

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>51</b>

### 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 met.

#### Question 1 (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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	51

**Question 1 (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 a 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.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>51</b>

### 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 met.

#### 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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	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.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>51</b>

**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
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	51

- 1 (a) To what extent are the views about Godwin in Document D corroborated by the evidence Document A? [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:

- They agree that he was determined – enraged in A and able to prevail in D.
- They agree he could compromise, settling matters in A and negotiating in D.

Differences:

- The documents emphasise different aspects of Godwin's character. In A he is clearly so appalled he is ready to fight, but in D he comes with peaceful intentions.
- In A, he seems to cede some of the initiative to Leofric, while in D he is very much in control.
- In A, there is a more equal division between the forces of Godwin and Edward, suggesting Godwin was not universally popular, while D is more forgiving.
- His persuasive skills are praised in D, but less in evidence in A.

Provenance:

- William of Malmesbury is quite impressed by what Godwin was able to achieve, despite his age, and, indeed, he died shortly after these events. But he also has words of praise for Edward so this may not signify much. Simeon of Durham is clearly sympathetic with Godwin and feels he was fully justified in demanding that the brutal Eustace be punished. It was also a matter of honour for Godwin to be seen to be defending the people of his county, as Simeon recognised.
- In both cases, a negotiated settlement is reached showing Godwin's political skill and experience.
- Thus the documents do largely corroborate each other.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that in 1051–52 Earl Godwin was more powerful than Edward the Confessor?

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.

Most of the documents suggest that power was balanced between the two with each of them in turn winning the upper hand. Even in the outcome of the crisis of 1051–52, Document E shows that Godwin was not in the business of humiliating the unfortunate monarch.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	51

In Document A, Edward does not emerge with much credit. He was uncertain what to do and only ready to resist when he was sure he had enough support. He then worked up his army so much that he had to restrain their impatience, but the final negotiation seems to have been started off by Leofric on very pragmatic grounds. Godwin comes over as a better leader, taking up the cause of his wronged people strongly.

B shows the downfall of Godwin. Apart from his removal of much treasure, he is much less powerful than Edward and his family base has been destroyed. Worse still, Edward is favouring his French friends by entertaining William as he had supported Eustace in A. They are enemies of Godwin.

But C shows Godwin's rehabilitation. He used his popularity in southern England as a means of gradually winning men to his side. He had family support. He treated the people on the South Coast with respect and he made overtures to the important merchants in London. This all suggests he was ready to challenge Edward. D indicates Godwin's success, although it also shows Edward displaying some authority. But in the negotiations, Godwin got all he wanted and so showed his greater power. But E makes it clear that the overthrow of Edward was not his aim, so outwardly the king remained powerful, but, in effect, Godwin was the power behind the throne and hoped for a descendant to follow Edward.

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



Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	51

**2 How justified is the view that the victory of the Normans at the Battle of Hastings resulted from their superior military strength? [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 the events of 1066, both before and during the battle of Hastings.

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

Candidates could argue that the Normans did have military superiority. They certainly used cavalry to good effect as the Bayeux Tapestry shows. The leadership of William turned out to be better than that of Harold. Tactically they were ahead of the English with their feigned retreats and they were disciplined enough to turn and attack again. They seem also to have had more archers than the English and, again, to have made effective use of them.

Alternatively, candidates could suggest that, since the battle lasted all day, and was decided very much by the death of Harold, the two sides must have been quite evenly matched. The shield wall of Harold's housecarls proved almost impenetrable and their courage in fighting to the end is not in question. Hence other factors may need to be sought. The error made by Harold in proceeding to attack William before all the English troops, and particularly archers, were assembled proved pivotal. His army was weary and morale was low, while the Normans were more buoyant and had been living off foraged supplies in Kent and Sussex. There is some suggestion that the English earls were not entirely eager to fight for Harold.

Candidates can reach a number of different conclusions about the crucial factor here.

**AO3** – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	51

**3 What best explains the changing levels of English resistance to William I during his reign? [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 the main examples of resistance to William and the means by which he quelled them.

**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 suggest that the changing circumstances of the reign are one explanation. Potential rebels knew that the best time to unseat the new king would be when his grasp of the throne was least strong and very recent. Hence there was a spate of unrest in the early years after 1066. As William became more entrenched, then resistance faded.

There was the lack of a credible alternative to William. There was no English candidate as such and Edgar the Aetheling was eventually neutralised. Again, the longer William ruled, the more acceptable the new regime became.

William feared the possibility of a Scandinavian invasion, even more so once Flanders became hostile, but the feuding Danish kings were not able to mount a serious threat and, in 1075–76, arrived too late to join the rebellion against William. The failure of all his enemies to unite led to a lessening of resistance.

But candidates are likely to argue that William's uncompromising attitude to resistance was the main reason for its decline and may even evince some surprise that risings were still going on in 1075–76. The 'Harrying of the North', the replacement of unreliable English earls by aggressive Normans, and the massive castle-building programme reduced both the level and extent of opposition.

But there are some late instances such as the murder of Bishop Walcher at Gateshead in 1079, which required a punitive northern expedition under Odo to restore order.

**AO3** – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2.

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

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	51

4 'More continuity than change.' How valid is this judgement on the impact of the Norman Conquest on English government and law? [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 methods of government, use of advisors, raising of revenue and the legal system.

**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 there was considerable change. William was more of a king than Edward had been and enhanced his powers where he could with crown-wearing ceremonies and the exaction of allegiance from his vassals. There was a largely foreign aristocracy – William's regents, Odo and FitzOsbern are one example. The king's writ held absolute sway. Domesday Book was another instance of the changing nature of his regime. Legally, he introduced trial by battle and the forest law.

Alternatively, candidates could suggest that the basic Anglo-Saxon administration carried on much as before, given that it was one of the more sophisticated governmental machines in Europe. The witan carried on in the same way, even if now referred to as a council. The king's court was staffed by Normans but functionally little changed. The legal reforms affected only the upper classes and the Saxon laws continued to be enforced. William, like Saxon kings, saw the enforcement of justice for all as a key royal role. The divisions of shire and hundred were continued.

Candidates could conclude that the immediate changes were relatively few, but, as time went on, Norman government and laws became more influential, but, by then some of those they governed had come to believe that the Norman customs were those which had prevailed under King Edward.

**AO3** – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur they should be rewarded under AO2

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