

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/12**

Paper 1A (British History Outlines c.1399–1815),  
maximum raw mark 90

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

Mark schemes 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 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

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

## **Introduction**

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

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

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

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### **Band 1: 25–30**

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

### **Band 2: 19–24**

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

### **Band 3: 13–18**

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

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

#### **Band 4: 7–12**

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

#### **Band 5: 0–6**

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

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### Section 1: 1399–1461

#### 1 Assess the significance of Henry IV's achievements.

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. It could be argued that there was not a great deal of positive achievement during this reign given the widespread unrest of the period. On the other hand it could also be argued that simply to survive after usurpation and hand the throne on to his son, intact, was in itself an achievement, particularly given the problems of the previous reign. From 1399 to 1406 he experienced a great many problems, rebellions, financial problems and problems in Parliament. His illness in the later part of his reign also caused problems for him. Yet he was clearly able in many of the ways that counted most; he was an accomplished soldier, he was pious and well educated and understood the business of government. He was able to counter all the major revolts of his reign; he also managed to keep hold of his prerogative powers even though these were challenged, and he was able to intervene in Europe. The loyalty of his sons in the last years of his reign could be noted at a time when it could be argued that Prince Henry was well placed to usurp his father.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus should be on weighing his achievements such as they were against a very difficult inheritance. The issue of the circumstances of his accession can never be forgotten, but the answer should range further than this. It could be argued that his achievements were not substantial, especially in the light of those of his son, yet he did retain his throne and prerogative power intact and he did pass his throne on to his son.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## 2 How great a threat did Owain Glyndwr represent to Henry IV?

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is to be expected – that is an evaluation of the extent of the threat posed to Henry IV. It is expected that candidates are able to cover the whole period of the uprising and to evaluate change and development in the scale as well as the nature of the threat. Candidates might well take a chronological approach, which so long as it is not descriptive, might work well. Owain Glyndwr declared himself Prince of Wales in 1400 and ruled Wales for nearly 10 years. Candidates might look at his parliaments and what they achieved, his dealings with the French, the Papacy and his dynastic ambitions by marrying his daughter to the rival for the English throne, Edmund, Earl of March. Candidates will need to explain how the problems with Owain Glyndwr exacerbated other problems for Henry IV, in other words Glyndwr needs to be set in the wider perspective of Henry IV's reign, although the focus should always be on the Welsh problem. Candidates may also wish to consider the social, economic and political consequences of almost continual fighting in Wales and the Marches over this period. Although Henry was triumphant in 1409, it may be that candidates will evaluate the legacy of Glyndwr.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus will be on an evaluation of the nature and seriousness of the threat especially since it comes so soon after Henry IV's usurpation. Candidates should certainly consider how the threat changes and develops and how Henry deals with it. The threat can be seen both in its own terms, how it destabilises Wales and the effort and expense of putting it down, but also in terms of how it constrains Henry IV, a new monarch, in other areas of his rule.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### 3 'Nothing more than a great soldier.' Discuss this view of Henry V.

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. This question requires an evaluation of both Henry V's military career and his domestic policy. Most candidates will probably agree at least in some measure with the view that he was a great soldier, though they need to go further than simply recount his successes. Material that might be referred to includes: an assessment of his campaigns, not just his success at Agincourt but his ability to plan, equip and sustain those campaigns, sometimes against overwhelming odds. It could be argued of course that he left his successor dangerously over exposed, yet he did not expect to die so young. In the end what he achieved in a comparatively short space of time was remarkable. Yet, candidates may well argue that he would have been unable to triumph abroad, had England not been so well governed, especially given the unrest of his father's reign. Candidates may well review his interest in the law and the improvements that were made; his ability to reposition the authority of the crown is generally seen as very successful; his relationship with his nobility was secure, although this may be closely linked to his success as a soldier. He was even able to institute and inspire reforms in the Church.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is clearly on seeing the inter relation of his work as a soldier and his achievements as the King of England. This is not an evaluation of whether he was a good soldier or not. The historical debate generally holds that Henry V was both a great soldier and a great King, although some evaluation of contemporary views which might have coloured historical thinking could be discussed. Clearly Henry was very aware of his own image; nevertheless he did gain the French crown, reign over a quietly governed country and institute useful reform. Moreover the throne was passed on to his baby son, whole and secure and the minority years of Henry VI's reign may well be a testament to the fact that Henry V was far more than just a great soldier

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**4 How important was lack of money in explaining the loss of French lands under Henry VI by 1453?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The focus of this question should be on a relative evaluation of whether the main reason for the loss of French lands in this period was a lack of money. Whilst candidates are expected to have knowledge of a whole range of factors, significant treatment must be given to the issue of a lack of money. Clearly many of the reasons are inter related and linked and good answers should be able to show that. Clearly the situation changes and develops over time and candidates should be able to show this rather than simply evaluating the situation in 1453. However, narrative accounts of the wars is not what is required in this question. The quality of the English leaders will be considered, perhaps comparing Suffolk and Somerset to Bedford and perhaps York. Henry VI's use of faction will of course be important and this is linked to the issue of finance, providing for some, whilst keeping others such as York short. The financial exactions of the crown, their borrowing both on the money markets and from individuals will be mentioned and the increasing inability to make the French lands pay for themselves. Some might take a longer term view that the whole enterprise was unsustainable from the time of conquest, especially with a resurgent France. Other issues include Henry's marriage and faction fighting in England.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is very much on evaluation of the relative merits of the causes of collapse. Some might take the line that no amount of money would ever have been sufficient to secure Henry V's legacy. It could be argued that the fault is in the leadership of Henry VI and those he chose to pursue his policies. It could also be argued that the financial issues perhaps emerge as the most significant issue and are cumulative. These have to be linked to the inability of Henry VI to rule well and the problems that he creates through factionism, which are also both cause and effect of the financial issues.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**5 To what extent was the civil strife of 1455–1461 caused by ‘overmighty subjects’?**

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are many reasons for the civil strife of this period; candidates can be expected to evaluate these issues and find links between them. Nevertheless there should be a significant focus on the issue of overmighty subjects. It may also be the case that candidates are able to explain and analyse how issues change and develop over the period. In terms of overmighty subjects the Beauforts are certainly candidates as is York and his Neville allies; Margaret of Anjou might also lay claim to the title. At the heart of the issue is an undermighty King who relies on factionism and might be accused of creating the problem by over rewarding the Beauforts. Both the Beauforts and York have a claim to the throne and are excessively wealthy and the issue of the claim to the throne is especially important to Margaret of Anjou as the mother of the heir. Other issues are important, the failure of the war in France and the financial problems that causes and social unrest. The wider noble feuds might be assessed. Success in various battles might be considered as well as significant turning points, such as the desertion of London by Henry VI after 1456, the Parliament of Devils, the Act of Accord and the death of York.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on the causes and continuation of civil strife. It is not sufficient simply to consider the reasons for its outbreak in 1455, as issues change and develop over the period. It would be unusual for a candidate simply to disregard the issue of overmighty subjects; a very persuasive case can be made for the argument, although the point might be made that Henry VI was indeed responsible for the creation and mishandling of overmighty subjects. A convincing argument can also be found in evaluating the claims and personalities of the various overmighty subjects, especially York and Margaret of Anjou.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## Section 2: 1461–1547

### 6 How secure was Edward IV in his first reign (1461–1470)?

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The first reign of Edward IV starts and ends with a usurpation, it might be argued that the throne cannot be regarded as secure if Edward IV has to leave the country in such a hurry in 1470. However, there is much to be said for his efforts to establish a secure hold on the throne during this period. The first 3 years of the reign are concerned with securing his position, by 1464 he is secure in the north, especially after the battle of Hexham, but he might be criticised for his over reliance on Warwick and the Nevilles in this area and that Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou remained at large. He can be commended for his efforts in re-establishing the administration and going some way towards reviving crown finances. He also makes substantial headway with foreign alliances and coming to terms with the Percies. However he does make a terrible mistake with his marriage and arguably his collection of taxation. It might be argued that Edward could never be secure while Warwick wanted to rule and Edward proved, especially after 1464, that he had a mind of his own. Edward could also be criticised for his inaction in 1468–9.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on an assessment of the security of Edward IV's throne during his first reign. A traditional evaluation might see this period as highly unstable, but the very fact that he is relatively secure from Lancastrian and foreign interference and threat by 1464 might suggest otherwise. The fact that the threat comes from within his own faction, and indeed family might not have been foreseen. The argument may well revolve around an evaluation of Edward's mistakes and Warwick's unquenchable ambition. Nevertheless some sense of the positive steps Edward made to strengthen his position should be included.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**7 'For all his good qualities as King, Richard III was never likely to achieve stability.'**  
**Discuss.**

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates may consider the circumstances of Richard's accession and the events of 1483 as evidence that the reign could not achieve 'the presumption of stability'. Richard overcame the rebellion of the Duke of Buckingham in 1483. A progress of 1483 was careful to cultivate the cities he passed through, refusing sums of money offered. Richard held a parliament which met in January and February 1484 and which abolished benevolences. There were judicial reforms introducing bail, introducing property qualifications for jurors and restricting the powers of 'piepowder' courts. Richard accepted the protection of English merchants from foreign competition, but the regulations excluded books. Henry offered a charter to the College of Arms and gave it a house for its records. There was a forerunner of the Court of Requests in December 1483 to consider the legal petitions from poor people. In July 1484 the Council of the north was re-established. He continued to patronise ecclesiastical building and gave money for the completion of St George's Chapel, Windsor and King's College. He was active in promoting building – Sudeley Castle's great hall and the hall at Middleham. In April 1484 Prince Edward died – leaving Richard without an heir and his wife Anne died, opening up rumours that he killed her, hoping to marry Elizabeth of York – he publicly denied this and sent Elizabeth away. Richard had to appoint his nephew as heir presumptive. Hostile forces gathered round Henry Tudor and the Battle of Bosworth saw key lords either failing to engage or changing sides. Richard's death in battle was a decisive, if unusual event.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The arguments may focus on the usurpation destroying credibility – the bloody elimination of rivals, the imprisonment of the princes and the rumours of the murders; the Buckingham Rebellion in the same year may indicate a lack of stability from which the reign could not recover. However, the justification in Edward's precontract and the petition of parliament and the desire not to repeat the instability of the minority of Henry VI, together with Richard's high repudiation in the North and his military prowess and piety, may challenge this. His loyalty to Edward and his good qualities as soldier and administrator may not have made him inherently likely to have been overthrown. Other medieval kings had come to the throne in violent and disturbed circumstances. The productive parliament of 1484; the efforts Richard made to get support by making his council include former Lancastrians; his successful progress and the generally efficient way that the Yorkist conciliar government operated do not suggest to some an ongoing state of emergency. What may have been more significant was the death of his son and then his heir – unforeseen in 1483, and the fortunes of the battlefield. Either the treachery he faced is indicative of inherent instability or it is merely typical of the period. His race to strike down Henry Tudor which ended in his death is either a result of his fear for the loyalty of his followers unless a swift result ensued; or it is a sign of his bravery and his kingly qualities.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**8 Assess the view that in his aims and methods, Henry VII was a deeply conservative ruler.**

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A good range of factors need to be considered here with perhaps some discussion over the issue of 'New Monarchy'. It might be argued that Henry VII's main aim was to secure the throne and his dynasty and he did this by repositioning the monarchy and the nobility and addressing issues of law and order. His relations with the nobility should be considered, issues relating to his treatment of them, use of attainders, bonds and recognisances, Council Learned in the Law and whether he might be seen as 'anti-nobility' and his alleged use of 'new men'. His style of government, use of council and use of Chamber finance and his personal scrutiny of government. His policies to restore law and order, especially his use of JPs. His financial dealings should be considered, as well as his foreign policy dynastic policies and dealings with other rulers.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on whether Henry introduced new policies that perhaps amounted to a 'New Monarchy' or whether he in fact used the traditional policies and methods, albeit very efficiently. There is a lively historical debate to be had here, although the idea of a 'New Monarchy' has lost any real credibility. He might be seen as innovative in his financial policy, especially his use of Chamber finance. Although this was used by Edward IV, he certainly appears to be rapacious, but tends to use traditional methods in an over scrupulous way. He has been seen as being anti-noble, but all of the methods he uses, with the exception of the Council Learned in the Law, are traditional. Perhaps it might be argued that he was attempting to restore the monarchy to its traditional position after a period of civil war. It is difficult to see any real areas of innovation, although perhaps he does understand the new order in Europe and this is partly why he does not attempt a particularly ambitious foreign policy.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 13</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## 9 Why did Henry VIII enjoy limited success in foreign policy from 1509 to 1529?

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Judged against Henry's grandiose schemes and aims, to dominate Europe and follow in the footsteps of Henry V by winning the French crown, Henry VIII's successes in foreign policy look slender indeed. It will be important to have some view of the context of Europe, that England lacked the finance and manpower compared to France, Spain or the Empire, especially once the Empire and Spain are combined under Charles V in 1519. Moreover Henry is frequently the dupe of his allies, consistently let down by rulers whose real focus tended to be Spain. A chronological approach is possible, but should avoid narrative. In his early forays, he makes little impact save for the so called Battle of the Spurs, he is let down by his father-in-law, Ferdinand, and the real success comes in Scotland whilst he was out of the country. He achieves some temporary success with the treaty of London, where the diplomatic skills of Wolsey ensured that for a moment London was the centre of European diplomacy. The Field of the Cloth of Gold was an expensive piece of window dressing at a time when Henry had decided to renew his alliance with Charles V. In the early 1520s he is again let down by his allies and is unable to capitalise on Habsburg victory at Pavia for lack of money. After this his efforts switch to his attempts to gain a divorce.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus of the argument must be on an evaluation of success and for the outlay of money there seems to be little success. However, at times Henry is courted by the other European powers. They certainly cannot ignore him, despite the fact that they frequently fail to adhere to their agreements with him. Candidates may well point to the treaty of London as a high point and argue that Henry is more successful in diplomacy than war. An evaluation of Wolsey may well be part of the argument; however the thrust of the answer should always be an evaluation of foreign policy.

A03 [not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 14</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## 10 How serious was opposition to the Henrician Reformation?

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Opposition to the Henrician Reformation takes a variety of forms and candidates will need to show that they know about a range of these; however the thrust of the answer cannot be simply describing this range but evaluating the threat they posed to the throne and to the Reformation itself. There was individual opposition, Fisher, More and Elizabeth Barton. The better answers will show that they understand that the opposition of each of these was for different reasons. Fisher and More were well known and well respected; there was a struggle with all three to silence them. There are groups, especially monks, whose opposition was passive but again these were well respected individuals. Most important in terms of threat is the Pilgrimage of Grace and it would be unusual for candidates not to spend some time on this. It is arguably the largest revolt of the century and was not easy to put down. It could be argued that they did not threaten Henry, but his advisors; nevertheless it does constitute serious threat. Some candidates might include the issue of perceived threat, for example it is argued that rebellion was a possibility in 1539, which is one reason why Henry himself pulled the plug on the Reformation. It might also be discussed why there was not more opposition.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on an evaluation of the nature and seriousness of the threat. Some sense of evaluation of the different forms of opposition will be expected, candidates might also evaluate whether the threat was greater at certain times than others. There is also a clear historical debate on why opposition was not greater; this might include arguing that the Pilgrimage of Grace was not primarily a religious uprising, although this is rather contentious. There is also a debate centring on the fact that since the Reformation in Henry's reign was piecemeal, people did not really know at what point to rebel. Candidates might also mention the fact that the population tended to be in the habit of obeying their King and that Henry took unprecedented steps to threaten and punish opposition.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines.]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 15</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### Section 3: 1547–1603

#### 11 How consistently troubled was the reign of Edward VI?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There is a very lively debate to be had here. There is often a tendency to write off the whole of Edward's reign as a disaster, however there are many areas that need to be evaluated. The reign began with war against France and Scotland, neither of which succeeded in their aims and put the regime under intolerable financial stress for the rest of the reign. Religion is also an important area. The picture is mixed here, certainly there was opposition to the religious policies, but not in all areas of the country; nevertheless this does need to be linked to the Western Rebellion. The issue of the economy is also important both in terms of government policy such as debasement and in terms of economic events such as poor harvests which were beyond their control. It could be argued that under Somerset there was a breakdown in consiliar rule and that governance does break down completely in the summer of 1549. Yet it is possible to reassert governance fairly quickly and it could be argued that the second half of the reign does witness a better administration. Clearly the last months of the reign can also be highlighted as a time of acute crisis as well. Candidates might well compare the abilities of Somerset and Northumberland, over which there is considerable historiographical debate.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus must be on an evaluation on the issue of consistency, it is not sufficient to narrate the events of Edward's reign. The best answers will identify different forms of crisis and will perhaps highlight the summer of 1549 and the last months of the reign as period of especial difficulty. Much has been written recently which focuses on the role of the council and how well it was used. There is considerable debate over the abilities of both Somerset and Northumberland which could be used very effectively in this debate.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 16</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## **12 Mary I's attempt to restore Catholicism was an impossible dream.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Mary is most often associated with her religious policies, and whilst there may be some other aspects of her rule that link to religious policies, not least her marriage and foreign policies, the thrust of the answer should be on religious matters. The traditional argument that she faced a good deal of opposition has been convincingly challenged, yet there are significant areas of opposition. An evaluation of her dealings with parliament, both the Commons and the Lords, will be important, but candidates might note that much of this is to do with property and heresy laws, and these issues are settled. Candidates will certainly refer to the exiles and to the burnings; they will also refer to Wyatt's Rebellion, but might evaluate this as being mainly about other issues such as the Spanish marriage. She was successful in returning England to the papacy and candidates might note that had she lived longer, or had a Catholic heir, she much have succeeded in a permanent counter-reformation. Candidates might refer to her lack of inspiring clergy and lack of money, or the harshness of people like Pole, or the population's distaste for the burnings. They might note that one of the problems was not anti-Catholicism, but a deeply rooted anti-papal attitude. The successful answers will achieve a real debate centred on the issue of the extent of her success or otherwise.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is clearly on religious policy. The historical debate could well be used very effectively to argue that Protestantism was far from secure and that there were very real differences in various parts of the country. Mary took heart from her enthusiastic elevation to the throne and her attitudes and understanding could be key, especially as she took an increasingly hard line. Clearly there were areas, such as the property issue that was never going to be resolved in her favour, and in the end she struggled with a lack of time, money and perhaps real enthusiasm for Roman Catholicism.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 17</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### 13 How effectively did Elizabeth I manage her parliaments?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates might present a chronological approach to this question, but unless it deals overtly with the issue of management and evaluates Elizabeth's success and effectiveness the response cannot score very highly. Candidates will need to understand the perspectives of Elizabethan parliaments and the fact that it only came into being by the express wish of the queen; she generally wanted them to grant supply, address certain issues she brought to them and then go home as soon as possible. However, she was also realistic enough to understand that they also wished to address certain issues themselves. It might be helpful to view this as she did herself, that there were issues of the commonwealth which they might discuss, and issues of state which could only be discussed if she introduced the issue. As far as she was concerned the issues of religion, after 1559, succession and her marriage were strictly off limits. It might be noted that parliaments in Elizabeth's reign were infrequent. In general she managed parliament very well. She seldom had to pack parliament and she was prepared to make full use of her own speeches, her councillors and the veto to ensure good management. The main areas for discussion are likely to include: the religious settlement and attempts to modify it; subsidies; Mary Queen of Scots; marriage; succession and freedom of speech.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on evaluation of her effectiveness. The historical arguments here are varied, candidates will almost certainly reject the views of Neale and conclude that with some notable exceptions she managed parliament well. Examples of opposition and possible mismanagement can be found, but it could be argued that these were generally when the council could gain no satisfaction and took their grievances to a wider audience in parliament. Some candidates may be able to comment on the role of patronage in parliament, especially that of Cecil.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 18</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

#### **14 Who presented the greater threat to Elizabeth I: English Catholics or English Puritans?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Here the focus should be on a comparison of threat, best done by direct comparison. However, candidates may well conclude the nature of the threat of Puritans as compared to Catholics was very different and indeed the nature and intensity of the threat does change and develop over time. Generally speaking, the Catholics are likely to be seen as more menacing. Candidates are likely to refer to Mary Queen of Scots; the various plots; foreign intervention; the Revolt of the Northern Earls; the Armada and Seminary priests and Jesuits. It could be contended the threat really begins to materialise after the Papal Bull of Excommunication. The Puritan threat really revolves around the problems it caused Elizabeth in the governance of her realm. The following issues may well be included: control of churches in the localities; rights of advowson; the threat posed to supremacy by the Presbyterians and the nuisance factor caused by some Puritans in parliament. It could be argued that while the Puritans do not go away, they are prepared to throw their weight behind the crown once the threat of the Catholics really materialises.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. This is very much an issue of evaluation of threat. It might be argued that because the Catholics owed their allegiance to a foreign power they were always bound to be the greater threat, yet this is not really the case until later in the reign. Candidates might suggest that the majority of Catholics were loyal subjects and were prepared to keep their beliefs to themselves. On the other hand, the Puritans take it upon themselves to question the settlement and try to work from within to effect a change to the religious settlement on which Elizabeth believed she had had the final word. The historical debate on this issue is very lively and candidates could make good use of it.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 19</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**15 Explain why successive governments met with only limited success in Ireland in the period 1547–1603.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Answers should have a sharp focus on Ireland and there should be a reasonably good balance over the entire period. The main focus must be on an evaluation of success and an analysis of the issue of how limited it was. Candidates will be expected to be able to make some comment on change, progress and regress over the period. Some of the areas which might be covered include: political, social and tribal structures of Ireland; the limited area of effective control in 1547; religious complications as England became more Protestant; the background of Irish resistance; limited resources available and the huge costs involved in any systematic policy. The policy used was largely one of subjugation and coercion. Under Somerset and Mary there is a policy of garrisons; plantation and colonisation is used more or less throughout the period; divide and rule and the use of Anglo-Irish nobility; provincial councils; appointment of English Lord Deputies; use of the Irish Parliament – although only four were called during the period; the suppression of rebellion, reference might especially be made to Kildare and Hugh O'Neill; conquest and devastation under Essex and the prevention of Spanish invasion in the 1590s.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates might look at the issues in terms of English aims and may argue that certainly at times these went beyond mere subjugation and colonisation. It may be argued that Ireland is more or less strategically important at different times and therefore policy changes and develops. Success is also dependent on resources and other demands on the English crown. Candidates might also identify relative high points and low points; indeed it could be argued that the position in 1603 is far stronger than it was in 1547. Candidates might well consider the issue of whether anything more than limited success could have been expected in this period.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 20</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

#### **Section 4: Themes c.1399–c.1603**

### **16 To what extent was the House of Commons more powerful in 1529 than it had been in 1399?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Responses to this question will need to range across the whole period and should take careful note of the key dates. There is no real set answer here, but the most successful answers may well consider change and development over the period. A thematic approach could also prove to be fruitful in considering issues such as taxation; support for war; usage for succession; punishment of nobility during rebellion and civil war and increased use by individual members. In terms of taxation, supply for Henry V and Henry VIII's wars could be contrasted with growing hostility to the taxation for the failing war in the reign of Henry VI and the reluctance of Henry VII to ask for taxation. There is considerable material to be referred to when dealing with succession, most notably after a usurpation and such issues as the Act of Accord. The use of Parliament for attainders, resumptions and treason could be indicated; the Parliament of Devils could be referred to; the growing use of Parliament for issues related to trade and local issues. The focus must clearly be on the House of Commons, with some sense of how this relates to the power of the House of Lords.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus will be to evaluate usage and importance. Most candidates may well conclude that it waxes and wanes, but that by the end of there period there is no real profound change. Candidates may well reflect on the nature of Parliament, in particular its relationship to the Lords through patronage and faction, how the Commons can be 'packed' and influenced by significant figures. Some candidates might reflect on how its significance and power relates to that of the King.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 21</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## 17 How serious a threat was Lollardy to the medieval church?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There is a great deal of debate here over the size of the problem. Candidates will need to consider the nature and extent of the threat and may well conclude that the threat certainly diminishes over the period. Moreover, the threat is more prevalent in some areas, in particular the south, than in other areas. It could well be concluded that Lollardy had already had its day by 1399, Wyclif having died in 1384 and his sometime supporter John of Gaunt in 1399. The movement is increasingly persecuted and driven underground, although there are some notable survivals. Candidates may well take the view that Lollardy did encourage a greater sense of individual piety and a focus on the gospels; it also encouraged criticism of Church institutions and anti-clericalism. Most will probably conclude that it was not a particularly serious threat in itself, but was more of a threat in terms of encouraging criticism.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on evaluation the nature and extent of threat. The historical argument is interesting. Traditionally Lollardy was credited with having encouraged the Reformation in terms of its survivals and the habits of criticism it encouraged in the English people. However, this view has been convincingly challenged, with many historians largely discounting Lollardy after the mid-fifteenth century. Some candidates might argue that rather than being a threat, Lollardy gave the Church the opportunity to examine itself and rectify some of the problems.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 22</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**18 How are the remarkable achievements in fifteenth-century English architecture best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates have a range of options here, clearly the issue of church architecture is an important one and there is more than enough material to write entirely about this, and a well written and supported piece which concentrates on this issue should be judged on its merits. However, candidates may also wish to consider domestic architecture as well. There is a good deal to be said here in terms of the fifteenth-century halls and barns and in terms of building erected by towns, universities and individuals. Despite the civil war in the century it is a time of considerable prosperity, particularly in certain areas of the country. The so-called cloth churches of East Anglia and the Cotswolds are a case in point. Candidates might explore the unique building style of this period. Simple prosperity is not enough to explain this however, and candidates might comment on the increases in lay piety, a movement away from monastic building to parish churches and indeed private chapels. Changes in the way in which lay piety is expressed might also go some way to explain the buildings in Oxford and Cambridge. In terms of lay architecture issues such as the rise of the yeomanry, civic pride and so on might be considered. It is important that examples are used to support the argument.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on evaluating the relative reasons for the growth. Of course candidates might consider that this growth was far from uniform, some might argue that this calls into question the whole premise of the question. This is a reasonable issue to raise but should not constitute the bulk of the argument.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 23</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**19 How is the expansion in educational provision in Tudor England best explained?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A range of issues might be raised but the key to success is in the relative evaluation of these factors and how they link to each other. Clearly there is also much to be made from considering the uniformity of provision, both in terms of a geographical spread and in terms of change and development over the course of the century. One area to consider is the issue of demand: England was becoming more literate and more litigious. Clearly the printing press and the development of both religious and lay printing must be considered. Certainly the Dissolution of the Monasteries is also an important area to consider. Candidates might consider the provision of grammar schools and the early public schools in various provincial towns. Candidates must certainly consider the growth and relevance of the universities. Changes in the types of charitable giving particularly after the break from Rome can also be considered. It will not be enough simply to base the answer on one specific school or university. Specific examples 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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on relative evaluation of factors. Certainly it can be argued that coverage was patchy and not at all uniform. In many cases schools are established but are closed within a generation. The variety of reasons why benefactors chose to support education can be seen as a reason for this. Candidates might consider arguing that the period can clearly be broken into two halves, yet the growth in lay provision even before the Dissolution of the Monasteries has to be considered

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 24</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**20 Assess the importance of population growth on the social and economic condition of Tudor England.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Whilst the overall situation is one of growth when the century is taken as a whole, candidates will need to show that they understand that there was a considerable break in the upward trend during the reign of Mary I, when approximately 1/5 of the population succumbed to epidemic in 1558. Candidates may well identify two particular crisis points in Edward VI's reign and at the end of Elizabeth I's reign. Moreover, at certain points severe crop failure does put the breaks on population growth. The importance can be seen in a number of ways. Candidates might consider the growth of towns, whilst noting that there was a decline in some others, as with population growth itself the impact is not uniform all over the country. Of particular concern to contemporaries is the rise in vagabondage and some comment on how governments dealt with this might be expected, although this is not the main thrust of the debate. Population growth also has an impact on agriculture and the patterns of internal trade. Candidates might comment on better record keeping from the middle of the century and they might also comment on the way in which commentators begin to understand the problem.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on assessing importance and evaluating the relative merits of change. Candidates might well comment on the other issues which impact on social and economic change, such as the Dissolution of the Monasteries; changes in trade; changes in land ownership and enclosure. This approach has merit but the bulk of the argument must be based on the impact of population growth itself.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 25</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## **21 How significantly did the pattern of overseas trade change in the sixteenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are significant changes in the patterns of trade during this period, as well as a significant increase in its total. The answer should focus clearly on evaluating the significance of the change rather than simply explaining it. Clearly there are significant changes due to war and foreign policy, perhaps the most significant of which is the fall of Antwerp. Trade with France along the traditional routes is also impacted by war. Routes in the Baltic and the Levant are opened up and flourish. There is a significant impact brought by the opening up of the New World at the end of the period. Trade is also affected by legislation, both that brought by the crown and that instigated by private individuals and groups in the House of Commons; here the London merchants have a significant role to play. The answer must range over the whole of the period although there is certainly more to be said about the later part. It is important that specific examples are used in support of the argument.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on assessing the significance of change as a whole over the course of a century. There is some significant debate here. The traditional view marks Elizabeth out as presiding over the beginnings of Empire and a seagoing fleet. More recently historians have been more cautious, setting this against the damage done to trade as a result of war with Spain and this disruption to the Netherlands. The role of a handful of privateers tends to be down played. Nevertheless change is significant during this period.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 26</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### Section 5: 1603–1689

#### 22 How successfully did James I and Charles I deal with their financial problems between 1603 and 1629?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The issue of finance has always been seen as central to an evaluation of this period. Both monarchs were chronically short of money and both were accused of profligacy. The issue also had a profound effect on their relationships with Parliament and with the country more generally. For James there was always the spectre of his extravagance and perhaps a lack of understanding of how finance operated. Various options to curb his spending and properly endow the crown were tried: the Book of Bounty in 1608; the plundering of Crown lands; the exploitation of customs duties, feudal dues and purveyance. Candidates can be expected to deal with the Great Contract in some detail, with its failure a consideration of the increasingly desperate means of gaining supply need to be considered. Relations with Parliament and the lack of success in gaining money from that source also needs to be considered. The war at the end of James I's reign added a new dimension to the problem and the efforts of Charles to gain money, whilst successful in some measure, came at tremendous cost. The roles of various advisors and ministers might 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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on evaluating success, many candidates will be tempted to conclude that both monarchs were singularly unsuccessful and at a cost of alienating many. This has to be set against very real problems however, many of which were not of their own making. There were several notable missed opportunities, but there were also some ingenious, albeit unpopular solutions. There is considerable historical debate which could be evaluated.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 27</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### 23 Do religious issues alone explain the unpopularity of Archbishop Laud?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The issue of Arminianism and the unpopularity of Laud must be set within the context of the other reasons why Charles I's subjects were wary of him. The religious issues are clear; many contemporaries disliked the focus on uniformity and the authority of Bishops and royal prerogative. Candidates may well consider the debates and disputes in Parliament over issues of Religion and it is here that opposition to what they saw as religious innovation became associated to other forms of opposition. The conference at York House in 1626 might be considered. The situation became more serious once Laud was Archbishop of Canterbury. Clearly much of his unpopularity is based entirely on religious issues, in particular his attacks on preaching; his insistence on a strict adherence to the prayer book and vestments and the railing of the altar. Evaluating opposition in this period is difficult given that Parliament was not meeting. Clearly Laud's attack on property rights is important; he might have seen it as a religious issue, but land owners most certainly did not. Other issues, such as the Book of Sports and the blurring of social distinction by some actions of uniformity served to make Laud unpopular. Of course he was also involved in politics; he joined the Privy Council in 1627 and was deeply involved in domestic policies. His close association with Charles himself also has to be considered. His fall and execution might also 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 of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on evaluating the various reasons why Laud was unpopular. It also needs to be noted that he was not universally unpopular. Clearly his intentions were religiously motivated, yet the impact was far more than solely on religious practice. Candidates may wish to evaluate the historical debate which sees Laud as the real revolutionary and innovator. His relationship with the King also needs to be evaluated. Laud's inflexible personality could also go some way to explaining his lack of popularity.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 28</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**24 'Superior military organisation accounts for Parliament's success in the First Civil War.'  
Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A chronological approach might be attempted, however this may well result in a narrative of events and battles. The focus should be on a relative analysis of the factors which brought about a Parliamentary victory. Some candidates might argue that given the military deadlock at the end of 1644 it is surprising that Parliament in fact won, they might then concentrate more on the later years of the war. This could prove to be a useful approach. Certainly the effectiveness of the New Model Army and the military victories of 1645 should be evaluated as should the reorganisation following the Self Denying Ordinance. Military and political leadership on both sides warrants evaluation. The Scottish factor is important. Candidates might well also comment on supply and financing of war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus should be on relative evaluation and seeking to demonstrate links between the factors. There is a good deal of debate and the historical debate is far from straight forward. There may well be a variety of approaches and the most effective answers will evaluate this.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 29</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## 25 How much was restored by the Restoration of 1660?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. In many ways it would be easy to argue that this was a simple restoration, given the Convention Parliament of 1661. The House of Lords with its Bishops; the Anglican Church and the Monarchy itself had all returned. The key to success will be to evaluate the more subtle changes and shifts which were evident. Candidates might evaluate the Puritan cause and Venner's rising, but for the most part the Puritans did not prevail, indeed the Uniformity Act of 1662 might be used to illustrate this, yet the Act did vest in Parliament the right to determine religion. It could be argued that subtle changes were apparent with Charles II's patronage of science and enquiry. Other subtle changes are evident in foreign affairs and economic issues. Candidates might also usefully consider the sort of man Charles II was and what sort of a King he was, perhaps in the end much was restored because people were tired of innovation and all that had entailed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on evaluating extent. Most candidates will probably conclude that it was very much a restoration and will evaluate issues such as the power of the Monarchy, the nature of the Church settlement and the power of Parliament. A more subtle argument will point out that it was restoration in the shadow of the recent events and in a sense there could be no going back to 1640, only an attempt to deal with issues as they presented themselves, given a real desire to heal and settle the country as a whole.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 30</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

## 26 Why did James II enjoy so much support in 1685, but so little in 1688?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Although a chronological approach might be attempted the real thrust of the question is in the comparison between the circumstances of 1685 as compared to those of 1688. Candidates should be able to engage with the sharp contrast inherent in the question; therefore narratives of the reign will probably not do very well. Candidates might evaluate the strength and reasons for the support of the new King in 1685, they might consider the conditions of support for the maintenance of the Anglican Church given to James by the Tories. Candidates will be expected to make some reference to James's attempts to repeal the penal and test legislation, his expansion of the standing army, the arrival of a possible rival monarch in William of Orange in 1688 and opposition to his methods such as the purging of office holders, erection of ecclesiastical commission and the trial of the seven bishops. Candidates may well draw on the circumstances of his downfall.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on the comparison between the two dates, as the contrast is so stark, but an explanation of how a seemingly popular monarch could lose almost all his support in a period of just three years needs to be explored. There may be some evaluation of key personalities, not least James himself and how far his lack of judgement resulted in his own downfall. Candidates might look for key turning points and test the issue of loyalty and opposition at these key times.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 31</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### Section 6: 1689–1760

#### 27 Explain the contrasting fortunes of the Tory party in the years 1689–1714.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the development of the Tory party within the political system at this time. The focus will be on ‘contrasting fortunes’. Candidates should know about the factors which influenced Tory fortunes. The most important are likely to be the two wars which frame the period, including the costs of those wars and the implications for taxation, religion (especially support for the Church of England), the accession of a pro-Tory Queen in Anne (1702) and in Anne’s reign, manoeuvres towards Union and the need for a Protestant succession. Candidates might also note William III’s attempts to act as a ‘trimmer’, with Tories (Danby, Godolphin, Nottingham and Halifax) included in a Privy Council where Whigs were in the majority. William also attempted management of parliaments in which Tories and Whigs were fairly evenly balanced. Candidates may also note that that party structures and disciplines in this period were fluid, especially during William’s reign. Candidates should know that Whigs and Tories were fairly evenly balanced during William’s reign and that, though Anne usually favoured Tories, Whigs held the upper hand from 1705–10. The reasons for the decisive Tory victories in the elections of 1710 and 1713 should also be known. There may also be knowledge of the contrasting versions of Toryism espoused by Harley and by St John.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Tories in the reigns of William & Mary and of Anne. Candidates are likely to place emphasis on three factors above others – the succession of a partisan Queen; the impact of war (and especially the widely-felt need for peace from c1710); the defence of the Church of England against non-conformity (often presented as disloyalty). Candidates should know why support for the Church often went hand in hand with support for the Tories. Good candidates might argue that lingering support for Jacobitism within the party usually worked against the Tories. They may also wish to distinguish between so-called ‘Court Tories’ and the ‘Country Party’. Some may argue that, by 1710, country-party attitudes (pro-Church, anti-taxation, suspicion and resentment of the new moneyed interest etc.) were often indistinguishable from support for the Tories. Some candidates might also wish to argue that contrasting fortunes for the Tories also reflected a lack of developed party consciousness, especially in the reign of William. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of debates over the nature of the Tory party, including the distinction between so-called ‘court Tories’ and ‘country Tories at this time.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 32	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	12

**28 To what extent may Britain's participation in the war of the Spanish Succession be considered a success?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the reasons why Britain entered the war: to prevent Louis XIV's domination of Spain as well as France, to safeguard its trade and, thanks largely to William III's position, to support the Dutch against threat from the south. After Louis recognised James Edward Stuart as the rightful King of England, also, King and Parliament saw this as a dynastic struggle. There should also be knowledge both of the War itself and the outcome. Candidates should know about Marlborough's campaigns and especially his successes first in the Low Countries and then in Germany at the head of English, Dutch and German forces. There are successes (particularly the battles of Blenheim and Oudenarde and the capture of Gibraltar). Candidates may know that the major successes of the war were front-loaded. Achievement after 1708 was limited. Allied campaigns in France and Spain from 1709 involved a number of defeats and setbacks. Overall, these campaigns achieved little. It is relevant to mention campaigns, especially at sea, in the Americas, both in the West Indies and on the eastern seaboard. There is much activity but little in the way of decisive success. Candidates may also be aware that after the Tory success in the election of 1710 was followed by considerably less commitment to continuing the war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on how far Britain could claim success in this war. Most are likely to argue that Britain was militarily successful, especially early in the war, though some may argue that attempts in France and Spain towards the end of the war involved much expense and very little success. Even a notional victory at Malplaquet was achieved only at major cost (20,000 allied casualties). Stronger candidates may use the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht in order to judge whether the greater involvement in European affairs which was more or less forced on the British from 1713 represented a success in itself. Some might argue that Utrecht recognised Britain as unprecedentedly influential as a great power in Europe. Most are likely to note that the renunciation of the French throne by Philip V of Spain represented success, since the threat of a united Bourbon control of both France and Spain. However, given that Allied forces generally enjoyed more success in the war than France and Spain, the peace brought very few territorial changes. Was the outcome proportionate to successes achieved? Also, was it too costly? France and Spain remained firm allies after the war ended, thus an enduring threat to Britain. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of debates over whether the war had any decisive outcomes but rather maintained the late seventeenth-century *status quo* and also, perhaps, about the extent to which Swift's anti-Churchill argument that the war was not about safeguarding the national interests but 'the aggrandising of a particular Family'.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 33</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**29 'Whig Supremacy': is this an adequate description of British politics in the years 1714–56?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the party politics of the period. Candidates should know that the Whig party was in more or less continuous control of Parliament during this period and that the Whigs had long-running prime ministers, notably Robert Walpole and Henry Pelham. A good answer should also show awareness of the activities of the Tories, including the extent of their association with Jacobitism. Candidates should also know about the influence of the two relevant Hanoverian monarchs – George I and George II – on the political stage and also understand why both were strongly committed to supporting Whig ministers.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about a given proposition related to 'Whig supremacy'. Candidates should understand what the phrase means and also be able to use it to discuss its significance in the context of early and mid-c18 politics. Good candidates should make some kind of attempt to qualify a description which does not do justice to the political complexities of the period. They might, for example, note that there was no single 'Whig party' but what was never more than a loose federation of interest groups which coalesced around the need for a Protestant, Hanoverian monarchy. Beyond this, the so-called 'Supremacy' was riven on a number of issues – notably concerning diplomacy, the way royal power was often appropriated by ministers. Candidates might wish to use the fact that, particularly after 1729, there was usually an influential, and often a resentful, Whig opposition to the policies of Whig prime ministers, and especially to Walpole's. Two other qualifying issues are worth mentioning: a) the presence of a more or less cohesive Tory opposition grouping, which generally supported what in the reigns of William III and Anne would have been called 'country policies', and b) monarchs who were careful to guard their own interests and to use monarchical power to ensure that British diplomacy was strongly pro-Hanover and also to put their own stamp on both the policies of, and the leading personalities in, the armed forces. Overall, there is much material for candidates to use if they wish to argue that the use of the key phrase in the question considerably over-simplifies a complex political situation. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of debates in which rather greater emphasis has been given to the importance of Tory policies and politics, especially in the constituencies, and also to the ways in which royal power was exercised.

AO3 [not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 34	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	12

**30 'A Church characterised by weak leadership and an inability to meet the needs of a changing society.' Assess the validity of this view of the Church of England in the years 1714–60.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the state of the Church of England in this period. This should include information about both church leadership and also the extent to which the Church was able to adapt to change. In the first category, the emphasis is likely to be on the bishops and good candidates should know something about some leaders of the Church hierarchy, such as Edmund Gibson (frequently dubbed 'Walpole's pope'), William Wake, Thomas Sherlock, John Potter or the influential William Warburton. Beyond the personalities – and the list above provides a decent cross-section of the useful and the largely useless – lies the broader issue of how leadership was exercised and whether the Church of England presented itself as effective, vigorous and doctrinally lucid. In the second category, candidates should have knowledge of the challenges faced by the Church, notably the linked factors of growing urbanisation and the challenge of nonconformity. Candidates should know how the Church attempted to meet these, while being aware that, certainly by 1760, the Church of England was much stronger and also provided a more secure pastoral 'service' in the countryside than the towns. It is also relevant, so long as the chronology is secure, to include material on the Church's response to Enlightenment thinking. Material on the early career of John Wesley is, of course, relevant, perhaps as part of a discussion on the growing importance of evangelical religion.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on the effectiveness of the Church of England within the defined period. Candidates may wish to argue that the Church was indeed too 'politicised', especially since the appointment of bishops had to be approved by leading ministers as well as the monarch. This might suggest to some that politics was placed before the discharge of effective pastoral care. Candidates who broadly accept the judgement provided in the quotation are likely to note the relative weakness of the Church in the growing towns, especially of the Midlands and North, and in the industrial areas, not least in the mining areas. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of recent debates about the effectiveness of the Church. The Church has been portrayed in a more sympathetic light of late, often on the evidence of clerical visitations.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 35	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	12

**31 'Britain's desire for great-power status best explains its involvement in conflicts on the continent of Europe in the years 1739–63.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain's involvement in the War of Jenkins's Ear, the War of Austrian Succession and the Seven Years War. Candidates should know about Britain's allies in the 1740s and 1750s and about the significance of the 'diplomatic revolution' of 1756, which cemented a British-Prussian alliance. There should also be knowledge of the outcome of the Austrian Succession and Seven Years wars, linked to changing perceptions of Britain as a great power.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on the causes of Britain's involvement during this period. Candidates may well refer to the long-standing suspicion of French power and influence, especially when linked in alliance to Spain. They may argue either that it was desire for trading and colonial supremacy rather than a desire to be recognised as a great power which best explains Britain's involvement. Some candidates may use the knowledge that Walpole felt himself forced into war against his will in 1739 as evidence that the government did not wish to enhance its status in Europe. Other candidates may argue that great-power status was an ambition, but one which related to trans-continental commercial influence rather than the exercise of military power on the continent of Europe. Some candidates may argue that the pursuit of great power status had much to do with the Elder Pitt's period in office. Some candidates could refer to the influence of George II in defending European family interests while trying to ensure that relations with ever more powerful Brandenburg-Prussia was not at the expense of Hanover. For strong candidates, discussion about what great-power status actually meant (commercial and colonial dominance outside Europe or recognised parity with France and Austria on the continent of Europe) may determine the thrust of an answer which should concentrate on the *causes* of involvement in these wars. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of debates over the roles of George II and on whether Britain remained as reluctant to commit directly to European wars in the 1750s as in the late 1730s.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 36	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	12

## Section 7: 1760–1815

### 32 How is the ministerial instability of the 1760s best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British politics in the 1760s. The focus will be on the theme of political instability. Candidates should have knowledge of the end of the Whig supremacy and the significance of the succession of a new 'British' monarch, anxious to cleanse what he saw as the Augean stables of party politics and graft. They should know about the significance of George III's appointment of Bute as an 'outsider' prime minister. They are also likely to refer to the political conflicts which arose over how to end the Seven Years War. A further cause of controversy was the growth of opposition in the Americas to Britain's taxation policies. The role of George personally is a significant one. The fact that Whig personalities, and attitudes, were so widely entrenched almost guaranteed instability when the new monarch tried to change things and exercise existing monarchical rights more actively. For the record, the relevant ministries of the period are: Newcastle/Pitt, 1757–1761/2; Bute, May 1762–April 1763; Grenville, April 1763–July 1765; Rockingham, July 1765–July 1766; Elder Pitt (Chatham), July 1766–October 1768; Grafton October 1768–January 1770; North (appointed, January 1770). Good candidates will see that answers to this question require some knowledge and understanding of individuals as well as issues. The key political figures, apart from a young, inexperienced and wilful King, are the leading ministers but candidates might find a place for a 'spoiler' like Wilkes who might destabilise or undermine ministries. They might also refer to the controversial issues which made parliamentary management difficult.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about which factors were most important in explaining why George III appointed seven ministers in less than ten years. Many will wish to weigh the relative responsibility George III should bear for the ministerial instability experienced against other factors. George III's inexperience and lack of political *nous* in the early part of his reign certainly mattered. His failure to find a minister who could command reliable majorities in Parliament alongside royal favour was clearly an important factor. The quality of some of the prime ministers he picked is also a factor. Bute and Grafton have come in for particular criticism. George was also stubborn and could be impervious to argument and suggestions from those who knew the political world better than he. Those who wish to argue that it is too easy just to blame George III are likely to raise the importance of the issues involved: how the Seven Years War was to be concluded, and how paid for; the growth of opposition in the Americas and frequently weak or ambivalent government responses. Some may also wish to adduce the maverick activities of John Wilkes as a cause of instability. Given that the question requires a judgement on what 'best explains' the instability, strong candidates must include in their answers discussion of relative importance. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, some candidates may be aware of debates on the validity of Whig criticisms that the King should bear greatest blame for the political problems because he didn't trust his ministers and sometimes actively schemed against them. They may also be aware that George III's reputation stands somewhat higher than it did and that it was hardly his fault that the stratagems which had sustained a 'court Whig' supremacy for Walpole and the Pelhams had largely broken down, leaving effective political management a much more difficult process precisely at the time when a young and inexperienced monarch took over.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

<b>Page 37</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

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

**33 How important was foreign intervention by France and Spain in determining the outcome of the American colonists' struggle for independence in the years 1775–83?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the reasons for American victory. In view of the question, we should expect some concentration on the importance of foreign intervention. Candidates should know about the significance of France and Spain as great powers and also of their status as long-established and significant powers in the American continent. They should know that, from 1778, Britain needed to pay greater attention to its navy since both France, especially, and Spain (who entered the war in 1779) represented a significant threat to supremacy at sea. France and Spain were also in a position to help provision the colonies, making it less likely that the colonies could be starved into submission. Other factors on which candidates should draw include: Britain's unpreparedness for the kind of guerrilla war which the Colonies were waging and the lack of knowledge of the terrain; the quality of British generalship; the military abilities of the Colonies, including perhaps some concentration on the campaigns of Washington. They are likely to know about key military conflicts, including: Lexington (1775), Saratoga (1777), Charleston (1780) and Yorktown (1781).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on the reasons for American victory and this requires evaluation of the relative importance of several linked causes. Candidates might argue that key weaknesses in Britain's campaign to subdue its colonies had already been revealed before 1778 and that military defeats which had little to do with France or Spain were the main reasons for the loss of its colonies. On the other hand, the intervention of two major powers substantially increased the dimensions of the task, not least by providing a much increased threat to the British navy and to its trading operations. It can be argued that both British morale and opposition to Britain's involvement in the conflict increased substantially after 1778. Candidates will need to make an informed judgement about the importance of foreign intervention compared with other factors. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates will be aware of debates about the extent of American resilience. Some argue that, with a substantial minority of colonists opposed to radical American policies and wishing to sustain the colonial relationship, the impact of foreign intervention was particularly important since it put the conflict into a different dimension.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 38</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### 34 Why was Charles James Fox so rarely in office?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Fox's career, with particular reference to his time in office. They should know that Fox held high office only three times, each as foreign secretary, under Shelburne (1782), in the Fox-North Coalition (1783) and under Grenville just before he died (1806). Some good candidates will know that he held minor office under North before resigning and they might also see why the question has been asked – given Fox's clear abilities (particularly as an orator) and his highly privileged aristocratic background. He was the son of Henry Fox and the family was heavily involved in national politics. Fox might be said almost to have been bred for office. Candidates should also know about the problems which faced Fox, both in terms of personality (especially his conflict with the younger Pitt) and, particularly, policy. Candidates should also know about George III's hostility to Fox and its importance for his career. Some candidates might stress Fox's sweeping defeat in the 1784 general election as confirming how royal power could still swing the political balance.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for Fox's long periods out of office, particularly in view of his abilities and background. There are a number of factors to consider, including: royal hostility (which from 1783 onwards was as implacable as it was sustained); the political abilities of Pitt (who had much more harmonious relations with the King); key issues, particularly those concerned liberty as against order (particularly in the 1790s) and support for peace and accommodation rather than war against French revolutionaries, many of whose principles and policies Fox supported. Candidates might also note that Fox was a strong 'party man', which also offended the King, whereas Pitt was careful not to create a personal party or to link himself too closely to one of the great landed political families. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of debates over the nature of party politics in the 1780s and 1790s and consideration of the extent to which Fox's political career was irredeemably blighted early on or as a result of ideological differences which divided the Whigs in the 1790s and led to the Pitt-Portland coalition in 1794.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 39</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**35 How great was the radical threat to the established political order in the years 1789–1803?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of radicalism in the 1790s. Candidates should know about the radicals' desire to change the political system, via parliamentary reform and, for some, both democracy and republicanism. They should also know how organisations like the London Corresponding Society and the Society for Constitutional Information were inspired by the French Revolution. Some candidates will also know about the links between radicalism and growing discontent in Ireland with British rule. Good candidates should be aware of movements which were organised by artisans and skilled workers, especially in London and other craft towns, and those which were predominantly middle-class. It is also relevant to discuss the Whig-based Society of the Friends of the People.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on the impact of radicalism, and particularly the extent of the threat it posed. Candidates who argue that the threat was real might stress the extent to which radicalism grew in the 1790s and the extent also to which it politicised groups who had not been prominent before. They might also stress the genuine radicalism of movements which aimed to put into practice political doctrines which drew their inspiration from the Enlightenment. On the other hand, candidates might argue that the radicals had only a limited power base and that Whig divisions helped Pitt to dominate political life and effectively mobilise the forces of order. Some candidates might argue that revolutionary threats in the later 1790s and early 1800s were relatively easily headed off. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of relatively recent work which stresses how much popular support there was for conservative policies and especially for defeating the French and, therefore, the ideas of the French Revolution. Popular conservatism has received more extensive treatment in the last two decades than before.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 40	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	12

### 36 Who contributed more to British success in the French Wars of 1793–1815: Nelson or Wellington?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the naval/military careers of Nelson and Wellington. Some biographical information is permissible but good candidates will link this to the effectiveness of both men as commanders. On Nelson, candidates are likely to know of his contributions at St Vincent (1797), the Nile (1798) and Copenhagen (1801) as well as at Trafalgar (1805). They should also know about his strategy as a naval commander and his tactical awareness and use of the element of surprise. On Wellington, candidates may know about his extensive career in India but, given the focus of the question, should concentrate on his leadership in the Peninsula (1808–14), including his victory at Talavera (1809) and his effectiveness in fighting what was often a defensive campaign. Candidates are likely to have detailed knowledge of his victory at Waterloo (1815).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on the relative importance of two key commanders during the French Wars. Although candidates are required to make a judgement about whose was the greater contribution, it is important that they discuss the nature of the contribution made by each man. It could be argued that Nelson played a key role in securing British naval supremacy and thus preventing Napoleon from launching his long anticipated, and much-feared, invasion of Britain. Arguably, Nelson played a major part in ensuring that Britain would not be defeated on home territory. Wellington's main contribution comes later and candidates may well wish to argue that he showed great ability in the Peninsula in defending territory against often much larger forces. However, good candidates should explain why the Peninsula (Napoleon's famous 'Spanish ulcer') mattered so much to the outcome of the war. Wellington, it could be argued, helped to prolong the war and thus give the government further options, not least in reforming anti-Napoleonic alliances with other great powers. Although many candidates will argue that it was Wellington who delivered the final *coup de grace* at Waterloo, it was more important that in keeping the war going, Wellington enabled Britain to maximise its economic advantages during what was a very long and expensive war. On one analysis, Britain won because its resources were greater than France's and because it could prevent Napoleon from starving Britain into submission after 1806. It does not matter which commander a candidate chooses in terms of contribution, so long as the treatment covers both and is concentrates on the *nature* of contributions made by both men in reaching an informed judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of debates over the nature of party politics and the predominant view that party politics was growing in importance over this period.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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



<b>Page 41</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

### Section 8: Themes c.1603–c.1815

#### **37 How profoundly influenced by continental Europe were the art and architecture of Stuart Britain?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. The answers to this question must focus on both aspects of the question whilst ranging across the whole century, although precise balance between these elements is not being sought. In terms of art many might argue that the century is a tale of two halves. Many historians have suggested that the first half of the century is heavily influenced by painters from the Low Countries with very little that could be described as being British. It has been argued that much of the reason for this was a lack of patronage and the preferences of individual monarchs, especially Charles I. British art was, it could be argued, very slow to assert itself in the century and only began really to assert itself towards the very end of the period. Continental influences can also be observed at the start of the century in architecture. Indigo Jones had been particularly influenced by Italian architecture. A lack of money also suggests that innovation in architecture is lacking in the first half of the century. So much changes however in the reign of Charles II with the rise to prominence of Wren and the opportunities of the Great Fire of London and building work in Oxford and Cambridge. Candidates might also consider the work of Gibbons and Hawksmoor. Commissions by members of the aristocracy might also be considered and some weight might be given to the view that French influences were, by the end of the century, being brought to bear. It is important that specific examples be cited.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus range and change and development over the course of the whole era. Candidates might compare and contrast the way in which art and architecture fare, but they might also see the links between them. Some consideration might be given to the reasons for these changes and developments, but the focus should always be on both art and architecture.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 42</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**38 To what extent, and why, did the English economy expand in the second half of the seventeenth century?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. There are clearly a good range of issues to be addressed here but the main thrust of the essay should be on an evaluation of extent and an explanation of it. Candidates will be expected to focus their argument on the period in the question, though there may be some comparisons with the first half of the century, and perhaps also with continental rivals. Agricultural growth and the increase in the use of enclosure might be tackled. Although there are deep regional variations, there is not the antipathy to enclosure that had been seen in earlier periods. Improvements in land and animal husbandry might also be considered and the relative prices of various commodities might be used to evaluate extent. Candidates might also consider the motivation to improve. So far as trade is concerned, the fall in the wool market but increase in trans-Atlantic trade is an issue. This in part was due to a type of deregulation and other legislation to improve trade. Candidates might use examples of the relative volumes of trade to exemplify their arguments. Changes to finance and the banking system could also be considered as well as the growth of ports such as Liverpool.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on an evaluation of extent and explanation. The range is very wide so that a balanced coverage is desirable, but quite a broad-brush approach might be taken. Nevertheless specific examples will be expected. Candidates can point to variety in terms of location and the decline of some areas of the economy compared to the growth in other areas. Some candidates might point to other more subtle examples, such as the growth in stately home building, albeit often financed on debt.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 43</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**39 'Britain's relationship with Ireland in the seventeenth century was primarily determined by a desire to preserve the Protestant Ascendancy.' Discuss.**

Candidates should:

A01 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Candidates might embrace or refute this claim; the quality of their argument will be paramount. It would be unlikely that the idea be completely rejected, but other factors such as the civil war, the ambitions of the various groups in Ireland and security should also be considered. James started well given the collapse of resistance by Tyrone, and he took an active part in the plantation of Ulster. Clearly, during Charles I's reign the issue of uniformity was important and the issue of the Presbyterian settlers also needs to be considered and the role of Wentworth, the policy of Thorough and the financial drain on the Crown. Clearly during Charles I's personal reign more is at stake than religion alone. The rebellion of 1641 is important, which has religious issues but might also be evaluated as a matter of security. There may well be a good deal of discussion over the role of Ireland during the Interregnum and particularly Cromwell's role in bringing stability to Ireland, albeit at tremendous cost. After the Restoration the expulsion of Catholic landowners and imposition of uniformity does seem to confirm the quote. This situation clearly changes under James II; after his deposition the focus is once again national security.

A02 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here the focus is on relative evaluation of a range of issues and noting that these factors change and develop over time. Candidates might argue that the aim of maintaining the Protestant Ascendancy was perhaps the cause of many of the other problems, or at the very least exacerbated them.

A03 [Not applicable to Outlines]

A04 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and especially in stronger candidates fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

<b>Page 44</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

#### **40 Did Britain experience a 'transport revolution' in the period 1689–1815?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the main transport developments of the eighteenth century. The focus will be on how extensive those changes were. Candidates will be expected to have some knowledge of developments in: canal construction, including the purpose of substantial investment in canals; the use of new technology in road construction (especially, perhaps 'tarmacadam'), the greater use of roads for long distance transport and the development, and functioning, of turnpike trusts. Candidates might also wish to discuss the development of shipping, both for long-distance, heavy-haul journeys and also for coastal transport. Some candidates may include railway development which is legitimate in an answer which should not go beyond 1815, although candidates will need to demonstrate knowledge of the earlier forms of rail development.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. In this question, good candidates will be able to sequence the main developments and be aware of the differences, for example, between the experience of road transport in 1800 as compared with 1700. In this question, the focus is on reaching a judgement about the extent of change and whether this represented a revolution. Drawing on factual material as in AO1 above, candidates might argue that the opening up of longer, and to a degree safer, transport on land and by sea does of itself constitute a 'revolution.' The argument about revolution could be buttressed by stressing the huge levels of investment in canals in the later-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. Some will argue that the 'canal revolution' was a key factor in the early phase of industrialism since it facilitated quicker and more convenient transportation of raw materials from the ports and of manufactured goods back to the ports for export. Most are likely to argue that, at the least, some aspects of transport development in this period were revolutionary. The minority who argue the opposite case might suggest that, despite the importance of developments being made, an essential element in a transport revolution – massive increases in the speed of journeys – did not make a full impact until the widespread development of steam railways. This development did not take full hold until at least the 1830s. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent analyses of the impact of developments in transport which link directly with the contribution to the overall economy.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 45</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**41 Assess the view that the contribution of women to the development of eighteenth-century British society was both distinctive and substantial.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here concerns women's roles in eighteenth-century society. Good candidates will see the importance both of identifying a range of roles and also of avoiding stereotypes. Candidates have a wide range to choose from. At the peak of society, women's role in the aristocracy was as hostess and often, as with Georgina, Duchess of Devonshire, as power broker and political confidante. In the middle ranks of society women might develop 'accomplishments' as in the visual arts, as singers or performers on musical instruments, especially harpsichord and fortepiano. Some were business partners for their husbands. Some performed a wide range of charitable functions. Lower down the social scale, women played a vital role in domestic manufactures. In the burgeoning textile industry, working-class women found new opportunities in textile factories. Candidates might recognise the family as an economic unit in which all played a distinctive role. Additionally, women often took the lead in managing scarce resources. In the growing towns, also, unmarried young women found ready employment as domestic servants, although avenues for promotion were few.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on a presented view of women's role. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Many candidates will interpret 'distinctive' as giving them an opportunity to discuss whether women's roles were indeed separately identified and discharged. Especially among the propertied, distinctively gendered roles were the norm rather than the exception. Few candidates are likely to challenge the view that women's economic and social roles were substantial, whether as contributors to a basic domestic economy in working-class families, or as domestic managers, or hostesses, for example, at weekend gatherings in great houses as aristocratic wives. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates will be aware of the substantial recent literature which has argued that women's roles were significant even in areas previously considered to be exclusively male preserves, such as political activities.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

<b>Page 46</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>12</b>

**42 To what extent, and why, did intellectual life flourish in eighteenth century England and Scotland?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme here is intellectual life in eighteenth-century England and Scotland. The focus here is likely to be on the impact of the Enlightenment in the two countries. Candidates are likely to argue that intellectual life flourished distinctively in Scotland with its allegedly more extensive and superior educational system and easier route into higher education for a large proportion of the Scottish population. Some candidates might note the larger number of universities and earlier adoption of 'new' subjects such as economics and applied sciences in Scottish universities. However, intellectual life and practical business accomplishments were found in England also. The Lunar Society in Birmingham acted as a magnet for business and professional people to discuss politics, economics and, increasingly, the state of society during a period of accelerating change. In both countries, the Enlightenment was making a substantial impact by the end of the century.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement on the reasons for, and the impact of, changes in learning. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Most candidates are likely to argue that it flourished to a considerable extent, with emphasis on 'new' learning in subjects such as politics and economics. The emphasis was on questioning assumptions on the basis of investigation and research and on applying the results of such investigations to addressing practical problems – such as how things worked, how to address problems of scarce resources etc. Candidates are likely to stress the role of enlightenment thinking but some might wish to argue that the nurturing of intellectual life, research and enquiry was a much more pronounced feature of middle-class existence than lower down the social scale. Some good candidates will take up the clear hint offered by the phrasing of the question to distinguish between the kinds of 'intellectual life' stressed in Scotland in at least partial contrast to England. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance answers, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, however, some candidates may be aware of ongoing debates about enlightenment thinking in this period. Has the 'smile of reason' in Britain been exaggerated or otherwise distorted by excessive concentration on the influence of Smith and the French philosophers?

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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