



## Cambridge Pre-U

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/56**

Paper 5 French Revolution, 1774–1794

**May/June 2022**

**MARK SCHEME**

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Published**

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

## Introduction

This assessment is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material.

## Generic guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.

If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range.

If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

## Assessment Objectives

### AO1

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately.

### AO2

Showing understanding of appropriate concepts, investigate and respond to historical questions clearly and persuasively using an appropriate coherent structure to reach a substantiated and sustained judgement.

### AO3

Analyse, interpret and evaluate source material and/or interpretations of the historical events studied.

## Levels-based mark schemes

The levels-based mark schemes address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 2 and 3, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content for each question in the mark scheme.

**Levels-based mark scheme for Question 1**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Level description</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>3</b>	<p>Analyses both similarities and differences. Compares and contrasts the documents, integrating comments on both documents by content, theme or issue.</p> <p>Makes clear and well-supported comparisons of the content of the documents, and explores their themes and issues.</p> <p>Focuses consistently on the matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Analyses the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, and explains why with reference to their provenance.</p> <p>Demonstrates supported critical evaluation of both documents as historical evidence.</p>	8–10
<b>2</b>	<p>Describes the main similarities or the main differences and includes some reference to the alternative viewpoint.</p> <p>There may be some imbalance between comparison and contrast. At the lower end of the level, may treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes clear and supported comparisons of content, themes and issues.</p> <p>Deals largely with the matter under discussion, but use of the documents in relation to the question may be uneven.</p> <p>Some analysis of how far the documents agree or disagree. At the higher end of the level, there may be some explanation of why they might agree or differ, though the consideration of provenance will not be well developed.</p> <p>At the higher end of the level, demonstrates some critical evaluation of the documents as historical evidence.</p>	4–7
<b>1</b>	<p>Refers to some differences or similarities. May be uneven, for example, differences may be covered but not similarities or vice versa.</p> <p>Makes some comparison or contrast of content, themes or issues, but may be largely description or paraphrase. Likely to treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes reference to the wider topic but with limited focus on the specific matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Limited analysis of the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, though this may be implicit or asserted. Limited reference to provenance of the documents.</p> <p>At the lower end of the level, there may be simply description or paraphrase of the documents.</p>	1–3
<b>0</b>	No creditable response	0

**Levels-based mark scheme for Question 2**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks</b>	<b>Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks</b>
<b>5</b>	9–10 marks Full analysis of all the documents as a set, interpreting them in relation to the question.	17–20 marks Well-sustained critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is well explained and supported throughout. Has a precise focus on the question. Coherent and developed judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on clear and persuasive evidence from the documents in their historical context.
<b>4</b>	7–8 marks Analyses all the documents, interpreting them in relation to the question, but some unevenness in depth or coverage of the documents.	13–16 marks Generally sustains a critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is mostly well explained and supported throughout. Has a broad focus on the question. Coherent judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on evidence from the documents in their historical context which is mostly clear and persuasive, but unevenly developed.
<b>3</b>	5–6 marks Some analysis of all the documents, with some interpretation of them in relation to the question. Uneven in depth of coverage of the documents with some omissions, description or irrelevance.	9–12 marks Some critical evaluation of evidence from the documents, but unevenly supported and explained. Generally coherent and contains some argument applicable to the question. Undeveloped judgement based predominantly on evidence from the documents which is occasionally clear and persuasive.
<b>2</b>	3–4 marks Limited analysis of the documents, with little interpretation of them in relation to the question. The depth of coverage of the documents will be very uneven, with significant omissions or evidence of misinterpretation of some documents, and with much description or irrelevance.	5–8 marks Limited critical evaluation of the evidence from the documents. Generalised critical comments with limited support and uneven explanations. Generally coherent and introduces argument which is mostly relevant to the topic. Attempts a judgement but offers limited supporting evidence from the documents.
<b>1</b>	1–2 marks Describes or paraphrases the documents. Little or no analysis and there may be major omissions of documents and very limited reference to the question. Answers reveal serious misinterpretation of the documents.	1–4 marks Little critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Has some coherence. Few parts of the response are relevant. It responds to some of the issues raised by the topic. No judgement beyond simple and unsupported assertions or relies on description of the documents.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks</b>	<b>Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks</b>
<b>0</b>	0 marks No creditable response	0 marks No creditable response

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Compare and contrast the evidence in Documents A and B about the demands for change in 1789. You should analyse the content and the provenance of both documents.</b></p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sees the need for cooperation between the king and the nation and B agrees that there should be cooperation between king and nation.</li> <li>• A sees the consent of the nation as being part of a true monarchy and thus vital and B also sees the consent of the nation over taxation as being key to reform.</li> <li>• Both accept the renunciation of financial privilege.</li> <li>• Both refer to the States General though A is more specific in seeing it as ‘the nation’.</li> <li>• Both consider that Law should be upheld.</li> </ul> <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most striking difference refers to the Constitution with A saying that it should be observed and B thinking that it does not exist in a fixed form.</li> <li>• There is a difference over privilege which gives up (‘we desire to sustain the burden of taxation in common’) but B, while agreeing, still wants special consideration for poorer nobles.</li> <li>• B is rather more specific on the rights it is claiming for no punishment without due justice.</li> </ul> <p>Provenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both are influenced by ideas of shared power, the rule of law and the ‘nation’ and both show the impact of Enlightenment ideas on educated Frenchmen. Both are produced in the heady atmosphere of public consultation prior to the meeting of the Estates General.</li> <li>• Both are written in consciousness of the financial crisis. The clergy seem more aware of the ancient constitution perhaps because of the links between Church and State. The nobles are more radical reflecting perhaps the impact of the Enlightenment but also more concerned for the poorer members of the class because of the greater diversity in the class.</li> </ul>	10

Question	Answer	Marks						
2	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided in this set of documents for the view that Robespierre was responsible for his own downfall? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in the set (C–F).</b></p> <p>Main Issue:</p> <p>The discussion is about the main cause of Robespierre’s fall with the factor in the question focusing on the opposition created by his policies, the concentration of power and his ideas, such as his religious eccentricities. Alternatives could be offered such as the more general unpopularity created by the extreme period of the Revolution, broader economic problems and the actions of the Convention in turning against Robespierre. It has also been suggested that with the end of the immediate crisis of foreign invasion the rigours of the terror were less acceptable.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="316 786 1313 1720"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="316 786 815 884">Analysis of interpretation in Documents (AO3)</th> <th data-bbox="815 786 1313 884">Critical Evaluation of Documents (AO3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 884 815 1352"> <p>C This account moves away from political rivalry to explanations based on Robespierre’s general unpopularity. The opponents of the revolution include a cross section of French society indicating a general political failure on Robespierre’s part rather than political rivalry.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="815 884 1313 1352"> <p>The provenance for C suggests caution. This is what his readers would like to hear given the concerns in Britain about the radicalism and the wish in catholic and royalist circles for the success of counter revolution. However, many of Robespierre’s enemies were extremists; revolutionary activity did not stop after his fall and the sans culottes were not enemies of the Jacobins and the Convention as such.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 1352 815 1720"> <p>D This refers to ‘tyranny’ but focuses on economic problems which undermined the leadership of Robespierre with the price controls leading to shortages which cut away Robespierre’s popular support in the capital.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="815 1352 1313 1720"> <p>In D, the association of the English writer with the Girondins whom Robespierre destroyed may make this an unsympathetic analysis, but Helen Williams was no casual visitor and had been in Paris through the Revolution and the failure of the sans culottes to rally to Robespierre could support this view.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis of interpretation in Documents (AO3)	Critical Evaluation of Documents (AO3)	<p>C This account moves away from political rivalry to explanations based on Robespierre’s general unpopularity. The opponents of the revolution include a cross section of French society indicating a general political failure on Robespierre’s part rather than political rivalry.</p>	<p>The provenance for C suggests caution. This is what his readers would like to hear given the concerns in Britain about the radicalism and the wish in catholic and royalist circles for the success of counter revolution. However, many of Robespierre’s enemies were extremists; revolutionary activity did not stop after his fall and the sans culottes were not enemies of the Jacobins and the Convention as such.</p>	<p>D This refers to ‘tyranny’ but focuses on economic problems which undermined the leadership of Robespierre with the price controls leading to shortages which cut away Robespierre’s popular support in the capital.</p>	<p>In D, the association of the English writer with the Girondins whom Robespierre destroyed may make this an unsympathetic analysis, but Helen Williams was no casual visitor and had been in Paris through the Revolution and the failure of the sans culottes to rally to Robespierre could support this view.</p>	30
Analysis of interpretation in Documents (AO3)	Critical Evaluation of Documents (AO3)							
<p>C This account moves away from political rivalry to explanations based on Robespierre’s general unpopularity. The opponents of the revolution include a cross section of French society indicating a general political failure on Robespierre’s part rather than political rivalry.</p>	<p>The provenance for C suggests caution. This is what his readers would like to hear given the concerns in Britain about the radicalism and the wish in catholic and royalist circles for the success of counter revolution. However, many of Robespierre’s enemies were extremists; revolutionary activity did not stop after his fall and the sans culottes were not enemies of the Jacobins and the Convention as such.</p>							
<p>D This refers to ‘tyranny’ but focuses on economic problems which undermined the leadership of Robespierre with the price controls leading to shortages which cut away Robespierre’s popular support in the capital.</p>	<p>In D, the association of the English writer with the Girondins whom Robespierre destroyed may make this an unsympathetic analysis, but Helen Williams was no casual visitor and had been in Paris through the Revolution and the failure of the sans culottes to rally to Robespierre could support this view.</p>							



Question	Answer		Marks
2	Analysis of interpretation in Documents (AO3)	Critical Evaluation of Documents (AO3)	
	E Robespierre is seen to be associated with an obscure Cult and also to be highly ambitious not only to dominate the political, but also the spiritual, sphere.	In E, the association with a Deist Cult which exhibited eccentric manifestations made Robespierre seem ridiculous and lost support among anti-clerical radicals. That this comes from a source fearing punishment and anxious to disassociate himself from a former chief may make it unreliable but on the other hand, he could be expressing a commonly held view among Robespierre's revolutionary enemies to ingratiate himself.	
	F This plumps firmly for the key role of the Convention, fearful of being purged and rivals for power. With Robespierre in command of other power bases, the Convention became key to his removal.	In F, a moderate Jacobin might well want to credit the Convention with overthrowing tyranny, particularly in a memoir written years after the Revolution. The widespread criticism in the Convention is not likely and many of those opposed to Robespierre were ardent terrorists not necessarily opposed to 'tyranny' but fearful of another round of infighting.	
	Possible judgements. (AO2):  It is possible to see Robespierre's erratic judgements and the fears and resentments of rivals as the key – but the fate of Danton and Robespierre's powerful bases in Paris may make this a matter of apprehension rather than a struggle for power. It is possible to see changes in context as equally important, with economic difficulties and a decline in the threats from foreign powers being important.		