

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/11**

Paper 11 (British History Outlines, c. 300–1547),  
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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

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

## **Introduction**

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

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

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

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### **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.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

#### **Band 4: 7–12**

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

#### **Band 5: 0–6**

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### SECTION 1: c. 300–663

#### 1 How is the end of Roman rule in Britain best explained?

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. Analysis and evaluation are required. A narrative of events will not answer the question much, unless there is good explanation. Answers may go back into the late fourth century, but the focus is more on the fifth century and an explanation around key turning points (there are several). Consideration may be given to events in 401 (Constantine III and the troop withdrawals), 410 (Honorius' letter, seen by some as a key date), 429 (Germanus' visit), 442 (the Saxons), c.446 (the appeal to Aetius). Explanations may well include features such as declining Roman assets and resources, barbarian settlement and penetration (here, 406 is important), civil wars, the need to withdraw troops from Britain, the breakdown of Roman rule and ordered life, possible separatism, the possible effects of Pelagianism, changing economic and social circumstances. References to the wider issues of Roman problems in the West, in Gaul, and the contracting nature of the Empire would be acceptable, provided that Britain remains the central focus.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is debate here, with an open argument arena as to the reasons for the rejection and removal of Roman rule and authority, the balance of internal and external factors. There has been argument as to crucial dates and the nature of the end of Roman rule, slow and piecemeal, more sudden; and there is debate over the place of events in Britain in a wider imperial context (the decline, contraction of the Empire).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## 2 How extensive was Anglo-Saxon settlement in England in the period c. 450–c. 600?

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. Narrative or description is not required. Analysis and evaluation are required, illustrated from across the period. Focus needs to be on the extent, probably linked to reasons for success, though there will need to be discussion of the evidence for settlements and for that success. Reference can be made to the written sources and the evidence of Gildas, the *Chronicle*, Bede (perhaps especially so), though Nennius and Procopius could be used. Archaeological, toponymic, numismatic evidence may be valuable also, not least as to locations, nature and extent of settlements and changes over time. The nature of habitation, military and economic activity, social customs may all be adduced, with an emphasis upon the ability of Angles, Jutes and Saxons to settle as a result of successful military (and naval) operations, linked to growing weaknesses of native British rulers. References can be made to the Germanic Vortigern, Hengist and Horsa myths of tribes invited to protect the Roman province and to Bede's account of plundering tribes that came to stay subsequently. Awareness of prior Anglo-Saxon presence and likely roles will help in the assessment of subsequent arrivals and the attendant issue of the ease of displacement of English or British overlordship and of communities. Area, regional, local examples will be welcome. So, too, any ideas of the actual levels of penetration and numerical settlement achieved.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation sets up argument and 'How extensive ...' sets up consideration of geographical areas and extents and invites assessment of a range of factors and features, with a sense of relative importance and an ordering of factors, but with awareness of connections. There is scope for debate: how far the Anglo-Saxons succeeded because of prior incursions and settlements ('enemy within'), or because of the enfeebled Romano-British defences on the shore and inland, or because of the strength, dynamism and power of the new invaders (and settlers).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**3 How serious were the problems experienced by the kingdoms of Southern England and East Anglia 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. A form of narrative here will not work well; analysis and evaluation are required in the scope of the answer. The emphasis here is upon explanation and evaluation of both the features and the extent of those kingdoms' survival and longevity (or otherwise). The durability of the kingdoms and the ever-present risk of being eclipsed by neighbours and rivals will be a feature: Kent was eclipsed by Mercia over time for example. Internecine struggles, bigger, more powerful rivals, the effects of elements of Christianity might be adduced. Reference can be made to a range of factors and issues: the nature of the various kingdoms; their leadership and the power of their kings; the internal make-up of those kingdoms and their elites; internal as well as external problems; geographical location, settlements, lordship and overlordship; pressures from changing contextual factors. An idea of rulers (identities) and their activities would help.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How serious ...' opens up evaluation and argument over scale, nature, extent of problems: inherent; external; rulership; possible religious-cultural. Geographical location, geopolitics, the nature of the structures of the kingdoms can be seen as inter-related here; it may be argued that these kingdoms, no matter their tribal origins, were vulnerable to growingly powerful rivals.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

#### **4 Explain the significance of the Synod of Whitby (664).**

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. A narrative or form of description will not work here, unless there is good embedded explanation. Analysis and evaluation are needed. The Synod was convened in the presence of King Oswiu and Abbes Hild to hear arguments about how best to determine future dates for the celebration of Easter. At heart were different strands of emergent Christianity. We know much about the Synod from Bede's account. Key figures were Colman (Celtic), Agilbert (senior ecclesiastic) and Wilfrid (Roman). The context was important and Whitby needs to be seen within the context as broader developments within England and the competitiveness of Roman and Celtic missionary work. In the end King Oswiu decided in favour of the Roman, not Celtic, lines of Christianity. The outcome needs to be assessed in its scope and importance.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation opens up argument and counter-argument; answers may favour one line or the other. 'Explain the significance ...' sets up such argument areas, evaluation of (relative) importance, here based around aims, motives and outcomes. There is scope for debate, not least about the shaping of future Christianity developments, character and content. The traditional argument is that Whitby marked the moment when the Roman version of Christianity triumphed over the Celtic version. Good answers will examine and explain the differences between the two traditions; such answers may well look ahead to the work of Theodore and the work along Roman lines of the Church in England. They may well also consider the directions Celtic Christianity subsequently took. But it is possible to argue that the contrasts between the two have been overdrawn, and that for this and other reasons (this was a Northumbrian, not a national, synod), the significance of Whitby has been overdrawn. A sense of the near – future progression of the Church in England will be an important aspect of evaluation here.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## 5 Why did the kingdom of Northumbria dominate seventh-century England?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of events will not succeed unless there is strong explanation. Even then, good, persistent analysis and evaluation are needed. Answers need to consider extent, security, longevity of dominance, linked to the issues of bretwaldaship, but keep a focus on reasons, internal and external. Focus is likely on the positive aspects of, for example, the Deira/Bernicia distinction and its significance at key moments; the issues of accepted or disputed successions, the expansion led by Aethelfrith (d.616); the ability of Edwin, Oswald and Oswiu to maintain a hegemony over the English; the problem of Mercia but also its relative weaknesses; relations with and the extent of power over such as the Britons of Elmet and Strathclyde, the Picts and the Irish; military and political skills and successes; the uses made of the Church; the dependence on rivals remaining weak. Brief reference to the problems in the later years of Oswiu, the reigns of Ecgrith and Aldfrith could be used to contrast the earlier successes and dominance. The main focus is likely to be on the period from the reigns of Aethelfrith (d. 616) to Oswiu (d. 670); the Northumbrian hegemony came to an end in 685 with the death of Ecgrith. The challenge of Mercia, if an uneven one, may be set against other, internal factors. Much attention will be given to the nature and scope of military and political power, in part in the context of the 'heptarchy'.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Why ...' sets up evaluation of reasons, with a sense of relative importance but also awareness of connections. Good focus on 'dominant' is expected and the emphasis needs to be on success, power, control (etc.), rather than on the transient nature of that power and control. Personal rulership may be viewed as significant; or else fortuitous, temporary, favourable circumstances, not least the position of neighbours and rivals.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## SECTION 2: 663–978

### 6 Who contributed more to the consolidation of Christianity in England: St Wilfrid or Theodore of Tarsus?

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. A narrative or description will not succeed, unless there is good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required. Answers will need to balance the work of Theodore and St. Wilfrid and assess their often difficult relationship. Reference can be made to Theodore's work in developing the Church along strong Roman organisational lines, his diocesan re-organisation, new episcopal appointments, the sense of quality and endeavour, the Councils of Hertford and Hatfield, relations with the Northumbrian Church, with kings, his legal work (penances) and his consolidation of the work of others. For St. Wilfrid, obviously the relationship with Theodore, in the context of issues surrounding the Northumbrian Church, will be prominent; the Synod of Whitby (664) and its importance; his career (deprivations in 664-9, 678-86, 691-706) and divisions of his see of Northumbria, disagreements with Kings Ecgrith and Aldfrith and with the Archbishops of Canterbury, Theodore and Behrtwald; visits to the Pope, appeals, imprisonment, exile; councils in 705-706; his missionary work (Frisians; South and West Saxons; Mercians). He had a particular view of the Church, one of large sees, big episcopal estates, a high political life (personal asceticism, public grandeur), while Theodore wanted the reverse. Wilfrid aroused feelings, intense, powerful, bitter, but did much good work in founding monasteries and furthering conversions. Theodore's successes after 672 were major: he built up an episcopate, organised and united the Church under Canterbury; he stimulated monastic growth, attracted land grants; there was a Canterbury 'school' and important synods, so extending reforms and authority; he developed the outcomes of Whitby and so the Roman version of Christianity, using a dominant Roman model.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up argument and counter-argument, with good scope for debate. Personalities and personal roles mattered – each was significant – though there is a view that contextual matters were of great importance; the appeal to rulers, their responses, territorial-political input and outcomes. 'Who contributed ...' invites comparison and contrast, linked to evaluation of roles.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

**7 Assess the relative importance of Aethelbald and Offa to Mercian power in the eighth 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. A narrative of the reigns will not go very far here; analysis and evaluation are needed. A sequential and analytical approach would have merit, but a comparative one based around analysis and evaluation is likely to go further still. Consideration will be given to the context as well as to outcomes, continuities and differences. For Aethelbald, possible or likely issues are: his charters, the title of *rex Britanniae*, and the claims made thereby, relations with the Church; Boniface's strictures on his private life; relations with Wessex; his actions towards London and Middlesex; the length and nature of his hegemony. A link to Offa might well be the sense of barbarian or Christianised warlords. Good answers will point up the problems of evidence survival for Aethelbald as against that for Offa. For the latter, good areas are: his relations with other kingdoms, especially Wessex; his military power; the Dyke; his charters and titles; coins; relations with the Church (Lichfield, Canterbury, the Papacy); trading interests; Charlemagne contacts; laws, the anointing of his son. Military and political powers will figure well here, as will the sense of the transitory nature of Mercian hegemony. There is likely to be assessment of the personal roles and powerful input of both, especially Offa, set in the context of weakening or weak rivals (with an eye on Northumbrian and Wessex in particular).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Assess ...' opens up evaluation, explanation, argument, with a sense of factors, roles, relative importance, links and comparison; there is scope for debate, not least as to how far Mercian power depended on either strong personal rulers or on favourable circumstances – political, geographical, military, even diplomatic. Offa's reign did represent a peak in Mercian strength and power – transient in the end. Some of AO1 will be relevant here, not least the position of Wessex.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

**8 'Alfred's reputation depends as much on cultural achievements as on military successes.'**  
**Assess the validity of this claim.**

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. A narrative of the reign will not succeed here; good analysis and evaluation are required. There will need to be coverage of both cultural and military areas, though there does not need to be balance, the quality of argument and counter-argument will determine such. Matters that are likely to be surveyed: the active encouragement of learning; the revival of religious life and the content of that revival (the 'Alfredian Renaissance'); translations, scholars, monasteries, relations with the Church (some unevenness); government, political skills; London and Mercia, the submission of some of the English; the role of *burhs*; the military and naval reforms; the wars of 871-8 and 892-6, operations in the intervening years; Guthrum; 886; later Danish operations and settlements (the Danelaw). Good answers are likely to mirror Alfred's activism in linking cultural and military activities around the 'scourge' of the Vikings, they will see links, overlaps, interactions and assess his strong personal contributions, above all when contrasting his inheritance and legacy. It would be permissible to question some of the scope and extent of his successes; this might be one feature of higher quality answers.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is scope here for argument and counter-argument, not least based on Alfred's reputation and status. There is scope for debate here and attempts can be made to downgrade aspects of Alfred's career. Then again, the sheer range of his royal activities and actions needs to be appreciated, conveyed and assessed as to significance and imprint. Good answers will need to convey the issues of reputation, the actual levels of military success and the place of cultural activity in the reign and any assessment of the reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, 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 overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 13</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**9 How far was Athelstan's success in uniting England based on the achievements of Edward the Elder?**

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. A narrative will not succeed much here; analysis and evaluation are required in scope. The focus is on reasons and candidates will need to use their knowledge of events to illustrate such, seeking some balance between the two reigns and between factors within and outside their control. The expansion of Wessex, its growing political and military hegemony, the value of Mercia, the control of the Danelaw, the defeat and subjugation of enemies (Norse, British), the developments of monarchy, laws, government, conciliar features, the support of ealdormen – all may well feature. For Edward: the valuable role of his family as well as the inheritance from Alfred; Tettenhall; the building of fortifications; the submissions of 918-20 are likely areas. For Aethelstan: the campaigns of 926-7, 934, 937; charters and law codes; recognition from the Continent; national assemblies; the use of Danes as councillors. An important point is that Edward's authority did not extend north of the Humber, but Aethelstan's went much further in overlordship and subjugations. Military, political and diplomatic skills, the weaknesses or errors of opponents, will help to explain success; personal and contextual factors will need consideration.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How far ...' sets up assessment and explanation of reasons, with a sense of relative importance but also awareness of connections. There is scope for argument, comparison and a sense of continuities; reference to the Alfredian legacy and to the strong personal roles of the two kings will be useful to evaluation. Debate can be advanced, based around the growing power and capacity (for supremacy) of Wessex and its projection as the kingdom core for 'England'. Some have argued that Athelstan owed much to Edward (even Alfred); some that his achievements were substantial in their own right. And the extent and depth of the unification process is open to further debate also.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 14	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

**10 How much did St Dunstan contribute to the success of the tenth-century reformation of the English Church?**

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. A narrative or some form of description will not have much merit here. Analysis and evaluation are required. Candidates will need to focus on the explanation of success, blending in examples and considering individuals, ideas, kings and churchmen. The features of the reform movement will be addressed: the roles of such as Dunstan, Aethelwold, Oswald, monastic foundations; the support and protection of Edgar; the value of the *Regularis Concordia*; the state of the secular church at the time, the effects on and role of bishops, organisations, learning, the ordinary clergy. Reference to Continental contacts and influences would be useful also (see AO2 below). The contemporary context (wars, peace, renewed Danish assaults) should be considered as well. Local and regional examples will help – Winchester and Canterbury, for example. The scope, power and nature of the reform movement will be assessed, in context: for example, the need for reform, the prevailing political context, royal interest levels, Continental ideas and influences, the powerful personalities and spiritual standing of these church leaders.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is scope for debate here: the role of individuals, the closeness of the Church and the monarchy; the balance between internal motivations and spirituality and external Continental ideas and precedents. Personalities, roles, impact will feature here; so, too, the contextual arena of mid- and late-tenth century England, spirituality, monastic places. The formulation 'How much ...' sets up argument, a range of reasons, relative importance, an awareness of connections.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 15	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

### SECTION 3: 978–1135

#### 11 How convincing is the argument that the Danish conquest of England (c. 980–c. 1020) could not have been prevented?

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. A narrative of the period will need much good explanation to score decently well at least. Good analysis and evaluation are required. There were four phases: 980-91 saw a series of local attacks; 991-1005 saw wider, greater attacks (geld was paid); 1006-12 saw two major invasions (1006-7, 1009-12); 1013-16 another two major invasions (1013, 1016) culminating in conquests. The conquest of Sweyn Forkbeard in 1014 was brief, that of Cnut in 1016 long-lasting. These attacks and settlements on lands broke the unified nature of late Anglo-Saxon England. After the death of Edmund Ironside in 1016, Cnut made important moves in 1017 and 1018 (peace, justice, a sense of Danish ways, the Oxford political settlement), 1020 (religion) and c.1020-1 (law codes), to mould a new Anglo-Danish Kingdom, to become part of a North Sea empire. Some consideration of Aethelred's inheritance and certainly of the character, scale and power of the new Danish attacks will help here. Consideration can be given to the murder of Edward (the Martyr) and the legacy, the possible consequences for Aethelred, possible or likely factional-sectional tensions, the subordinates he empowered, a possible lack of fighting spirit at key junctures, major events such as 1002, the divisions in the country, Danish strengths, the divisions of the kingdom, Edmund Ironside's role, the strengths of the government.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How convincing...' opens up debate, argument and counter-argument. There is plenty of scope here to investigate, and assess interpretations of, the nature and scale of Danish attacks and invasions linked to reappraisals of the reign of Aethelred II. There is fruitful debate here, not least given the re-evaluations of his kingship, in part as a result of a better appreciation of the quality and scale of threats faced – professional, well-led troops (etc.), for example. Then again, the treachery of Streona and the evident contrasts with Cnut after 1016 do point up palpable weaknesses. The question formulation invites argument and counter-argument, with the personal qualities of Aethelred II and the nature of Danish attacks at the centre here. It can be argued that no Anglo-Saxon ruler could have prevented these attacks. Then again, Aethelred's leadership can be questioned.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 16	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

## 12 Did the strengths of Edward the Confessor as a ruler outweigh his weaknesses?

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. A narrative of the reign will not suffice, unless there is good explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required here. Answers will need to assess strengths and weaknesses, though balance is not essential; the quality of argument will determine much here. Good answers could make use of the *Vita Edwardi* as evidence of particular character strengths and weaknesses. The virtual absence of the king from major affairs for a long period after 1053 – 55 may be regarded as significant. Then again, the nature of the evidence, the succession of Harold, the attendant problems, the prejudices of later Norman sources may be assessed. Likely areas for consideration are: Edward's inheritance, indeed the nature of the late Anglo-Saxon state; his longevity; the great crises of 1051-2, 1065 and what they tell us about his authority and control; the alleged favouritism to Normans; his relations with, and general reliance on, the Godwines; the whole succession issue; Westminster Abbey; Stigand and the Church; general government administration, laws and coinage, the wealth of the kingdom.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question opens up debate and 'Assess ...' calls for a sense of the relative importance of factors, albeit with a sense of connections. Candidates will be aware of the plentiful debates over Edward, Godwin, Harold, the succession. Edward needs to be the centre of focus here but good answers are likely to point to the issues that surround contemporary source evidence and what is presented there.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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



Page 17	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

### 13 Why was William I so successful as King of England?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the Normans' conquest of England and William I's reign will not go far at all here. Good analysis and evaluation are required. Reasons are important here, with suitably selected illustrative examples. There is plenty of material here: his personality; his political and military skills; his use of good strategy and tactics; the success of 1066 and indeed the successes in defeating subsequent serious unrest; his use of castles and forms of terror tactics; the loyalty he inspired in his Norman-French followers; his skills in rewarding the new aristocracy; the development of a workable military organisation, based around lands, knights' fees, feudal service; the use of native Englishmen at key junctures and the use of the *fyrd*; the inheritance of a strong and viable state, government, set of laws, controlled coinage, his uses of the wealth of England; the ability to blend old and new, English and Norman practices; able regents and deputies; the successful tenurial-territorial revolution of c.1070-72; the harnessing of English resources to aid the defence of Normandy; the general level of security by the mid 1070s (allowing for continuing Scandinavian threats, not least at the end of the reign); the nature of control during his frequent absences; Domesday Book and its importance.

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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation sets up argument, debate, assessment, a sense of reasons, with some relative importance and an awareness of connections. William I's personality will be at the core here – with personal qualities given a breadth of treatment. His adaptability, strengths of leadership, use of opportunities, use of what he had gained in 1066, all will be assessed in context here. There is scope for argument and debate, not least given reputation and status.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 18</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

#### **14 How great were the tensions between Scotland and England from 1066 to 1124?**

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. A narrative of events will not suffice, unless there is good, embedded explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required here. The question is bounded by the reign of Malcolm II and the accession of the powerful David I. Candidates will need to balance English and Scottish factors, with awareness of the differences of the two kingdoms as well as of the needs of rulers, above all the Norman kings. Issues of security, defence, the denial of succour to enemies, the assertion of border claims, the movement of people (and cattle) across porous frontiers, all will feature in some form, with suitably selected examples from across the period. The pre-1066 period will need some assessment and certainly the post-1066 period, when the new rulers sought security in the North, usually by expeditions and demonstrations of military powers. The reign of Henry I represented something of a change in approach, to be capped by the accession of David I and his feudal-honorial relationship with Henry I. Major events, actions, expeditions and the creation of security, castles and honorial lordships in the North of England adjacent to the Scottish kingdom, will feature here. 1066 can be said to have created a power vacuum in the North, one uneasily filled; the new Anglo-Norman kings had interests elsewhere, there were issues of lordship, new settlers in the North of England, a recognisable Scottish identity and response (forged before 1066), feudal politics.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question 'How great?' opens up debate. Explanation and evaluation are important, in context, using internal and external factors and with some scope for debate. A good sense of change – nature, extent, scope – will be needed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 19</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## 15 How considerable were the achievements of Henry I as King of England?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the reign is not required; good, embedded explanation would be needed to score tolerably well. Good analysis and evaluation are needed. There is plenty here to assess and the level, extent, nature and substance of achievements should figure, mindful of the contrasts between 1100 and 1135 as of the consequences of his reign in the unrest of the next reign. The nature of his inheritance, the efforts to re-unite England and Normandy, the success of 1106, the dominance of the needs of the Duchy, the problems of the succession after 1120, Matilda, the rise of Stephen, all will feature. Henry's activities with regard to laws, administration, finance, the Church, baronial attitudes (patronage, punishments, rewards, possible 'ins' and 'outs') can be expected in coverage: for example, the reforms of c.1108-14; the extant Pipe Roll; the development of a new aristocracy; the settlement with the Church; the prevalence of gifted administrators; the development of itinerant justice. Candidates may judge the centrality of the reunion of England and Normandy and the relationship with the baronage as two key areas, around which so much turned.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation ('How considerable ...') opens up argument and debate; a sense of substance will be important. There is scope for assessment of Henry I's reputation and status, always high, set in the context of the reign's politics, Anglo-Norman connections and longevity but with significant contrasts between the start and the end. The king's qualities will be a significant feature.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 20</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

#### SECTION 4: Themes, c. 300–c. 1066

### 16 How significantly did the pattern of internal and external trade develop in the ninth and tenth 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. A description or some form of narrative of trading activity across the designated period is unlikely to go very far, unless there is good explanation linked to the needs of the question. Given the time period, selected examples across the centuries will be needed, to support analysis and evaluation, quite possibly built around key themes. Regional examples will help here and a good sense of context matters – security, insecurity, internal unrest, external attacks. The interest of kings, Church, and political élites as well as various Continental connections will be worthy of consideration. Urban developments will have value here; so, too, assessment of types of trading activity and materials, agrarian needs and outputs. Reference can be made to routes by sea, waterways, on land, and to the materials conveyed and traded (foodstuffs, precious metals, equipment, consumer goods for élites, etc.); royal mints, coinage and re-coinage can be used to illustrate the growth of trade and/or its disruptions, with towns as markets and mints. The effects on population, social groups, areas can be a feature here.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How significantly ...' opens up explanation, evaluation, a sense of a range of reasons, with relative importance and awareness of connections. Economic and social aspects will need treatment, but not necessarily in equal measure; the two are connected here, of course. There is scope for debate here, based around the nature of the Anglo-Saxon economy, the legacy (still) of Romano-Britain, the effects of tribal-political-territorial changes, the rise and decline of kingdoms, invasions and other major events. A good sense of developments needs to be conveyed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 21</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## 17 How effectively was agriculture organized from c. 650–c. 1000?

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. A description of agricultural activity is unlikely to go far here unless there is good explanation linked to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation, based around selected examples from across the period, are required. Given the wide period, selection will be necessary, but such has to represent the period range. Regional-area examples are welcome as is awareness of the effects of military activity and political changes. Lordship and communities may well feature; the idea of the village, Roman and Romano-British remnants and legacies; fields, patterns, crops, tillage, pasture and arable, forest lands; the possible pick up of activity in the eighth and tenth centuries. Field systems; the place of goats, cattle, sheep; the balance of arable and pasture; the role of woodlands; the attempts to reclaim new lands; animal husbandry; the importance of such as barley, rye, wheat, beans, peas; evidence of forms of early crop rotation and the division of units of land – all could be invoked in examination and evaluation.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The form of question ('How effectively...') opens up assessment and evaluation as important here – with a sense of change to the fore. There is scope for argument and debate here, set in the context of Anglo-Saxon economic (and social) changes and the impact of major events, political, military, territorial.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 22</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**18 Examine the importance of cultural and religious contacts with continental Europe in the period c. 600–c. 900.**

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. A narrative or description of contacts is unlikely to go very far here and would need good explanation linked to the question to secure some reward. Analysis and evaluation are needed. Given the time span, select examples will be required, representative of the span and of changes and continuities. Commercial and economic factors could be mentioned but these would need careful relation to the needs of the question; religious and cultural links need to feature here. The role of religious houses and influences, the crossings of the seas by English, British non-natives, the shaping of trade links and cultural forces (e.g. Carolingian), the importance of rulers and their patronage, all are useful themes here. The collection of books (Benedict Biscop for example), the place of Charlemagne (Northumbrian, Mercian politics as these might affect cultural or religious areas), influences on rulers such as Alfred, the importation of ideas on church reform, administrative practices and governmental institutions and practices, the place of such as St Wilfrid and Alcuin on the Continent, the materials collected by Bede – such are possible reference points.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Examine ...' opens up assessment, evaluation, some argument. 'Importance' will need consideration as to scale, scope, nature. Cultural and religious both need treatment, though not in equal measure: there were links and overlaps; cultural expressions of religious commitment and developments were of importance. The roles of strong personalities as rulers and cultural or religious leaders will feature.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 23</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**19 How destructive was the Scandinavian impact on Britain in the period c. 900–c. 1069?**

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. A narrative of Scandinavian activity, attacks, threats, (etc.) will not succeed here; good explanation linked to the needs of the question may help to some extent. Analysis and evaluation are needed, suitably illustrated from across the period. A themed approach may work well here – military, political, economic (etc.). External and internal dimensions should be considered: for example, prior and existing settlements; new settlements; the Danelaw; the levels of integration between Scandinavian and British or English; laws, economic systems and structures; commercial activity; towns; farming and trade; the perception of external threats (Aethelred II's reign; the events of 1066 – 69); the events of 1013-14, 1016; Cnut's impact as a ruler; the creation of a new political élite. Other but related elements can be the effects on language, place names, settlements, legal processes. Reference to the effects elsewhere, including Scotland, will be useful – the question refers to 'Britain' – and a sense of similar or different aspects would be useful (attacks, raids, settlements, trade, etc).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation ('How destructive...') opens up debate, assessment, explanation; a sense of relative importance of factors and an awareness of links will be useful. There is scope for argument and evaluation, scope for debate. There has been much debate over Scandinavian impact, ranging from a very negative (destructive) view to a more positive (constructive) view; this shift has been reflected over time and reflects a re-evaluation of contemporary evidence.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 24</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## **20 Assess the strengths of the late Anglo-Saxon Church (c. 1000–1066).**

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. A description of features of the late Anglo-Saxon Church or a narrative of events and actions will not go far here, unless there is strong linkage to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation are needed here with a standpoint around 1066 and how that Church was viewed by the Norman invaders, who asserted their views that reforms were urgently needed. Candidates will need to consider that – whether the Church was really in need of reforms (was it backward? corrupt? out of touch with European practices?) – as well as a range of other factors. Apart from the legacy of the later tenth century reform movement and of the renewed Danish assaults, reference could be made to Wulfstan, Cnut's relationship with the Church, literary works, continued monastic activity, the Confessor's piety and patronage, Stigand. A wider Continental perspective would help: relations with the Papacy (uneven at times); how far the English Church fitted into a European framework of scholarship, piety, learning, good works, corrupt practices, leading exemplars of spiritual standards.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Assess ...' sets up explanation, evaluation, a sense of the relative importance of factors with awareness of connections. There is scope for argument and counter-argument, for debate: How strong was the Church? How can that strength be measured? How important were signs of corrupt ways? Was the Church capable of playing a significant social role? Good answers are likely to be aware of subsequent Norman writings that blackened many areas of Church life.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 25</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## 21 How wealthy was late Anglo-Saxon England?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Description will not suffice here. There needs to be good, sustained analysis and evaluation. This is not a question about the nature of late Anglo-Saxon society, though some reference would be acceptable. Rather, good answers need to draw on their knowledge of the status and strengths of the economy, supporting their arguments by selected examples. Likely areas of consideration are: towns, internal and external trade, markets, produce and products, coinage, the generation of wealth, the role of the economy as a successful under-pinning to the monarchy. Reference could be made to geld payments, the benefits that Cnut and his successors drew from England and those that William I was to derive. Continental awareness of English wealth drew admiration, envy, plundering raids, invasion. By 1066 England was a wealthy country with a range of valuable resources and assets in its towns, markets and mints, ports and controls provided by its political leaders.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation ('How wealthy ...') opens up assessment, explanation, evaluation; there is scope for argument and debate – wealth can be measured and expressed in different ways (see AO1 above); some post-Conquest retrospective analysis may be helpful; there is debate over, for example, the evidence of geld payments as over the importance of the evidence from coins and mints.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 26</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## SECTION 5: 1135–1272

### 22 How weak was royal authority under King Stephen?

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. A narrative of the reign is not required. Good analysis and evaluation are required, with examples drawn in for support. Answers will need to show an awareness of the whole reign and not end in, say, 1141 or 1144. There are many issues involved and capable of illustration: the legacy of Henry I; the throne, the disputed succession; the defence, unity and the division of the cross-Channel state; the very nature of royal authority, law and order; the control of local government; the integrity of the kingdom, the invasions of Matilda and King David, the eventual tripartite division; possible feudal-proprietorial rights; baronial interests, the control and use of writs and coins. No doubt such will be set in the context of the so-called 'anarchy'; baronial self-interest may be examined in the light of royal authority claims and potency (reference also to the range of known intra-baronial treaties and agreements).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is scope here for debate, not least given the plentiful literature on the reign, on Stephen as a king, on the 'anarchy'; recent re-evaluations of Stephen's kingship may feature. There will need to be a good focus on 'How weak ...', inviting argument and counter-argument. For example, it can be argued that Stephen was a highly successful baronial lord and leader but never fit to wear the crown, or that he was able and capable but overwhelmed by a range of problems many of which originated in Henry I's reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, 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 overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 27</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### **23 Have the achievements of Henry II as ruler of England been overestimated?**

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. A narrative of the reign or description of features and changes will not suffice; rather, good analysis and evaluation are needed here. There is much material here that can be assessed, linked to a sense of stature, status, authority and control. Likely areas for consideration are: his energy, ability, firmness; the developments in and nature of government and administration; developments in civil and criminal law, the use of juries, sheriffs, returnable writs, itinerant justices; the justiciarship; relations with the Church (though Becket should not dominate); relations with the aristocracy, patronage, loyalism, unrest (1173-4); defence of the frontiers and military expeditions. The range of great inquests may be seen as significant, though they should not become the only focus of an answer. The scale of activity, the activism, the demonstrations of firm rule, all are important to any assessment. The legacy of Stephen's reign may be considered; so, too, the situation at Henry II's death; both will assist understanding of the nature of impact.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question invites argument and counter-argument, linked to debate areas and to the standing and status of Henry II in an English context. Was he a great reformer? Why was he keen to promote such a range of reforms? Was this the beginning of English common law? How far were royal needs (fiscal, legal, political) the impetus to change?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 28	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

**24 'John's problems as King of England arose entirely from his untrustworthiness.' 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. A narrative of the reign will not work; there would have to be good, embedded explanation to succeed at least tolerably well. Analysis and evaluation are needed. Answers need to address John's administrative talents set against his poor military and political skills. Of course, they may point out that he had successes in the latter areas: before 1204, and in Wales and Ireland and in the wars of 1215-16; in his handling of Innocent III in the ultimate settlement. That said, there were serious political and military flaws. He took a keen interest in administration, with a close personal interest in the development of a powerful, demanding (grasping) financial and legal apparatus; reference can be made to developments in rolls, record-keeping, the vigorous pursuit of legal and financial demands; he was well-served by some administrators. This could be put into the wider context of the Angevin system of government that he inherited and then refined. This can form a good bridge to the central issues of the loss of Normandy and other lands, the consequences, the husbanding of resources for his grand plans of 1214, the growing tensions with sections of the baronage, the Northerners, *Magna Carta*, civil war. Relations with the Church can be adduced but should not become a major feature, rather they could be used to illustrate aspects of the argument and counter-argument.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is good scope for debate, argument and counter-argument, with plenty of re-evaluation of John's kingship and some upgrading of his ability as a ruler, above all as a successful administrator. The question formulation sets up debate and invites argument: the nature, scope and scale of the problems; the issue of personal qualities and defects (just how untrustworthy was John?). That then needs to be set against the needy qualities of a successful ruler as a soldier and a politician. The context of Angevin rule (was this a tyranny?) and the growth of administrative records and record-keeping (for royal needs) can be linked here to any evaluation of John's personality and proficiency as a ruler. Was he an example of the failings of a personal monarchy?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, 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 overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 29</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## **25 How well did Henry III manage the English nobility?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the long reign will not work much here; rather there needs to be strong analysis and evaluation. Answers will need to address the great crisis of 1258-65 assessing its nature, content and scope. Then they will need to contextualise, considering Henry III's longevity, the nature of his government, general law and order, security issues, the rise of Prince Edward. The inheritance from John, the re-issue of charters in 1217 and 1225, the broader issues of crown-baronial relations may be considered. The Provisions of Oxford and Westminster, the Mise of Amiens, armed conflict should all feature as well as the background to such, the issues involved: for example, Henry's reliance on foreigners; his personal household government; favouritism; the Sicilian adventure; the personal ambitions of such as De Montfort and Prince Edward. Then there needs to be consideration of the aftermath of the conflict and of the last years, linked to the development of Prince Edward as the king-in-waiting. A good sense of the nature and importance of the crisis of 1258-65 is needed, but also a sense of how far its prominence may overshadow areas of success in the reign.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question opens up argument and counter-argument; it invites a sense of debate. For example, was the crisis of 1258-65 very much of Henry III's making, hence it was a sign of failure? Then again, was it almost an aberration in crown-baronial relations fuelled by the ambitions of a minority of magnates? How significant is the simple longevity of the reign?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, 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 overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 30</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**26 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Scottish monarchy in the period 1165–1286.**

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. A narrative of the long period is not of use here. There needs to be good explanation based around clear analysis and evaluation. The question is bounded by the accession of William I the Lion (1165) and the death of Alexander III (1286). Some selectivity of knowledge examples will be needed, to illustrate key themes. A narrative of events will not go far; and it would need good explanation linked to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation, quite possibly built around key themes, will work here. Consolidation and security, the development of a secure relationship of crown and political nation and of a solid administrative structure, the benefits of feudal politics, the husbanding of resources, the benefits from the distractions of the English rulers, these are some important themes. Reference can be made to such areas as the attempts by English kings to assert overlordship (or more), Scottish responses, expeditions, cross-border raids, the development of a relatively strong Scottish polity and its control and support in the important Lowland and Marcher areas. Geopolitics entered here.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Why ...' sets up a range of reasons, with connections and relative importance. There is scope for argument as well as assessment, and debate can be engaged here. For example, it can be argued that the rulers were adroit, opportunistic, at times lucky, able to defend independence and exploit problems of the rulers of England; or that the latter were never able to assert their claims, pretensions, strengths in any meaningful way, other than (often) in propagandistic terms. The reigns of Henry II and John may be seen as significant in this respect and in the context of 1165-1286.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 31	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

## SECTION 6: 1272–1399

### 27 Examine the view that political developments were as important as military achievements in the reign of Edward 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. A narrative of the reign will not suffice. There needs to be good clear analysis and evaluation based around key issues. Here, political developments do need good consideration and links to military activities should be made; indeed, the two are closely connected. Careful use of military events is required; there should not be excessive focus on Wales (success), Scotland (partial success). Links are likely to be made via assessment of the nature of Edwardian rule, government and administration, financial demands, fiscal pressures, relations with the political nation. The great crisis of 1297 should receive attention. Reference can be made to Edward's legislation and the extent of the development of parliament (composition, function, frequency, possible institutionalisation), government by consent, the role of legislation, the significance of principal statutes and measures, the Articles of 1297, and 1300, developments in local-county administration, the range of legislative and governmental activity before 1290 focusing on the range of statutes and enquiries then achieved (e.g. Westminster I and II, Mortmain, Acton Burnell, Rhuddlan, Winchester, *Quo Warranto* and *Quia Emptores*). There will need to be consideration of wars, military activity, the pursuit of wars (Wales, Scotland) and the attendant logistical, administrative and financial as well as political pressures, not least as to the diversion of royal energies and focus and the creation of tensions with the political community. Some sense of balance is needed, though it does not have to be absolute.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation opens up argument and counter-argument as well as debate. Edward I's wars have rightly attracted much attention; his military qualities are seen as significant. But he was also a political leader (as he had to be to fuel the needs of war) and there is argument over the reign and its phases – a relatively successful period early on (Wales, legislation, administration), then a period of problems after 1297-1300 (Scotland, political community, parliament, resources).

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 32</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## **28 What issues were at stake in the Anglo-Scottish Wars of 1286-1357?**

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. A narrative of events will not go very far; rather there needs to be good analysis and evaluation based around core themes and issues. The question parameters are formed by the death of Alexander III and its consequences and the signing of the Treaty of Berwick in 1357, with a special focus on what are regarded as the Scottish wars of independence of 1296 – 1357. Edward I's campaigns, events under Edward II and III will feature by way of illustration, and there will be consideration of diplomacy (the French connections). Scottish independence, its assertion, security and defence, the ambitions of English kings and a tradition of interference and intervention as well as belief in overlordship (or more) will be assessed here. Reference can be made to such areas and issues as: Edward I, Balliol, Wallace, Bruce, Comyn; the three phases of struggle (1296 – 1304, 1306 – 28, 1332 – 57); Scottish successes (Wallace, more so Bruce); English successes (1332, 1337; the capture of David II, 1346 – 57); the nature of the warfare; the settlements of 1328 and 1357.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question opens up areas of debate, argument and assessment. It can be argued that internal Scottish factors were of real significance; or that external English factors (different kings, different success levels, their own problems and distractions) were the more significant: what was at stake was Scottish independence set against English dominance and control.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 33</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

## 29 How incompetent a ruler was Edward 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. A narrative of the reign and its troubles will not succeed much here. Good, clear analysis and evaluation are required here. There is plenty of material in a relatively short reign to use to address the issues of Edward's fitness to rule. This is not, however, simply a question on why he was deposed. That should form but a part of the assessment of the reign and its key issues. Candidates need to be aware of the legacy of Edward I and the problems that existed in 1307 (political-constitutional, financial, structural). It would be possible to use these to explain some of the problems Edward II faced, but much turned on his style of kingship, his ideas, actions, mistakes, favouritism, misuse of patronage, flouting the conventions of successful kingship. Key features of the reign that merit attention are: the Coronation Oath, the Ordinances, the Treaty of Leake, the Statute of York, the alleged 'tyranny' of 1322-26, linked to royal favourites in Gaveston and the Despensers, the role of Thomas of Lancaster, the place of the royal council and household, the residual loyalty of many nobles, the presence of a 'middle ground' grouping of nobles, foreign policy, setbacks in Scotland, the pressures on royal resources. It is likely that his relationship with the political nation will be seen as crucial.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is some scope for counter-argument here and debate is possible; there has been some re-evaluation of the reign and of Edward II as a ruler. Works on several of the leading magnates, not least Thomas of Lancaster, have helped to re-define some aspects of the reign and the alleged 'tyranny' of 1322-6 has been well examined. The wider context of what has been described as the pendular swings between forms of royal authoritarianism and severe baronial reaction could be used here, perhaps tellingly.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 34</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### 30 How are Edward III's achievements best explained?

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. This is a long reign and some selectivity is required. Analytical themes and evaluation of Edward's rulership are central to any good answer. A narrative of events will not go very far, unless there is good explanation embedded. The longevity of the reign needs consideration, especially the contrast between early and late set in the context of the inheritance from Edward II and the legacy for Richard II. There was a considerable change of tone and character in the later years compared to earlier high points and successes. Wars dominated and their political, logistical, administrative and financial aspects need assessment; so, too, perceived social issues surrounding military activity. Edward III's personality, the role of his family, his successful relationship with the political nation, his handling of parliament and success in promoting warfare and its rightful status, will be important to assessment here. The great military successes at sea and on land (1340, 1346, 1356) and the reasons for such can be assessed; also the success in handling the growing powerful 'community of the realm', but the later years of the reign should be assessed also, for what they indicate about the consequences of the failing health of the king and the effects of weakened personal monarchy; early skills were not found later.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formulation sets up argument and counter-argument, assessment and evaluation of levels of success (or failure). There is scope for debate. Edward III's reputation and status – a great king? – and his impact over a long reign, the context of the start of the Hundred Years' War, the demands of the war politically, fiscally, socially, the arguable high point of crown-baronial relations (compared to the reigns before and after), all are important issues here.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 35</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**31 'Richard II was deposed because he became too powerful in the eyes of the nobility.'  
Discuss this view.**

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. A narrative of Richard II's reign will not go far here, unless there is strong explanation linked to the needs of the question. Analysis and evaluation are required. There is plenty of material here, set in a wider context of crown-baronial relations, tensions (especially since Edward II's reign and the experiences then) and the pressures on both. Candidates may consider also the legacy of Edward III's reign and the possible structural-political tensions bequeathed. There will need to be awareness that Richard II retained loyalty and support for a long time; the eventual overthrow and deposition were undertaken only after a long period of problems, disquiet, reluctance to face up to the king. The events and issues of 1386 – 88 and 1397 – 99 will be prominent but also set in context and with some balance across the reign. There are a good many factors to be addressed: political-constitutional issues; the nature and style of kingship enunciated and practised by Richard II (absolutist?); the management of the nobility, both individually and collectively (Gaunt, Bolingbroke); patronage; the role of household government, not least locally; the royal affinity; property and title rights; the choice of advisers and their role; foreign policy, France, a preference for peace; Ireland.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up argument and counter-argument. There is scope for debate here, centred on Richard II's personality and style of kingship and placed in the context of fourteenth-century political tensions (pendular swings between 'high' kingship and severe baronial reactions). Attention can be given to his favouritism, alienation of key individuals and groups and to the much debated topic of possible royal absolutist tendencies.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 36</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### Section 7: 1399–1461

#### 32 How seriously challenged was Henry IV by rebellion and conspiracy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative account of rebellions would not score highly. The question requires analysis and assessment. Some explanation of context would be helpful. Although the unpopularity of Richard II was of some advantage to Henry IV there was still some support for the former king, for example, in the North and Midlands and, notably, from the Franciscans. Rebellion and conspiracy against Henry IV should also be seen against the background of his usurpation and the existence of other possible claimants. The rebellion of Owain Glyndwr presented a threat both to Henry IV as King and to the English position in the Marches; it was long-lasting (Owain did not disappear until 1413) and enjoyed support in Wales as well as having connections with opposition to the Lancastrians in England. Owain had grandiose pretensions: he declared himself King; entered into diplomatic negotiations with the Papacy and France; and married the daughter of Edmund, Earl of March who had a claim to the English throne. Henry's other major problem in terms of opposition came from the Percies whose grievances and discontent made them persistent rebels. Here, candidates may be expected to deal with and analyse the following: the defeat and death of Hotspur at Shrewsbury (1403); the rebellion and conspiracy of Northumberland and Scrope which produced a Northern rising (1405) and resulted in Scrope's execution; the defeat of Northumberland at Bramham Moor (1408).

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here candidates may be expected to demonstrate a more sharply argued approach towards 'how seriously'. There is a case for arguing that the challenge to Henry IV's position was much less serious after Shrewsbury (an early stage in the reign). On the other hand it might be argued that Henry was not really secure until the surrender of Glyndwr's principal strongholds and Bramham Moor (both 1408). With reference to Glyndwr's lengthy resistance, there is an argument that this, for most of the period, was on Henry's periphery and could not be sustained indefinitely. At the same time, it might be argued, existing commitments against France and Scotland imposed significant burdens on finances and military resources.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 37	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

### 33 How valid is the judgement that Henry V represented 'the ideal of late-medieval kingship'?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptive accounts of Henry V's reign are unlikely to be successful. Candidates should show a clear understanding of what was expected of a king in this period and go on to demonstrate how far this was exemplified by Henry V. Kings were expected to be successful leaders in war and Henry certainly lived up to this. Agincourt, for example, was seen as an astonishing victory, and not only in England. Henry was also widely praised by contemporaries as being a 'flower of chivalry' and true to his word. A further expectation was that kings should uphold the law, render justice impartially and maintain order and domestic harmony. Henry's record here stands high as does the quality of his government and renewal and extension of royal authority. His achievements in maintaining financial rectitude and in conserving the Crown's rights and revenues stand high. The key to any late-medieval king's success and reputation was the achievement of a right relationship with his nobility; Henry succeeded in this although, it might be argued, it depended to a large extent on waging a successful war. Kings were expected to pursue glory and Henry gained a second crown; he was the conqueror of France but he might also be represented as its saviour. In terms of religious observance, Henry was notably pious; he waged war against heresy (the Lollards); intervened to help end the Schism in the Church; protected the rights and privileges of the Church; fulfilled his coronation oath. In terms of personal conduct there is strong evidence that he was abstemious and chaste.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here the argument and assessment may be sharpened in various directions. There is evidence that Henry deliberately set out to be the perfect king. Contemporaries saw him as a symbol of national identity and praised his governance as well as his military ability. However, the candidates may question the reliability of contemporary sources. The anonymous author of the *Gesta Henrici Quinti* (a chaplain to the King and an eye-witness of events) saw Henry as being blessed by God. Lydgate saw him as the epitome of knighthood. Hocleve (a clerk to the Privy Seal Office) dedicated his Regement of Princes to Henry. It might be argued that the greatest test of Henry's achievements (and, in particular, his relationship with the nobility) was the ease with which his infant son succeeded and the relatively trouble-free minority although the candidates might question for how long his achievements could be sustained. It might be argued that Henry was obsessed by war and that the human and financial cost went too far. Furthermore he might be accused of pride and cruelty, both on the battlefield and in dealing with Lollardy.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 38</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### **34 Account for the mixed fortunes of the English in France in the period 1422–53.**

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. Plain narratives of the Hundred Years War should not score highly. The chronological focus is from the death of Henry V to the battle of Castillon and the end of the war. Answers should show a sharp awareness of 'mixed' fortunes, a balanced coverage of the period and a strong sense of analysis and explanation. It should not be assumed that the English position collapsed immediately upon the death of Henry V. Bedford proved an able Regent of France and military commander and important victories were won, for example, at Verneuil and Cravant. Nevertheless, it might be argued that the English position in France was maintained and consolidated rather than expanded, Bedford's strategy was less successful than Henry V's, the English cause overall was weakened by the division of authority and rivalry between Bedford and Gloucester, the kingdom of Bourges was not overthrown. Candidates may well argue that the real turning point was 1435 when the Duke of Burgundy and Charles VII came to terms at the Congress of Arras. In the same year Bedford died. After 1435 the English cause certainly declined and military defeats followed. Candidates may be expected to offer the following explanations: French resurgence under Charles VII; the war-weariness of England, problems of resources and finance; the role of Joan of Arc; strategic and tactical mistakes on the part of the English; the unsuitability of Henry VI as a military leader, the unpopularity and corruption of the Suffolk regime, the Anjou marriage; popular discontent in England (Cade's rebellion, for example); quarrels among the English nobility, with York and Somerset as striking examples.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates may be expected to have a sharpened perception of the 'mixed' nature of English fortunes. The extent to which the decline of the English position in France was a result of weaknesses and problems at home might be further explored. Candidates may well pose the question as to whether, in any case, Henry V's achievements could be sustained in the longer term.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines].

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

Page 39	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

**35 To what extent did the outbreak of civil strife in England in 1455 arise out of conflicting claims to the throne?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The focus of the question is on the outbreak of civil strife in 1455, marked by the first battle of St Albans. However treatment of events and developments before 1455 will be required, together with some relevant comments on events after this date. Although candidates may prefer other explanations for the outbreak of the Wars of the Roses, nevertheless the issue of conflicting claims should form a substantial part of the answer. Answers should be aware of the origins of the Lancastrians as usurpers (although especially after the reign of Henry V the claim had been vindicated and the minority of Henry VI was not contested) and of what might be seen as a superior claim on the part of Richard of York. It might be argued that Richard would have been content to bide his time, Henry VI being childless, but that his ambitions were dashed by the birth of Prince Edward and anxieties raised by the Beaufort claim in the person of Somerset. Alternative explanations and arguments can be expected which may include the following. The personal unsuitability of Henry VI, his mental breakdown in 1453 and the influence of Margaret of Anjou. The feud between Somerset and York on matters other than dynastic claims, for example, the management of the war in France, funds owed to York and his frustrations concerning the influence of Somerset and the ending of York's first Protectorate. Feuds between noble families (the escalation of private 'feuds' argument) which not only dislocated some regions of the kingdom but also impinged upon national issues. Examples of such feuds are Courtenay v. Bonville and Nevilles v. Percy. At St Albans the Nevilles sided with York whilst the Percies stood with the King (Lancaster). The aftermath of the English involvement in France including defeat, the loss of noble incomes, the Crown's financial difficulties, popular distress and discontent at home, including Cade's rebellion. More widely, candidates may consider whether mid-fifteenth century society was unstable: overmighty subjects (alongside an undermighty king); falling revenues from landed estates; the abuses of retaining and clientage (the 'Bastard Feudalism' argument).

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. With reference to the dynastic aspect of the question candidates might argue the uncertainty of York's ambitions whether, in the early- and mid-1450s he was actually aiming to take the throne, or whether he was concerned simply to occupy what he saw as his natural place. Candidates may also argue that whatever York's ambitions were, the nobility were remarkably resistant to contemplate Henry VI's deposition. In taking this line of argument it will be important to point out that York did not openly claim the throne until 1460. In further developing the argument candidates may seek to demonstrate the relative importance of the factors at work and how closely they were interlinked.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines].

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

<b>Page 40</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**36 Assess the importance of the nobility to the government and military activity of the kingdom of England in this period (c. 1399–c. 1461)**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Purely descriptive accounts should not score highly; the concentration must be on assessing the importance of the nobility and there should be a reasonable, although not necessarily equal, balance between 'government' and 'military activity'. Candidates should recognise that the English nobles constituted a relatively small group, of around fifty individuals, which enjoyed great social prestige and political influence. Some had close dynastic connections to the king. Taking the nobility as a whole, the internal stability of the kingdom depended upon the relationship between them and the monarch. Candidates are likely to discuss the importance of the nobility in terms of the following. The role of the nobles in the Great Council, although some assessment of its significance and frequency of meeting will be needed. Membership of the House of Lords although, again, the importance of Parliament's power as well as frequency of sittings should be discussed. Local influence in the regions, the ability to impose law and order there (or to lose control), the holding of courts, influence over the gentry and the offices of J.P. and sheriff. The lack of an official 'police force' gave added importance to the role of the nobility in local affairs and there was a recognisable trend by lords to accumulate the local powers formerly executed by the Crown. Given that there was no official 'standing army' the military significance of the nobility was considerable in raising forces for the Crown to serve in France, for example, to command in battle and to enlist soldiers to crush rebellion against the Crown (or to raise 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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here it would be relevant and helpful to rehearse some of the problems faced by the nobles as a means of shedding light on their ambitions, preoccupations and actions. One argument is that nobles suffered from declining income from land and that there was increased competition for Crown patronage and profitable marriages. After 1453 opportunities in France were lost. These considerations help to explain noble feuds with the resulting breakdown of law and order in some localities. Candidates may also be expected to rehearse the pros and cons for the stability of kingdom of clientage/retinues, and some indication of the 'bastard feudalism' debate is a possibility. Another area for debate is the nature of the relationship between the lords and the gentry and the role of the latter in the governance of the localities. The examples of Pastons, Stonors and Plumptons may be quoted to illustrate the argument. Were the nobles everywhere the dominant force in all regions or were concerted groups of gentry more important in some? Other debates might include whether England was more disorderly in this period than, say, in the fourteenth century and how 'overmighty' the nobles actually were.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 41</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### Section 8: 1461–1547

#### 37 How insecure was the legacy passed by Edward IV to his sons?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates are perfectly entitled to argue that Edward IV's legacy was secure or insecure or that there were elements of both. Answers may well begin with the observation that on the death of Edward IV the throne was usurped, his sons disinherited and there was a return to civil strife. However some sense of balance will normally be required for the highest marks. Edward IV's second reign was largely successful (especially compared with his first). Internal peace was restored. Edward had the confidence and strength to execute Clarence, economic prosperity was restored (in the south at least), a successful treaty was concluded with France, the finances were healthy and administrative reforms had been implemented. Nevertheless the aristocracy were not united (here some comparison might be made with 1422). Edward chose to rule through great nobles but failed to defuse tensions, for example, between Dorset and Hastings. The unwisdom of depending upon a small group of magnates might be discussed. Given that Edward might be seen as a usurper the Yorkist dynasty could be seen as partisan (although the same might be said of Henry IV and Henry V). Meanwhile, the advancement of the Woodvilles had made them enduringly unpopular (and a threat to Gloucester). It might also be argued that Edward's provisions for the succession were inadequate and incomplete. As to other matters, by the end of the reign, foreign policy was in disarray and there was war with Scotland.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here the argument might be further sharpened. A sense of perspective may lead some answers to point out that other regimes survived minorities (Henry V/Henry VI and Henry VIII/Edward VI). Perhaps Edward IV lacked the authority to inspire the same sort of awe as Henry V and Henry VIII. How far was Yorkist rule seen simply as the rule of the faction which had triumphed in civil war? To what extent can it be argued that the Yorkists lacked a sense of family solidarity? On the other hand, it might be argued, Edward (and his dynasty) was unfortunate in that he died young. Had he lived another six or even four years his son's accession would, almost certainly, have been unchallenged. Again, could the actions of Gloucester have been foreseen, given his loyalty to Edward IV?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 42	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

**38 Discuss the accuracy of the judgement that the key to Henry VII's success was his relationship with the nobility.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A useful opening might be to put the question into the context of the fifteenth century, for example: Henry VI, Somerset and York; Edward IV and Warwick; Richard III and Buckingham. The experience of Henry VI's reign had certainly demonstrated the imbalance between overmighty subject and an undermighty King; the nobility were able not only to challenge royal authority but pursued personal feuds which created internal instability. Answers should show a good understanding of the role of the nobility as local magnates responsible for the peace and good governance of the regions, in raising and commanding armed forces and as counsellors. Kings needed not only to demonstrate their authority over the nobles but also to win trust and goodwill and answers should deal with this balance. Exploration and analysis of the following policies are to be expected: acts of attainder and reversal of attainder; bonds and recognisances; measures to deal with the abuses of clientage and retaining; wardship; the enhancement of the Tudor dynasty; the role of the Court; a frugal approach towards the granting of titles, promotions and lands; appointment to the Council; reduced reliance on the nobility as royal agents in the provinces. Although the chief focus has to be on relations with the nobility, there should be some consideration of other factors in Henry VII's success, for example: the enhancement of royal estates; finance; government and administration; justice; the successful crushing of rebellion and conspiracy; marriage to Elizabeth of York and the production of heirs; relations with Parliament; a cautious foreign policy alongside successful marriage alliances.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here candidates may choose to sharpen the argument in evaluating the relative importance of the factors explaining Henry VII's success and also in demonstrating the connections between them. It might be argued that Henry benefited from the deaths of great nobles (Northumberland) and a relatively large number of minorities in noble families (Buckingham, for example). Again, it might be argued, Henry was fortunate that there was a relative lack of nobles with strong claims to the throne and no close relatives to challenge his position (Clarence and Edward IV might be quoted). One great test of his success, it might be argued, was that there were no noble rebellions after the early years of the reign and that, on the whole, the great nobles were not involved.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 43</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**39 Who was more successful in advancing the authority of the Scottish monarchy: James IV or James V?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The required chronological concentration is on the half-century from the accession of James IV in 1488 to the death of James V in 1542. Nevertheless some reference should be made to their inheritance and legacy. Narrative accounts of the reigns should not score highly; assessment and argument, as to the extent of 'success' will need to be shown. A thematic approach across the period is most likely to work well with real comparisons: relations with the nobility; the establishment and maintenance of internal order; relations with other rulers, especially with England and France; primacy over other potential power bases in the kingdom; relations with the Church; the prestige of the royal court. Contrasts as well as comparisons between the kings would enhance the argument. James IV concluded a marriage alliance with England and, more widely, earned considerable respect abroad; extended royal influence over the Church; maintained a brilliant Renaissance court, developed ambitious building projects and proved a generous patron of the arts. James V succeeded as a minor, in 1513, and his own independent rule did not begin until 1528. He earned considerable prestige abroad, including two French marriage alliances (the second with Mary of Guise); he extended royal control over the Church; restored the finances; conducted a vigorous relationship with the nobility; and maintained a magnificent court.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here candidates may seek to balance the generally favourable reputations of both Kings. How far did their influence depend on their relations with France and England and their ability to manipulate them? Were they over-committed to a French alliance? How well did they deal with border problems with England? How extensive were the powers left to the nobility? Were both too inclined to punch above their weight? Both Kings died prematurely, both in, or shortly after battle (James IV at Flodden, and James V after Solway Moss) and both left minors to succeed them.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 44</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

#### **40 With what justification did Henry VIII regard himself as '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. The questions requires an assessment of Henry VIII's achievements and historical reputation rather than a narrative of his reign. Judgements should be made, to a large extent at least, on the basis of contemporary values. Discussion of the following themes and events may be expected. Henry VIII had the capacity to dominate and command; ministers, servants and subjects were in awe of him. In spite of matrimonial problems he secured the succession for his three children. He defied the Papacy, created an imperial/sovereign monarchy and made himself Supreme Head of the Church. He chose able and loyal ministers, dismissed them at his pleasure and, according to circumstances, directed the government himself. The realm was successfully defended by ships and fortifications, ambitious wars were fought, victories were won in France and territory gained, two crushing defeats were inflicted on Scotland. Wales was incorporated into England and Henry took the title King of Ireland. He suppressed rebellion (Pilgrimage of Grace) and strengthened royal authority in the North. Henry maintained a magnificent court, in his youth and early middle age he was active in sport and tournament, he was cultivated well educated and accomplished. He was a great builder, spent lavishly and patronised the arts.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates may well be expected to balance the argument. In warfare and diplomacy Henry's achievements might be regarded as limited. Perhaps he never quite equalled the glory of his contemporaries (Charles V and Francis I) and lacked the resources to do so. In terms of what Henry said he intended, it might be argued that he misused the confiscated wealth of the Church. He failed, in the end, to solve the 'Scottish problem' and was not really able to impose his will on Ireland. A useful line of enquiry might be to examine his reputation amongst contemporaries. How effective was the image of the King as presented by, for example, Holbein? How far has the attribution 'Great' been supported by historians?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 45</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**41 How convincing is the argument that the breach with Rome was a movement from below rather than a policy enforced from above?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates should demonstrate a good balance in their treatment of the two propositions in the question and should make a conscious and argued attempt to deal with the issue of 'how convincing'. A 'movement from below' may be seen as a popular desire for a Church that was spiritually more fulfilling. Such sentiments, in part at least, drew upon the teaching of Wycliffe and stressed the importance of an understanding of 'the Word' which, in turn, necessitated the translation of the Scriptures. Answers may be expected to go on to assess the extent of the growth of Lutheranism in England. Associated with the 'movement from below' approach is the impact and extent of anti-clericalism - objections to moral offences by the clergy, clerical taxation and jurisdiction and other abuses. Some clergy were badly educated. Candidates may well seek to demonstrate the connections between anti-clericalism and Wycliffe's teaching and an attempt to estimate the scale of Lollard survival would be helpful. In examining the alternative proposition candidates should be looking for evidence of opposition to the Church by the Crown, government and supporters. Was the Breach with Rome- Henrician Reformation an 'official reformation' inspired and led by the Crown? How far was it an attempted solution to the King's matrimonial and dynastic concerns which went further? Or was the 'King's Great Matter' just the occasion rather than the cause which, in fact, sprang from the long-running contest between spiritual and temporal authority? Certainly, as matters turned out, the divorce could only be gained by a transfer of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. However, this led to, or involved, greater claims to royal supremacy and an imperial/sovereign monarchy. It also led to opportunities for re-endowing the finances of the Crown by a seizure of Church property and taxation. How far were these developments part of a longer term ambition and intention? Closely connected with the debate is the question as to how corrupt and unpopular or how popular and thriving the pre-Reformation English Church was. A further ingredient in the argument is the extent to which there was doctrinal change.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There are good opportunities here for a discussion of the historiography with candidates being likely to discuss and evaluate the views of, for example, Dickens, Elton, Haigh, Scarisbrick and Duffy. Part of the debate is about methodology, the kind of evidence gathered and how it is used. How did contemporaries see the Henrician reformation? Some reformers saw it as the fulfilment of the Church's need for renewal, for example, Tyndale. Other 'official reformers' saw it as serving the needs of the monarchy and candidates may quote the examples of Robert Barnes, Cromwell, Christopher St. German and Gardiner.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 46</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### SECTION 9: Themes c. 1066–1547

#### 42 In what ways, and why, did the economic and political status of towns develop in the period c. 1066–c. 1300?

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. A form of narrative or just possibly description will not do much here to meet the needs of the question, unless there is substantial explanation. Analysis and evaluation are required, supported by a suitable range of examples. Towns and trade will be seen as related closely, interdependent. The question is framed around the Conquest of 1066 and an arguable peak of economic activity (and, importantly, population levels) prior to the onset of the Black Death and changes. A range of examples – big, smaller, ports, inland – will be helpful here. Growth will be a factor here – growth in the size and activities of towns, growth in the scale, scope and volume of trade. Reference can be made to such areas as the size of towns, their location, markets, mints, industries, their food supply, royal charters, wealth, relationship with regions, trade routes (land, waterways, sea), goods carried, products and produce (metals, glass, pottery, wool, food, wine, etc), links to the Continent, links to baronial or royal lordships, the impact of population growth, agrarian changes, commercial changes and volume, greater demand for supply.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'In what ways, and why ...' represent two parts to the question; both need to be answered but not equally. There is scope for argument as well as evaluation here and for debate. Population change and growth may be seen as a key factor; or else greater overall stability and peace; or changing trade routes may be seen as a key element, with more focus still on towns as commercial and economic centres.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 47</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

### **43 How feudal was English society in the period c. 1066–c. 1300?**

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. A description of feudal features will not go very far here, unless there is good explanation linked to the question. Analysis and evaluation are required, supported by a suitable range of examples. The question embraces what has been described as ‘the first century of English feudalism’ and what may be viewed as something of a peak of feudal activity and practice. A definition of ‘feudal’ and ‘feudalism’ will be required, probably related to ideas of land-holding, forms of service (military, non-military), homage and fealty, knight service (and forms of commendation), the post-Conquest settlement and colonisation of England (and extensions into Wales and Scotland), honours and honorial lordship, forms of manorialism and agrarian activities. The responses will embrace economic, social, military and political-legal arenas, to include feudal lordship, feudal rights, royal-feudal authority and claims to rights. Good answers will probably range from the top to the lower reaches of society – kings, lords, knights, peasants.

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. ‘How ... ’ opens up argument and counter-argument, inviting debate. There has been much debate, of course, as to the nature of English feudalism and its development – Norman genesis, English elements, Anglo-Norman; military above all else or more socio-economic; more political-legal than anything else; top-down features; the links to a very hierarchical social order; the importance of homage and fealty; the extra ingredient of royal power and title (and entitlement); the issues of any equation of feudal and lawlessness, or the reverse.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 48	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2010	9769	11

**44 The dispute over Langton was more damaging to relations between the English Crown and the Papacy than the dispute over Becket' 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. The question is bounded by the period 1166 – 1228. A narrative or form of description of events will not go very far here, unless there is good explanation involved. Analysis and evaluation are required. The events and issues surrounding Anselm, Becket and Langton will need to be set against those of other archbishops and a theme of conflict v co-operation, disharmony v harmony, will be assessed. Candidates will need to show awareness of the disputes here and of the periods of quiescence. Reference can be made to the personalities of Archbishops and Kings; issues of church-papal standing and relations; external as well as internal pressures; prevailing papal ideologies of reform and supremacy, *regnum v sacerdotium*; the place of the church and archbishops in royal administration and government; church courts, benefit of clergy and other clerical rights; taxation; the value of Church revenues to the Crown; royal powers of appointment; diplomacy; foreign relations and contexts (e.g. Popes and French Kings). Examples of archbishops who were ultra-loyal, reliable, non-confrontational would be useful (e.g. Lanfranc, Richard of Dover, Hubert Walter). Support for archbishops and for Kings – often more for the latter, including amongst bishops (e.g. Anselm, Becket phases) – should be considered as should the actual stances and interests of Popes, often ambivalent or shifting (e.g. Innocent III).

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 with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question sets up evaluation around argument and counter-argument. There has been much debate. It can be argued that the events surrounding the three archbishops did damage relations (though candidates will be aware that Innocent III turned on Langton); then again, it can be argued that there was no lasting damage and that co-operation, harmony and quiescence were key norms. Candidates may well assess the evidence about how England and its kings were viewed in Rome and in a wider European context.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 49</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

#### **45 How prosperous was the English economy in the fifteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Explanation and assessment are required rather than plain description. The following themes and issues are likely to be addressed: demographic change, the declining impact of plague and its consequences; stable prices and rising wages; how favourably circumstances suited labourers and small landed proprietors; the relative balance between good and bad harvests; the rising wealth of London and of some provincial towns; why some towns declined and others prospered; the decline in the wool trade alongside the growth of the cloth industry; the mixed fortunes of the greater landed proprietors; the growth in such industries as building, salt production and mining; the rise of substantial tenant farmers; the effects of commutation of labour services; changes in land utilisation, the consolidation of holdings and their effects; farming for profit.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There are a number of debates to be explored and further developed. How accurate is the view that the fifteenth century was 'the golden age of the English labourer'? What were the benefits and problems of 'enclosure'? How far did the growth of London determine the decline of provincial towns and outposts? How beneficial to the economy and overall prosperity was the growth of merchant oligarchies?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 50</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**46 To what extent can it be argued that Parliament was a check on, rather than an aid to, royal power in the period 1399–1529?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The chronology is deliberately designed to stop short before the Reformation Parliament. The question requires argument and analysis rather than descriptive accounts of relations between King and Parliament. Candidates should show a good sense of balance across the whole period and be aware of such changing circumstances as economic factors, foreign war, the personalities and abilities of the respective kings. Candidates may be expected to point out that Parliament met much more frequently before 1461 than after and offer explanations. How did this reflect upon the relative power of King and Parliament? Taking the period as a whole Parliament became more influential in the fields of grant of supply, the formulation of law (statute came to be seen as superior to other forms of law), as a political forum where great matters of State were raised and ministers called to account (the impeachment of Suffolk in 1450, for example); the Speaker was regularly elected to preside for the whole Parliament; the presentation of petitions to the King. Candidates may be expected to comment upon the extent to which these broad developments enhanced or limited the powers of the Crown. Other issues which can be used in a relevant fashion are: impeachment and attainder, disputed claims to the throne and confirmation of royal title; Acts of Resumption; the election of household and government officials to the Commons and the presence of great officers of state in the Lords.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. It should be recognised that Parliaments met infrequently (especially after 1461) and irregularly and it might be argued that kings summoned Parliaments because they needed rather than wanted them (the principal need being taxation). The Crown's automatic entitlement to customs duties gave it greater financial independence and the end of the war with France explains, in large part, why Parliament met less frequently after the middle of the fifteenth century. Candidates may well use this theme to demonstrate the flaws in the thesis of 'the Lancastrian constitutional experiment'. Parliament gained an important element of control over legislation and taxation, established the beginnings of parliamentary privilege and, as a result, could oppose kings and could not be entirely controlled by them. However, in the last resort, Parliament depended upon the King because he alone could summon it.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, 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.

<b>Page 51</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2010</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>11</b>

**47 Assess the influence of printing as a force for change in Britain in the late-fifteenth and 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. Candidates should recognise that multiple copies of books were produced before printing but that the scale expanded. Moreover, in Britain the output of printed material was lower than in some other states and regions of Europe. Candidates should seek to demonstrate the scale and significance of the changes influenced by printing across a range of fields, such as, religious, political, the law, intellectual enquiry, society and the economy, the arts and architecture. Until the early sixteenth century most books published were on conservative or conventional themes such as Bibles, mass books and reference works, with religious books accounting for some three quarters of the output. However as the sixteenth century progressed printing encouraged the circulation in larger numbers of books in Hebrew and Greek, on scientific subjects including botany, astronomy, anatomy, geography and cosmology; mathematical treatises; humanist ideas, works on a range of social, economic and political ideas (including agriculture and inflation); illustrated books; printed music. Clearly, the impact on religious thinking was significant with key European as well as British texts in circulation. In the period 1525-47 around 800 separate works in English on religious subjects (many of them Protestant inspired) were produced. Printing went hand in hand with the growing importance of the vernacular in bringing a wider range of works to a wider reading audience. In the early part of the sixteenth century around 800 different books were printed per decade, by the 1590s this had risen to 3000. Print runs averaged 1200 copies. Answers may also note the impact that printing had on the development of private libraries (as distinct from those in monasteries, cathedrals and colleges of the universities). The increasing use of the vernacular in print applied to Welsh as well as English.

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. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here candidates may be expected to sharpen the argument in terms of the scale of private works, availability and levels of lay literacy. One test of the effectiveness of printing as a force for change may be the development and extent of censorship, for example, in the later years of Elizabeth I's reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, 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.