

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/22

Paper 2b (European History Outlines, c.1378 – c.1815),
maximum raw mark 90

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

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

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 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	22

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

Introduction

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

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

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

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear, although lacking in real fluency.

Band 5: 0–6

The 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	22

Section 1: c.1378–c.1461

1 What best explains the economic influence of the Italian city states in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: their major role in commerce and banking, extensive manufacturing expertise, the way in which the merchant class was socially dominant; their quality municipal government which was flexible and responsive to needs; a good education system and civic pride; the fact that Milan was on a cross-roads of trade routes; had iron ore resources and a good agricultural base; Venice, for example, was the international trader and entrepot, and controlled much of the Arab trade; there was an extensive shipbuilding and carrying trade which helped domination of Mediterranean markets; an effective guild system which was not a hindrance to development and innovation.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. It is unlikely that one specific point will dominate. A range of factors is looked for and the ablest will differentiate and prioritise. Those that manage to explain why there was such a widespread influence both in the Mediterranean and beyond, as well as further North into Europe should be rewarded. The focus should not be just on the internal reasons for growth and development.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

2 What best explains the fall of Constantinople?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the military and administrative skills of the Ottomans, vital for keeping an army in being; extensive divisions within the ‘European’ opponents of the Ottomans; Greek/Byzantine incompetence and neglect; the main Ottoman focus had shifted from East to West with consequent concentration of resources; the total failure of Union of Florence to have any real effect; the traditional split/rivalry between Roman Catholic and Orthodox; the utilisation of cannon by the Ottomans; c 7000 defenders versus c 80 000 attackers; the old treachery argument.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Identification of the key factors with reasons why they were the ‘key’ factors and why others were of lesser importance is looked for. There is, as always, no ‘right’ answer, but a careful weighing up of what the candidate considers to be the principal reasons with effective reasoning and good supportive detail is what is looked for.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

3 Assess the nature and extent of the threat Hus posed to the Roman Catholic Church.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: whether the focus should be on him before his death – or after; the way in which he became linked to Bohemian nationalism; the fact that four crusades were needed to repress the movement after his death gives an idea of the strength of the movement; perhaps the Hussites were more dangerous than Hus himself; the Four Articles of Prague and their implications; the issue of whether he was more dangerous when linked to military leadership of Zizka and Prokop; the Hussites were internally weakened by faction fighting the Utraquists versus the Taborites; in theory it was all sorted by 1436, yet still an issue in the late-fifteenth century; the longevity of ‘dangerous’ ideas, such as freedom of preaching, ideas on communion and lay control of church.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The best will look first at the nature of the threat, what form it took, and whether it was the man himself or the ideas he advocated that were the real or assumed threat to the church and state. The point about whether his specific ideas were important, or whether they were only dangerous when linked to wider forces such as nationalism or anti clericalism. A picture of ‘extent’ is also needed, and should be dealt with separately, and it could well be argued that the threat was more imagined than real, and that a crass response created a much more serious problem than it actually was.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

4 'The nobility was always the most serious problem faced by the Valois monarchy in this period.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: as threats – possibly the English; general factors such as particularism, internal divisions and desire for local autonomy; there was institutional chaos usually present; there was always individual monarchs themselves, who were flawed, bar Charles the Wise; plenty of the nobles – such as Anjou, Berry, Orleans, and Burgundy were serious problems; population decline and devastation caused by war did not help; the tax exemption of nobles was a real issue as were private armies; the lack of a standing army for the monarch.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a good case to be made either way, but on balance the nobles, or factors linked to them such as tax exemption and private armies might be the most popular answer. However there were other very important considerations which need to be raised in the case 'against', ranging from the inevitable English to personal incompetence. Given the inheritance and local traditions it would need someone quite remarkable to rule in any way effectively.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

5 Was military strength the main reason for the expansion of Muscovy in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: it was the key factor, but simple valour and a talent for treachery were also important; the ability to get good cooperation with the Khans of the Great Horde; the sensible patronage of Orthodox Church added religious backing to the cause; internal Mongol problems helped Muscovy ‘break away’; the growing economic strengths, self-sufficiency plus potential exports; there were talented ‘land acquirers’ such as Basil I who had political guile as well as military ability; the growth of the city of Moscow into a respectable looking ‘capital’ helped.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Certainly military ability was a factor, but the quality of rulers was also a factor, they were a great deal more than good fighters – Basil I is a good example of this. The decline of the Mongol overlordship was also a major factor as was religious endorsement. The growth of a real centre could also be considered.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

6 What best explains why Italy was the focus of so much diplomatic interest and military conflict in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the amount of cash and commerce, there was a lot of wealth there; ability to gain control of the Church/Papacy; the aggressive tendencies of rulers like Louis XII and Francis I; the tendency towards papal involvement in international politics; the Spanish imperial aims, Ferdinand and Naples for example; the militaristic activity of popes like Julius II; the role of Maximilian; the intervention of the Holy League, Henry VIII for example; it was the early stages of Habsburg-Valois rivalry; and the role of Charles V as Holy Roman Emperor which was to play a part.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The best will identify the primary reasons and argue why they and not others are more important. There is no one 'right' answer', but careful consideration of what are identified as the key factors and why this conclusion is reached is what is looked for. Those who manage to give serious consideration to the 'so much' aspect of the question should do very well, but it is unlikely that any attempt to challenge it will be successful.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

7 How important a role did Burgundy play in international politics between 1461 and 1515?

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the degree of autonomy from France till 1477; its wealth and commercial influence; its overall strategic position in that part of Europe; the role of balance of power factors – with England in particular; the alliances with England and Brittany; the ability and aspirations of Charles the Bold and Philip the Good; they were quality administrators and diplomats.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A clear analysis of the importance of Burgundy's role is looked for. Its significance is obvious and the reason for it needs to be considered but it is the nature of the role that is looked for and whether it really was a central factor in international relationships in the period.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

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

8 How effectively did the Papacy deal with the challenges facing it in this period?

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are, (and there is a wide range to choose from); nationalism, secularism, the legacies of the Schism and Conciliarism; money – its raising and spending; general anti papal sentiment; the wide range of ecclesiastical grievances; invasion of Italy; the Turks; Humanism and Luther – to name but some; the role of individual popes and organisations .

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are a wide range of challenges to consider and a variety of different reactions to them – or even ignoring them. The best will probably consider what ‘effective’ might mean in this context, and while the consensus will probably focus on ‘badly’ the extent of it needs to be considered. There should be a genuine attempt at balance.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

9 How unified was Spain by 1516?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the nature and extent of the actual unification process; the degree of territorial consolidation; the support by the nobility for a unified Spain; the degree of administrative unity/consistency; the attitude towards of monarchy; the relationships between the monarchy and the Cortes-Council of Castile; the degree of religious orthodoxy and the attitude of the Moslems and Jews; the implications of the conquest of Granada.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some definition of what the criteria are for a ‘unified’ country is looked for, the extent to which it is simply a matter of drawing lines on maps or whether a great deal more is involved, such as a common language or religion of degree of acceptance of the political and constitutional situation. The extent to which people felt ‘Spanish’ could also be considered.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

10 Assess the contribution of Ivan III to the rise of Muscovy

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his becoming Lord of All Russia; the development of imperial emblems, raising the whole status of rulers and state ; the absorption of other areas such as Novgorod; by 1500 taking Smolensk and the advance on the Dnieper; the building of the Kremlin; disposing of the Tartars, but keeping the best of their financial, political and military methods; he was an able diplomat, especially in moves to the East and South-East Lithuania; his developing contacts with the West and his employment of engineers, architects, gunners etc.; arguably he was the real founder of Russia.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A weighing up of the overall contribution is what is looked for. How much might be merely superficial and how much was critical to the emergence of Russia as a major geographical feature, as well as a major political and international force is expected. The focus should be on the ‘rise’ – the evolution – of Russia.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Section 3: c.1516–c.1559

11 Why did Luther's Ninety-Five Theses have such profound consequences?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the issues of indulgences touched a real anti-clerical 'chord'; the way in which the theses linked to nationalism and particularism in Germany; the overall role of Roman Papacy in the German states; the Church's management (mismanagement) of the whole issue; the legacy and background of Hus and humanism; the very nature of the attack – on the theoretical basis of the Church; the protection of Frederick; the role of Eck; the preaching ability of Luther and the invention of printing which enabled the spread; the background social and economic factors; the degree of interrelationship between Church and state; the distractions of Charles V.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A balanced argument is looked for as well as an analysis of what specific factors led from the 'publication' to the final breach. Consideration of both political as well as theological factors is expected, but the primary focus needs to be on what could be seen as the principal reasons for their impact and how effectively the supporting case can be made for them. The degree of 'profundity' could be considered, although attempts to challenge the 'such profound' would be unlikely to be successful. There needs to be real evidence of reflection on why this incident became more than just another theological spat.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

12 ‘Calvin’s success in Geneva was dependent on the foundations laid in Switzerland by Zwingli.’ Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered for Zwingli are: his theology salvation by faith alone etc.; his preaching ability; ideas such as the Bible as basis of all belief; his ideas on communion; his role in the early spread into Switzerland and South Germany; his ideas on the fusion of Church and State; his liturgical reforms; and his overall impact on Zurich.

For Calvin, factors which might be covered are: the Institutes; the particular politics of Geneva and the consistory; his Ecclesiastical Ordinances; the uncompromising nature of his works; his aggressive Protestantism which was to confront Catholicism more firmly; his missionary zeal.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An analysis of Calvin’s success in Geneva is looked for, and a weighing up of how much can be put down to his own work/ideas etc. and how much was dependent on the initial work of Zwingli. There is a valid case to be made each way. The best will come to a clear conclusion one way or the other, with valid reasons and good supportive detail.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 17	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

13 How well ruled was Spain under Charles I?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his rare visits; the high taxation for ‘foreign’ reasons and its very bad impact on Spain; the revolt of the Comuneros; the way in which he imposed on Spain from Flanders, Adrian of Utrecht, for example; his repression policies in Spain; his focus on the defence of Naples; yet on the other hand he had a difficult inheritance; he was too dominant in decision making – would not delegate; the man on the spot often given too little power to work effectively; he took too personal a view of the office; there was no ‘non personal’ institutional organisation; yet he did not attack local liberties; he lacked a sensible economic policy; he imported lots of silver, which had major consequences.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A good picture of what ‘well ruled’ might entail in this context is looked for initially. The best will attempt a definition which is appropriate for the circumstances in Spain at the time, and then argue a case each way. Examples of both quality and failings are looked for, plus a sensible conclusion which is well supported by evidence.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 18	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

14 To what extent does Suleiman deserve the title of ‘Magnificent’?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: he was a great organiser and military leader on land and sea; his defeat of Hungarians and the march on the Danube; the nature and extent of his range of conquests; he was a good talent spotter with Grand Viziers like Rustem; his employment of fine lawyers, theologians, architects; the great builder of fortresses etc.; his development of the fine Ottoman capital at Istanbul; yet the warmonger – taking on too much, overstretching the empire.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some definition and thinking about the criteria for ‘magnificent’ is looked for – and with that as a basis to work from, then a case each way is expected. There might be a contrast between the deserving the title in the short term, but perhaps not in the long term. A good picture of ‘extent’ should be there, and not just a list of factors which might be seen as both for and against.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

15 Assess the nature and extent of the development of Russia under Ivan IV.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical – knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his absorption of much of the Mongol state; his expansion into Don and Volga regions and the Caspian; his Siberian expansion; his ability to raise money – create military forces; his management of the Boyars; the increasing Muscovite control of the trade routes into Central Asia; the growth of serfdom and the ending of free peasant communities; his quality administrative reform keeping pace with territorial expansion; his quality local government developing under service gentry; the Legal Code of 1550; yet on the other hand there was too much terror; the disasters of 1571; the unfortunate legacy; economic exhaustion and civil war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is ample scope here for discussion in both the ‘nature’ and ‘extent’ parts of the essay. A balanced view of both aspects is looked for there are a variety of different possible conclusions, with possibly the extent being considerable but the nature possibly alarming. The focus of the discussion should be on the ‘development’ of Russia, and attempts to put what happened into a longer-term perspective should be rewarded.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Section 4: c.1559–c.1610

16 'Lacking both in vision and good judgement.' Assess this view of the rule of Philip II in Spain.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his obsession with heresy; his tendency to micromanage – distractions from domestic policy as he tried to manage an entire empire; his tendency to delay; 'motion but little movement' 'if death were to come from Spain etc...'; and the various outcomes of these conflicts; his absorption of Portugal; the Morisco issue; the revolt of Aragon; the use of New World wealth; the final bankruptcy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is no problem if the candidates focus more on Spain than elsewhere; the topic could be dealt with either very broadly – or more with a focus on a more narrow range. The key is looking at both the 'vision' and the 'good judgement' aspect and those who do it with a good degree of empathy for the man and his work could do well. It could well be argued that he had ample vision, but a singular lack of judgement.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

17 What best explains the intense rivalries in the Baltic region in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the amount of trade and commerce in the region; simple geography – the control of the Sound for example; the wide range of valuable resources in the area; the collapse of the ‘old order’ – such as the Hanse and the Teutonic Orders; the implications of the death of Gustavus Vasa of Sweden in 1560 and the deaths of Christian II and Christian III of Denmark in 1559; major religious changes; the continuation of traditional rivalries – such as Swedish/Danish ones; the legacy of aggressive tendencies of Gustavus Vasa of Sweden continued under Charles IX.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are a variety of factors which need to be considered, and the best will identify the key ones in their minds, produce a valid case to support them, while at the same time indicating with reasons why the other factors are less significant.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

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

18 Assess the contribution of the new religious orders to the success of both the Counter and Catholic Reformations.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the energy and dynamism they offered; the leadership of the various movements; the sharp focus on specific issues; their ideas on regeneration; the quality pastoral work – e.g. Friars; the missionary work – both with the Protestant and the ‘heathen’; their work with secular rulers; their roles in education; their work as confessors; the sheer rigour of much of what they did; the specific work of Capuchins – Theatines – Somaschi – Ursulines – Jesuits.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A weighing up of the contribution to both is looked for, balancing the input of the new orders (some flexibility can be allowed to what is ‘new’) with other factors. There is no need to get involved in the issue of ‘success’, but a considered view of their contribution/s and a contrast with other factors is what is looked for. There should be more than just a list of Jesuit works and there has to be a real focus on several ‘orders’.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

19 'Religion was the most important factor in both the causes and course of the Dutch Revolt to 1572.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered as causative factors are: the inheritance of Philip II; the work of Philip and his regents – Margaret-Don, John-Alva etc.; the importance of local traditions and particularism; the role and status of nobles; a range of economic factors – unemployment and hunger in particular; money and taxation; the impact of the Sea Beggars; the role of Orange; geographical factors and distance from Spain; Calvinism and its organisational strengths; the impact of different cultures and traditions.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Ideally the two elements, causes and course, should be treated separately and the impact of religion on both carefully analysed. Arguably it could be seen as a key feature of both, but also views on its importance to the latter are changing. There does not have to be a specific 'most important' factor given, the best will probably argue that several different factors played a role, at different times.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

20 Why did the Civil Wars in France last so long?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the role of the monarchy throughout; issues like foreign intervention; religion is, of course, critical and factors like the strong organisation of the Huguenots and the support from elsewhere could be raised; socio-economic factors, of course, need consideration; noble and regional autonomy played a part and the varying quality of leadership on both sides could at times be very significant.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The ‘so long’ aspect of the question is where the more sophisticated analysis should come in, and there are a variety of arguments which could be put forward. Ideally a range of reasons should be offered with valid reasons why some are more important than others.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 25	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Section 5: Themes c.1378–c.1610

21 What best explains the cultural flowering in Italy in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the long tradition of lay and clerical patronage; the reading and spread of classical texts and values – e.g. Petrarch; the thriving economies of the city states; the strong external influences via trade; the role of the wealthy elites and their social and cultural values; the role of individuals such as the Medicis; the educational traditions of the universities; the dynamic craft traditions; an economy linked to production of luxury goods; the support for humanist ideals.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A range of factors needs analysis and identification with valid reasons for the chosen order of importance. The best will identify the central ones and give good reasons as to why others are of less importance. There is no one primary factor expected. What is looked for ideally is a range of reasons, prioritised with the reasoning behind the prioritisation made clear. There are variables in different parts of Italy at different times and also great diversity of opinion as well.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 26	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

22 'Keeping alive the crusading ideal was the only redeeming feature of the fifteenth-century Church.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the grim picture normally there – usual abuses of nepotism etc.; the background of the Schism; at least awareness of need for reform; perhaps support for renaissance ideals; over-involvement in wars at home and abroad; the decline of the reputation of the Papacy; the treatment of Savonarola; the conciliar movement; the rise of national churches; see 'In Praise of Folly'!

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focussed and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should be able to rise above a list of all that was wrong. It may well be that the 'bad' side gets emphasis, but there should be a real attempt to evaluate any issues that merit credit.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

23 'Remarkable innovation was the central feature of the Northern Renaissance.' How valid is this judgement?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: there was inevitably a lot of Italian influence; the degree of independence in both style and substance; much less of the 'church fresco' approach; more interest in things like decorative detail of illustrative manuscripts; the focus on realism and not idealism; fewer nudes and more intense religiosity; details on Durer – Holbein – Cranach etc. all moved on from Italy; much stronger Humanist/Latin influence – e.g. Erasmus; the nature and extent of differences in areas ranging from architecture to philosophy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Evidence of thinking about 'remarkable' as well as 'innovation' is expected from the best, as well as thinking about both style and substance. There does not have to be coverage of all possible 'forms', but a good range is looked for in order for there to be a complete answer.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

24 To what extent was the desire to make money the motive behind overseas expansion in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the personal interests of rulers – e.g. Henry the Navigator; the desire for religious reconquest; the missionary spirit, crusading; commercial expansion and colonial acquisition; the general spirit of the age – renaissance curiosity; the work of individuals like Diaz; the need for settlement and concerns about overpopulation; gold, slaves and status.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The cash incentive needs to be balanced against a variety of other factors such as status and a genuine worry about overpopulation. Religious motives were certainly there, but the extent to which they were propaganda for more mundane reviving forces could well be debated.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

25 How far did the nature of warfare change in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the impact of the renaissance; the use of cannon; new roles for heavy infantry – such as Swiss squares; changing tactics in use of cavalry; the role of mercenaries and rise of the ‘citizen’ army; defence tactics becoming superior to offensive tactics; the development of fortification and siege warfare; great naval changes – the galley versus the ocean going ‘broadside’ ship; the development of portable firearms; the increased application of science.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Tactics is much easier than the strategy aspect, so those who have a good knowledge of the former but can at least outline some of the strategic developments (combined use of land/sea offensives, for example) should be rewarded. Some reflection on what is required from the ‘nature’ aspect of the question and there should not just be a list of the changes.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 30	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

26 Why did inflation have such profound consequences for European society 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. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the impact on food prices – and on subsistence living; its impact on all classes, for example, French wheat prices up 651% in the sixteenth century; it was unprecedented and difficult to adapt to changes; there were no alternatives to wheat/bread; the growth of poverty and impact on diet and health; the impact on wages – rents – incomes – rack renting; it led to a land revolution; the broad social impact; the impact on coinage – cost of wars – taxation – national bankruptcies.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The ability to explain a complex issue is looked for here. The focus should be on the ‘profound’ and more than a list of ‘impacts’ is looked for. Any serious attempt to place the results in some sort of order to ‘harm’ should be rewarded, as should those who really try and get a ‘big picture’ across and differentiate between the social and economic as well as political.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 31	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Section 6: c.1610–c.1660

27 ‘He truly served the interests of the French monarchy.’ Discuss this view of Richelieu.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: some definition of ‘truly served’; whether his policy was too anti-Habsburg; whether the relationship with Gustavus Adolphus and the Mantua disputes were sound ideas; whether he managed the relationship with the King and nobles wisely; his lack of reforms, especially in taxation; whether the Huguenot policy, La Rochelle etc. was wise; his mercantilist ideas; his creation of a ‘police’ state; his relationship with the Church; possibly over-concerned with founding a personal dynasty?

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Reflection on what constitutes the true ‘interests’ of the monarchy is likely to feature in the best responses and a ‘merits/demerits’ approach on its own will not get far. There is a case to be made that he did it much harm, and while Louis XIV may have relied on the base Richelieu laid, the foundations themselves may have been pretty flawed. There needs to be evidence of thinking about quite what a ‘true servant’ might have done for the highest marks. A straightforward merits/demerits approach might work but the best will give a definition of the ‘true servant’ appropriate to seventeenth-century France and argue out a case each way.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

28 Assess both the domestic and foreign achievements of Gustavus Adolphus.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his utilisation of resources at his disposal; his overdependence on weaknesses of others – especially Russia after Stolbova; the quality work in building up army and navy; his capture of Riga and expansion into Livonia; his overshadowing of Denmark; Lutzen and the Baltic Empire acquisition; just the tool of Richelieu perhaps; the creation of an unsustainable empire; his overexploitation of Sweden, the constant drain on small country; his ability in developing resources, iron and weapons, for example; he was a great general who created a fine army; his sensible religious policy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Possible answers range from the near hagiographical to the severely critical, the brilliant impact to the overstretched man who got killed unnecessarily at Nordlingen. Serious thinking about both the ‘nature’ and the ‘extent’ is looked for and the two should be kept separate.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

29 'Rivalry between France and the Habsburgs was the principal cause of the Thirty Years War.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the dynastic rivalry itself; religious factors; geographical and socio/economic factors; Augsburg and the Dutch/Spanish deals always seen as temporary truces; princely/noble factionalism; the role of individuals like Rudolf Ferdinand II and Matthias as causes; the decline of the power of the Holy Roman Empire; nationalism, in Bohemia, for example; the role of the mercenary; the intervention of countries like Sweden.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The debate on the causes should be well known and the focus should be on the causes and not the longevity. A good survey of the causes is looked for with the traditional rivalry put into its place alongside the other factors.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

30 'He inspired a period of exceptional progress within Prussia.' How valid is this judgement on the work of Frederick William the Great Elector between 1640 and 1688?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his marriage policies; his gains at Westphalia – with French support; the integration of a diverse range of units into one state; the role of the army; the centralisation of institutions; his management of the Estates – raising money etc.; his clever involvement in war and diplomacy – e.g. the war of the North; his management of the nobles; the creation of the Generalskriegskommissariat; his absolutism; his military leadership, e.g. Fehrbellin; his support for commerce – issues like Edict of Potsdam.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Those who consider carefully the 'exceptional' aspect of the question and debate it should be rewarded. The extent to which it is down to individuals – leadership – the intelligent use of resources – or just opportunism and luck needs to be debated. Identification of key reasons with supporting arguments is what is looked for.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

31 How important to Dutch commercial success were shipbuilding and the merchant fleet in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: there were other factors like geography and weakness of others; the surprising political stability and good government there; naval support; social factors also important – the ‘aristocracy’ of wealth; the mechanism of a staple market; Antwerp cut off from the sea helped; banks, banking and currency were all sound; the rise of Amsterdam as a commercial centre; its domination of the whole Baltic trade – always the great carrier; it had great reserves of capital; the role of the entrepreneurs and the East and West Indian Companies; the great range of industry there – from fishing to finishing.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The concept of a ‘nation in decline’ needs careful thought. There is a case to be made arguing that it did not – it was just others that ‘rose’, and that much of its early predominance was dependent on the weakness and distractions of others. There was still real strength in depth there, particularly economic, but also worrying signs for the future. Much was obviously interconnected and the role of shipping in all its forms needs to be balanced against a sensible range of other factors.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Section 7: c.1660–c.1715

32 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Brandenburg Prussia in 1713.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: that it was a ‘composite territory’; it was overdependent on an individual ruler; its institutional strengths; it was largely agrarian; the existence of both localism and particularism; the army; its tax system; whether there was a viable economic base there; the attitude of other nations towards it.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An overview of both the strengths and weaknesses is looked for. Prioritisation is to be expected, with reasons given for the choice and positioning. Comment on which might be superficial and which might have profound consequences is to be looked for as well as overall judgment. There needs to be real reflection on what might be seen as the ‘strengths’ and the weaknesses’ of a nation.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

33 'Lack of money was Spain's greatest problem in the later seventeenth century.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: money at the root of all problems; a failure to realise it was no longer a great power; the population decline; the polarisation of society; military disasters; its continuing international ambitions; the ongoing aristocratic factions and their infighting; the role of the Catholic Church in society; the decline of trade; the expulsion of the Moriscos and its impact on agriculture; the flawed monarchy itself; the incompetence of governments/Ministers.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A debate on the extent to which Spain's many problems in the seventeenth century had cash shortage at their root. Was there sufficient if greater realism had been there? Was there misuse of resources? Would even more money have prevented what happened?

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

34 What best explains the religious policies of Louis XIV?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: his personal ambition; his ideas on divine right; his desire for autocracy; his respect for orthodoxy and uniformity; whether it was just another inconsistent policy of his; his attitude towards Gallicanism – Jansenism – Huguenots; regale, money and the prerogatives of the Crown; part of his attitude towards Pope and the Papacy; perhaps just a desire to embarrass Innocent; to be more Catholic than the Pope suited his anti-Habsburg policy; out for glory – another Charlemagne; the influence of confessor/women.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A survey with comment of the motivation is looked for. There may well have been different motives at different times. There is a great range of possibilities and obviously no right answer but examination of several factors and good reasoning about why they are more or less important than others is looked for.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

35 'The Great Northern War proved that Sweden never deserved to be considered as a great power in this period.' How valid is this judgement?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: that arguably Lutzen had showed it; the serious struggles of Oxenstierna to retain it; the balance of power in the Baltic had already shifted away; the reign of Charles II had already alienated many others; economic issues, famine in the 1690s caused major problems; the success at Narva just a flash in the pan; there were a huge range of enemies and Sweden was wide open to most; Sweden was too dependent on support or neutrality of others – e.g. maritime powers; the refusal of peace when all in its favour; it had a population of 3 m, a scattered empire, limited resources and no allies.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Thinking about the implications of 'great power' status is expected from the best. There should be some criteria set out and analysis of the extent to which Sweden did or did not deserve it.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 40	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

36 'The Utrecht Settlement settled nothing.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered as 'unsettled' are: the right to the Spanish throne; the right of James to English throne; the Family Compact; there was still Spain and France versus the UK; the Spanish Netherlands and the Emperor; however French advance was limited; the extent to which the UK attained its war aims; possibly ending the Spanish–Dutch conflict.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are a large number of issues which could be considered. Ideally there should be an overview and the treaty looked at with some perspective. However, if the focus is more on the short-term implications that is acceptable, as the syllabus only goes up to 1715, although the implications are specified.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 41	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Section 8: c.1715–c.1774

37 'Badly governed at home and unsuccessful abroad.' Discuss this view of France either under the Regency or under Fleury.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are:

Regency. Management of the minority; the conflict between traditional advisers and professionals of the 'Colbert' type; the role of Regent and role of Parlement; Orleans was an able soldier and well educated but lazy and arguably lacking in principle; too many concessions to lawyers and nobles; there were no reforms but a degree of stability attained; there was a competent foreign policy under Dubois with peace and alliances; relations with Spain were finally sorted; the role of Law.

Fleury. He was able, a Richelieu type; he had a sound foreign policy, the Treaty of Vienna, for example, the 'negotiate not fight' approach; the Escorial Treaty and Family Compact; he was ruthless with opposition; there was some prosperity and economic growth, the work of Orry; he was arbitrary but conformist; he advised against the Seven Years War.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Both parts of the question should be challenged and the idea of 'misrule' and 'success' (in terms of foreign policy) should be considered. A good case each way is looked for.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 42	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

38 How effectively were the Habsburg lands ruled in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the rule surviving under Charles; his loss of territory – Belgrade, for example; his failure to reduce privilege; his lack of reform, be it military or economic; his regime was weak; his neglect of agriculture and education; he was the ‘artist not accountant’; there was a lack leadership under Charles, he had good advisers like Bartenstein but ignored them; weakness of both military and foreign policy, too concerned with Pragmatic Sanction; under Maria Theresa it was too conservative and Catholic possibly; there was the work of Bartenstein, Haugwitz, Kaunitz, their reforms; costly wars fought; the Hungarian problem; the work in Netherlands and Italy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some thinking of what ‘effective rule’ might involve in that part of the 18th century is looked for. Once a definition is considered, then a case each way is expected. It may well be that different conclusions are reached for Charles and Maria Theresa.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 43	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

39 Compare and contrast the contributions of Frederick William I and Frederick II to the development of Prussia.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: Frederick William I – the build-up of resources; the diplomacy with Austria and the Empire; establishing authority within the state; his development of the army; his finance, tax and excise; the Generalskriegskommissariat; his work on local government control and centralisation; his efforts overall, the guilds, management of the economy and the judiciary.

Frederick II – the autocrat and man of action; he was militaristic and hardworking; never a delegator; perhaps overconcerned with paper/administration; had limited success in economics; some sound work with industry and justice; perhaps obsessed with his army.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is ample scope here for a wide-ranging discussion. The best will look at the two in some perspective and get some real balance into the discussion, possibly differentiating between what they achieved for Prussia rather and just for the monarchy.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 44	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

40 How well ruled was Spain under the Bourbons in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: Philip: the role of the Church; his overall aims and ambitions; his management of Aragon and Castile; too dominated by Elizabeth; the good work of Alberoni on tax etc.; he was obsessed with dynastic factors; perhaps also the work of Ripperda.

Ferdinand: pacific; there were some limited reforms; the work of Patino.

Charles: competent and hardworking; there were quality ministers; he was enlightened and pro-industry; he supported the able Squillace; treatment of the Jesuits; his work in South America.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. An overview initially is looked for, with reflection on what might make a country 'well ruled' in the eighteenth-century. Once the criteria are established, there is ample scope for a good case to be made each way. It was not all gloom/doom and decline.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 45	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

41 'The reign of Louis XV, after 1743, demonstrates all too clearly what was wrong with the ancien régime.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the system's overdependence on the character and failings of monarchs; foreign policy provided a good example of flaws; too concerned with hunting and women; he was indecisive and bored with affairs of state; tolerant of factions; made ministerial instability into a principle of government; allowed struggles over religion and finance; his mis/management of Jansenism issues; his management of Parlement; his mismanagement of money/taxation etc.; allowed the growth of a privileged versus unprivileged struggle; tolerated rigid industrial processes and office holding; clung on to Divine Right ideas.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a possible case against, but it could take some developing. The main focus should be on identifying the flaws in the ancien régime, ideally prioritising them, and demonstrating how well, or otherwise, the latter part of the reign demonstrated them.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 46	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Section 9: c.1774–c.1815

42 ‘Thoroughly undeserving of the title «Enlightened Despot». ‘ Discuss this view of Joseph II.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: both co ruler and ‘own’ period should be looked at; the work of Kaunitz; he carried on Maria Theresa’s measures; he was quite radical, wanting a unified secular state, for example; he was an egalitarian who wanted to rationalise and centralise; he was a ruthless opportunist in foreign policy; his attacks on traditions and privilege; his sensible aims of self-sufficiency, unity and a competent government; his belief in dignity of the individual; his humane and sound welfare ideas; his tolerance; his views on Poland and Turkey.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. A definition, as always, is looked for. Once the criteria are established then it should be possible to develop a good case each way and come to a considered conclusion. It is a well-known and well debated topic, so mature reflection is expected.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 47	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

43 ‘Clever and successful.’ Discuss this view of the foreign policy of Catherine the Great.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: she had weak neighbours which made life easier; encouraged expansionism – but was that beneficial necessarily; her Turkish and Polish policies; perhaps took on too much; made Russia too ‘big’; the Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji with the Turks; becoming patron of the orthodox in the Balkans; her Black Sea advances and navigating into the Med.; the move towards the Crimea and the Black Earth lands.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Both terms need considering and challenging. The ‘perceptive’ aspect needs both definition and reflection, and ‘success’ needs to be considered, not just in terms of acquiring territory. The best will have a definition of both terms in context, with a balanced argument on both aspects.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 48	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

44 How important were economic factors in bringing about the crisis in France in 1789?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: a whole range of economic factors need to be considered, both national and local, as well as issues like famine, poverty and the condition of peasantry; also the impact of enlightened ideas; social and class factors; monarchical incompetence; egalitarianism; the various financial crises; ministerial competence/incompetence and the work of Necker and Calonne; the summoning of the Estates General; as well as a range of long-term factors.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The role of economic factors compared to the myriad of other factors needs to be carefully considered. It is hardly a new approach so balance and depth are looked for with a clear argument as to why economic factors were more/less important than other factors.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 49	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

45 'Of enormous benefit to France.' Discuss this verdict on Napoleon's domestic policies.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the 'heir to the revolution' ideas; the termination of the revolutionary phase and restoration of internal stability; the return to autocracy; his propaganda and censorship; the implications of the Berlin Decrees on the economy; his Civil Code, the Concordat and education changes; his egalitarian ideas and 'careers open to talent'; his version of law and order; industry subordinated to war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a lot to debate here and while some might argue that he did bring some benefits to France, it could also be argued that they were hardly enormous and perhaps short term. Sometimes the standard texts appear to be scratching around trying to find something kind to say about Napoleon on the domestic front.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 50	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

46 'Unwise experiments followed by savage reaction.' Discuss this view of the domestic policies of Alexander I.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: he had some sympathy with French Revolutionary ideas (early ones), and also for Poland; the 'Reform by assassination' approach; he re-opened the breach between Crown and nobility; the return initially to the better days of Catherine; he was unstable and double-faced: he had lots of ideas but simply never carried them out, for example. On the constitution and rights: his educational ideas never happened; there was no reform of serfdom; he became an aggressively evangelical conservative; the role of Arakcheev; his later treatment of Poland and the military colonies.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The 'wisdom' and the 'savage' aspects might be challenged, as might also the extent to which they were experiments. Current consensus is that he had some not very good ideas, toyed with them, and then lapsed back into classical 'tsarism'.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 51	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

Section 10: Themes c.1610–c.1815

- 47 Discuss the view that both slavery and the slave trade were of limited importance to the continental European economies 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. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the vital provision of labour in ‘difficult’ climates; the booms in sugar, cotton, tobacco, but only a small part of the Atlantic trade; the impact on great ports like Nantes and Bristol and Liverpool; over 8 million carried; plantation economies were always unstable; most lost rather than gained from the trade; there were huge costs for nations in defence of the system; the main beneficiaries were some absentee landlords, and European consumers of cotton, tobacco and sugar and governments with their import duties; it was always a very risky business.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Ideally the system and the trade should be dealt with separately but be tolerant to those who combine the two as they are not always easy to separate. Also differentiating between the two centuries is not easy, so overlap or dealing with general issues which affect both should be acceptable.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 52	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

48 How important was military leadership to the development of warfare 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. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the size and financing of armies; their input into training and discipline; their development of artillery, e.g. Prussians at Kesseldorf; the new infantry training – the square etc.; the work of Frederick the Great, the writer on the subject; the new focus on the ‘short and lively’ war; the focus on destroying enemy forces – surprise – discipline and aggression; there were a whole range of new ideas on strategy – tactics and fortifications; the French and Austrians had new ideas on types and use of artillery.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The answer is probably ‘vital – but there were other important factors’, there are few other contenders, but the case needs to be made clearly with good supporting evidence.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 53	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

49 How far did formal rules and conventions inhibit true creativity in eighteenth-century music?

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. The range is from the late Baroque of Bach and Handel and their contemporaries through the ‘gallant’ style to the Viennese classical music of Haydn and Mozart and early Beethoven. There might be a distinction between vocal and instrumental music. Formal organisational conventions became less significant in operas – the great works of Mozart are not dictated to by formal da capo or sonata form style.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required. From a nineteenth-century viewpoint, the formalities precluded the sort of tone painting or free flow that characterised later music. The great composers of the eighteenth century, however, went far beyond the formal rules that dominated the music of their lesser contemporaries. Haydn brought a flood of invention to his 104 symphonies and was always prepared to introduce novelties. It would be absurd to see Bach’s mastery of form as being incompatible with elements of fantasy and, above all, expression. Mozart, especially in the da Ponte operas took formal contrivances to a new level of creativity. However, minor masters like Sammartini, Krauss and Canabich were less successful. Connoisseurs may point to interesting variations of form, but only a handful of geniuses transcended both operatic and instrumental convention. Whether freeflow romanticism or eclectic modernism produced anything better than the St Matthew Passion, Handel’s Giulio Cesare or Mozart’s Prague Symphony, though, may be doubted.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, 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 54	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

50 Discuss the view that colonies in the eighteenth century brought few benefits to their European owners.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the benefits of trade and settlement; the influx of raw materials; the opening up of new markets; the development of great centres like Amsterdam and Nantes; but there the costs of wars and maintenance gave an inappropriate focus to foreign policy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some consideration of what might or might not be ‘benefits’ needs to be there. There is a straightforward case to be made each way. What contemporaries may have seen as a benefit might not appear the same to posterity, with the ‘millstones around our necks’ view.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 55	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

51 Assess the nature and extent of industrial development in eighteenth-century 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. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: arguably pre-industrial to c.1750; self-sufficiency still the aim; economies still dominated by, for example, the handloom weavers of Catalonia or Abbeville; the lack of specialisation; what changes tended to be embryonic; often subordinated to needs of state/war; there was some growth of awareness by government, and changes in banking and investment.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Nature and extent: both need to be considered separately. While there are not the massive changes evident in the UK, there are signs of growth, and awareness of potential and possible benefits and resources.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 56	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	22

52 What best explains changes in styles of monarchy in Europe during this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Factors which might be considered are: the re-examination of both role and responsibility of the monarch; the arrival of more contractual ideas; a growing awareness of the failings of ancien régimes; the spread of the ideas of Locke; the ideas of Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau; the impact of the American revolution; the bombshell of the French revolution.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Reflection on both roles and responsibilities should be there and consideration of whether changes in attitude were superficial or profound.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

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