as a whole, it was severely retarded in the mid-century: war, famine and religious change all played their part. Specific examples will be required.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 26	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

Section 5: 1603–1689

22 'Finance lay at the root of the problematic relationship between Crown and Parliament between 1603 and 1629.' 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. Answers will need to go beyond an account of the financial issues which lay between the early Stuarts and their Parliaments. An evaluation of the importance of finance as an issue is required together with an evaluation of some alternative explanations or difficulties. The chief focus will almost certainly be on James I but a balanced treatment of Charles I will also be required. The chronological focus is from James's succession to Charles's dissolution of the Third Parliament of his reign and the beginning of the personal rule. Specific financial issues can be summarised as follows: purveyance and wardship; the Great Contract; demands for subsidies; impositions; monopolies; forced loans; tonnage and poundage. It would be relevant and helpful for answers to lay out the context of the Crown's financial position in 1603; inelastic and outdated sources of revenue; the effects of the sixteenth-century inflation; the strain imposed by the war with Spain; pent-up demands for patronage. In these circumstances Parliament was able to invoke the principle of redress before supply. James I's extravagance may be set alongside this. Apart from the issues raised by finance, it is closely associated with the conduct of foreign policy and war and with the grievances surrounding favourites and the royal court. Other factors to be considered include religion; the personalities and styles of the monarchs and their promotion of the royal prerogative and Divine Right; the union with Scotland.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. It might be argued that conflict arose to a large extent out of a clash between two sets of principles – royal prerogative on the one hand and the privileges and growing pretensions of Parliament on the other. Connected with this, the Crown's failure to manage Parliament might be assessed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

23 How persuasive is the view that the personal rule of Charles I (1629–40) was a time of peace and good 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. A chronological account of 1629–40 should be avoided, and the question is best considered by topic or theme. These might include: diplomacy, the ending of the war in 1629–30 with peace treaties with France and Spain and the maintenance of peace until the Bishops' War; economically, unemployment and dearth in the early 1630s and intermittent plague throughout the decade, but some improvement too after 1630, as long-term pressures of population increased and inflation eased; the contested imposition of Laudian reforms in the Church and prerogative taxation, most prominently ship money, in the state. Set pieces such as the trial and punishment of the Puritan Trio and Hampden's ship money trial are particular examples of controversy and opposition rather than peace. There is also a case for considering change across the decade and contrasting the relative peace of the early part of the 1630s with the gathering troubles from 1637–40.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The 1630s can be viewed as a more peaceful and prosperous decade than the 1620s, with its regular but unsuccessful Parliaments, as well as the decade of civil war which followed. The severe criticism levelled at Charles I's government in the Long and Short Parliaments in 1640 may suggest that the political peace of the 1630s was more apparent than real and that most contemporaries lacked a platform, in the absence of Parliament, on which to express their grievances. Alternatively, it could be argued that it was only the problems with two unpopular and unsuccessful wars against Scotland that fermented discontent. Some, of course, supported Laudianism or believed that ship money was legal so a case can be made for a variety of reactions to the personal rule. Moreover, 'peace and good government' can be uncoupled and different judgements made on each. Prosperity can also be judged against the suffering and misery of the Thirty Years War on the continent.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

24 ‘Good luck rather than ability explains Oliver Cromwell’s rise to power.’ Discuss with reference to the period c.1645 to c.1653.

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. From rather obscure beginnings, it has often been difficult to explain the rise of Cromwell in this period and there is considerable debate surrounding this issue. Candidates might take a chronological approach, but this should focus on explanation and analysis rather than narrative. Ability might explain his early successes in the military arena which then gave him increased prominence and a platform; certainly the formation of the New Model Army and the victory of Naseby could be included here. Candidates might review his personal qualities and popularity amongst his men. The negotiations with Charles might be argued to owe more to luck and the behaviour of the King, as it is difficult to discern his policy at this point. Again, his military prowess comes to the fore, but candidates might debate his role in the King’s execution. His relations with the Rump should be interrogated and he might be seen wanting. His campaigns in Ireland and Scotland should be evaluated. The fall of the Rump is significant.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Candidates might argue this issue either way; he certainly had great military ability, although some of his success must rest on the inadequacies of the royalists. Candidates might argue that his power rested too heavily on the army and that perhaps in other areas his ability was not so great.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

25 How successful a king was 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. A straightforward account of the reign will only meet with moderate success. There should be a good balance between the treatment of foreign and domestic policies with a sharp focus on Charles's own role. In dealing with domestic policy, it would be helpful to explain the context of the Restoration settlement and the security and advantages it gave to Charles as well as possible pitfalls. Answers may be expected to deal with the following: the working out of the Restoration settlement in the 1660s and the extent of success/failure. Difficulties faced in the 1670s with defeat over the Declaration of Indulgence and the passing of the Test Act; suspicions about the King's motives and possible preference for absolutism and the impeachment of Danby; the Popish Plot; the Exclusion Crisis; the Oxford Parliament and the absolutist period of the last years of the reign. In dealing with foreign policy, answers may consider issues of the European balance of power; the conflict between the Dutch Republic and Louis XIV's France and England's commercial, colonial and naval rivalry.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might be expected to indicate the close connections between foreign and domestic policies and thus arrive at a coherent judgement as to Charles's overall success.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 30	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

26 Why did attempts to alter the succession fail during the Exclusion Crisis, but succeed at the Glorious Revolution?

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. A chronological account across the period is best avoided, although candidates could well examine failure in 1679–81 followed by successes in 1688–89. The very different circumstances of the two periods needs analysis: in the first, Charles II was firmly against altering the succession and manipulated when and where Parliament met in 1678–81 to frustrate his opponents, and after 1681 never convened it again; there were various solutions to the succession question (exclusion, limitations, Charles II to remarry, a regency and Monmouth's candidature) which divided those in favour of alternation; Charles played a canny hand and allied with the emergent Tory party to defeat exclusion, the favoured solution of their enemies the Whigs. In 1688–89 things were very different: James II had forfeited the active support of the Tories and created a fragile alliance of Catholics and Dissenters. He had an unreliable army to face an invasion force led by William of Orange who cleverly appealed to the majority of the political nation by pushing for a free Parliament, which almost all could support, while piling on the psychological pressure on James II, whose nerve snapped and he fled in December 1688. With William thereafter running the country, the most likely outcome of the Convention Parliament was that William and/or Mary would be offered the throne.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. The contrast between the Parliament-centred struggle in 1678–81 and a much broader struggle in 1688–89 is worth emphasising.

For the first time the Whigs had limited options since they did not command a majority in both houses, and with increasing revenue from trade and a renewed French subsidy, Charles II could dispense with Parliament in 1681. In 1688–89 with a foreign army in England, James II was cornered in a way his brother never had been and only had the options of fighting, negotiating or fleeing. Once he had reached France, with a Dutch army occupying London and William as *de facto* head of state, there was a good case for seeing an alteration of succession, effective before Parliament met.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 31	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

Section 6: 1689–1760

27 To what extent, in practice, did the Revolution Settlement of 1689 limit the powers of the Crown in the years to 1714?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: monarchical influence in the wake of the Glorious Revolution; the extent and constraints of royal power; the Bill of Rights and the importance of ‘without consent of parliament’; Parliament’s role in sanctioning revenue; power devolved to parliament and party struggles over influence with the monarch; the appointment of ministers because of party connections; the link between the this Settlement and both the Triennial Act (1694) and the Act of Settlement (1701) which finally debarred Roman Catholics from the succession.

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 in order to arriving at a well-considered judgement. The discussion may centre on the importance of the Glorious Revolution for continuing royal power in the reigns of William III and Queen Anne. Good candidates should show an understanding of how power in late-eighteenth and early-seventeenth centuries worked, including the relationship between Monarch, court, government and parliament. Candidates might argue that the powers left to the monarch remained extensive and that the extent to which the monarch appeared constrained was at least as much related to the ability of the monarchs as to the growing power of parliament. Both William and Anne worked within a political framework and often showed pronounced preferences for one party or the other: William III often for Whigs; Anne usually for Tories. Working within this framework might be seen as a significant constraint on untrammelled royal power. On the other hand, William III had relatively little trouble in obtaining finances for war. Some may debate the significance of ‘in practice’ as a clue to debate specific opportunities for the exercise of royal power as well as limitations.

No set view is required,

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

28 How important was the contribution of the Duke of Marlborough to Britain's success in the War of Spanish Succession?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

Candidates may refer to: key aspects of Marlborough's military career, especially his leadership of the allied armies against France and his victories at Schellenberg (June 1704), Blenheim (Aug 1704), Ramillies (Apr 1706), Oudenarde (July 1708) and (though many would call this pyrrhic) Malplaquet (Sept 1709); his clearing of Spanish Netherlands from French occupation (1706) and breaking through French lines in the Netherlands (1711).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. The discussion should centre on the relative importance of Marlborough's contribution. Many will argue the importance of military victories although their impact was lessened by diplomatic squabbles and, especially, by Dutch concern to secure peace. Some candidates may note that Marlborough had been dismissed (Dec 1711) before peace was secured, so that Britain's key objective – the Protestant Hanoverian succession – was not finally agreed until Marlborough had left the scene. In making a rounded judgement, candidates may be aware of the importance of other factors such as: the effectiveness of British diplomacy; the contribution of Britain's allies (particularly the Dutch, Savoy and north German states); the significance of the 'Grand Alliance'; the frequent weakness of French military response; Britain's naval supremacy .

No set view is required,

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

29 Who gained more in this period from the Union of 1707: Scotland or England?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: background to passage of Union in Jan 1707 (although this should be brief and essentially introductory); weakness of Scottish economy, including suspension of payments by Bank of Scotland; English attack on Scottish trade via the Aliens Act (1705); agreement to abolition of Scottish Parliament and creation of a new British Parliament at Westminster; 16 elected Scottish peers sit in the Lords and 45 Scottish MPs elected to the Commons, though on a very small franchise; free trade between England and Scotland from 1707; Protestant succession accepted by Scotland as well as England; Scottish legal and educational systems remained; common currency agreed; discontent and anti-Union rioting (1712); attempted Jacobite invasion (1708) and strength of Jacobites in Scotland, especially in 1715 and 1745.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. The discussion may centre on: similarities and differences between the situation in England and Scotland; England gained greater security from the deal arranged in 1707, although having to face two Jacobite risings; agreement aided expansion of trade and reduced threats from a 'noisy neighbour'. Law and education remained Scottish; Scottish traders gained access to substantial, and expanding colonial markets; Scottish trade increased markedly; growing prosperity of Glasgow and Edinburgh; in religion, Presbyterian Church preserved its rights; arguably, middle and upper classes gained more from Union than peasants (especially) and working classes; Scottish Highlands (where support for both Jacobite risings was greatest) did not benefit in long term, especially in the wake of the failure of the 'Forty-Five', the 'Disarming of the Highlands' and persecution of Scottish episcopal clergy.

No set view is required and candidates can argue either way, although most are likely to argue that English domination of the Union saw the greater advantage go to the larger country. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Overall, a sense of context and change will help to produce a convincing judgement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

30 How effective was the parliamentary opposition to Walpole in the 1730s and early 1740s?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: growth of opposition after Walpole tried to make his position impregnable by use of patronage and bribery; strength of opposition to Walpole on issue of ‘corruption’; the significance of the Excise Crisis (1733) and Walpole’s near defeat both on that in Commons and on management of South Sea Company in Lords; the ‘reversionary interest’ and role of Frederick Prince of Wales as a focus for opposition politicians; Pulteney the Patriot Whigs and the role of the elder Pitt; the role of anti-government newspapers such as ‘*Craftsman*’; Walpole’s vulnerability on ‘Hanoverianism’; significance of his inability to prevent war with Spain; rapid weakening of position after 1739.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Using material such as that in AO1 above, the discussion may centre on: extent to which the opposition grew; the importance of failed or dismissed ministers as a focus for opposition; reasons for growth of opposition by mid-1730s; significance of the outbreak of war (not least as an indicator that Walpole’s power was waning) and the cost of fighting it; the significance of the 1741 general election in indicating that Walpole’s influence over elections had diminished. Specifically on ‘effectiveness’, candidates should note: that it had been an important factor since the later 1720s, yet until 1739, an articulate and increasingly well organised did little to shake George II’s belief that Walpole was the right man to head his government; parliamentary opposition more articulate than effective?.

Candidates might suggest that opposition was more effective after the war broke out and that its string of earlier failures (however well publicised) during the 1730s indicated that Walpole was able to repel all previous threats to his position.

No set view is required,

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

31 Did the early successes of the Methodist movement, to c.1760, owe more to the leadership of John Wesley or to the weaknesses of the Church of England?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: Wesley’s method of leadership and the effectiveness of his open-air ‘field preaching’; his organisation and the ‘class’ system; overall growing importance of evangelicalism, bringing the word of God to the people, usually outside Church; the role of ‘lay preachers’. On the Church of England, they may refer to: its growing difficulties in reaching working people, especially in growing industrial towns and in mining areas (where Wesley built up a powerful following); a ‘political Church’ with perhaps too many of its bishops gaining preferment for reasons of political patronage rather than spirituality; lax administration at diocesan level; weakness of doctrinal message; lack of clearly focused leadership; beginning of division within the Church between ‘High’ and ‘Low’, especially over role of preaching

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. The discussion may centre on: how effective Wesley’s methods were and why he had greater success in some areas on his ‘evangelical tours’ than in others; how much impact Wesley had made by the 1760s; whether the Church of England was as ineffective as its opponents (and some of its pro-evangelical supporters) claimed; lack of headway for Methodism in most rural and agricultural areas, where some Anglican administration was efficient and pastoral support plentiful. Answer may deal with both Wesley’s new organisation and with the state of the Church.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

Section 7: 1760–1815

32 Assess the view that the prime cause of political instability in the 1760s was the incompetence of George III's ministers.

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: the frequent changes of ministry in this period, the end of the so-called Whig supremacy; the significance of the succession of a new, young and inexperienced 'British' monarch, anxious to cleanse what he saw as the Augean stables of party politics and graft; the appointment of Bute as an 'outsider' prime minister; political conflicts arising over how to end the Seven Years War; the significance in Britain of growing American opposition to taxation; George's attitudes and priorities: exercising monarchical rights more actively than George I and George II; challenge to the existing political order by John Wilkes. For the record, the short-lived ministries of the period are: Newcastle/Pitt (1757–1761/2); Bute May 1762–April 1763; Grenville, April 1763–July 1765; Rockingham, July 1765–July 1766; Elder Pitt (Chatham), July 1766–October 1768; Grafton October 1768–January 1770; North (appointed, January 1770).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. The discussion may centre on: extent of ministerial incompetence – especially, perhaps, in the cases of Bute and Grafton; the seriousness of the issues (especially terms for European peace in 1762–63 and the emergence of opposition in the American colonies, which soon divided opinion in Britain); George III's inexperience; his inability to find a minister who could ensure reliable majorities in Parliament; his attempts to side-line 'party' politicians; whether it was George, rather than his ministers, who was 'incompetent', stubborn, reluctant to compromise and unable to 'manage' the many controversial issues which arose during the 1760s; No set view is required but good candidates will see that they should offer a reasoned and informed judgement about relative responsibility for political instability. This will require consideration of other factors beside the quality of George III's ministers. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Overall, a sense of context and change will help to produce a convincing judgement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

33 Why did the American colonists rebel against British rule in 1775, and not before?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to factors leading up to rebellion: the security impact of the Treaty of Paris (1763); the Stamp and Declaratory Acts (1765 and 1766); Townsend duties (1767); British troops arriving in New England to quell disturbances and attacks on customs officers; repeal of Townsend duties (1769) and Revenue Act taxes only tea (1770); American resistance to unloading E India Company tea leading to ‘Boston Tea Party’ (1773); British Coercive Measures (including additional powers to Governor of Massachusetts (1774) and Colonists’ response; Gage tries to put down rebellion, leading to engagement with colonial troops at Lexington (Apr 1775) and, in effect, beginning 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 factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here candidates have to explain why rebellion was delayed until 1775, so the discussion may centre on: gradual build up of tension after the Stamp Act passed; mutual incomprehension about why taxes levied in 1760s when they had not been before; thirteen separate colonies and considerable division of view on whether to continue resistance, broadly on North-South lines; time taken to establish an effective Continental Congress; American recognition that there was considerable support for their resistance in Britain, which led many in New England to anticipate a workable compromise; substantial forcible American resistance, including guerrilla activity, delayed until early 1770s

No set view is required, although stronger candidates will see that the need to consider why the American Revolution did not happen before 1775 is an important discriminator. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Overall, a sense of context and changing circumstances will help to produce a convincing judgement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

34 How damaging to Britain in this period was the loss of the American colonies?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to the reasons why there was a widespread perception in late 1770s and early 1780s that this major colonial loss would be disastrous both for Britain’s strategic role and its trading opportunities; America had been both a large, and usually eager, recipient of British manufactured goods while also a supplier of raw materials – particularly cotton; frosty relationship between Britain and America at least until the Jay Treaty of ‘amity, commerce and navigation’ (1794); British and American economic interests remained close, despite American maritime grievances leading to two-year war of 1812–14.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. The discussion may centre on: short-term damage to British trade and diplomacy with continuance of hostility from France and Spain (allies of the colonists during the War of Independence); time taken to rebuild diplomatic bridges with the new USA which was damaging. On the other side of the argument: British industrial revolution continued rapidly and Anglo–American trade revived fairly quickly; Britain’s concerns during the French Wars were overwhelmingly with Europe and the British and French colonies in the West Indies; little interference with America until the war of 1812–14, which could be considered damaging but which was not costly and Peace of Ghent restored a not disadvantageous *status quo*. In longer term, British interests not threatened by Munroe doctrine and American influence in central and southern America considered much less threatening than French and Spanish control of strategic areas. Overall, most candidates are likely to argue that the loss of the colonies was far less damaging than contemporaries thought it would be but no set view is required. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Overall, a sense of context and change will help to produce a convincing judgement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

35 Is the political dominance of the Younger Pitt better explained by his own abilities or by the weakness of Charles James Fox and the Whigs?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: Pitt's rapid rise to power from 1781–84; his financial and administrative abilities; his effective alliance with mainstream Whigs in 1794; his generally harmonious relations with George III. On Fox and the Whigs: reasons for their loss in election of 1784; difficulty in persuading independent MPs to back them against an obviously competent, and increasingly self-confident Pitt; the short-lived Regency Crisis; Fox's limitations as a leader, less cool and politically astute than Pitt; Whig split over reaction to the French Revolution; significance of the split between Fox on the one hand and Portland and Burke on the other; Pitt's massive Commons majority from 1794.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. The discussion, linking to material identified in AO1 above, may centre on: Pitt's strengths and his ability to get independent MPs on his side; inadequacy of Whig response to their electoral defeat in 1784; Pitt's good luck in 1788 when George III ended the Regency Crisis by recovering; his effective political astuteness in maximising patriotic sentiment against the French to his benefit during the 1790s; Fox's abilities as an orator who inspired both respect and feelings of friendship in his followers might be mentioned; Fox finding himself on the wrong end of propertied public opinion for his views on the French Revolution and his attempts to get peace talks going in the early 1790s. Although no set view is required, and candidates are free to argue either way, most are likely to stress Pitt's abilities and mastery of the dull grind of government business as being more important than Whig weaknesses. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Overall, a sense of context and change will help to produce a convincing judgement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 40	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

36 How much did Britain's victory over Napoleon owe to alliances with other European powers?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: the string of alliances (and the subsidies which often went with them) which British governments entered into. Since the question asks about victory 'over Napoleon', candidates should confine themselves to the period from 1799. The major alliances cited are likely to include: treaties with Russia (1799 and 1805); Austria (1805) and Sweden (1804, renewed later); Prussia (1807); subsidies, especially to the Dutch and various North German states; treaties with Spain (1809) and Portugal (1810); the very important Treaties of Reichenbach with Russia and Prussia (1813) and Chaumont (with Russia, Prussia and Austria (1814). Other factors adduced are likely to include: British unchallengeable naval supremacy after Trafalgar; its ability to break Napoleon's 'Continental System'; the 'Spanish ulcer' from 1808

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. The discussion may centre on: the fragility of alliances, since most of Britain's continental allies suffered heavy military defeats; expenditure on subsidies to allies, difficult to justify – at least given the usual outcome; the abiding importance of naval supremacy; the quality of British defensive operations, particularly in the Peninsula; the value of its colonies in providing non-European markets while most of the European continent was dominated by Napoleon. Against this, it is possible to argue that Britain's determination both to seek and fund alliances with continental European powers was an indicator of Britain's economic strength and did serve a purpose since Napoleon, though he was hugely successful until 1813, was kept in the field and French resources were being drained..

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 41	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

Section 8: Themes c.1603–1815

37 What best explains the extent of colonial expansion in the seventeenth 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. There should be a reasonable range attempted here, both in terms of range over the century and geographical range. The cessation of war with Spain in the early part of the century was certainly a spur as was the persecution of Puritans. The role of the Merchant Adventurers and significant individuals could be assessed together with the perilous nature of early colonisation attempts in Virginia. The role of the Pilgrim Fathers and the rapid expansion in New England should be explored, numbers leaving during Charles I's reign could be analysed. Candidates could also examine colonisation in the West Indies. The impetu of the Civil War for migration was important and Cromwell's role in further expansion is key. Trade and Navigation Acts were important with the Restoration monarchy largely following the lead of Cromwell. The foundation of Carolina and Pennsylvania should be noted. In the later part of the century, settlement in and trade with India may be examined.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 42	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

38 Account for the changes in the British economy which took place during the second half of the seventeenth 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. Candidates will be expected to focus their answers on the period in question, though there may be some comparisons with the first half of the century, and perhaps with continental rivals. Agricultural growth and the increase in the use of enclosure might be tackled, although there are significant regional variations. Improvements in land and animal husbandry might also be considered and the relative prices of various commodities might be used to evaluate extent. Candidates might also consider motivation to improve. So far as trade is concerned, the fall of the wool market but increase in trans-Atlantic trade is an issue. This in part was due to a type of deregulation and other legislation to improve trade. Candidates might use examples of the relative volumes of trade to exemplify their arguments. Changes to finance and the banking system could also be considered as well as growth of ports such as Liverpool.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 43	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

39 What best explains the emergence and growth of protestant dissent from c.1640 to c.1700?

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. Dissent did develop in the period before 1640; however, candidates should confine themselves to the period of the question. Such dissenters might include Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers. One explanation for the growth will certainly be religious, the impulse within Protestantism to become more pure in doctrine and worship, driven by fears of popery and Laudianism, and also tensions between word-centred (Presbyterian) and spirit-centred (Quaker) understandings of true religion. A second explanation might be political circumstances: the collapse of censorship and then civil war and destruction of the established Church are all owed for experimentation, and the rise of competing sects, who enjoyed powerful backing so that they could develop, not least from Cromwell, who offered ‘liberty of conscience’ to dissenters during the protectorate. Although the period 1660–1700 was not one of growth rather than survival under persecution, opportunities for further growth came intermittently with indulgence offered by Charles II and James II and more significantly under the Toleration Act of 1689, a product of Anglican gratitude for dissenting support over the seven bishops’ trial of 1688 and with powerful backing from the Whigs and William III. A third reason might be the inspirational leadership of various individuals.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. There are competing explanations here, and a sense of the interrelationship between them is important. Protestantism may have had a tendency towards fragmentation, but this was largely resisted until the break-up of the national church in the 1640s. The decade also provided the means for disseminating ideas through the explosion of the printing press, as well as the urgency to shore up positions, as an intolerant Presbyterian state church seemed to threaten the development of rival groups. The atmosphere of experimentation is also prevalent as some Independents and Baptists of the 1640s then moved on to the more radical ideas of the Quakers of the 1650s.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 44	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

40 Assess the impact of improvements in transport on the British economy by c.1815.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of a significant theme. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: the expansion of canals; well-known eighteenth-century canals may be named, such as the Exeter (1701), Sankey Navigation (1757) and Bridgewater (1761); canal building in the later-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, including Grand Union (1810); on roads, the development of turnpikes, particularly in south of England, and in industrialising Yorkshire and Lancashire, especially in later eighteenth-century; greater use and range of stagecoaches to transport the well-to-do with expansion of coaching inns and shorter journey times – e.g. London to Bristol in 17 hours by mid-1780s; development of tarmac as a road surface from early-nineteenth century; railways were in their infancy by 1815 but pioneer developments of steam trains can be mentioned with early freight and passenger routes in the later 1820s; the work of individual pioneers, such as Thomas Telford (canals, roads and bridges), John McAdam and the Stevensons

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. The discussion should centre on the impact (consequences) of transport improvements, including: *canals*, linking navigable natural waterways enabled speedier and cheaper travel for goods, reducing prices of manufactured articles; considerable c. 18 expansion of both domestic and overseas trade; roads: transport improvements to wider economic growth via increasing speed of transportation; impact of investment in both canals ('canal mania') and roads on an industrialising society; improved roads enabled quicker, safer and cheaper transportation of goods and people; considerable impact on mobility of those who could afford to travel by stage-coach; overall impact of transport improvements on rate of economic growth and on Britain's emergence as the first industrial nation.

No set view is required, though good candidates will see that the prime focus of the question is on 'impact' or consequence. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Overall, a sense of context and change will help to produce a convincing judgement about impact, which is the key focus of this question.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 45	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

41 'Imposing but dull.' How far do you agree with this judgement on British architecture in either the seventeenth century or the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of a significant theme. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: the diversity of styles, including Palladian, neo-Gothic and Chinoiserie; late and early characterised by the English baroque of Vanburgh and Hawksmoor; 'Queen Anne' style in simple red brick; the greater sophistication and diversity of Georgian architecture; the work of John Wood elder and junior, especially in the redesign of Bath in Palladian revival style; neo-classicism associated with Robert Adam, James Wyatt and John Soane; urban architecture: town houses and squares; later Georgian or Regency-style architecture associated especially with John Nash and his redesign of much of central London and design of Brighton Pavilion; early stages of the Gothic Revival and its association with Romanticism.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. The discussion may centre on: the effectiveness of architecture; contrasts between rural 'country houses' and urban architecture; on whether 'dull', it might be argued that neo-classicism became so dominant that architecture became insufficiently diverse, particularly since neo-classicism emphasised straight lines and proportion. On the other side of the argument, candidates may note the diversity of architecture over the century, from stern, unadorned classicism at its beginning to quasi-Gothic 'excess' at its end.

No set view is required; candidates can argue either way, though most are likely to challenge the validity of the view which frames the question. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Overall, a sense of context and change will help to produce a convincing judgement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 46	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	12

42 Explain why Britain experienced so many popular disturbances during the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of a significant theme. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events. Candidates may refer to: food riots, which increased in number and perhaps threat as population increased supplies became threatened; religious riots, including Sacheverell (1710) and Gordon (1780); industrial disturbances (e.g. strikes and riots by cloth workers in the West Country and shipyard workers in the North East; machine-breaking in the late-eighteenth century); political riots, especially over Jacobitism in the earlier-eighteenth century, in support of John Wilkes’s ‘causes’ (1760s); in the wake of the French Revolution, both pro- and anti- the authorities (e.g. Priestley Riots in Birmingham, 1791 and the attack on George III’s coach, 1795); election riots throughout the century, often fuelled by drink; anti-press gang riots

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. The discussion may centre on: a rapidly changing urban and industrial landscape which destabilised workers and encouraged direct action against threats to established working conditions; the virulence of hostility generated by religion, especially anti-Catholic riots, which had strong political as well as religious origins; growth in population putting more pressure on food availability and prices; ideological differences. On ‘so many disturbances’, candidates may argue about the plethora of ‘change’ factors, including: rapidly growing population after c. 1740; a new dynasty whose legitimacy was challenged; rapid urban growth which brought both a lack of stability and more opportunity for the discontented to organise; the polarising effect of the French Revolution, especially after Britain declared war on France in 1793.

No set view is required, although stronger candidates will appreciate that the phrase ‘so many popular disturbances’ is intended to act as a discriminator. A range of examples is required, covering the period as a whole Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Overall, a sense of context and change will help to produce a convincing judgement.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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