

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

9769 HISTORY

9769/22

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

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

Mark schemes 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.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

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

Introduction

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

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

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

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Band 1: 25–30

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

Band 2: 19–24

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

Band 3: 13–18

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

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Band 4: 7–12

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

Band 5: 0–6

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

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 1: c. 1378–c.1461

1 'Overall, the conciliar movement must be deemed a failure.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts of the conciliar movement should not score highly. There should be awareness of what the conciliar movement involved, and also knowledge of some of the principal sessions such as Pisa, Constance, Siena and Basle. The schism was finally healed, but the nationalistic 'divisions' remained, as did many of the failings of the papacy. A list of what the causes of the Reformation were is not looked for.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some analysis of the concept of 'failure' in this context is called for, and candidates who really develop this line of thought deserve reward. There is a case to be made each way. The institution did survive, and while it did face up to the challenge of Hus – eventually – it was not in a strong position to face that of Luther. Expect a balanced analysis and completely one sided responses, however well argued, should not be over-rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

2 Why did Burgundy play such a central role in the politics and diplomacy of this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A range of factors should be considered. Possible ones are the cohesion and wealth of the region, the relationship with England, the competence of rulers – they tended to be good politicians – the acquisitions and the problems facing the French such as Agincourt.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Identification of a central reason is one approach, provided there are good cases made and clear indication of why it is the most important. An 'internal versus external factors' argument is equally acceptable, but hopefully it should have a clear focus one way or the other. Some thinking about how 'central' a role Burgundy had, is fine, but candidates who try and adapt this sort of question to their own ends and argue that it did not, should not get far. Prioritising the reasoning is expected, and this will lift it from the narrative.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

3 Discuss the view that weak and divided opponents provide the main explanation for the rapid expansion of the Ottoman Empire in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A case can be made both ways, ranging on one side with Greek disunity, the reluctance of any really to support determined opponents of the Turks such as the Serbs, to the divisions on Byzantium just before the fall of Constantinople, to the military skills, methods of rule, tolerance and efficiency on the other.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be balance, as a reasoned case can be made both ways. There should not be just a list of reasons, but those who prioritise their reasoning and make a strong case for one or two key points deserve some credit. There is a case for arguing they had an easy ride given the lack of a coherent opposition, but the better argument will almost certainly have a focus on the range of 'plus' points on the Ottoman side.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

4 How far were the problems facing the Valois monarchy in France during this period self-inflicted?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There should be identification of problems, which range from the military, relations with Burgundy and England to the financial. Charles V had a limited inheritance, but there was real competence there – but an early death was not his fault! Charles VI obviously had many failings, ranging from his dealings with Burgundy, the English and the disaster of 1420. A case could be made each way with Charles VII, with his treatment of the Maid on one side and the gradual assertion of monarchical power in the latter part of his reign.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be a good analysis of the problems facing the Valois monarchs in this period, ideally with an overview of the period as a whole, and then a closer examination of the work of the three key individuals. A clear generalised answer to the 'how far' is not easy, so answers which keep the focus on individuals are fine. 'Self-inflicted' should not cause any problems, so there is no reason why there should not be a clear case each way.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

5 What best explains the growth and development of Muscovy in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The reasons are partly internal, with the work of individual rulers, and successes like Kulikovo. Starting from their role as collectors of tribute for the Tartars, the rulers asserted dominance over the other minor states they were to absorb. Primogeniture played a part, as did weakness and distraction of opponents, good military skills and judicious marriages. The centring of the Orthodox Church in Moscow was another useful factor.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Evaluation is looking for a clear weighing up of reasons and there should also be identification of which are the main reasons and why. The list of factors ending with the 'thus therefore we can see that...' approach should not score highly unless the final analysis is very perceptive and actually fits in with drift of the description.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 2: c. 1461–c.1516

6 To what extent were the Italian city states similar in both structure and achievements?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Quite a complex question, and several of the 'heavies' such as Florence, Milan, Venice, Verona etc should be covered. A broadly thematic approach is looked for, following the points suggested in the title. Achievements should be interpreted broadly as well; more than just 'renaissance' factors are looked for. Do not insist on keeping within the narrow timescale of the suggested period.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There should be a clear answer to 'extent', and good reasons given for both agreeing and disagreeing with the suggested thesis. Don't expect a particular structure to the answer, candidates may wish to deal with both factors together, and there is no reason why this should be any more successful than if they treat them separately. Both should be dealt with, and ideally there should be about 50:50 coverage, but if it goes to 80:20 and the former is very good, then there is no reason why they should not do well.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

7 'Just another ruler of an Italian state.' Discuss this view of the post-conciliar Popes.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The role of the papacy within Italy as well as outside it, and also the broader spiritual role and involvement in 'politics' outside Italy could be covered, as well as factors such as the patrons of art and architecture. Issues such as ignoring the needs of wider reform and failing to learn the lessons of Hus and the Lollards could also be raised.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Quite a challenging question which needs to look broadly at the work and attainment of the papacy both within and outside of Italy. Getting over a clear picture of what the papacy did, or failed to do in the period, is looked for. The 'just another' offers tremendous scope and candidates who make a real attempt to consider the implications of the phrase should be rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

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

8 How successfully can it be argued that Maximilian I's greatest achievements lay in Germany?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Mere survival could be argued to be an achievement, but there are also a large range of other factors which could be considered, ranging from economic, religious, and social to political ones. The strength of the monarchy? The Turks? Italy? France? Taxation?

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. A good overview of the nature and extent of his achievements is looked for. What he attained inside Germany needs to be balanced against what he attained outside, and it could be looked at both in the long and the short term. Any candidate who demonstrates they have thought carefully about what might constitute an 'achievement' in this context should be rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

9 'Profoundly conservative rulers.' Discuss this view of Ferdinand and Isabella.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The union itself, the idea of a federal monarchy could be seen as contrary to this view, while the joint rulership had huge implications for the Spanish monarchy. Other factors which could be considered range from the administration of the Indies, the retention of local autonomies, Granada, the treatment of Moslems to their views on the role of religion and the administration of their country.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Clearly some thinking about 'conservative' is called for, and the better candidates will debate/define this term with some care. A baseline definition and a reasoned answer, preferably with good reasons why the contrary view is wrong, are called for. This is quite a challenging question, and any candidate who shows evidence of careful thinking about 'conservative' in this context should be highly rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 14	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

10 Did Ivan III achieve more inside Muscovy than outside it?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Be prepared to interpret 'inside' and 'outside' fairly tolerantly, as several areas could conceivably apply to both. Factors such as the claim to be the founder of the Russian state, acquisition of Novgorod, defeat of the Tartars, Kiev, what happened in Poland and Lithuania as well as his attainment as far as the monarchy itself is concerned.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. A retrospective overview of the reign is looked for, with clear weighing up of the evidence each way. There could well be the argument that he attained more in the short term in one respect, but more in the longer term in another. There is ample scope for good analysis here. Any candidate who shows signs of thinking carefully about 'achievement' in this context should be highly rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 15	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 3: c.1516–c.1559

11 Evaluate the respective contributions of Zwingli and Calvin to the evolution of the Protestant Reformation.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Expect a good level of knowledge of the work of both men. The Luther/Zwingli debates could be relevant, as well as Zwingli's key role in the development of Protestantism in Switzerland. His leadership there, his administrative work, and also his criticism of many catholic practices such as image worship and the focus on hierarchy. His theology should also be considered. Calvin's work should be better known, and expect detailed knowledge of his work as a writer, polemicist, theologian, 'spreader' into France, the Low Countries, Scotland etc, administrator, and founder of a theocracy. The list is enormous. Ideally treatment should be 50:50, but given the tendency to bypass Zwingli pretty quickly, 70:30 is just about acceptable-but no more.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The key word here is 'evaluate'. Candidates are expected to weigh up the respective contributions and keep the focus on 'evolution'. Those who simply list the work of both men, and go for the 'thus therefore we can see that....' should not do well. While it could easily be argued that Calvin was a more significant, and better known, figure, Zwingli's contribution to the evolution was vital in its own way. The key to the really high marks must lie with ample evidence that they have really tried to weigh up the overall contributions of both men-and then compared them. It is quite a challenge, but then it is more predictable than most.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 16	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

12 'A period of limited achievement.' Discuss this view of Charles V's reign as Holy Roman Emperor.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The focus should be on his work as HRE, although inevitably given the relationship between it and other aspects of his rule, there may be justifiable overlap. Religious disputes, both reformation and counter reformation are involved, as his relationship with the papacy. Other factors might be the administration of his inheritance, his economic policy (or possibly lack of?) and his dealings with the Turks. The failure of the imperial idea is central, but perhaps his policies towards France, Spain and the Netherlands less so. Germany should be covered, the conflicts, Schmalkaldic League, Muhlberg and possibly Augsburg and Cateau Cambresis.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The focus should be on the 'big picture' of his work as HRE. The more reflection/overview the better. Candidates who consider what actually was possible given the nature and range of his problems should do well. Should just holding it all together be seen as an achievement?

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 17	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

13 'While little was achieved outside France, much was achieved inside France.' Discuss this view of the reigns of Francis I and Henry II.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Externally the focus will be on the Italian wars and the growth in size as a result of conflicts with England and Charles V, with possibly the cost of the wars and the impact of that cost on the monarchy and France generally. Internally there is ample scope. The development of trade and industry, the increasing unity of France, the growing strength of the monarchy could all be seen as achievements, but the role of the Parlements and the growth of Protestantism could lead to some balance there.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is scope for debating and challenging both parts of the question, and the better candidates should evaluate the results of French foreign policy carefully. Can it all be seen as simply harmful? The focus of the essay should be on internal achievements, and there is ample scope there and candidates who think carefully what a 'real' achievement might be should be rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 18	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

14 To what extent were the government and organisation of the Ottoman Empire the key factors behind its success?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The range of possible points to be considered is large. The two factors mentioned in the title need developing, but so also do many other 'internal' factors such as the quality of the rulers, the skills of the soldiers and sailors, the methods of ruling subject peoples, their attitude to commerce etc. Obvious 'external' factors such as utilising the poor relationship between France and Spain/HRE, papal failings, the distractions of Lutheranism and the Low countries should be dealt with as well. This is a well known topic so thorough coverage of a good range of 'factors' is looked for.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The key word here is 'extent' and candidates should analyse carefully what they feel should be seen as the most important factors behind the successes of the empire. Those who think about 'successes' carefully should be rewarded; the question is not just about the expansion of the empire and a genuinely reflective approach is looked for. The approach should be primarily analytical and some serious thinking about what was the 'key' factor and why and why it was more important than others should be there for the highest marks.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 19	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

15 'A competent administrator, but little else.' Discuss this view of Ivan IV of Russia.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. His inheritance should be covered, as there was considerable 'recovery' from that. His management of the Chosen Council etc. There is a fair amount which could be considered in the case 'against', such as his management of the boyars, serious administrative changes, the massive expansion, the rise of the service gentry, changes in local government and legal codes. The special courts and the role of terror and the oprichnika are also possibly the work of some more than a competent administrator. The great expansion into the Lower Volga, his dealings with the Crimean Tatars etc. The dire internal legacy might be seen as a case 'against'.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some thinking about what a 'competent administrator' might amount to is looked for. Political skills as well as claims to statesmanship qualities might be considered as well as signs of any vision. His work needs to be analysed carefully and there should be a balanced case each way.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 20	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 4: c.1559–c.1610

16 How successfully did Philip II govern Spain?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A large number of areas might be considered ranging from his personal rule, his religious policies, the preservation of his inheritance, fiscal policy/bankruptcies, the role of the aristocracy and factionalism, Aragon and Castile to the Moriscos. The focus should be on government and there should be breadth as well as depth to good answers.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Consideration of what constitutes 'successful governance' is important and note that the focus of the analysis should be on Spain and internal factors. There should be balance there and candidates who look at the implications of his rule in the longer term as well as the short term should be rewarded. A candidate, who genuinely adopts a reflective approach, thinks about success and gets over some idea of a 'big picture' should be rewarded highly.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 21	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

17 To what extent was the weakness of the monarchy the principal cause of the civil wars in France between 1559 and 1598?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a large range of other factors which might be considered here. They range from socio/economic factors, issues such as inflation and peasant poverty and revolts. Obviously religion, autocracy, the problem of the over mighty subject etc. should be there. The various political crises, the minorities, faction fighting as well as the roles of individuals such as Marie, Conde, Coligny and the Guise's. St Bartholomew's ought to be there, as well as foreign intervention.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The weakness of the monarchy needs to be balanced against the many other factors. It could be argued also that incompetence was as much a factor as weakness. There does not have to be a focus just on the outbreak, and candidates might well argue that different factors rose and fell in importance as the wars progressed. There is no need to focus just on 1559.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

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

18 Assess the significance of the Baltic region to the economy of Europe in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The main focus should be on the work and impact of the Hanseatic ports; amongst other factors they were great carriers and their approach to business had a wide impact. The Steelyard in London, for example. Fish, iron and copper all played a role in their impact, and they were the great carriers for the Russian overseas trade. The growth of the Muscovy Company, for example, was 'Baltic' inspired.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Significance should not be seen as just another way of considering importance. Clearly candidates who are able to fit the Baltic region into wider economic developments for the rest of Europe should do well. The focus should very much be on the Baltic's impact on Europe in the period and not on just changes and developments in the Baltic itself.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 23	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

19 'The real credit for the recovery of France after 1598 must go to Henry IV.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A variety of points could be put forward stressing his role, such as his personality, flexibility, military and administrative competence, awareness of France's problems and possible solutions. However there are other factors which could be considered such as the work of ministers like Sully, the willingness of the other 'side' to compromise, near terminal exhaustion and the natural resilience of the country itself.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Expect a reasoned case each way. The focus might well be on Henry himself, but his contribution needs to be weighed up carefully against other factors. Those who think carefully about the 'real credit' element should be rewarded, as should those who considered longer term structural factors.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 24	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

20 What best explains the 'Time of Troubles' in Russia?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The legacy of Ivan is central to this. The tradition of autocracy, the overdependence of the regime on the personality of the Tsar is an obvious point. There was a disputed succession, warring palace and boyar factions as internal factors, and the intervention of the Poles, Swedes, and Cossacks did not help either. There are socio economic factors to consider, ranging from serfdom to hunger (c. 2.5 million dead?) and depopulation. Issues such as the conflict between the nobility, the service gentry and the clergy are also relevant.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The better answers should examine variety of causes for the Troubles and make out a balanced case, arguing that one or more were primarily responsible and ideally giving reasons why others were less important.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 25	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 5: Themes c.1378–c.1610

21 'The pre-reformation church was in need of fundamental reform.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The range of factors which could be examined in this context is considerable such as the increasing secularisation of the church and papacy; it had become a highly politicised and wealthy organisation. The papacy had become too much of a factor in Italian politics, and there were all the issues surrounding nepotism and corruption. The curia/college of cardinals might also be considered, as could all the issues arising out of the Schism and the conciliar movement.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are two issues requiring debate, the first is 'extent' and there should be comment on the degree of need, and there should also be consideration of the word 'fundamental'. There could be an argument that the 'fundamentals' were sound enough, and it was just minor/peripheral issues which needed change. It is consideration of the word 'fundamental' that should separate the good from the very good.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 26	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

22 Is 'renaissance' the most appropriate term for the artistic and cultural developments in Italy in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There is a huge range of 'possibles' here. Candidates might go for breadth or depth and there is merit in both approaches. The better candidates should separate 'artistic' from 'cultural' and there should be sound knowledge of both for the higher marks.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The debate is well known, and there should be a sound review of the cultural/intellectual/artistic history of Italy. There is a strong case for the 'cultural rebirth', and the 'renew' and also the views of many contemporaries to be considered. There is also the 'continuity' argument, but there is also the case for stressing much that was very novel. Was there a strong Greek influence? How great an impact did the 'roman' tradition have?

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 27	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

23 To what extent were the later Middle Ages a period of substantial social change?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Breadth is more important here than depth, and it is not an issue if candidate have knowledge of specific countries rather than Europe as a whole. Expect coverage of factors such as class, family, role of women, marriage age (see demographic factors as relevant). Social mobility could well be a factor in some countries.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There should be an answer to the issue of 'extent'. The degree to which there was, or was not, social change should be analysed. It is not a problem if it is argued that there was in some areas, but not in others. The focus should be on 'social' factors, but be tolerant towards factors, such as economic, which could be seen to be encroaching on the social.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 28	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

24 How convincing is the case for a 'military revolution' in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Expect good coverage of both 'land' and 'sea'. Expect also coverage of strategy, tactics, command, weaponry, application of science, ship structure etc.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Expect a balanced case each way, but the majority will probably favour the case 'for'. The better ones will keep the focus on the strength of the case, the 'convincing' part, and also consider what might, or might not, amount to a 'revolution' in this context.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 29	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

25 How far had the early Portuguese and Spanish explorers fulfilled their aims by the middle of the sixteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a variety of possible aims, ranging from curiosity, adventure, territorial acquisition, and the evangelical/crusading ideal, gaining a Christian ally in Africa (Portugal), acquisition of geographical knowledge, the spice trade, loot, the sea route to India and its markets, settlement, slavery and simply stopping someone else getting it. Spain of course had differing aims from Portugal at times; Cortes was very different from da Gama. There should be coverage of both and awareness that they had different aspirations, as well as some common ground.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The 'how far' aspect needs to be very carefully considered. It may well be that some of the aims were successful, while others less so. The best will probably adopt a fairly systematic approach, treating both Spanish and Portuguese separately, giving a clear picture of 'extent' in every case.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 30	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

26 'Inflation was the most important economic change in the sixteenth century.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a variety of other candidates for consideration, such as the decline of feudalism, the rise of capitalism, changes in banking and finance, commerce and trade, overseas empires, population changes and urbanisation.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Obviously there is a good case to be made for it, but there does need to be some balance there and consideration of several other factors. Candidates who simply argue that it was and give a list of reasons should not get far. There should be a focus on the 'economic' and a drift to the social is unlikely to be helpful, but there is scope for some overlap.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 31	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 6: c.1610–c.1660

27 How far did France benefit from the administrations of Richelieu and Mazarin?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a large number of possible avenues here for the candidate. There are many factors in Richelieu's career which can be considered as benefits, or otherwise, ranging from ecclesiastical and administrative reform, Intendants and Parlements, Huguenots and the nobility, to his foreign policy and his work for the monarchy. Mazarin is less easy, but Westphalia and the Frondes should be examined, and his contribution to the establishment of a great reign.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Careful thinking about what a 'benefit' might be needs rewarding, and candidates should also be rewarded if they look at the long term implications for France. Ideally the two should be treated separately, and the 'how far' element dealt with analytically.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 32	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

28 To what extent was Sweden ‘an overstretched and artificial empire’ in 1660?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The details about Sweden’s resources are well known, both in terms of money, manpower and economics. There should be precision about the nature and extent of the empire gained, which had to be held, as well as the enmities with nations such as Poland and Denmark, which were left simmering. The point about the French subsidy and its importance could also be made.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be careful thought about both ‘overstretched’ and ‘artificial’, and the better candidates should debate both terms and treat them separately. There should also be a clear answer to the ‘extent’ issue as well, with no ‘quite alot’ being accepted as a satisfactory answer.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 33	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

29 What best explains why the Thirty Years War lasted for 30 years?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There is ample scope here. The reluctance to compromise is central, as are the staggering complexity and interrelationship of so many conflicting issues – dynastic, religious, political, and territorial – to name but some. Foreign involvement was of course a major factor, with countries like Sweden, France and the Netherlands bringing their own agendas and ambitions to the conflict. There was the absence also of decisive factors as well as the role of men like Richelieu, Wallenstein and Gustavus Adolphus.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There are a large number of different 'cases' that could be argued. The best will identify a couple of primary factors and develop them, while at the same time considering why other possibilities are of less importance. Ideally a single point should not be overemphasised.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 34	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

30 'A remarkable achievement in the circumstances.' Discuss this view of the Treaty of Westphalia.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The terms and the circumstances should be well known and there should be coverage of the implications for all the major players. There should be more than just 'who gained what' with examination of issues like tolerance and national sovereignty. There should be some idea of the 'circumstances' for the separate participants.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is plenty to debate here. It could be argued that given the longevity of the conflict any settlement might be accepted. Some have argued that it merely confirmed long-term trends. Clear thinking about how 'remarkable' it was (or was not) and matching it to the 'circumstances' should be rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 35	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

31 How is the economic and commercial success of the Dutch republic in this period best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There should be coverage of both economics and commerce. The fact that the competition was at war may have helped. They seized lots of opportunities, especially with Portugal and Spain. Resources use, fish, shipbuilders and great carriers are all factors. Adventurers, traders, wise investors, factors and middlemen also. Sensible government which was conscious of the interests of trade, low interest rates, and open society are also possible.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Prioritisation of reasons is important. Candidates who separate both parts and identify different reasons should be rewarded. There may well be different factors to be analysed for the two different parts of the question, but it is not unreasonable to link the two closely.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 36	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 7: c.1660–c.1715

32 'Frederick William, the Great Elector, achieved more at home than abroad.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. On the domestic front issues such as his poor inheritance, impact of war, diet management, nobles and serfs, taxes, Huguenots and the civil service are all possible. Foreign affairs, his dealings with Sweden and the Habsburgs, Westphalia, Poland, the war of the North and Cleves are all possible.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be an obvious weighing up of the achievements, pointing out the merits and demerits of both. Probably the domestic should win? It is arguable. A possible debate might be over the short and long term nature of the achievements.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 37	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

33 'Without his ministers, Louis XIV would have achieved little.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Much more than a simple list of Louis' achievements is looked for. There needs to be a survey of what Louis' unique contribution was to the attainments in his reign as well as a picture of what ministers (and generals) contributed to the totality. There is no prescribed list of Ministers, but omission of Colbert would be unlikely to get the highest marks. The other possibilities range from Mazarin onwards.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The real skill here is looking at the reign as a whole and considering how important the ministers were to the success of the reign. The focus is always so much on the King. How much could have he done without Colbert? Those who really try and work out what Louis himself personally added to it all deserve much credit.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 38	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

34 How valid is the claim that the greatest achievements of Peter the Great lie in his expansionist foreign policy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. After the disastrous start against Sweden, there are gains in foreign policy on the Black Sea, Caspian and the Baltic. On the domestic front, the work on the army and navy post Azov, his overall vision for Russia, Westernisation, and the table of ranks, general work on government, administration, taxation, the capital and the church could be considered.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is lots to debate here. One argument might be that little of what he did internally really lasted, it was all superficial, and the direction he pointed Russia in was his real legacy. There needs to be a focus on the greatest achievements for the highest marks, as well as evidence that the nature and extent of those achievements was really thought about.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 39	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

35 'For much of the time it was a grim struggle for survival.' Discuss this view of the Dutch republic in this period.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There is much evidence for the 'grim' bit. The Anglo-Dutch wars, the fall of De Witt, the depression of the 1660s, and the hostile attitude of Colbert and the English, and the advances of Louis XIV. However the Dutch did lead successful coalitions against Louis, and there was still great progress on the domestic front in terms of economics and commerce.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The resilience and progress needs to be contrasted with the external and internal pressures. How much of a 'struggle' it was needs to be considered, as does the 'for much of the time'. Both could be challenged, but with some difficulty. The highest marks should go to those who are able to keep the 'overview' in mind while arguing a clear case.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 40	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

**36 'The primary cause of the War of the Spanish Succession was the ambition of Louis XIV.'
Do you agree?**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a variety of issues which could be considered, in addition to Louis himself. The English/Dutch attitude, trade and colonies, and there are possible economic factors as well. The will of Charles should also be considered. Broader factors such as tradition, militarism and the universal desire for prestige could also be covered.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The 'primary' element could be argued, but there would have to be good reasons. The word 'ambition' could also be debated. There were other factors, and they need to be considered and prioritised. There are lots of different views which could be argued, and there might be some who differentiate between the short term as well as the longer term causes.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 41	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 8: c.1715–c.1774

37 'An age of reform.' How valid is this view of France under Orleans and Fleury?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. What happened under the regency could be seen as superficial concessions only, lacking principle and vision. What happened could be seen primarily as political expediency with no real change. Better case could be made for Fleury. Still traditional and conservative? Peace and solvency mainly. Little done on Parlements or church.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. A case could be made, but only a thin one. An overview of the reign is looked for, with the likely answer being 'to a limited extent'. Those who reflect on what might or might not constitute an 'age of reform' and then match it up with what actually happened in the period should do well.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 42	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

38 Can Frederick II of Prussia reasonably be called 'an enlightened despot'?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. A case in favour can be made, the contrast between the writer, thinker, and architect with his focus on duty before rights, education, legal codification and a freer press. Yet on the other hand he was a brutal militarist. A sensible definition of the term is called for as well.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be thinking about 'enlightened despotism' and hopefully a good definition in this context. There needs to be a balanced argument each way. Candidates should consider what is 'reasonable' and also show awareness that they need to judge things by eighteenth and not twenty-first century standards.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 43	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

39 'Essentially a conflict over colonies.' Discuss this view of the Seven Years War.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a variety of causes which might be considered, such as just another part of the ongoing struggle between France and Britain over empire and trade. However, there are a lot of other factors which might be brought in; Prussia and its struggle for growth/survival being an obvious one. Austria was out for Silesia and was anxious to reduce the power of its growing neighbour. Russia and Sweden also had plans which widened the conflict and there were French ambitions on the Rhine and in the Austrian Netherlands. Colonies and commerce played a part, but they were not the only causes by a long way. Hanover was an issue for the British and the whole balance of power/diplomatic revolution issue might be brought in.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and different interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. The role of colonies and commerce should be covered and balanced against the wide variety of 'other factors'. A balanced case is looked for, and if there is a strong argument in favour of the proposition, then there needs to be real awareness of why the 'other factors' are of less importance.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 44	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

40 'It was a period of continuous decline, in spite of heroic efforts to prevent it.' How justified is this view of Spain in this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The dominant influence of the church remained in education etc. There were defeats, revolts, commercial failure etc. Yet look at the work of Orry and Amelot, Alberoni and Ripperda. Perhaps limited and piecemeal reform in the 1750s? Charles III and some good ministers such as Squillace.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There needs to be debate on the issue of 'heroic', and whether the efforts actually amounted to much. 'Continuous' also needs to be looked at, and just accepting the thesis is a very simplistic approach. Those who think carefully about 'decline' and consider what it implies should do well.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 45	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

41 'The reign of Louis XV demonstrated all of the bad features, and none of the good ones, of the ancien régime.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Women and hunting dominated his life. Factionalism dominated the court and the ancien régime continued. The absence of any real religious, social or economic policy might also be stressed. Foreign policy remained depressingly the same. The range of possible 'features' of the ancien régime is considerable and there should be consideration of issues ranging from taxation to social rigidity. The 'good ones' offers more scope to the very able, but areas which could be considered range from the artistic/cultural/architectural through to the grandiose and expansionist.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Careful thought about what might be the bad/good features of the ancien régime will obviously gain credit, as will consideration of the 'all' aspect of the title. What is really being looked for is the ability to view the reign as a whole and consider it in the light of the question.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 46	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 9: c.1774–c.1815

42 How 'great' was Catherine the Great?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There is ample scope here. The initial insecurity was overcome. The work in education, the legislative commission, institutional reform, government generally and her foreign policy all merit consideration, as do Pugachev and the costs of the wars.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There should be consideration of 'greatness' for the really high marks, some reasoned definition is needed as a baseline to start from. There needs to be a real debate about what she achieved. Other 'greats' might be considered for comparison, both within and outside Russia, and a long as well as a short term view could be taken, or both.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 47	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

43 'The partitions of Poland can be best explained by simple geographical factors.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There are a lot of 'other factors' which have to be considered, ranging from the lack of allies, anarchic internal tendencies, a poor economy, Prussian duplicity, greed, Russian loathing and Austria's devious policies. Some awareness of the lack of any good barriers would help also. There should also be evidence that this is about partitions, and that reasons behind the different ones might vary.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. They need to rise above a simple list of factors. Geographical factors need to be balanced against others, and prioritisation with valid reasons needs to be present. The best should consider the role of 'geography' and in each case, Poland was very easy to march into, and contrast it with other factors.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 48	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

44 Discuss the view that the Enlightenment played an insignificant part in causing the French Revolution.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The simple list of causes will need to be looked at carefully for relevance. What is expected is a good coverage of the possible links between the ideas of the enlightenment (and there should be some coverage of those ideas as well) and events/individuals. Obviously other causative factors need to be considered and expect to see examination of the usual long, medium and short term causes.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. What is looked for here is a good broad picture of what role, if any, the enlightenment played in the causes (and not the course) of the Revolution. Careful analysis of the part that it did play is expected, and then a case should be made out justifying the answer and contrasting the role of the Enlightenment with other factors.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 49	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

45 What best explains the political instability of France between 1793 and 1799?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There needs of course to be a good range of reasons. Factors which could be considered range from the background of war, ambitious personalities, terror, lack of consensus, massive social-economic-administrative-political changes being imposed on a system which had undergone such a radical change as the execution of the king and the termination of a long-established dynastic system.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should rise well above a simple list of reasons. There needs to be identification of one or more central factors and then the building of a well reasoned and argued case for it. There needs to be prioritisation and a clear answer. Hopefully there will be a good focus as well as definition of 'political instability'.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 50	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

46 'Napoleon was not a great general, just a lucky one.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Lots of scope here. The issue of 'war became of itself an affair of the people' might be covered. There were great changes in the size of his armies, the scale of his operations and the nature of his objectives, while on the other hand, tactics and techniques did not change a great deal. His mass conscription, careers open to talent, training based on national characteristics and the focus on morale might be part of a case for 'greatness', as was his ability to move large armies at speed and his foresight in separating his enemies and placing his troops, decision making at critical moments and the 'blitzkrieg' methods of Ulm, Jena and Austerlitz. However, Russia, Waterloo, the absence of much of a staff, too personalised and a tendency to get bogged down in detail might form a case 'against'.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Some thinking about 'great' and 'lucky' is called for, what might be the mark of a 'great' general and the extent to which one can make one's own 'luck'. With some definitions to work from, then expect a sound case each way on both parts of the question. Although he could be fortunate in his opponents at times, and their archaic methods, what he attained over a long period of time, and so often, was indicative of perhaps a lot more than luck.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 51	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

Section 10: Themes c.1610–c.1815

47 Did the scientific achievements of the seventeenth century amount to a revolution?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There is much which could be covered. Most cases should be based on the work of men such as Newton, Descartes, Huygens, Kepler, Boyle and the work of the Royal Society. There is no need to insist on massive depth, provided there is real breadth of knowledge.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. A definition should be expected and some pretty clear thinking about what is, or is not, a genuine scientific revolution. The focus could well be on what the work of the 17th century greats led to, as well on what they actually attained. One approach might be to examine the work of individuals and to see whether they amount in total to a revolution; another, equally valid approach might be to argue a broader case each way referring to a wide range of examples in the process and coming to a concise conclusion.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 52	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

48 Assess the impact of both slavery and the slave trade on the economies of Europe.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The likely countries to be covered might be the UK and Africa and the West Indies and the growth of companies, the growth of cities such as Bristol and Liverpool and the impact on the Lancashire cotton trade. The Dutch, Portuguese and Spain should also feature in answers and the impact that the institution and the trade had on their economies. The fact that it led to wars and commercial/colonial rivalry could also be stressed. The better ones will clearly differentiate between the institution and the trade itself.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should rise about the list and clearly separate the institution and the trade. There could be different factors affecting different countries, as well as the economy of Europe as a whole. There is great scope here for analysis and be prepared to reward highly those who view the impact in perspective.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 53	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

49 How 'absolute' were absolutist monarchs in seventeenth-century Europe?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. There should be evidence of a real attempt at definition here in the context of the 17th century. It might also be stressed that monarchs themselves tended not to be too bothered about theory and more concerned with issues like security and solvency. There are plenty of examples of the ruled defending their rights and liberties and getting away with it, and of monarchs compromising their 'power' in order to attain needed objectives. The general trend was towards centralisation, in economics as well as political/constitutional areas. There are examples, such as France, where the monarch had legislative sovereignty, but often had to compromise over issues such as noble privileges. The growth of social contract ideas might also be stressed, with the work of Hobbes, Grotius, Spinoza, Locke and Bossuet being covered. The range of examples could go from Louis XIV to Frederick the Great, Charles XII of Sweden and Charles II of Spain.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. A good grasp of the whole issue of absolutism is looked for, with a sensible definition in the context of the 17th century and a balanced case each way.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 54	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

50 'Essentially static.' Discuss this view of European cultural life in the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Interpret 'culture' broadly. The possible areas to cover range from architecture, drama, journalism, literature, painting and sculpture, music, the 'enlightenment'- which might cover philosophy and politics – to satire and the growth of national academies for the promotion of the arts. There should ideally be coverage of several of the above, and a candidate who just has knowledge of one area, such as painting or literature, would have to be really impressive to do well.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. There is a case to be made each way, increasingly the consensus is towards a 'no' answer when it comes to the latter part of the century.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 55	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

51 To what extent did the reasons for overseas colonisation change in the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. The focus should be on the various motives for colonisation and the development of existing colonies. The role that colonies and colonial trade played in national economies did change significantly in the period. The impact that the entrepot/carrying trade had on the Dutch was well noted by the British and the French. The awareness of the need to extract maximum profit from and share of the new colonial trade was growing. There was a massive expansion of overseas commerce and this generated wealth and employment and taxes. Industrialisation in the UK led to a real focus on export markets and sources of raw materials. There was also the wide growth of mercantilist ideas and a merchant class. Other factors may have played a part, such as preventing others from acquiring territory in order to defend one's own. Slavery and national prestige are also factors which might be considered.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. 'Extent' is the key word here, requiring a good analysis of reasons both at the beginning and the end of the century so any candidate who makes a genuine attempt at a synoptic overview, and does not just list events in specific counties, should be rewarded.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 56	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	22

52 'A period of limited economic development.' Discuss this view of continental Europe in the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to a question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narrative accounts should not score highly. Lots of factors could be considered. There were many changes in commerce, industry, regulation, finance, agriculture and economic theory. It depends on whether there is a focus on one area, or a very broad picture is viewed. There is ample evidence of population growth, which acted, for example in France, as a stimulus for changes in food production methods and enclosures. Yet on the other hand in France, given its huge potential, there was little overall development and the corvee/taille etc remained as significant barriers to change. There was little change in Austria for example, the odd glimmer on issues like serfdom, but little else. Industry and trade shows little change, with the isolated exception like Barcelona, while cities like Lyons actually declined seriously as a result of what was happening in the UK. By and large the answer is 'yes'.

AO2 – is able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance and factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Again, a question where the candidate with a good idea of the 'big picture' should be rewarded. There could be a fundamental/superficial argument, as well as differing views of what should come under the umbrella of 'economic'.

AO3 [Not applicable to Outlines]

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