

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/21

Paper 2a (European History Outlines, c. 300–1516),
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.

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

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

Introduction

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

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

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

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Band 1: 25–30

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

Band 2: 19–24

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

Band 3: 13–18

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

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Band 4: 7–12

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

Band 5: 0–6

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

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 1: c. 300–632

1 Which of Constantine or Diocletian had the greater impact on the development of the Roman Empire?

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 focus should be on an evaluation and analysis of the impact of BOTH emperors, with comparison central to any judgement. The military impact of both rulers, from defence of the empire to army reforms, government, from the development of the tetrarchy under Diocletian to its destruction by Constantine, internal administrative and legal reform under both emperors are likely areas of comparison. Their treatment of Christianity, and its role in the empire under Constantine, is likely to be central to any comparison; candidates may consider how far the Empire controlled the spread of Christianity under Diocletian and how far it was transformed by Christianity under Constantine. Other areas for evaluation might be Diocletian's economic policies and the impact of Constantine's foundation of Constantinople.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Who had more impact' invites comparison of impact, and an awareness of the effects of actions in context; consideration may be given to the balance between the effects of the individual emperors' actions and the long-term structural factors affecting the Empire.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

2 To what extent, and why, were the barbarians a threat to the survival of the Roman Empire in the west?

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. Answers need to do more than describe the actions of the barbarians. There is a debate about the impact of the barbarians and argument and counter-argument are expected. One view would be that the barbarians destroyed the Empire from without and from within, putting pressure on the emperors to allow them to settle and then destroying the Roman political, economic and social systems from within, as much by neglect as by direct violence. A more subtle view would be to look at the extent to which the threats to the survival of the western empire came from within, through political and social divisions and its inherent economic and military weaknesses, and to see the barbarians as adapting to this changing situation and even having some role in preserving Roman institutions; the impact of Ostrogoths in Italy, Visigoths and Vandals in Spain and Franks in Gaul could all be discussed, as examples of the extent to which barbarians preserved Roman institutions and officials, often blending them with their own legal and military customs, and observing at least titular allegiance to the eastern emperor, while at the same time gradually overseeing the decline of much of Roman government and society. There should be some evaluation of the reasons for this threat, which requires analysis of both the motives of the barbarians and the reasons for the effect of their actions on the empire

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question requires a focus on the extent of and reasons for a barbarian threat to the survival of Empire; this will need analysis of both the extent of the impact and the reasons for that impact. There is room for debate over both issues, and candidates may reach a judgement over whether the barbarians were aiming at and successful in the deliberate destruction of the western empire or its preservation and adaptation in their own interests.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

3 Assess the importance of Gregory the Great in the development of the Western 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. Answers which narrate the events of Gregory's life and career will not address the question unless there is clear analysis of their importance. This will include an analysis of impact and effects in both the immediate context of the church and empire and in the longer term. Answers could include his relations with the barbarians, both religious and secular, including Augustine's mission to the English, relations with the French church and political negotiations with the Lombards; his government of Rome, including charitable works and reform of the patrimony; his relations with the eastern emperor; his writings; the 'monasticisation' of the papacy. His reputation immediately and in the longer term, and its impact on the status of the papacy, may also be considered.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this case, the changing interpretations of his effects, from contemporaries to later commentators, may well be relevant, since his achievements may have seemed more limited at the time than in retrospect.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

4 To what extent were the achievements of Clovis dependent upon his decision to embrace Catholicism?

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. Candidates will need to demonstrate a clear view of the nature of Clovis' achievements, and will need to evaluate the extent of their dependence on his conversion. Consideration of his achievements is likely to include his military successes, his diplomacy and his reign as King of the Franks, including his government and development of legislation. The advantages to be gained from conversion included the support of the Frankish Church and of the Gallo-Roman population, and especially of their aristocracy, both in his internal government and in his wars against Arian neighbours such as the Visigoths.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'To what extent' requires candidates to evaluate the balance between the advantages attached to his conversion and the qualities already present in Clovis as a ruler and military leader.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

5 'The wars of Justinian the Great made a far greater impression on the Roman Empire than did his domestic policies.' How far do you agree?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, rather than a narrative of military and domestic events. The impact of the wars will need to be assessed, in the light of the condition of the empire in Justinian's time; the resources needed for the wars and the economic and political impact of acquiring these, the effects of the extended campaigns, especially in Italy and North Africa, on these lands as well as on the east, the effects on the frontiers and relations with the Slavs and the Persians are likely to be evaluated. Domestic policies may include the legal reforms, religious policies and economic policies. There may be some discussion of the impact of the wars on the domestic policies, and vice versa. Justinian's legacy, and the immediate aftermath of his policies, may be considered; how secure were the conquests, and how far did the domestic policies endure beyond his 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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Debate may focus on the extent to which the destructive effect of the wars outweighed and hampered any constructive effects of his domestic policies, and hastened the military and political decline of the empire under the impact of both its western and eastern enemies.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 2: c. 632–c. 919

6 Assess the social and cultural impact of Muslim rule in Spain from 756 to 961.

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 events will not answer the question unless it includes analysis and evaluation. The boundary dates are the start of the Umayyad dynasty in Spain under Abd-al Rahman I and the death of Abd-al Rahman III. Social and cultural impact could include the effects of Muslim rule on the Christian society of al-Andalus, the extent and nature of religious conversion and cultural assimilation – language, dress, social relationships, intermarriage – the impact of Islamic culture and the development of Andalusian culture, independent of the Abbasid Caliphate in Baghdad. Literature, philosophy, science, music and architecture might be discussed. There could well also be some reference to the economic impact of Islamic rule, especially its effects on agriculture and trade, and the development of urban life, and of Cordoba in particular. The extent of cultural and social interaction between Muslims, Christians and Jews or 'convivencia', might be explored.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Assess the impact' invites consideration of the extent of impact, and this could well include a discussion of the extent to which Visigothic culture and society survived, or was swept away along with the language; this has been the subject of scholarly debate for many years, and some argument and counter-argument could be included.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

7 How important was the support of the Church and the Papacy in the rise of the Carolingians from 687 to 751?

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 rise of the Carolingians will not answer the question unless it includes evaluation of causes. The rise of the Carolingians should be placed in the context of the decline of the Merovingians, and the reasons for both analysed. These reasons are likely to include the rise of the Carolingians as administratively effective Mayors of the Palace, and the increasingly ineffective rule of the Merovingians; the victory of Pepin II at Tertry; the loyalty of their followers; the growing military and political power of Charles Martel, and the impact of his defeat of the Muslims (732). The growing alliance with the, Frankish church and with the papacy, culminating in the deposition of Childeric and the coronation of Pepin in 751, should be assessed in the context of some of these factors.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How important' requires assessment of relative importance, with possibly some awareness of the links between the decline of the Merovingians and their loss of noble and ecclesiastical support and the rise of the Carolingians, as they came to seem the natural leaders and protectors of the Christian kingdom.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

8 How effective was Charlemagne as a military leader?

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, especially of the wars, is not required. Candidates will need to be aware of the extent of Charlemagne's military campaigns throughout the reign, and the nature of the military, political and fiscal challenges that these created for him. They may choose to focus on one or more particular series of campaigns, such as those against the Saxons, to examine the methods used by Charlemagne to secure their final submission. There needs to be an awareness of how troops were raised and sustained, and the feudal and political systems used to secure their loyalty. There should be focus on Charlemagne's personal contribution, both as military and political leader, in inspiring and leading his armies. There may well be discussion of the role of religion in the motivation of both Charlemagne and his followers.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How effective' requires argument about the extent to which Charlemagne was able to achieve his aims. How far, especially in his latter years, was he responding to events, and how far was he able to do more than contain the threats from so many enemies on the borders of his empire?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

9 How significant was the Treaty of Verdun in the break-up of the Carolingian Empire?

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 break-up of the Carolingian Empire will not answer the question without causal analysis. The significance of the Treaty of Verdun needs to be assessed in the context of other factors. These could include the increasing threats from external enemies, especially the Vikings; the legacy of Charlemagne, to include the internal weaknesses of the empire as well as its strengths; the limitations of Carolingian rulers after Charlemagne and their disagreements; the growing independence of noble families; the breakdown of central 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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How significant' invites discussion of other factors, and of the extent to which this was a final turning-point in the decline of the Carolingians; candidates may well assess the strength of the empire before and after 843, and consider other possible turning points, such as the death of Charlemagne, or even see decline as inherent in the empire in Charlemagne's own reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 14	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

10 What effects did the Vikings have on trade and settlement in western continental Europe in the ninth 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. Candidates should assess the nature of the Vikings' effects on trade and settlement, and not provide a narrative of the Viking attacks. There is historical debate based on physical evidence as well as on hostile chronicles, which balances the impact of Viking raids with the effects of Vikings as settlers and traders. Candidates should consider both the destructive effects of raids on trade and settlement – goods seized, geld payments, routes endangered, towns and monasteries attacked or abandoned and more positive effects such as adaptation, defence, emergence of strong local rule, trading and settlement. They should also assess the more peaceful aspects of the settlement of the Vikings themselves – new settlements and trade routes, trading relations with local populations. A range of examples from continental Europe is expected.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this case, there is debate based on the nature and significance of written and physical evidence as to the effects of the Viking raids and settlements both in the wider context of the economic and political development of western continental Europe and in local instances. Stronger answers will show an understanding of this debate, at either a local or a continental level, and will show a good sense of judgment over the balance between destructive and more positive effects. They may also show some awareness of the debate over the significance of the evidence.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 15	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 3: c. 919–1099

11 How effectively did Otto I control the German duchies?

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 of Otto I is not required. The effectiveness of Otto's control of the duchies throughout the reign should be the central focus of analysis and evaluation, though candidates may refer to other aspects of his reign, and the extent to which the duchies supported or hindered these. Reference could be made to the strength of Otto's own position in Saxony at the start of his reign, and the allegiance of the dukes as shown at his coronation. Subsequent policies to be considered could be his successful defeat of the rebellion in Bavaria (938–41), his control of the other duchies through family alliances, such as the appointment of his brother Henry as Duke of Bavaria, later unrest and rebellions, including that by his own son Liudolf and son-in-law Conrad, as well as unrest in Saxony itself, and Otto's later appointments in Swabia and Lotharingia. Reference could also be made to the limitations of royal administration in Germany, both in terms of the numbers and power of the royal officials and the autonomy of local magnates, and Otto's use of the church, through the Ottonian system, to establish secure administration and provide revenues for the monarchy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates will need to discuss the concept of effectiveness, debating the extent to which Otto was able to rule and rely on the loyalty of his dukes and their armies. Otto's reputation as a strong ruler could be debated.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 16	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

12 How successful a ruler was Roger II of Sicily?

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, and a narrative of the reign will not provide this, unless there is analysis and evaluation embedded within it. Roger II is seen as a strong and highly successful ruler who achieved the royal title, and a balanced assessment of his reputation is needed, possibly in the context of his predecessors as Norman rulers of Sicily, but the focus needs to be on Roger II himself. Reference can be made to his assumption of power after the regency of his mother, and his establishment of his own rule and strong administration in Sicily, the legal reforms of the assembly at Melfi (1129), his conquest of Apulia, his relations with the papacy which led to his royal title, later difficulties both with the Papacy and in southern Italy, his relations with both eastern and western emperors, his naval strength, conquests in North Africa, the development of trade and industry. The situation at the end of the reign, and the problems awaiting his successor, both from internal unrest and external enemies could also be considered.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Candidates need to focus on the extent of success, balancing Roger's achievements, in his administration, conquests, trade and diplomatic relations, with the hostility raised by his strong and ruthless rule and the suspicion and direct hostility his expansion provoked from the papacy and both eastern and western emperors.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 17	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

13 How significant was religious motivation in the Reconquest of Spain and Portugal in the years from 1085 to 1212?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The period between the capture of Toledo and the battle of las Navas de Tolosa is the focus of the question, and candidates will need to be aware of the significance of these dates. A narrative of conquest will not succeed without evaluation and analysis of motivation. Motives apart from religion could include the political strength, rivalry and ambition of Christian rulers such as Alfonso VI, the weakness of many areas of Muslim rule after the collapse of the Caliphate, and the economic and military opportunism of both sides. Reference can be made to the development of the idea of Holy War, in the context both of Spain and the wider Crusading movement, and its relevance to the wars in Spain and Portugal after 1085. The religious motivation of both Moslems and Christians can be considered, and the arrival of the Almoravids in 1086 and the Almohads in 1146 contributed both to the military balance of power and to the religious nature of the conflict. The system of parias, or protection rackets, which existed before 1085, as illustrated by the career of Rodrigo Diaz, El Cid, continued beyond this date and into the Almoravid period. The campaigns of Alfonso VI, VII and VIII in Castile, and Afonso I Henriques in Portugal, Alfonso I of Aragon and Ramon Berenguer, Count of Barcelona, might all be referred to. The increasing influence of ideas of Holy War, both from within Iberia and from the influence of the Roman church and soldiers from France and Normandy, can be discussed, and the conquest of Lisbon in 1147 may well be seen as part of the second Crusade. The role of Innocent III in the campaign which led to victory in 1212, with remission of sins for all who took part, should also be considered.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is much debate as to the extent to which and at what point the Reconquest became a religiously motivated conflict, on both sides, and candidates need to offer argument and counter-argument. They need to focus on 'How significant', examining political, economic and military as well as religious motives.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 18	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

14 How far was the Papal Reform movement responsible for the Investiture Contest in the years to 1085?

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. There is much debate about the reason for the conflict between Empire and Papacy, and candidates should provide an analytical evaluation of causes. Reference needs to be made to the development of the Papal Reform movement, with analysis of its central ideas and the extent to which these were at odds with previous ideas about the relations between church and state, as well as with the actual situation within the Empire. The development of these ideas, from thinkers such as Peter Damian and Humbert to Gregory VII, and the role of the Empire in the development of Papal Reform, may well also be discussed. There may also be discussion of the practical effects of the reform movement, in transforming the Papacy and in giving the Cluniac order a powerful role in western Christendom. The intellectual and political position of the Empire, from Henry III to Henry IV, also needs to be evaluated, and placed in the context of the practical needs of government. The role of these ideas, and other factors, such as the personalities of both Henry and Gregory and the responses of bishops and nobles, in the events of the conflict itself, also needs evaluation. The conflict may be placed in the wider context of the overall strength and positions of both papacy and Empire.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. There is plenty of room for debate as to the relative importance of the whole reform movement in the struggle between Gregory and Henry, and the role of personalities in the context of both ideological developments and political and economic realities. The extent to which the competing claims of the developing papal and imperial governments were bound to clash may be discussed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 19	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

15 'The success of the First Crusade was mainly due to Muslim disunity.' How far do you agree?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the First Crusade cannot answer the question unless there is analysis and evaluation. The focus needs to be on the reasons for its success. Reference could be made to the major divisions within the Muslims, between the Fatimids and Seljuks, as well as divisions between rulers such as Ridwan of Aleppo and Duqaq of Damascus, and the effects these had on the campaigns themselves, for example on the conquests of Nicaea and Antioch. Other factors to include would be the role of Urban II and the preachers of the crusade in western Christendom; the spiritual leadership of Adhemar of le Puy and the military leadership of Bohemond, Godfrey, Raymond and others; the relative unity of the Christian forces; the help supplied by the Byzantines; the religious and military fervour of the crusading armies; the tactics used and the adaptation of the crusading armies to the unfamiliar conditions and to the tactics of the Muslim armies. The success of the crusaders at specific points, such as the conquest of Nicaea and of Antioch and of Jerusalem itself, could be discussed with reference to specific factors such as Byzantine naval support at Nicaea and Bohemond's planning and secret negotiations at Antioch.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The focus should be on 'mainly due'; after analysis of specific campaigns and stages in the Crusade, there needs to be an overall judgement as to the extent to which Muslim disunity was the most important factor, although there could well be an understanding of the links between this and other factors; for example, how far could effective leadership of the crusaders take advantage of Muslim disunity.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 20	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 4: 1085–1250

16 How consistently did Frederick Barbarossa pursue his aims in Italy?

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 of the nature of Barbarossa's aims in Italy is required, as well as the extent to which he consistently pursued them. There may well be some discussion of the extent to which the competing claims for Barbarossa's attention in Germany affected his policies in Italy, but the focus needs to be mainly on Italy. Analysis of the aims of Barbarossa's five expeditions to Italy, and how far these changed, is needed. There could be discussion of how far Frederick was concerned to assert his overall dominance as Emperor, or rather to reassert control over territories such as Milan and the Lombard cities, which he saw as rightfully his. Did his relationship with and view of the papacy change according to his military fortunes? There may well be discussion of Frederick's view of his imperial role, and how this affected his policies both in conquering and ruling within Italy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The focus needs to be on the consistency between aims and actual policy; did Frederick maintain a clear vision, or did he increasingly respond to events? Debate over the nature of these aims would be welcome; the extent to which they were bound up with a wider view of the Emperor's role in restoring and maintaining order within Christendom, rather than simply asserting his authority and taking advantage of military disunity and weakness in Italy.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 21	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

17 Why was the French monarchy stronger in 1180 than in 1108?

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 the reigns of Louis VI and VII will not answer the question without analysis and evaluation. The extent to which Louis VII was able to consolidate the achievements of Louis VI may well be considered. There needs to be comparison between the position in 1108 and that in 1180, and therefore some evaluation of the monarchy under the earlier Capetians will be relevant, but the main focus should be on the impact of Louis VI and VII. Reference could be made over both reigns to: the development of administrative structures and the careful use of resources, especially of the royal domain; relations with nobility and towns; use of the royal feudal powers; relations with the Church in France and with the papacy; relations with other powers, including the Emperor and the Dukes of Normandy. In the reign of Louis VI, more specific reference could be made to his establishment of his own base in the Ile-de-France, his relations with Henry I, the role of Suger and his intervention in Flanders. For Louis VII, reference could be made to the Angevin marriage and its consequences, the effects of his role in the Second Crusade on the monarchy, his relations with Henry II, his cultural patronage.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The focus should be on the reasons for the increasing strength of the monarchy overall, despite the setbacks in many areas. Reference needs to be made to the factors limiting the effectiveness of monarchy before 1108, such as the feudal powers and territorial control of the great nobles, and the extent to which royal policies succeeded in reducing this and bringing the nobles and their lands, the towns and the church under firmer royal control.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 22	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

18 How great a ruler was Philip Augustus?

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, without analysis or evaluation, will not answer the question. The extent of success needs to be evaluated, possibly linked to a discussion of his position on his succession to the throne in 1180, and the resources available to him, and a comparison of this with the position in 1223. Reference is likely to be made to his personal qualities of leadership; his military, diplomatic and political skills and the extent to which these enabled him to extend his powers both through conquests and through firmer control of those lands already within the monarchy; his development of a complex bureaucracy, financial and judicial system and his ability to control these; his preparations for and eventual success in his campaigns against John; his use of ecclesiastical support. The extent of his achievements, over a long reign, should be considered, and some discussion of its limitations, for example in the attention paid to the south, might be expected.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The focus should be on 'how great' and therefore there may be discussion of the extent to which Philip relied on the achievements of his predecessors and the weaknesses of his opponents, especially John. There may well be debate about the strength of the French monarchy in 1223, and how far he succeeded in establishing firm structures which would survive him.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 23	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

19 How effectively did Innocent III implement his views on Papal authority?

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. There needs to be clear reference to and analysis of Innocent's views on papal authority, which will include plenitudo potestatis and ratione peccati, and an evaluation of the extent to which these were effectively pursued in his practical policies. Reference is likely to be made to his relations with secular rulers, especially John, Philip Augustus and Frederick II; his development of the papal curia and of legislation and ecclesiastical reform, especially the Fourth Lateran Council and its claims over and effects on the lives of all western Christians; his calls to crusade, in Spain and the Holy Land, and pursuit of the Fourth Crusade; his campaigns against heresy and the Albigensian Crusade. The methods he used to make these aims effective, through development of administration and through personal action interdict and excommunication, might also be considered. The extent to which his ultimate aims were balanced by temporary and more pragmatic considerations, as in his changing support of factions in the Imperial election, or his relations with John, might also be discussed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The focus should be on the effectiveness of Innocent's pursuit of his views, and this is likely to include some assessment both of the impact of his policies, on both society and its rulers, and the extent to which his policies themselves were influenced by factors other than his quest for papal supremacy over a truly Christian society.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 24	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

20 'Frederick II's problems resulted from the nature of his inheritance rather than his own shortcomings.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative or description of his problems without explanation will not answer the question. There will need to be a balanced evaluation of the extent to which Frederick's problems were present at or developed after his accession, either through his own actions or through other factors. Reference will need to be made to the period of civil war in Germany, and the extent to which this increased the problems facing him there; candidates may also discuss the extent to which imperial control over Germany was a more deep-rooted issue, going back to Barbarossa and beyond, but the focus of the question needs to be on the immediate situation before and during the reign of Frederick II. The relations between the Empire and the northern Italian states, especially Milan, may be discussed. The situation in Sicily will also need to be considered, and there may well be discussion of the extent to which the overall inheritance was in itself overwhelming for any monarch, and whether the administrative and fiscal systems were in place to ensure effective rule over so large an inheritance. This will need to be balanced with an evaluation of Frederick's own aims and policies, and the extent to which these caused him problems; this could include reference to his policies in Germany, his government of the Kingdom of Sicily, his relations with the papacy, his intervention in northern Italy, his attitude towards crusading, his success in the Holy Land and his excommunication.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The focus should be here on an analysis of extent, with debate about his inheritance, the role of Frederick himself, his imperial vision and his actions, and those of the papacy and other rulers leading to a balanced evaluation of his reign; his reputation has been the subject of much debate, and candidates could well consider how far he can be seen as over-ambitious or rather the inheritor of an impossible combination of roles.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 25	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 5: Themes c. 300–c. 1200

21 How significant was the impact of population change in either the period c. 400–800 or c. 1000–1200?

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. Simple description of changes in population will not answer the question, unless there is sufficient explanation of the significance of their impact. Analysis and evaluation need to be supported by suitably selected examples from across the period. Awareness of significance will require discussion both of the extent of population changes and of the reasons for and importance of these. Reference could therefore be made to how widespread the changes were in either period, ranging over much of Europe, and assessing how far there were regional exceptions and developments, and how far trends, for example in the growth of urban areas, were widespread. Discussion of reasons should still focus on significance, so there may well be reference to overall factors such as disease, political stability or unrest, the effects of wars, agricultural factors and shifts in trade, and the extent to which these supported or inhibited population growth. There may also be discussion of the effects of population change, again with examples, to show its impact on trade, political systems, the development of towns, education and cultural contacts. Regional variations may well be discussed, with an awareness of how far the evidence supports any view of general trends.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How significant' invites a discussion of the extent, depth and long or short-term nature of any changes, and candidates should be aware of variations, for example between northern and southern Europe. It also invites debate over the reasons for and effects of population change, and its part in wider economic and social developments.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 26	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

22 Why did towns grow more quickly from 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. Descriptions of the growth of towns will need to be linked to clear and evaluative explanation. An analysis of a range of factors is needed, supported by suitably selected examples from across the period. Likely factors to be discussed will be: population growth; increasing political stability in some areas and the need for political and physical protection from invaders such as the Vikings in others; the development and revival of trade, locally, regionally and across Europe and beyond; religious reasons such as the growth of monastic communities and the economic activity they supported and the building of cathedrals and the growth of communities around them; the development of urban institutions and communes with their rights and privileges; the demands of local rulers – counts, margraves – and of monarchs. There is likely to be some awareness of regional variations, and of the areas of Europe where the development of towns was most marked in this period, and the links between these areas and one or more of the factors outlined, especially those connected with trade.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The focus invites discussion of the relative importance of factors, with possible debate as to the role of economic developments compared to the political needs of often recently established governments, both large-scale – the Kings of France and the Saxon kings – and small-scale – the nobles controlling towns within their domains in Italy and Germany, as well as the role of the Church in developing urban centres as the focus for both religion and government.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 27	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

23 Assess the significance of either Cluny and its influence in the eleventh century or the Cistercians and their influence in the twelfth 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 development of the Cluniac or Cistercian order will not address the question. Candidates will need to analyse and evaluate the development of the order, and its influence on the church and wider society. Likely factors are: the reasons for the development of each order, and the support provided for them by lay patrons and by the papacy; the spirit of monastic reform, and the form this took in each order; the spiritual contribution of each order; the development of monastic organisation, with Cluny or Clairvaux at its centre; the development of monastic independence from local lay control, especially for Cluny; Cluny's role within the reform movement and the Investiture Contest, and the role of Urban II and Cluny in the First Crusade. For the Cistercians, other factors could be an emphasis on their spirit of rejection of worldliness, and the redefinition of the rule by St. Bernard, together with the role of Bernard and other leading Cistercian figures, such as Robert of Molesme; the rapid development of the Cistercian order and their acquisition of lands and privileges under papal protection and in independence from the local episcopal authority.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Assessment of significance invites an evaluation of the impact of the development of the order, on some of the following: monasticism itself, the structure of the church, the relations between monastic and secular clergy or between monasticism and secular society, and developments such as the Investiture Contest and the Crusades. Short-term evaluation may examine the immediate impact on religious and secular politics; long-term evaluation may place the order in the context of religious reform and revival over a longer period.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 28	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

24 Who, if anyone, was to blame for the outcome of the Fourth Crusade?

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 answer the question unless it includes evaluation and analysis of the causes of the attack on Constantinople. There will need to be a clear understanding of the reasons for the diversion of the Crusade from its initial aim of the Holy Land to Egypt, then Zara and finally Constantinople. The roles of Innocent III, the crusaders themselves, the Venetians and especially the Doge, Enrico Dandolo, and the Byzantine pretender Alexius Angelus will be central to any evaluation, and Philip of Swabia may also be considered. There may well be discussion of how much the behaviour of the crusaders after they had captured Constantinople reflected longer-term relations between the Christians of east and west, as a result of 1054 and their encounters in previous crusades. The reactions of those involved, and especially of Innocent III, may well be examined.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The question formula sets up debate about the extent to which the outcome of the Crusade may be seen as intended, the result of a 'conspiracy', or as the unintended consequence of events. There has been debate on these issues since the contemporary chroniclers, with Villehardouin providing support to the interpretation of the events as the result of chance, and others such as Emoul blaming the Venetians. Candidates do not need to be acquainted with these sources, but will be rewarded for evaluating the debate, which is reflected in many subsequent accounts.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 29	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

25 Was there a 'twelfth-century Renaissance'?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A description of cultural developments will not answer the question. There needs to be evaluation of the extent to which such developments constitute a 'Renaissance'. Possible areas for consideration are: developments in philosophy linked to the rediscovery of parts of Aristotle's works; developments in legal theory and practical legislation, in both secular and canon law; theology, including the works of thinkers such as Anselm and Abelard; developments in art and architecture; secular literature; the study of science and medicine. It is likely that the social and intellectual context of these developments will be considered; the nature of the scholarly life, the cathedral and monastic schools, the great teachers, the overall levels of literacy amongst the population, and so the extent of the impact of new intellectual and artistic developments. There may also be some reference to the wider society, and the extent to which the growth of towns and trade, and of the legal and administrative organisation of church and state, provided a context in which greater levels of literacy and a more varied society fostered cultural and intellectual developments of all kinds.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The wording of the question invites consideration of the nature of 'Renaissance'. There is scope for debate as to the extent to which new developments depended on the rediscovery of classical learning, and how far it represented a new departure. There is also room for discussion of the extent of the impact of these new developments, both geographically and socially, and whether this was sufficiently widespread to be considered a 'Renaissance'.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 30	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

26 How great was the threat of heresy to the Church in the twelfth and thirteenth 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 of heretical movements is not required. Evaluation and analysis of the threat they posed to the church will need to focus on the extent and depth of support these movements inspired, and the ways in which they challenged the church. Possible examples might be the Humiliati, the Waldensians, the Bogomils and Cathars. The role of popular preachers, and the size and nature of their following, both in very local movements and more widespread organisation, needs to be examined. Both Cathars and Waldensians achieved some form of organization, and the strength and depth of this needs to be examined. The messages of the heretical movements are also relevant: the extent to which the heretics were simply answering the perennial call for reform, through stress on Christian simplicity and possibly greater lay participation, rather than, as in the case of the Cathars, developing a fully fledged separate religion with its own distinct theology and ecclesiastical organization.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The wording of the question requires an assessment of the extent of the threat, and candidates may choose to discuss this with reference to the nature of the Church's response, and how easily the heretics were controlled. However, this question does NOT require a lengthy narrative of the Church's responses, and it is important that the central focus should be on the heretics rather than the Church.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 31	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 6: 1250–c. 1378

27 Assess the wider political significance of the Sicilian Vespers of 1282.

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 Sicilian Vespers will not answer the question without evaluation and analysis of its wider significance. An understanding of the central role of Sicily in the politics of the period is required, as well as the background to the revolt in popular responses to Angevin rule, and the nature of Charles of Anjou's ambitions and policies outside Sicily, as well as the rivalries which these provoked, especially with Byzantium and Aragon, as well as the Hohenstaufen. All of this supports an analysis of how the local rebellion against Angevin rule developed into a much wider conflict between Angevins and Aragonese, leading to the loss of Sicily to the Aragonese. Answers will show awareness of the links between the revolt and the wider war, and the significance of the latter for the balance of power. The role of the Papacy may well also be evaluated.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'Assess the wider political significance' invites debate as to the importance of the revolt in the development of relationships between the major ruling dynasties of Anjou, Aragon and Byzantium. Answers will assess significance both for Sicily itself and for wider factors, such as the relationship of the papacy to the ruling dynasties and their relationships with each other.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 32	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

28 To what extent was Mongol expansion due to the weaknesses of both their Muslim and their Christian opponents?

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 focus should be on the period c.1250 to 1378, in the aftermath of the Mongol expansion and victories in Kiev and Hungary in 1241 and the emergence of Kublai Khan (1259–94) as Great Khan. A narrative of expansion will need to include analysis and evaluation of the reasons for its success. Likely factors will be: the role of Kublai Khan as war leader and conqueror; the tactics of the Mongols; the divisions amongst and weaknesses of the Abbasid caliphate and of the Seljuks in Asia Minor; the lack of unity between the Kievan, Polish and Hungarian rulers, and the limitations of their own defences; the divisions between the princely rulers in Russia, leading to the subjection of most of them to Mongol rule. The role of Alexander Nevsky (1246–63), in balancing his victories against Swedes and Teutonic knights with his diplomacy as Great Prince, submitting to the fiscal control of the Mongols, might be discussed, and the absence of a similarly unifying leader after his death as another factor in the continued expansion of Mongol rule over Russia.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'To what extent' requires a balanced assessment of the weaknesses of opponents with the strengths of the Mongols themselves. Strengths could include both tactics and leadership, and candidates may comment on the changing fortunes of the Mongols, which varied according to the divisions within their own leadership, as well as the strengths of their enemies. Kublai Khan's later focus on China was also key in explaining the limited impact of the Mongol invasions on Europe beyond Russia.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 33	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

29 How far did Louis IX strengthen the French monarchy?

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 events of the reign will not answer the question, unless there is sound explanation of the effects on the monarchy. Analysis and evaluation should focus on the extent to which the monarchy was strengthened. Likely aspects of the reign to be assessed are: the concern for justice; the development of royal administration and financial machinery; the development of the royal coinage; taxation of the Jews; control over the church and royal patronage of religious foundations; persecution of the Cathars; protection of the towns; diplomacy and peace with Aragon (1258) and England (1259), and the prohibition of private war in France (1258); neutrality in the papal conflict with Frederick II; the growth in the reputation and popularity of the monarchy under his 'saintly' rule and crusading mission. Amongst the limitations of his policies and of the monarchy which could be discussed are: the limitations of his control of the French nobility, his absence and eventual death on a failed crusade and the effects on government which relied so heavily on the king's person; the abuses of power by his officials which he could not fully control.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How far' invites debate as to the extent to which the monarchy was strengthened, and the nature of the limitations upon it. Some comparison of the monarchy at the start and end of the reign might be made, and there is scope for discussion of how far the strengths depended on the personal control of Louis, rather than of any institutions or methods of government developed by him. There may well be some evaluation of his legacy, and the extent to which this was positive.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 34	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

30 The influence of the French monarchy was the main reason why the Papacy was moved to Avignon between 1309 and 1377.' 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. Analysis of the reasons for the Avignon residence, rather than a narrative of events, is required. Focus should be on: the context of relations between the papacy and secular authority, in practical terms and as expressed in theories of papal and royal powers; the initial causes of Boniface's dispute with Philip IV, culminating in Anagni and French control of the papacy; the removal to Avignon by Clement V and his motives, the reasons for the continuation of the papal residence in Avignon – independence from Rome, the French monarchy and the Empire, French-born popes, difficulties in Rome; the personal aims and ambitions of secular and religious leaders – Philip IV, Boniface, Gregory XI. Longer-term factors, such as the growing power of the French monarchy, the ideological assertions of the papacy (*Unam Sanctam*), the development of the papal administration and financial systems in Avignon, may also be discussed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The wording of the question allows for debate as to the relative importance of factors. Long and short-term reasons for both the initial removal to Avignon and its continuance need to be evaluated, and links made between the immediate and personal factors and the longer term issues of political power and ideological authority. The advantages of Avignon for the papacy and its ability to develop as an independent and increasingly efficient administration could be included.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 35	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

31 How important were economic factors in the growing independence of Italian city-states in the fourteenth 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 growth of independence will need to include good analysis and evaluation of the causes, with a range of examples such as Venice, Pisa, Genoa, Florence, Milan. There should be an awareness of common features and differences between city states, as well as the effects of the plague on both economic and political factors. There will need to be sound evaluation of the role of economic factors in the development of communal institutions and independence; these factors could include the development of trade, banking and credit, the movement of population between town and country, the power of the guilds. Evaluation of social, political, military and cultural factors is also needed. Such factors are likely to include: the declining influence of the papacy and Empire; the rivalries between and within the city-states; the growth of urban educated populations and their desire for political and cultural autonomy; popular political movements such as the Ciompi in Florence; the rise and fall of powerful families, whose power might be based on trade or on military force the Bardi, Visconti. Sforza – and the effects of their rivalries. There should be a strong focus on the links between these factors in the growth of the autonomy of city states, and good answers should attempt to cover a range of factors as these developed over this extended period and in a variety of city-states.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. 'How important' invites debate as to the relative importance of different factors economic, political, military, social – and these should be considered both in the individual examples chosen and with a view to developing an overall assessment of the importance of the economic factors over the extended period and in differing local situations. Good answers may well attempt to link economic developments with other factors, to establish some overall evaluation of the basis for autonomy in the city-states.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 36	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 7: c. 1378–c. 1461

32 Why was the Great Schism so prolonged?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates will need to demonstrate understanding of a variety of factors. They may outline the circumstances which led to the development of the Great Schism and then consider the reasons for its prolongation. These may include the role of the French, the relative even support each claimant enjoyed and the intransigence of some of those chosen as Pope. Candidates may discuss why efforts to end the Schism failed, such as the slowness of communications in 1394 and the insanity of the French king which made it difficult for France, in the best position to bring pressure on both camps, to do so. The way in which the Schism ended is less relevant but candidates may refer to it to show how a new set of circumstances was more conducive to a settlement.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The question does not ask candidates to decide which were the more important factors, but they are likely to see the part played by the French as crucial, not least because, in the end, it was the support of the French which allowed the Avignon faction to survive.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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 2011	9769	2a

33 How is the political instability in Northern Italy in this period best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates will need to demonstrate understanding of a variety of factors. They may refer to the growing power of the *condottieri* and their ambitions and readiness to fight for the highest bidder. Some individuals like Gian Galeazzo Visconti contributed to the instability by his seizure of Verona and Padua. The wealth of some states meant they could pursue their own ends determinedly and thus raise up opposition. The death of Gian Galeazzo caused a fresh round of upheaval as did the revival of Milan under Filippo Maria and then the end of the Viscontis and the rise of Francesco Sforza. Fictious and trading rivalries also affected Florence and the Albizzi/Medici contest, along with the nature of the Florentine constitution further contributed to instability. The example of the Bentivoglio in Bologna might also be used. It could be argued that there was a transition from city states to territorial states. There should be discussion of both general and particular explanations.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. The question asks candidates to suggest which of the explanations is the most valid and the debate may well be between the role of particular individuals on the one hand and the part played by the constitutions of the states in Northern Italy which made it hard to establish a stable government. There could be discussion as to whether events in Milan, Venice or Florence had the greater impact, but the answer should not be confined to a single state.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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 38	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

34 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Dukes of Burgundy during this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. This period covers the rule of three Dukes of Burgundy; Philippe le Hardi, Jean Sans Peur and Philippe le Bon. A chronological approach is not likely to form a successful response. Strengths of the Burgundian Dukes might include their accumulation of lands in the Low Countries, their strong civil service, the wealth and the trading power of their territories, which included the mouths of the Rhine and the Scheldt and the cities of Bruges and Antwerp, the alliance with England up to 1435, the magnificence of their court and their patronage role with van Eyck as Philippe le Bon's court painter. The Order of the Golden Fleece had a European-wide membership. Weaknesses might be the lack of unity in their loose bundle of territories, where there was little administrative centralisation, the decline of the Flanders cloth industry as a result of competition with England, the beginning of the decline of Bruges at the end of the period, their failure to win the title of king from the Emperor and the unfortunate impact of events in France such as the rivalry of Jean sans Peur with the Dauphin resulting in his death in 1419 and the disputes over the Somme towns. Philippe le Bon was on bad terms with Charles VII in the latter part of his rule which was not helped by the Dauphin taking refuge on Burgundian soil.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates are asked to assess the strengths and weaknesses which implies considering which outweighed the other. They can decide either way, but might argue that up to 1467 the Dukes were stronger rather than weaker, given the standing of Philippe in Europe. They might point out that the rule of Charles was a disaster and ruined Burgundy, which could be credited, although beyond the scope of the question.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 2011	9769	2a

35 Why did the Hussites incur the hostility of both lay and ecclesiastical leaders?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Lay leaders were hostile to the Hussites because of their anarchic tendencies and especially their rejection of property rights, disavowal of the need for a lay ruler and beliefs that there should be no serfdom or taxation. In addition Sigismund, king of the Romans was opposed to the moves towards the independence of Bohemia and the fact that the Czechs, led by Zizka, prevented his recognition as king of Bohemia would obviously increase his ill-feeling towards them. The ecclesiastical leadership was concerned particularly that Hus was so critical of the corruption of the clergy, more so than over his theology. The development of his views on the levelling of the status of the priest and the layman, symbolised by the receiving of communion in both kinds by the people as well as the priest, was seen as a threat to the position of the priesthood. He further believed that obedience to the church was only to be enforced when the church complied with biblical teaching. This led on to clerical marriage, rejection of images and the abandonment of the Latin liturgy. Hus was burned as a heretic in 1415.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates could comment that, given the radical nature of much of Hussite belief, the support which they received from the landed classes in Bohemia is surprising and shows that dislike of the German influence could outweigh class interests. Candidates might, therefore, take issue with the terms of the question. They could also suggest which factors had the greatest impact in causing opposition to Hussitism.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 40	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

36 Account for the recovery of France in the reign of Charles VII.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might point out that the Treaty of Troyes represented the nadir of French fortunes so that any improvement was to be applauded. The reasons for recovery are balanced between the revival of France and the problems in England. The French military successes, beginning with the relief of Orleans, were a key factor. Candidates might discuss how much these owed to Joan of Arc, whose role has been challenged, although made much of in many contemporary accounts. Another vital factor was the Burgundian abandonment of England for a French alliance at Arras in 1435. Although the terms were humiliating on paper for Charles VII, he evaded the worst of them. Military and financial reforms followed. On the other hand, the English suffered from the premature death of Henry V and the factionalism of the English court, notably after the death of the duke of Bedford in 1435. Their estrangement from Burgundy was 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 differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates could argue that it was the Burgundian alliance which made all the difference, to France for gaining it and to England for losing it. The determination of Charles VII compared with the less committed attitude of Henry VI and his ministers also contributed.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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 41	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 8: c. 1461–c. 1516

37 'The achievements of Louis XI have been much overestimated'. Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The evidence for this statement comes largely from the two major errors Louis made during his reign. The first of these was the crisis at Peronne in 1468 when he became a virtual prisoner of the Burgundian duke and was forced to renounce his allies in Liege, although the concessions he had to make were later scaled back somewhat. More serious was his over enthusiasm to profit from the death of Charles in 1477, leading to the marriage of Mary of Burgundy to Maximilian of Austria which had grave long term results for the security of France. But the alternative view has a large body of evidence to support it, and Louis succeeded in his three main aims, to overthrow the virtually independent Burgundy, to reduce the power of the feudal nobility in France and to prevent any English intervention in France. His dismantling of the League of the Public Weal, his use of allies to overcome Charles, his diplomacy in reconciling Warwick and Margaret of Anjou and then, when they fell, in buying off Edward IV all contributed. His financial security and encouragement of trade were other assets. It could be argued that Louis had some good fortune as well as clear policies. Several noble houses died out and Charles of Burgundy's rash character helped lead to the implosion of his duchy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Better candidates will consider the two sides of the argument rather than look at aspects of the reign to see if the achievement has been overestimated.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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 2011	9769	2a

38 Why did Italy experience so much foreign intervention in the late fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. The reasons fall into two categories; the attractions of Italy for an invader and the rivalries of the main European powers, the rulers of France and Spain. Candidates can draw examples from the wars throughout the period but the question could be seen to end in 1529 and instances from a much later period are not relevant. Italy was a magnet for intervention since it was enviably rich, a trading centre for the Mediterranean Sea and the Eastern trade and the focus of an artistic revival. It was also the seat of the Papacy. It was not a united state and the feuding between the main states weakened it. Armies tended to be of mercenaries and so of unreliable loyalty. Ludovico Sforza went so far as to invite a French invasion in pursuit of his own ends. On the other hand, the French revival led Charles VIII in search of glory and his invasion was compounded by the existence of claims to Milan and Naples which he had inherited. Louis XII and Francis I continued the trend. Equally, the accession of Charles V to the throne of Spain and as HRE prolonged the fighting. The French resisted the control of Charles and he was determined to take the prize. The two sides with their allies were relatively evenly balanced and there were few really decisive battles. Pavia in 1525 is an exception.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may well try to assess which of the factors had the greater impact or distinguish between the underlying and immediate causes, seeing Italy as a temptation to an invader but also ascribing a major role to the circumstances of 1492. Candidates could feel that once the wars began, a permanent settlement was hard to achieve, as one power was usually left feeling aggrieved.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 43	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

39 How great were the achievements of the Ottoman Turks in the period 1451–1520?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates are likely to conclude that the achievements of the Ottomans in this period outweighed their failures. The prime success is likely to be seen as the capture of Constantinople in 1453 from the Byzantines by Mehmet II. The further territorial advances of the Turks meant that they had mastery over the Greek world as well as making serious advances into Asia. The Black Sea came under their control, giving them a key position in trade with the East. Under Bayezid II and Selim I sea power was built up which led to the conquest of Syria and Egypt. Although the reign of Suleiman is outside the set dates, candidates could refer to his magnificence as the outcome of the growth of Turkish dominance under previous rulers. On the negative side, Belgrade under Hunyadi and Rhodes held out against the Turks, although both were to fall to Suleiman and Venice spearheaded some resistance to maintain her trading rights. The incompetence of several of the European rulers who tried to resist the Turks could be seen as flattering them. The religious unity was broken by the sectarianism in Islam. The power of the Janissaries was made clear by the need for new Sultans to bribe them to get their backing.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether the achievements were that great, but may well struggle to find much to say on the negative side. But some suggestion that the view that the Ottomans were all-powerful and all-conquering can be qualified should be attempted for the higher bands.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 44	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

40 To what extent, if at all, did Ferdinand and Isabella of Castile unite Spain?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might suggest that religion was one area where there was a degree of unity. Ecclesiastical appointments came under the control of the monarchs and Cisneros carried out church reform. The Inquisition was the only institution common to Castile and Aragon and the expulsion of the Jews was widely welcomed. The conquest of Granada may have had a uniting effect. There was some unity in foreign policy and in diplomatic correspondence the title King of Spain was first used to describe Ferdinand. The acquisition of Roussillon, Cerdagne and Navarre were beneficial to Spain and the wars in Italy were largely national undertakings. Beyond this, the two components remained distinct. The *fueros* enjoyed by Aragon meant the king could make little impact there, failing to introduce the Hermandad successfully, so he concentrated more on Castile where he spent most of his time. Castile and Aragon had their own institutions, laws, coinage and economies – Aragon played no part in the expansion in America. Arguably the monarchs did not see unity as a priority but were more concerned with stability in the kingdoms and the defeat of France. The crisis on the death of Joanna exemplifies the lack of unity.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether Spain was at all united. They are likely to indicate there was some movement in that direction. They may be aware of debate about the relative success of the Inquisition and other reforms and may argue that the monarchs concentrated their efforts on Castile, which was easier to control and more rewarding and this was their main aim. Events after 1516 show some reaction to the policies and could be used as further evidence.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 45	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

41 To what extent did Ivan III strengthen the Muscovite state?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates might suggest that Ivan was very successful in expanding the frontiers of Muscovy, absorbing his neighbours gradually. He was able to secure Novgorod and then to make his power there a reality. He benefited from rivalries among the Tatar states to make allies of some of them. He became influential in Kazan and once he had built up his position was able to attack Lithuania, his long term aim. His enlarged territories required a more extensive administrative system and power began to move from the boyars to professionals. Land acquired by his conquests was given to new tenants in exchange for the provision of troops, which gave him an army not dependent on the boyars. These reforms were only a start and succeeding rulers had much to do to bring them to completion and the boyars revived somewhat when there was a minority and so were able to threaten the security of the Muscovite state.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to how far Ivan strengthened the state looking at the situation when he began to reign and at the end of his reign.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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 46	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

Section 9: Themes c. 1200–c. 1516

42 'An economic and social disaster.' Consider this judgement on the Black Death in western Europe.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. A narrative of the causes or events of the Black Death will not answer the question. Evaluation and analysis of the extent and nature of its impact on the economies and societies of western Europe is required. Examples should be chosen from western Europe, and could include England, but should also include other examples for comparison. The principal focus is likely to be on the major outbreak of the Black Death in 1347–50, but there may be some reference to its endemic nature and the recurrent epidemics. Assessment of the extent of its economic and social impact is likely to include: the death rate, in towns and rural areas; the consequent impact on the supply of labour, wages and prices; the fall in the price of lands and in rents; the acquisition of lands by those who survived; the change in land usage from arable to pastoral; the effects on the church's economic and social position, due to the high mortality rates of the clergy; the effects on the relationships between landowners and peasantry, including increasing commutation of feudal services for cash rents; attempts to fix wages and prices; the religious and spiritual responses, including the Flagellant movement and attacks on the Jews.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The wording of the question invites debate as to whether and for whom the impact of the Black Death should be seen as disastrous. Answers are likely to acknowledge the catastrophic effects of the labour shortage, the impact of the huge death rate on social stability. Counter arguments may focus on the short and long-term improvement in the position of the peasantry, and the political and social ideas which arose after the Black Death, justifying their aspirations to greater freedom from feudal dues and the opportunity to improve their social and economic position.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 47	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

43 How far did economic circumstances define the position of women in the later Middle Ages?

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 the position of women in medieval states will need to be linked to assessment and analysis. The question implies that economic circumstances provided both limitations and opportunities for women, and candidates should consider the extent to which this was the case, for women in different ranks of society, and also for women whose personal circumstances – most often through inheritance or widowhood – brought both economic challenges and opportunities. The ability of women to hold land and to run households and businesses should be considered. There may also be some discussion of the extent to which wider social and economic changes – the Black Death, the development of towns – affected the status of women. Candidates may also consider what other factors defined the position of women – and here their status as defined by secular law and by the church's teachings and institutions will be most relevant. Candidates should not concentrate in their answers solely on the lives of women from higher ranks in society, even though the evidence is greatest for them, but should show some awareness of what the evidence suggest about the lives of the majority. A range of examples from continental Europe will be expected.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. One area of debate might be the contrast between the legal status of women and the reality of their position, and the extent to which this was fluid and adaptable to local and personal circumstances and to wider social and economic changes; how far were women affected by greater social mobility and instability in many parts of Europe in this period?

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 48	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

44 How significant was the role of Florence in the development of the Italian Renaissance?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required, in this case an assessment of the importance of Florence culturally, politically and economically in the development of the Renaissance. Candidates are likely to focus on individual artists and patrons, and on specific works of art, but a list of these will not meet the requirements of the question. Answers will need to focus on the different ways in which Florence contributed to the development of the Renaissance. These are likely to include: the economic success of the city, and of its merchants and bankers, and their role in patronage of the arts – the Medici are central here, but good answers may focus on the impact of economic prosperity on the wider commercial community, and its desire to patronise the visual arts; the political status of the city, and its impact on both the visual arts and literature – the development of civic humanism, as well as, again, the political role of the Medici. Assessment of Florence's cultural contributions to the Renaissance might include reference to the construction of the Cathedral and other civic buildings such as the Innocenti, or the development of neo-Platonist scholarship, as well as painting, sculpture and historical writing. Specific individuals and their contributions might include: Brunelleschi, Masaccio, Bruni, Machiavelli, Giucciardini, Michelangelo, Leonardo, Vasari, Ficino, but other examples may well be used. Candidates may show some awareness of the chronological development of the Renaissance, and the extent to which attention moved away from Florence and towards Rome.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Debate might focus on the wider perspectives and an appreciation of the relative importance of Florence, through an awareness of the roles of other states; these should include the papacy (and here a link might be made, through the Medici), and some of the other Italian city states, such as Mantua, Urbino, Milan and Ferrara, as well as the Kingdom of Naples. There might well be some discussion of how far the early development of the Renaissance depended on the combination of economic, political and cultural circumstances which existed in Florence and, to a lesser extent, in other city-states, rather than in the papal states or the monarchies of Italy and the rest of Europe.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 49	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

45 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the pre-Reformation Church.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could argue that the strengths of the church lay in the general acceptance of its rituals by much of Europe as the basis of the daily round. Private religious practices were often flourishing as the *devotio moderna* illustrates. The onset of printing had helped here. The power of the church was considerable, as a political force in Italy and as a major provider of administrators in many countries. It was wealthy. Alternatively there was criticism of the structure of the church and of some of its leaders – unworthy popes and proud prelates, more interested in riches than in religion. The religious orders came under much attack for the neglect of the poor and moving away from their prime purposes. Ignorant clergy were the butt of critics like Erasmus. Candidates could assess how justified such complaints were.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to whether the strengths outweighed the weaknesses. Given the fact of the Reformation they could well argue they did.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both 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 50	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

46 How significant were developments in the conduct of war in the period up to c. 1550?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could argue that there were significant developments, with a move away from feudal armies to more disciplined and trained forces. Another significant change was the use of firearms, with the arquebus gradually replacing the power of the pike or bow. The possession of cannon became a matter of pride and standing for monarchs and the expense of such weaponry reduced the capability of princes to war against their lords. In the Atlantic especially, naval warfare was dominated by the broadside rather than ram and grapple tactics. Diplomacy also developed and the idea of the balance of power became prevalent. Ferdinand of Aragon was a master of this art. Alternatively there were some areas where there was less change. Sieges and the methods of attrition were still important and the infantry remained a key factor. In the Mediterranean traditional fighting methods continued. On balance the changes could be seen as highly significant as they presaged the age of the musket and professional armies.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to the extent of the changes in waging war.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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 51	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	2a

47 To what extent did the aims of Portugal in overseas expansion in the fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries go beyond a quest for slaves and bullion?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could argue that slaves and bullion were the key targets of the Portuguese. There had been a marked shortage of gold in Portugal which had led to a lack of gold for minting coins. From the earliest days of exploration gold from Guinea was being transported to Portugal. The trade in slaves tended to develop later when Spain began to colonise America and needed extra labour. Portugal dominated the Atlantic slave trade until the challenge from England in the 1560s. But there were other motives. Early expeditions were often led by nobles who wanted to serve the crown, win personal glory and crusade against non-Christians. The patronage of overseas voyages by Henry the Navigator, although his role has been reassessed, resulted from his curiosity but also his willingness to exploit the opportunities he saw. The kings of Portugal also realised they could profit and this probably became their main motive as exploration progressed and access to the lucrative spice trade became a possibility. There was, too, their hope of finding a Christian ruler in Africa such as the legendary Prester John. Examples from the Atlantic Islands, Africa, Asia and Brazil could be used but not all need to be mentioned.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates should try to form a judgement as to which motives predominated and may well argue that financial incentives were bound to have the greatest sway.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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