

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/51

Paper 5a (Special Subject: The Norman Conquest, 1051–1087), maximum raw mark 60

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	51

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers 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.

In marking an answer 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.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

Special Subject Essays

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.

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

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.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

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.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

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.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

Nominated topic: Opposition to Norman rule

- 1 (a) How far are the views expressed about William I's reaction to invasion in Document C corroborated by those in Document D? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities:

- Both agree that William reacted with fury – resentment in C and vengeance in D.
- Both agree that his reaction was to lay waste in C and harry the land in D.
- Both agree the result was a severe famine with the land stripped of sustenance and that all suffered.

Differences:

- C suggests William paid off the Danes and let them ravage English coasts, while D indicates that he ordered his men to repel the Danes.
- C claims that the whole country was affected by the famine, while in D it is the area north of the Humber.

Provenance:

- Florence of Worcester takes the English viewpoint, emphasising William's resentment, his evil actions and the dreadful outcome including cannibalism.
- William of Malmesbury is more balanced – he recognises William did not bother to restrain himself and that the innocent suffered, but overall he is more temperate and also more inclined to laud William's efforts in extirpating the Danish threat. This threat was always going to seem serious to a king who had won the crown through an unlikely invasion himself.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that William I dealt with opposition by using the tactics of terror?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well-constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of different historical interpretations is to be expected. Documents C and D most strongly agree with the statement, with some support in document E. Documents A and B have other explanations for William's success and show he used a variety of methods, often suiting his reaction to the seriousness of the threat. William used leniency towards Edgar the Aetheling, showing some psychological grasp of the boy's position in document A and even reconciling with him in Document B after further resistance from Edgar. He also relied on castle building specifically in B and by implication in A and candidates may give other examples. He had capable defenders in his castles in A and D. A also explains how he won men to his cause, while B emphasises his grasp of tactics and his technical skill. More forceful methods are outlined in B, both around Ely and in Scotland and in E where an immense army was raised. The terror tactics are outlined in C and D and the unpleasant results explained. Candidates may add that the frequency of areas in the north being described as *waste* in the Domesday Book illustrates the long term effect of William's brutality. Document E illustrates that even towards the end of his reign William was still prepared to act in a way that harmed his subjects in order to repel invaders. E also shows that he had some good fortune in that the Danes were a disunited force, while B similarly suggests disunity among the English. These documents tend to imply that William overcame opposition with relative ease, apart from the case of the valiant Hereward, so candidates could argue that the use of terror was not necessary. But they may also suggest that, as the Normans were in the minority in England, and there were a variety of disaffected groups, it behoved them to show who was in charge without any possible ambiguity.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

2 How effective was the Church in Anglo-Saxon England before 1066? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates could refer to aspects of the church such as its leadership, relations with the Papacy, monasteries and priests and worship.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may argue that the church was well led, often by bishops from Normandy, such as William who became bishop of London. These bishops generally were praised by contemporaries for their dedication to their dioceses. Relations with the Papacy were good and English bishops attended Papal Councils. The Archbishop of Canterbury travelled to Rome to be given his pallium. Disputes in the church were settled by appeal to the pope as when Ealdred tried to remain bishop of Worcester when he was elevated to York. Monasteries had been reformed and the writings of Aelfric in English exerted a strong and beneficial influence. Most of the bishops had been monks and brought monastic discipline to their sees and tried to ensure the lives of their priests were worthy and upright. Alternatively candidates could suggest that the Norman bishops were not universally popular. Ulf of Dorchester and Robert of Jumieges who was made archbishop of Canterbury by Edward the Confessor were both driven into exile and Robert's appointment was probably part of Edward's doomed attempt to reassert himself against earl Godwine. The replacement of Robert by Stigand, one of Godwine's men was controversial and, in the view of the reformers, illegal and Alexander II supported William of Normandy's claim to the throne partly as a way to dislodge Stigand. It can be argued that priests remained very reluctant to give up their 'wives' and take on the celibate life, while the monastic revival was very much confined to the south and had little penetration in the Midlands and the north. The high point of the reform and flowering of the tenth century was over.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

3 Assess the view that William’s leadership was the decisive factor in his victory at Hastings. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to various aspects of the events of 1066, William’s preparations and invasion, Harold’s march north, William’s unopposed landing and movement inland, Harold’s enforced march south and the fateful events of 14 October 1066.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may argue that William was, indeed, a very skilled leader. Examples might include his ability to put together a large fleet and an army of mercenaries to invade at short notice, his skill in boosting and maintaining its morale, his sound tactics on the day and his refusal to be daunted by rumours that he was dead or by the retreat of some of his troops. The final attack of the Normans is a further tribute to his powers. But there are other explanations. William was extremely fortunate over the changing of the wind at the right moment to enable him to invade and at the absence of Harold from the south coast when his fleet made landfall. He could also claim the moral high ground and depict Harold as an oath breaker and a defier of Rome in his patronage of Stigand (although Harold was probably not crowned by Stigand but by Ealdred of York). Harold was weakened by the loss of key men at Stamford Bridge and the weariness of his troops who had marched south so rapidly. Harold made some poor decisions. He allowed himself to be outraged by William’s attacks on his personal lands and so ignored advice that he should wait in London for reinforcements before risking battle with William. His troops failed to show the necessary discipline at Hastings, but were also at a disadvantage in that they were largely infantry and short of archers. Finally Harold was killed; in whatever way this occurred it was a crucial moment. Candidates can argue convincingly either way, that William’s leadership was what swung the battle in his favour, or that other factors mounted up against Harold who could not circumvent them.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	51

4 To what extent was there more continuity than change in the government of England after 1066? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the position of the nobles, the Witan, local government, land distribution and the church.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates are likely to argue that there was some change. Power under William rested with a military organisation which he controlled. The giving of land to Norman knights who then exercised authority in their localities brought an alien presence into government. The rebellions of 1069 accelerated this process, especially in northern areas. By 1087 all the sheriffs were Normans. The introduction of forest laws to protect the royal hunting grounds was an unpopular innovation. The Norman Council met quite regularly but had less power than the Witan had enjoyed, William wore his crown at various church festivals to show his monarchical position and divine approval. Latin became the language of his writs with French used for charters by the end of his reign. The use of juries in investigations became common and was universal in the Domesday Inquests. William brought in his own legal code. Alternatively candidates could suggest that William only made changes gradually so that initially there was much continuity. Up to 1069 most of the sheriffs were still English and Aethelwig, abbot of Evesham played an extensive role in the administration. The bishops were unchanged initially and all bar one remained loyal to William. He even left it to the Pope to depose Stigand and allowed Stigand his lands and position until the Pope ruled against him. The financial administration was little altered and the treasury remained at Winchester.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

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