

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/12

Paper 1b (British History Outlines, 1399–1815),
maximum raw mark 90

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

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

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Band 1: 25–30

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

Band 2: 19–24

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

Band 3: 13–18

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

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Section 1:1399–1461

1 'Henry IV was ineffective as a monarch because of the circumstances of his accession.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Whilst the circumstances of his accession are highlighted in the question, answers must range across the whole period of Henry IV's reign. Chronological narratives will not score well. Topics that could well be included are: the nature of the usurpation and Henry's reputation as a usurper; the circumstances of Richard II's death and continued support for his cause and the nature and causes of rebellion. These factors which might be seen as consequent of his usurpation may well be weighed against other problems which were either inherited from Richard, such as finance, or developed during the reign. Other factors that could be included are: relations with France and Scotland; Lollardy; Wales and the Marches; rival claims to the throne and the King's declining health.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the relative importance of the factors outlined above and how they might link to each other and how the nature of his inheritance impacts on developing problems during the reign. Some candidates might well point to the fact that after some initial problems England was peaceful for several years, which might suggest that the later problems were not caused by the usurpation. Candidates might also reflect on the fact that Henry was able to handle most of these problems well.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

2 To what extent have Henry V's abilities as king been over-estimated?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative of the reign of Henry V will not be rewarded well; there should also be a consideration of all the aspects of Henry as a King. Answers which concentrate wholly on Henry as a military commander will not do well. Generally Henry V has been seen as a very able and successful King, but some criticisms more recently have suggested that he was not without fault. Henry's abilities as a military commander are well rehearsed, although his successes were not foregone conclusions and did involve the kingdom in huge expense. It was essential that the kingdom be well ruled whilst Henry was at war, he certainly was able to maintain peace and stability in England and extend the prestige of the monarchy. He was able to achieve considerable feats with finance and accounting. His relationship with the nobility was sound and assured, although this might depend largely on his success in war. Henry was also notably pious and worked against Lollardy and worked with the papacy.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore some of the counter arguments to Henry's greatness. One problem is his legacy, but candidates might point out that it was hardly his fault that he died so young. Some of the criticisms have been levelled on the nature of the sources; contemporaries were universally complimentary. It could be argued that he was obsessed by war and in the end this was unsustainable, but in the parameters of his own reign this is difficult to sustain.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

3 Why were the English unable to maintain their hold on France during the period 1422–53?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narratives of the Hundred Years War should not score highly. However, a chronological approach from the death of Henry V to the Battle of Castillon and the end of the war might be adopted. Answers should focus sharply on the issue of the inability to maintain the substantial acquisitions of Henry V. Clearly the argument that the position was ultimately unsustainable may be explored; nevertheless Bedford did prove himself to be an effective Regent of France and won some important victories such as Verneuil and Cravant. Clearly the English position was weakened by the dual nature of the regency. Candidates may well argue that the renewal of French fortunes is paramount; a turning point here is the Congress of Arras where Charles VII and the Duke of Burgundy came to terms. After 1435 the situation deteriorates very rapidly. Candidates might well reflect on the personal inability of Henry VI to rule effectively; the growing effectiveness of Charles VII; war-weariness and lack of money in England; the unpopularity of Suffolk and the Anjou marriage and the growing factionism at Henry VI's court. There should be some treatment of the military blunders as well.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the inter relationship of longer term and shorter term aspects. It is clearly not enough simply to argue that it was unsustainable, neither is it enough to argue that it was entirely the fault of Henry VI. Candidates might be expected to argue that both of these issues produced the circumstances in which it was impossible for England to maintain her lands in France.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

4 To what extent did the actions of Margaret of Anjou contribute to the loss of Henry VI's throne in 1461?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narratives of Margaret of Anjou's career will not score well. There is a great deal to be said for Margaret's culpability; she was French and was personally associated with the disastrous policies of the 1440s and 1450s in France. The withdrawal of the court to the midlands in 1456 created faction and neglected the governance of the realm, allowing York and Warwick to pose as competent rulers. She favoured the Percies and was personally hostile to York and Warwick, her vindictive behaviour at the Parliament of Devils set York on the path to claiming the throne, yet when he was killed at Wakefield she neglected to follow up the victory. Her inability to take London after the Second Battle of St Albans allowed Edward to claim the throne. On the other hand she was intelligent and energetic, she worked hard to restore her husband's fortunes after the First Battle of St Albans and provided his cause with the leadership it needed.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore both Margaret's undoubted strengths and weaknesses. Nevertheless they might conclude that the real issue was Henry's weakness and his reliance on faction and on his wife to fight his battles for him. A real case can be made for her culpability and the focus must be on her role in events.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

5 How convincingly can it be argued that the nobility was a source of stability in England 1399–c.1450?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptive accounts of the function of the nobility will not score highly. Taking the nobility as a whole the stability of the realm depended on the relationship of the nobility and the monarchy. Candidates may well evaluate the importance of the nobility as military leaders, in central government and in the localities. The nobility were a small group, many of whom had very close ties to the monarchy and were personally known to the monarch. Candidates might consider the role they played in the advice they gave to the King; in the House of Lords; as Sheriffs and their control over JPs. The picture is quite mixed during this period: rebellion against Henry IV; the nobility's role in the military adventures of Henry V; the role they played during the minority of Henry VI and the growing factionism towards the end of this period.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the debate over bastard feudalism, which postulates that the retaining by the nobility was a source of instability in this period. This debate has largely been overturned, arguing instead that it is far more the quality of the relationship between the monarch and the nobles both on an individual level and collectively which dictates the extent of stability. As a usurper Henry IV faced particular problems, Henry VI was a weak individual who promoted factionalism during his personal rule, but members of the nobility were inspired by the lure of glory and riches during the military campaigns of Henry V.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Section 2: 1461–1547

6 ‘A good King, but a bad man.’ Assess this view of Richard III.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narratives of Richard’s reign cannot score well. The thrust of the debate is over whether, notwithstanding his infamy for the murder of his nephews, Richard III was in fact an able and energetic ruler. He was certainly tough and hardy and had an excellent reputation on the battlefield. He had a reputation for piety and gave generously to the church, although this might have been to assuage his conscience. He showed great loyalty to his friends and chose his advisors well. Government was sound and very well administered. Candidates might refer to his military prowess and excellent governance of the North during his brother’s reign, though should not dwell on this. He showed considerable concern for justice and his one Parliament was incident free. On the other hand, he suffered very major rebellion, could prove to be vindictive and cruel, was hugely acquisitive and ignored land rights and trusted government to a narrow and unpopular group of northerners.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the argument that he set out to remove the stain of infamy by providing good governance; this argument was certainly put forward by contemporaries. The historical debate is very lively; it is mostly agreed that he had some excellent leadership qualities, but perhaps in the end no King can be good if he gains the throne through infanticide. No particular line of argument is expected and this can be equally effectively argued both ways.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

7 How far was the power of the Scottish monarchy enhanced during the reigns of James IV and James V?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates will need to range across the whole of this period; James IV acceded to the throne in 1488 and James V died in 1542; serious lack of balance here cannot be rewarded well, neither can a narrative approach. The broad themes that could be addressed include: internal peace and order in Scotland; primacy over the power bases of the kingdom; the court; relations with foreign powers, especially England and France. James IV was energetic and pious, he was well known for establishing a brilliant renaissance court and for coming to terms with England by his marriage to Margaret Tudor. He patronised and extended his influence over the church and undertook a substantial building programme. James V was a minor on accession and his personal rule began in 1528. He continued his father's work in exerting power over the Church, restoring finances and cementing alliance with France through marriage. He also maintained a glittering court.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the possible detractors to what is generally seen as a very successful period for Scotland. Both Kings died prematurely, James IV at Flodden and James V immediately after Solway Moss. There are criticisms of how well James V handled the nobility, and whether their prestige essentially rested upon wise alliances with England and later France. It is also debatable as to whether these achievements survived.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

8 Why was Henry VII so preoccupied with the security of this throne and dynasty throughout his reign?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative account of Henry's reign will not score highly; it is also important that there is reasonable coverage of most of the reign. Clearly candidates will deal with the nature of his usurpation and weak claim to the throne; this might be done in some detail with a clear focus on his flexibility in dealing with the problems. He did encounter threats, in particular the pretenders and two tax revolts. His relationship with foreign powers is clearly important both in terms of wiping out threats to his throne and in establishing legitimacy for his dynasty by marriage to foreign dynasties. Finance may also be considered, in that Henry may well have attempted to build an impressive fortune in order to feel secure. His dealings with the nobility should also be considered. The better answers will consider his renewed concerns in the later part of his reign, following the death of his eldest son, the death of his wife and the cooling in relationships with Ferdinand of Aragon.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might argue that this is really the key to understanding Henry's reign. There is little doubt that this was his single most important preoccupation and that all other policies served this end. Clearly his usurpation and background do contribute very strongly to this, but candidates will need to show why this preoccupation continued and, some might argue, became more important throughout his reign in order to score well. Debates over New Monarchy and innovation are not really relevant to this question.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

9 ‘Always the King’s loyal servant.’ Discuss this judgement on Thomas Wolsey.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narratives of Wolsey’s time in power will not score well; there should also be some consideration of the full range of his activities in government. It is for his work with foreign policy for which he is best known. On face value it could be argued that this is because it was what Henry most wanted and as a good servant Wolsey obliged Henry. There is a debate that Wolsey embarked on foreign and diplomatic policy for his own glory and even to further his ambition to become Pope, though this is largely discredited. Candidates will be expected to know something of his work in Henry’s early French campaigns, the treaty of London, which might be described as one of his greatest achievements and the Field of the Cloth of Gold. His inability to deliver on his master’s requirements in the 1520s and especially not to be able to capitalise on the French defeat at the Battle of Pavia show a reversal of fortune. Most importantly there was Wolsey’s inability to deliver the divorce. Candidates might consider his work in legal reforms as Lord Chancellor and to a lesser extent his attempts to reform some aspects of the Church. Candidates might also reflect that Wolsey also served himself very well by amassing huge wealth and prominence.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the nature of the relationship between Wolsey and Henry. There is a clear line of argument that Wolsey was entirely self-seeking and was an ‘Alter Rex’. This can be countered by pointing out that Wolsey was dependent on Henry for all his appointments and patronage and Henry kept him whilst he is useful to him. Once Wolsey stumbles over the Amicable Grant and then is unable to produce a divorce, he no longer provided what Henry required, so as any servant he was dismissed. Some candidates might reflect that Wolsey was largely able to serve his own interests best by serving those of his king and becoming very wealthy and powerful in the process.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

10 Why did the Henrician Reformation not meet with more effective opposition?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narratives of the process of reformation or descriptions of opposition will not be well rewarded. Candidates might reflect on the nature of opposition, some understanding of opposition in Parliament might be expected, although it might be concluded that this was never serious. The opposition and reasons for opposition by individuals such as Fisher, More and Barton should be considered. Candidates might conclude that with More in particular the nature of his opposition was difficult to understand, although there is sufficient concern over the case of Barton for new legislation to be introduced. It might be argued that until the Dissolution of the Monasteries there was little that was substantial for people to oppose. Candidates cannot overlook or ignore the Pilgrimage of Grace, the most serious Tudor rebellion. They may well argue that this opposition was both serious and effective, so much so that Henry reconsidered the pace and nature of change. It could also be argued that the majority of people were in the habit of obeying authority and that Henry did use draconian measures to elicit compliance.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the nature of the argument put forward more recently that the Henrician Reformation was essential piecemeal so that people found it difficult to know what to support and what to reject and where to draw the line. Some understanding of the debate over ‘top down/bottom up’ reform might be discussed, although it is unlikely that candidates will conclude that there was little opposition because this was what the people wanted.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Section 3: 1547–1603

11 Consider the view that religion was the chief cause of instability in the period 1547–58.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narratives of the Mid-Tudor period will not score well; whilst candidates will conclude that there are a range of possible causes of instability, there needs to be substantial treatment of religion as a factor. Whilst candidates may well question whether this is a period of instability, the focus should not be on evaluating whether or not there was a 'Mid-Tudor Crisis'. Certainly religion may well have been the factor that saw most change in this period. Answers will need to show an understanding of the rapid and profound changes made, from Catholicism without the Pope at the end of Henry VIII's reign, to moderate, then radical Protestantism under Edward, and a return to Rome with issues of persecution under Mary. It could be argued that religion leads to instability of governance and is a tool of factionalism in both reigns, that it is the cause of the Western Rebellion and a partial cause of Wyatt's rebellion and is an important cause of the attempt to put Jane Grey on the throne. On the other hand, although there is opposition to religious changes, most people go along with the changes. It is highly likely there will be reference to persecution. Other causes of instability might be considered to be the persons of the monarchs; severe economic and financial problems and issues of foreign policy and defence. The most important issue will be how effectively candidates undertake relative evaluation of factors whilst keeping the issue of religion to the fore.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the inter-relationship of factors for instability. They can argue this in any way; it is the quality of the argument that is paramount. Religion is clearly an area of huge change, but arguably more people are affected by inflation and poor harvests. On the other hand, governance only briefly breaks down in the summer of 1549, the monarchs are able to pursue the policies they wish, whilst threatening insurrection was countered.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

12 How is support for, and opposition to, the Elizabethan Settlement in the years 1558–66 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The focus of this question is the Settlement and the aftermath of its inception. Description of the process of the Settlement will not score highly; neither will a description of the support for and opposition to it. The focus must be on explaining and evaluating the extent of these. Elizabeth met with opposition from both sides. Though it is fair to say that there was not a great deal of popular opposition, candidates might comment on this in relation to the religious policies of Elizabeth's predecessors. Clearly the opposition in the Lords at first needs to be dealt with and the solution of splitting the Settlement into two statutes, the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity with some key concessions and the removal of the Catholic Bishops had an impact. Candidates will also no doubt wish to comment on the opposition from the protestant exiles and the historical debate over this. Opposition initially is somewhat confused by the fact the Elizabeth was not excommunicated by the Pope and retained the support of Philip II. Protestant opposition was not unified and many Protestants did not understand that the settlement was to be Elizabeth's final word, so that in this period opposition was not as powerful as it might have been.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the traditional argument that the Elizabethan Settlement was effected by a 'Puritan Choir' and the subsequent rebuttal of this thesis and alternative views that Elizabeth was more influenced by conservative critics. Candidates might argue that the Settlement appears to be largely what Elizabeth wanted so that opposition could not have been that serious. Candidates might also consider some of the compromises Elizabeth was willing to make, such as the adoption of the title 'Supreme Governor' to mollify the male supremacists and conservatives. Candidates may well conclude that opposition was not nearly as serious as it might have been.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 17	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

13 To what extent was Mary Stuart personally responsible for the problems she encountered in Scotland in the years 1560–68?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. This period covers the time from the death of Mary of Guise to the flight of Mary Stuart to England. Descriptive accounts of this period will not score highly. Candidates might explore the relevance of her being brought up in France as a devout catholic and her relations to the powerful Guise faction. Her claim to the English throne might also be evaluated. It should be noted that Mary did not return to Scotland until after the death of her husband, Francis II. Issues to consider upon her return include the Scottish Reformation inspired by Knox and her plans to restore Catholicism. At first she might be seen as being successful, but her half brother Moray, pro-English and Protestant, was a problem. Mary's marriage to Darnley might be seen as a turning point in her fortunes, especially his behaviour and death. Further problems were compounded when she decided to marry Bothwell and ultimately had to flee to England.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the extent to which these problems were caused by her personally, how well she coped with the problems and how much she was the victim of others. Clearly she could not be held responsible for her minority or her absence, but was responsible for a choice of husbands.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 18	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

14 Assess the reasons for the deteriorating relationship between England and Spain in the years 1568–1603.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative survey of Elizabethan foreign policy will not score well. Candidates might comment on the fact that relations with Spain were generally good until Alva's arrival in the Netherlands in 1567, but should not go into too much detail before 1568. Some explanation of the actions of 1568 might be expected and the attempted healing of the rift in 1572, but it was events in the Netherlands prompted by Elizabeth's expulsion of the Sea Beggars which led to further deterioration in relations. For the next three years Elizabeth tried to stay neutral despite pressure from her council. The Perpetual Edict was signed in 1577, she opened marriage negotiations in 1579 with Anjou in response to growing Spanish power, and by 1584 with Anjou and Orange dead the stage was set for an invasion of England. This led to Philip's alliance with the Guise faction in France and his championing of Mary Stuart's cause in England. The Treaty of Nonesuch is pivotal, Leicester's expedition to the Netherlands in 1585 was tantamount to a declaration of war, yet Elizabeth still pursued diplomatic avenues. Candidates should consider the build up to and defeat of the Armada, the attempted subsequent Armadas and diplomacy to the end of the reign.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the importance of national security in the light of the Spanish army in the Netherlands and the need to balance French and Spanish power whilst continuing to trade. There is considerable historical debate over whether Elizabeth was simply reactive and at the mercy of events or whether she had a genuine policy. Events in the Netherlands, pressure from the council, diplomacy with France, behaviour of Drake and Hawkins etc should all be considered.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

15 How effectively did Tudor governments in the second half of the sixteenth century deal with the problems of poverty and social distress?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates may well present a survey of the nature of the problem caused by rising population, inflation, changes in agriculture and a seeming rise in vagabondage, but answers which simply describe this will not score well. The focus should be on how well this was dealt with. The period starts with draconian measures to deal with vagrants and orphaned children, this was relaxed later when parishes were encouraged to make collections for the impotent poor and when begging became legalised in 1555. Candidates might refer to the Statute of Artificers to control wages and further attempts to encourage parish poor relief in the early part of Elizabeth's reign. In 1572 legislation made a clear distinction between vagabonds and the more deserving poor. Legislation of 1597 and 1598 is perhaps the most wide ranging and sought to make some attempts to address the agrarian problems. In addition to these specific measures in times of dearth there were attempts to regulate prices and supply of grain. The key to placing an answer in the higher bands will be an overt engagement with the issue of 'how effective' these measures were.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the issue of effectiveness; they might do this by comparing particular attempts to each other, or seeing the period as a whole whilst pointing out moments of change and development. Candidates might argue that the efforts were not particularly effective given the poor understanding of their causes.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Section 4: Themes c. 1399–c.1603

16 ‘Flourishing and vibrant.’ Assess this view of the late-medieval English Church.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. The focus of this question is largely the fifteenth century, but there is no reason why this should not be extended to go up to 1529. However, this is firmly centred on the qualities of the late medieval English Church and is not a question about the causes of the Reformation, although some comment on this being a counter argument to the debate on a bottom-up reformation can be mentioned. It is clear that there is much to be said for the Church, there was an increase in the numbers of clergy who held degrees although this can be countered by the levels of abuse and the poor quality of some clergy. There were increased lay literacy levels and with it increased levels of lay piety. Religiosity certainly begun to turn its back on the monastic houses, but there is massive rebuilding of parish churches in the perpendicular style. Private chapels, chantries, hospitals, schools and lay fraternities abounded. A significant number of Oxbridge colleges were founded. The influence of the Renaissance can be found in religious art and the impact of printing could be evaluated. On the other side of the argument candidates might wish to evaluate the importance of Lollardy, anti-clericalism and anger over issues such as tithes, mortuary fees and Church courts.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the issues of popularity with the laity, artistic, architectural and intellectual innovation. Some candidates might reflect on what is genuinely English about the Church in this period and whether innovation and vitality came from within, or was the influence of outside forces. It could be argued that some anti-clericalism and criticism could have stemmed from the fact that the Church was flourishing and critics wanted to see it do even better. Some sense that the picture was mixed, according to location and social class might also be useful.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

17 Assess the importance of women to fifteenth-century society and economy.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Whilst it can be argued that this was a century of particular opportunity for women, this must be set in the context of a patriarchal society where women had few rights and any advancement for them usually depended on their own particular circumstances. There is evidence that due to pandemic and the changes in society and economy that these brought, more women were involved in economic activities than in the previous or subsequent century. More women are found to have been members of guilds and running workshops and acting as merchants than before. Richer women can also be found running estates in widowhood or whilst their husbands were away on business. Individuals can be used as examples such as Margaret of Anjou, Elizabeth Woodville, Margaret Beaufort and Margaret Paston. Candidates might also refer to the powerful position abbesses might hold. Some candidates might consider the issue of evidence, clearly peasant and yeoman women were essential to the economy as agricultural workers, spinners, brewster and so on, but the overt evidence for this is thin and often overlooked.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the debate over whether the fifteenth century can be seen as different, largely for demographic reasons. There is debate on either side and no set answer is to be expected.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 22	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

18 How socially mobile was fifteenth-century society?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptions of fifteenth-century society will not score well. Better answers will note that whilst fifteenth-century society appears to frown on social mobility, there was in fact considerable scope for mobility at all levels. Movement into the nobility was frequent for a number of reasons. It was a century which included a number of usurpations so there was plenty of scope for promotion with each successive king seeking to patronise his own supporters, over and above the traditional loss of noble families through inability to continue in the male line. Candidates might comment on the different aptitudes of different monarchs to promotion. Reference might also be made to issues such as the marriage of heiresses and promotion due to the French wars. It might also be noted that there was considerable scope for ruination through war, civil war and attainder. Promotion to the upper ranks usually took place from the gentry. It is also a period of the rise of the wealthy yeoman farmer, there is considerable evidence for this. Candidates might reflect on the favourable agrarian conditions which allowed for this. There may also be some consideration of the growing wealth of mercantile classes and how these groups acquired lands and titles. Some reference to specific examples might be expected, for example the Pastons, the Woodvilles and so on.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore extent and the variety of causes for social mobility, whilst the structure of society looks on the face of it to be static there was considerable movement within that structure, both up and down. There is considerable historical debate which candidates might refer to.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

19 How serious a threat did rebellions pose to the Tudor monarchs?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates will be expected to range over the whole period, although equal treatment of all the rebellions is not expected. Narratives of the rebellions will not be rewarded well. Candidates might argue that whilst serious at the time, with a greater sense of the theory of obligation and greater centralisation of government, rebellion was not as threatening as it might have been perceived to have been. Nevertheless it was a preoccupation for the monarchs, and perhaps their greatest fear. Candidates might consider the severity of treatment of insurrection, particular following the Pilgrimage of Grace. Certainly relatively few, the pretenders of Henry VII's reign and Catholic conspiracies of Elizabeth's reign being exceptions, sought directly to challenge the monarch. It could be argued that the Pilgrimage of Grace was really threatening, as the largest rebellion, or that the summer of 1549 was particularly serious with two, very different rebellions at the same time. Candidates might also consider that the only successful rebellion of the period was that which brought Mary to the throne.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the varying nature of rebellion and conclude that whilst there are some similarities most were specific responses to very specific circumstances and unlike the unrest of the mid-fifteenth century were not led by substantial members of the nobility, except for the revolt of the Northern Earls. It is also worth reflecting, that compared to Europe, English rebellion was not particularly serious. Many of the Tudor rebellions lacked really effective leadership, or were essentially localised or were ruthlessly put down by the crown.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

20 Assess the benefits and disadvantages of enclosure in sixteenth-century England.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates might seek to explain the wider context of enclosure in terms of population growth and agricultural diversification towards the end of the century, however the focus must be on enclosure and general economic descriptions will not score well. Candidates should be able to see this issue in the context of acute contemporary debate and better answers may well reflect on how this might have influenced the views of historians. They may also reflect on the fact that enclosure was not new and consider the importance of the wool trade. For many enclosure was responsible for many of rural society's problems; reference could be made to Kett's rebellion and the views of Wolsey and later Somerset. This could be evaluated in the light of the fact that most hardship was not caused by enclosure but by other abuses such as engrossing. Another issue is that it is difficult to find a dominant pattern for enclosure and the fact that the picture across the country was so mixed. Attempts to control enclosure might be considered along with the views of the Commonwealth Men. Clearly landowners and wool merchants benefited, but substantial peasants could also benefit from consolidating land; some decayed villages were restored. Whilst there are claims that enclosure swelled the ranks of the vagabonds, there is also much evidence that people were able to gain employment elsewhere and that this phenomenon was caused by other issues.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the balance between gains and losses, the best answers may well also consider the problems of evidence and the mixed nature of enclosure.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 25	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

21 How is the growth of England's involvement in overseas exploration during the sixteenth century best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narratives of the growth of overseas exploration will not score well; the focus should be on a relative evaluation of the causes of this expansion. Motives tend to be divided into political, economic and strategic. A major motive for successive governments was to protect the seas as a method of national security against foreign invasion, piracy and in the interests of trade. This can be linked to the building of the merchant marine and the navy. There were also ambitions to follow in the footsteps of other realms which had established trade and colonies. The importance of Bristol to Atlantic exploration is important especially in terms of Newfoundland and the North-West Passage. The development of the slave trade in the second half of the century is important as is the growth in privateering.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates will need to explore the whole period in order to give weight to changes and developments and how different motivations are of primary importance at particular times. The role of particular individuals will also be important. The answer also needs to be set in the context of changing foreign policy objectives.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 26	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Section 5: 1603–1689

22 How skilful a ruler was James I?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A chronological narrative should be avoided and instead candidates may well prefer to consider James I's abilities thematically. It could be noted that James was already an experienced and successful monarch, albeit of a much smaller kingdom by the time he came to the English throne in 1603. It might be argued that his skill was always limited by the unrealistic expectations he had of England when he arrived. Candidates might also wish to comment on his choice of ministers and advisors. Certainly James was determined to enjoy his position and both contemporaries and historians have seen him as being lazy. He also did not choose his closest advisors with particular skill and was not prepared to back down in the face of their unpopularity. He was probably skilful in facing the issues of the Church and whilst not finding a real solution was able to balance rival groups. He was active in foreign policy especially after the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. The chief criticism of James usually refers to his extravagance and inability to make reforms to the finances. Whilst the issue of inflation and economic problems do mitigate this accusation, candidates will probably conclude that he was not very skilful here. His plans to unify England and Scotland do not indicate political skill, and his handling of Parliament indicated a mixed analysis.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the extent of his skills as a King. The answer is bound to be mixed; he showed considerable skill in some areas and naivety or idleness in others. Candidates might refer to some mitigating circumstances which were beyond the control of even the most able monarch. There is considerable historical debate over the reputation of James I; candidates might make use of this.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

23 With what justice may Charles I's personal rule (1629-40) be regarded as a period of tyranny?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Descriptions of this period will not score highly; it is the quality of evaluation of how far this period was one of tyranny which should be the focus. One line of argument might be that it became more of a tyranny as time went on. Candidates might also consider the historical debate, which no longer accepts the idea, but instead accepts the view that Charles did not have a long term strategy to move towards absolutist government. It might also be mentioned that Charles had to remain more or less within the law if he were to continue to have the support of the local elites upon which he depended for support and governance. There is substantial evidence that Charles tended to remain within the system which already existed, as with the Book of Orders of 1631. One of the main areas of focus will be finance, especially the exploitation of prerogative rights and Ship Money. Candidates might look at the operation of the law and conclude that there might be some sense in which Charles acted as a tyrant and the issues of the Church might also be considered.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the debate over whether the concept of tyranny can be accepted at all or perhaps partially. There is significant historical debate here which might be evaluated; however candidates should be considering their evaluation of this period and not the causes of the Civil War.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

24 How successfully did the rulers of England deal with the problems of Ireland in the years 1603–89?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative of the relations between England and Ireland will not score well; however a chronological approach is acceptable if there is evaluation of the success of the English rulers. Under James I English settlement rapidly advanced after the revolt of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, under Lord Deputy Chichester. Candidates might deal with the limited success of trying to establish the Anglican Church and the harshness of land confiscation especially in Ulster, and how this developed up to 1641. Relationships with the Irish aristocracy could be evaluated and changes in pace and attitude after the appointment of Lord Falkland to the role of Deputy, whose efforts were undermined by Parliament. Wentworth was appointed as Deputy in 1631 and his policy of ‘thorough’ will have to be evaluated. Whilst he had to deal with interference from London he was surprisingly effective, although he did little to reduce the bitterness of the Irish. Wentworth’s role in 1640 could be briefly evaluated. Clearly English governance had not been successful as judged by the revolt of 1641 and Charles only compounded the problems. Cromwell’s role and the massacre of Drogheda and Wexford and the pacification of Ireland under Ireton should be considered. Government under Cromwell’s rule was successful but fateful. There were attempts at healing and settling after the restoration but political weakness continued, Ormonde’s role could be considered, law and order was restored and some measure of prosperity. The role of Ireland in the Glorious Revolution could also be assessed.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the variety of methods used, but reflect that the anger of the native Irish was always a problem. Success really was quite limited and often depended on the quality of the Deputy, even so interference from London often proved to be overwhelming. Perhaps the English were only really successful when they were at their most brutal, and in the long term that was counter-productive.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

25 How radical were the governments of the Interregnum?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Narratives of the period will not score well. The question could be seen in two ways, firstly how radical were the solutions to how the country should be governed and secondly how radical were the policies they espoused. Both elements need to be present in successful answers, although the balance between the two might vary considerably. A chronological approach could work if there is evaluation of the extent to which governments were radical. The Rump's decision to abolish the Lords and the Monarchy at the outset might be regarded as radical, yet it was not radical enough for the likes of the Levellers. Despite the declaration of Commonwealth in 1649, which could be considered to be radical, in essence the government was a military dictatorship. Cromwell's attempts to make the Commonwealth more popular by reducing taxes, allowing a measure of religious toleration and legal reforms might be seen as more pragmatic than radical. In the light of the war with the United Provinces government, especially the legal reforms became more reactionary. This was followed by the Barebones Parliament, but they were unlikely to achieve much, despite their truly radical agendas. The Instrument of Government was in many ways a radical solution and candidates might evaluate its aims. Cromwell's role as Protector should be assessed as should the Rule of the Major Generals. After 1657 attempts to find a solution became less and less radical, including the Humble Petition and the speed with which the protectorate crumbled after Cromwell's death.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore whether radical solutions were what was required and whether the more radical solutions were somewhat doomed. The issue that nothing particularly radical survived and the more radical the solution the more conservative people became might act as an assessment.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 30	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

26 Who gained, and who lost, by the revolution of 1688–89?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. This question seeks to evaluate outcomes and a narrative of the events of the Revolution will not score well. Clearly James II was the greatest loser, as was any concept of absolutism and any claims the Catholics might have for toleration let alone equality. On the face of it Parliament and the rule of Law won. The picture is far more complex than this however, and it is at this point that some candidates might choose to evaluate the historical debate, including an evaluation that within the context of other change, the Revolution itself effected little change at all. Some indeed would class it simply as the triumph of one faction over another. Candidates might consider the gains made by William and his supporters and gains made by Tory supporters of William. It could also be profitable to look at expectation: most wanted restoration rather than innovation and this was aided by the need for a swift solution. Many would argue that the real significance was in the future, but candidates must limit themselves with the immediate results.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the historical debate, though narratives of the historiography will not score well. Many candidates might reason that apart from the most obvious players, few neither lost much nor gained very much.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 31	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Section 6: 1689–1760

27 Why was Britain so frequently at war in the years 1689–1714?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British foreign and diplomatic policy in the reigns of William III and Anne. The focus will be on the years of war, 1689-97 and 1702-13. Candidates should have knowledge of the War of the Grand Alliance, of the campaigns in Ireland in 1690-91 and of the War of the Spanish Succession. The emphasis, however, should not be primarily on military events but on the causes of the wars and on the key issues which were of importance to monarch and politicians. Briefly, candidates should have knowledge of: William III's conflict with Louis XIV at the time he became King of England; of James II's attempts to regain his throne, particularly via Ireland; and the Treaty with the Holy Roman Emperor and the Netherlands in 1701. They may also have knowledge of England's growing commercial influence and of the need to preserve and expand its trade routes.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the causes of Britain's frequent involvement in war. Candidates might well identify the Revolution of 1688, and especially its outcome, as an important cause of the War since James II attempted to regain his throne by his campaign in Ireland. There should also be concentration on the balance of power in Europe and, perhaps particularly, on William III's perception that France represented a threat not only to the Netherlands but to Protestant Europe and also to the balance of power. In terms of longevity of the wars (a counterpart to the 'frequency' focus of the question), candidates may argue that the regular, and sometimes convoluted, attempts to set up alliance systems helped to prolong matters, not least by stopping Louis's troops from rapidly achieving their objectives. Some candidates might argue that Britain was at war for so long in the first decade of the 18th century because the alliance systems ensured that the combatants were fairly evenly matched. Good candidates might refer to the role of the Whigs in advocating war as a means not only of checking Louis XIV but also of advancing the country's commercial interest. Also, with a genuinely 'European' monarch on the throne from 1689 to 1702 many at court were encouraged to think much more in European than in isolationist, terms. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work on the importance of the navy and also of work which stresses the geographical extent of the Spanish Succession war, which can be readily linked to the frequency and longevity of the wars.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

28 Assess the nature, and the extent, of links between the Tory party and Jacobitism in the first half of the eighteenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British political history in the first half of the eighteenth century and particularly about the strength of support for Jacobite beliefs. There should be knowledge of the plots against the Hanoverian regime, including the Atterbury Plot, as well as the full-scale rebellions of 1715 and 1745-46. Candidates should also know about the composition of the Tory party, with reference to the amount of support for the revival of a Stuart monarchy. The party contained many landowners who thought the Hanoverian regime in general - and Walpole's use of power in particular – corrupt and corrupting. There was interchange between some Tory families and the alternative Stuart court-in-exile.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about links between Toryism and Jacobitism. Good candidates should produce a balanced treatment which examines the Tory party as well as Jacobitism. On 'nature', candidates should argue about the extent of support within the Tory party and whether this increased as the Hanoverian dynasty consolidated its rule. On Jacobitism, candidates should assess the relationship with pro-Stuart elements within the Tory party. On 'extent' candidates should reach a judgement based on selection of evidence both about Tory attitudes and beliefs and the support the Jacobite cause could tap, especially when planning to unseat the Hanoverian monarchy and defeat the Whig party. Jacobite support for Britain's enemies during the War of Austrian Succession can be used to link with Tory resentment at having to pay for a war having (for them) few benefits. On the other hand, what held many Tories back from closer links with the Pretenders was their Catholicism. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate on at least partly narrative accounts of Jacobite plots accompanied by little or no analysis on the nature of the Tory party in early eighteenth-century Britain. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work which has argued that historians have underplayed the extent of at least covert Jacobitism within the Tory party, especially before the outbreak of the '15.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

29 'Walpole's domestic policy was motivated by nothing more than the desire to stay in office.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Walpole's domestic policy. Candidates should know about the key elements of his economic policy which turned on sorting out the mess created by the South Sea Bubble and then sustaining a policy of peace (which held until 1739) as a means of restoring national finances. Candidates are also likely to know about the importance of 'faction'. His policy also aimed at keeping the Tories out of office and in maintaining close political and personal relations with the courts of both George I and George II. Candidates will know that Walpole's policies were widely criticised as self-serving and designed to reward those who were, above all, uncritically loyal to him. Candidates might also make use of Walpole's preference for reducing the burden of taxation on landowners – as a means of gaining support for the Whigs. Candidates might note that Walpole's policies were increasingly criticised and that his Excise Scheme of 1734 went badly wrong, greatly increasing his unpopularity.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the aims of Walpole's domestic policy. Many candidates may argue that Walpole was self-serving and did indeed create (as intended) a 'Robinocracy'. On the other hand, his economic policy was designed to re-fill the national coffers. Walpole undoubtedly wanted approval from his fellow property-owners but candidates might argue that his policies were less solipsistic than the quotation implies. Weak students are likely to concentrate on basic statements about economic policy and to offer generalised statements, perhaps in narrative form, about Walpole's prime ministership. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of debates over the extent to which Walpole perceived policy in narrow party-political terms or whether (as he asserted) he saw party divisions as both divisive and anachronistic.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

30 How is the rapid expansion of Methodism in the years c.1740–c.1760 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the growth of Methodism during its first twenty years. Candidates should know about: the personal role of John Wesley and also of his brother Charles; Methodist doctrine and especially the role of lay, itinerant preaching; the social groups at which the Methodist ‘mission’ was pitched; the state of the Anglican church in the mid-eighteenth century.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the various factors which explain why Methodism grew so quickly. Candidates are likely to concentrate on John Wesley as a leader and on his mission to convert groups either excluded by, or neglected by, the Church of England. Other factors likely to be mentioned include: the conversion experience; the effectiveness of lay preaching; the ‘support role’ of Methodist prayer and discussion groups; the limited effectiveness of the Church of England especially in areas undergoing rapid social change, such as the new towns and the mining areas. Weaker candidates are likely to have a limited hold on specific chronology and may also neglect the negative factors, such as Anglican weaknesses. They may also give a descriptive account of Wesley’s career. This may spread well beyond c.1760. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware that although relatively little scholarly work has recently been done on the Wesleys (though popular treatments have been offered by Roy Hattersley & Ralph Waller), research on the Church of England has generally argued that it maintained a fair degree of pastoral effectiveness. This may lead candidates to argue that Wesley’s successes derived more from Methodism’s popular appeal with the urban lower orders rather than to a weak challenge from a moribund Established Church.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

31 To what extent was the Elder Pitt personally responsible for Britain's successes in the Seven Years War?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the Seven Years War and of Britain's role, especially in the conflict with France. The focus should be on Pitt's personal contribution and here candidates are likely to concentrate on Pitt's vision, especially of the need to defeat France in the colonies and especially Canada & India. Candidates should also know about the 'diplomatic revolution' which saw Britain closely allied to Prussia, which enabled Britain to concentrate on the war outside Europe and especially on its naval strategy.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about Pitt's contribution to British victory. Good candidates will see that this question requires them to debate the relative importance of several linked factors. Here the relevant factors (in addition to Pitt's personality, drive and vision) include: the strength and effectiveness of Britain's navy, including the contribution of individual commanders; the role of Prussia in tying up France and Austria in Europe; Britain's military campaigns in Canada & India, including Wolfe and the capture of Quebec and Clive in India. Weaker candidates are likely to produce a predominantly descriptive account either of Pitt as prime minister or of Britain's achievements in the Seven Years War. Detail may be hazy and argument scant. Good candidates will need to consider a range of factors and adduce evidence to support statements of relative importance. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of the recent biography of Pitt the Elder by Edward Pearce and use Pearce's generally unfavourable judgement on Pitt to argue that other factors were more important than was the Prime Minister's direct leadership. They might also know that Peters has presented a 'warts and all' picture.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Section 7: 1760–1815

32 How effective a monarch was George III in the years 1760–84?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the early phase of George’s reign. The focus will be on effectiveness, so candidates should be expected to show understanding of: George’s use of patronage and his, probably precipitate, promotion of Bute as First Lord of the Treasury; the ministerial instability of the 1760s and George’s responsibility for this; the King’s handling of the growing conflict with the American colonies; the King’s support for the North ministry; his role in responding to the increasing discontent with the government from c.1778. Throughout, the predominant emphasis should be on the King’s constitutional role and how he interpreted this – as the first British-born Hanoverian monarch who was also determined to ‘be a king’.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the effectiveness of George III. Candidates are likely to be divided: making use of the evidence indicated in AO1 above, some will argue that the King was inexperienced, rash and evinced too strong a perception of the monarch’s role in the second half of the eighteenth century. Such candidates will argue that George’s ham-fistedness contributed substantially to the ministerial instability of the 1760s and, in so doing, was at least in part responsible for the increasingly crisis-ridden relationship with the North American colonies. It is possible that the same candidates will argue that the King chose the wrong man as prime minister in 1770 and, having done so, demonstrated characteristic Hanoverian obstinacy in keeping him in office as North’s ministry became increasingly unpopular and ineffective. On the other side of the argument, candidates might argue that George was legitimately invoking monarchical powers which remained after the Glorious Revolution and that he showed good judgement in trying to head off ‘government by faction’ or, indeed, by exceedingly posh, wealthy and – in many instances – corrupt Whig magnates. On this reading, George was a force for stability and showed increasingly good judgement. The middle way for other candidates may be the argument that George was an inexperienced monarchy in the 1760s but he learned from his mistakes. North proved a sound choice, at least in the first seven or eight years of his ministry and the relationship between First Lord and monarch showed how stability and even a legitimate ‘separation of powers’ which the American colonists were learning from Enlightenment tutors, could be sustained in Britain. Weaker candidates may offer a rather generalised and/or descriptive account which fails to engage sufficiently with issues relating to George’s competence to rule or to his objectives. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of the rather higher reputation which George III now has and might use the reinterpretation of North’s role as prime minister to argue the most positive case for royal effectiveness.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

33 Assess the view that Britain’s strategy and tactics during the war against the American colonies were ‘fundamentally flawed’.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the American Revolution and, in particular, British strategy and tactics during the war. Candidates are likely to have knowledge of the circumstances in which the war began, including the extent to which Britain was able to prevent armed hostilities. They should also know about: the British government’s strategy; the key conflicts (particularly, perhaps, Lexington, Trenton, Saratoga and the Yorktown surrender), the role of military commanders (Howe, Burgoyne, Clinton and, on the American side, Washington) and about the significance of French & Spanish intervention

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about Britain’s strategy and tactics during the War for Independence. Candidates are likely to discuss factors such as: Britain’s naval strategy & the problems of linking naval and military efforts across what were, in effect, 3000 miles of disputed territory; whether Britain made enough of the goodwill which continued to exist in many of the southern states and whether Britain over-estimated the extent of loyalism, especially in the North; Britain’s employment of mercenaries, which inflamed the colonists; the competence, or otherwise of British commanders and especially their response to the colonists’ guerrilla tactics; whether isolated military victories could have been worked into a conventional military strategy to defeat colonists who had been buoyed by victories such as those at Trenton (Dec 1776 & Jan 1777); whether large British forces in Canada could have been used more effectively further south. Most are likely to agree with the assessment in the question, although with some reservations, it remains possible to argue that, once the French entered the war, British victory against a tenacious foe fighting on its own soil would have been difficult, however effective strategy and tactics. Weaker candidates are likely to produce unbalanced and partial answers, perhaps with no distinction drawn between strategy and tactics. They may also concentrate excessively on key battles with little or no consideration of wider strategic issues. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of revisionist work which suggests that British military commanders were not as incompetent as used to be thought and that more weight might be given to the implications of the British government’s over-confidence about the outcome of the war and the over-estimation of Loyalist strength and ability to fight in support of British rule.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

34 How is Britain's 'national revival' in the years 1783–93 best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain in the first decade of Pitt's prime ministership. Good candidates should recognise the significance of the phrase 'national revival' and realise that this involves both political and economic factors. They are likely to know about: the younger Pitt's leadership, his political abilities and the securing a majority in the Commons from 1784 onwards; two more or less coherent party groupings (Pittite and Foxite) vying for supremacy, rather than confused, and often temporary, faction and family groupings; Pitt's administrative and fiscal reforms; the reduction of Britain's debt; the growth of the British economy and the impact of the growth of the textile industries. It is acceptable to see this question as one concerned with British domestic affairs, though material on Britain's foreign policy, if securely linked to the issue of stability and growing national prestige is acceptable.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of several linked causes of Britain's revival from both political turmoil and military defeat in America. Candidates will make use of the factors indicated under AO1. They might give more attention to political factors, including Pitt's steady leadership, than to economic ones but good candidates should see that there is an economic dimension to the 'revival' since Britain was in the process of establishing itself as the world's leading industrial power. Weaker candidates may produce answers which lack both balance and precision (e.g. about political developments and the performance of economy. Some may present an answer more or less totally concerned with an evaluation of Pitt's leadership. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may use recent work on the Younger Pitt, not least by William Hague, which continues to give emphasis to his political abilities and to his generally effective administrative and fiscal reforms.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

35 Assess the political importance of Edmund Burke.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Burke both as a Whig politician and as a political thinker. Candidates should know that Burke's writings, especially on America and on the impact of the French Revolution, have been seen as seminal contributions to the development of modern Conservatism. Key works are *Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontents* (1770) and *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790). He also believed in the importance of government in the hands of men of property. Candidates should know about Burke's political role, especially in: supporting the American colonists' struggle for independence; as a Foxite Whig; and latterly in breaking with Fox over the French Revolution. He produced articulate answers to the growing pressure for democratic reforms. Candidates may also know about his role in attacking the East India Company and in pursuing the impeachment of Warren Hastings and his attack on the Pitt government for trying to agree peace terms with France in 1796.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about Burke's political importance. Candidates are likely to concentrate on: his contribution to the debate on America and its independence; his challenge to the power of the King in the late 1760s and early 1770s, which he considered unconstitutional; and, perhaps especially, his role in attacking the French Revolutionaries (and in denying that 1789 was a French re-run of England's 'Glorious Revolution'), which led to his break with France and the split in the Whig party, which gave Pitt an unassailable majority in the Commons from 1794. Good candidates will use a selection of evidence along these lines to assess Burke's importance both as a thinker and as a politician. Most will argue that Burke's writings and speeches did alter contemporary perceptions, despite the fact that Burke never held high office. Those who argue 'against the grain' might suggest that, although Burke was articulate and persuasive, most of the developments with which he was associated would have happened anyway and that his ideas about government remaining in the hands of a small, socially select minority, came under increasing challenge. Weaker candidates are likely to produce either a limited biography of Burke or a chronological skewed treatment, possibly with excessive concentration on the 1770s or, more likely, on the impact of the French Revolution. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent writings (not least by Boyd Hilton) which suggest that Burke's thoughts, though influential, were not novel and that others were more effective than Burke in ensuring that support for loyalism against 'republicanism and democracy' grew rapidly after 1789.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 40	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

36 'Britain was in much greater danger of defeat by the French in the Revolutionary War of the 1790s than it was during the Napoleonic War of 1803–15.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the two wars Britain fought against France in the period specified. Candidates should know about the key stages of the two wars, including awareness of the importance of both naval and landed conflict in both wars. Candidates should also be aware of Britain's role in forming and sustaining anti-French alliances. It is also relevant to mention French attempts to mount an invasion of the British Isles, particularly in the 1790s but also in the period 1803–05.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about which of the two wars against France in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries presented the greater threat to Britain. Good candidates will see that they need to identify the factors which presented greater peril to Britain. Thus, Napoleon might be entirely dominant on mainland Europe (as he was in 1806–08) without offering a direct short-term threat to Britain, since after Trafalgar he had no realistic prospect of transporting and invasion army to Britain's shores. Candidates could also stress the economic dimension. Britain might have been in greater peril in the 1790s because of a financial crisis caused, in significant part, by wartime interruption to the country's lucrative trade routes. Also, France had developed invasion plans, via both Ireland and Wales, in the mid-late 1790s. It could be argued that Ireland's new status as part of the United Kingdom lessened the invasion threat. On the other hand, candidates might argue that Napoleon's sheer power at the height of his influence could have over-ridden other disadvantages. Britain might have been starved out of war by the Continental System had it not been for Wellington's ability to create a 'Spanish ulcer' for Napoleon during the Peninsular Wars and thus help to keep some commercial activities going. Weaker candidates may default to narratives of key battles. Alternatively, they may offer significantly unbalanced treatments with more on Napoleon, for example, than on the Revolutionary war of 1793-1802. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work of recent work by Charles Esdaile on the French wars, which offers new perspectives on the reasons for the fragility of anti-French coalitions before c.1813.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 41	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

Section 8: Themes c.1603–1815.

37 How is the expansion of London in the seventeenth century best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Clearly there are a range of factors to explain the growth of London in this period; however descriptions of the growth and development will not score well. Candidates might well consider London's political significance as the centre of government and Parliament. There is a significant growth in population from 200 000 in 1600 to 400 000 in 1650 and 475 000 in 1700, by which time it was the largest city in Western Europe. London also outgrew its original footprint. London was important for foreign trade and a consideration of the diversity of this and its growth will be important. It also became an important centre for finance and banking, it could also be considered to be an engine for growth for other towns in England. It was the centre for trading companies and the development of the American colonies, some candidates might also consider the importance of London as a cultural centre.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the issue of relative evaluation of a number of factors and how they might link together. Candidates might also set London in the perspective of growth of other towns and perhaps the negative impact this might have on other ports. There is also scope for understanding London's growth in its own terms and to explain the very fast rate of growth in the first part of the century, but slower growth in the second part.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 42	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

38 How significant were the changes in the role and status of women in the seventeenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Answers should have some perspective of the patriarchal nature of society in this period; descriptions of the role of women will not score well. Candidates may well evaluate this with reference to the difference in status of women, widows and heiresses for instance obtaining a greater level of independence. There is plenty of evidence of women being involved in trade and business and running their estates as widows. There were opportunities for women during the absence of their men folk; this can be seen to be the case during the Civil War. In some of the newer religious groups, such as the Quakers women enjoyed greater freedoms, though were more repressed in other sects and were more frequently accused of witchcraft than men. There are also some good examples of women acting as patronesses for the arts. Individuals such as Lucy, Countess of Bedford and Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle were patronesses, Bathua Makin set up schools, Nell Gwyn was a noted actress. However, candidates might reflect that these were very much exceptions to the rule.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the nature of the evidence, which is patchy and incomplete, they may well argue that whilst particular individuals made great strides, for the majority of women their role and status changed little.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 43	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

39 Account for the increase in religious radicalism in the mid-seventeenth century.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected, it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates are unlikely to present narratives of the period but might simply describe the various movements. This will not score well. However, they should be able to show some understanding of specific movements rather than dealing with generalities. Some of the movements might include the Quakers; Fifth Monarchists; Ranters; Seekers; Baptists and Muggletonians. Central to the argument is the breakdown of authority of the established Church and the bishops and the censorship they exercised, the turning point being 1641 when parliament abolished the Court of High Commission and the right of parishes to elect their own lecturers and later expel conservative clergy. This allowed more extreme Protestants to express their opinions about the elect and the imperative of conscience. The context of unrest and uncertainty propelled this further to include millenarian and levelling views. The influence of the army and its chaplains combined religious, social and political radicalism. The execution of the King encouraged millenarians even further.

AO2 – to be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Attempts to deal with historiography and with differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses. Here candidates might seek to explore the multiplicity of the religious sects in their own context to explain the growth in this area. A sense of how their growth promoted the further radicalism of religion might be hoped for. Some candidates might reflect on how quickly this was largely reversed in 1660 however.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 44	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

40 To what extent did Britain experience an ‘agricultural revolution’ during the eighteenth century?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain’s agricultural development in the eighteenth century. The focus will be on making a judgement on the extent of agricultural progress. Candidates are likely to have information on the following areas: the development of ‘new’ crops; agricultural reorganisation via enclosure; in predominantly pastoral areas, experiments with breeds and the development of more specialist markets; in predominantly arable areas, new crop rotations, reductions in the extent of fallow land; the links between scientific and agricultural experiments; parliamentary enclosure; the dissemination of new ideas via specialist magazines and societies. Some candidates may concentrate on ‘improvers’ such as Tull, Townshend, Marshall and Young

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about whether the changes referred to in AO1 above deserve, as a package, to be called revolutionary. Good candidates must – at least implicitly – make clear how they would justify (or challenge) the description ‘revolutionary’. Most are likely to argue that they were. Britain was able to feed a population which doubled in the eighteenth century and moves towards greater efficiency and productivity involving substantial innovation. On the other side of the coin, candidates may note that agricultural machinery made only a very limited contribution to eighteenth century agricultural developments and so contrasted with the main forces behind the so-called ‘industrial revolution’. Some may argue that continuity, albeit affected by innovation, was more important than change. By 1800, more than 70% of Britain’s working population remained on the land. Weaker candidates are likely to avoid offering any criteria for ‘revolutionary’ and to provide predominantly descriptive accounts either of new developments or key ‘improvers’ or both. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on agricultural developments which tend to stress impressive regional performance rather than any kind of ‘take-off’ into a nationally acknowledged revolution in agricultural productivity.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 45	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

41 How far was eighteenth-century British society dominated by its aristocracy?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British society in the eighteenth century. They should know that it remained predominantly rural and that disproportionate wealth was held by a small number of great landowners – almost all of whom had titles. Candidates should have knowledge of: the social role of the aristocracy and its relationship with smaller landowners and tenants; the judicial role of the aristocracy, particularly as Justices of the Peace; the political role of aristocracy, including use of patronage and nepotism to fill key political and administrative posts; the aristocracy as holders and developers of urban land.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the extent of aristocratic dominance. Most are likely to argue that the aristocracy was a dominant social and political force and candidates will need to select information (see AO1 above) which demonstrates that dominance. On the other hand, it is possible (just about!) to argue that aristocratic dominance can be exaggerated. In some new or rapidly expanding industrial and mining towns, great landowners remained the key urban developers. In most others, initiatives were increasingly taken by a successful & entrepreneurial bourgeoisie. Some of the most effective and assiduous members of the House of Commons were lawyers and professionals rather than the relatives of the aristocracy, who dominated numerically throughout the eighteenth century. Some candidates may argue that the social role of the established gentry is easily under-estimated. Weaker candidates are likely to offer a generalised treatment which concentrates on some aspects of the aristocracy's role rather than on a discussion of social 'dominance' grounded in selection of precise evidence. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by social and political historians, especially on how the aristocracy came to be involved in the expansion of mining and of urban development. The British aristocracy was never a closed caste.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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

Page 46	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	12

42 How is the rapid growth of British population in the eighteenth century best explained?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the growth of Britain’s population in the eighteenth century. The focus will be on making a judgement about the relative importance of several linked factors. Well-informed candidates should know about: a substantial rise in the birth rate; a decline in the death rate; the role of immigration and emigration; changes in health provision – especially the foundation of hospitals; factors affecting the age of marriage; increased levels of illegitimacy especially in the rapidly growing ‘new’ towns. Candidates might also be aware that population growth rates were much higher in the second half of the century than the first and strong candidates will probably need to use this information in their explanations.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for British population growth and especially on determining which factors are most important. Good candidates should go beyond straightforward explanations of the reasons for birth-rate increase and death-rate decline to produce explanations which note, for example, why birth-rates are particularly high in certain areas – particularly the new towns which were experiencing high levels of in-migration of young (and therefore disproportionately fertile) adults in search of work. Similarly, they may wish to argue that ‘birth-rate’ explanations are more important than ‘death-rate’ ones. They may also know that population hardly increased in the first thirty years of the eighteenth century (the 1720s almost certainly witnessed a decrease) before much more rapid growth from c.1750. Strong candidates are likely to link population increase to increases in economic activity since these tend to lower the age of first marriage of women – especially in urban areas. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate, usually in a rather general way, on birth-rate and death-rate changes. Their accounts may include some descriptive material as, for example, on the development of hospitals in urban areas, when abler candidates might query the efficacy of hospitals given their extremely limited strategies for containing the spread of infectious disease among already ill patients. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by the so-called ‘Cambridge School’ whose development of ‘family reconstruction’ has given much sharper insights into factors determining population change.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Outlines]

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