



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative B Unit 6W

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
 - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2007

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1470–1610

A2 Unit 6: Henry IV of France: A Modern King?

(a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** of Henry IV's authority in France by 1599.
(10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. | 3-5 |
| L3: | As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. | 6-8 |
| L4: | Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. | 9-10 |

Indicative content

The source indicates that it is Henry's view that he is king by 'inheritance and conquest'. He has made peace with France's enemies and is working to establish peace at home. A Level 1 response is likely to take this at face value and quote from the source to support it, e.g. he claims to have restored order: he has inherited France and asserted his right by conquest. For Level 2, answers will be aware of the reality, e.g. Henry had difficulty in asserting his authority as king as shown in, for example, the continuous warfare, the breakdown in law and order seen in peasant uprisings (the *Croquants*); Spanish troops still active in northern France in 1597. Level 3 responses could view the situation more widely, e.g. by reference to Henry's efforts to generate religious peace through the Edict of Nantes, or to the civil peace (Treaty of Vervins 1598) made with Spain. Both achievements are an indication that his sovereignty was accepted. Answers at Level 4 will consider both positive and negative aspects and come to a conclusion; they could be more critical of 'peace at home', e.g. this is Henry's assertion only; Huguenots are still regarded as second class citizens; not all parlements have yet approved the Edict, Paris in particular is still antagonistic. In contrast, Henry had made peace with the Pope in 1595 and took the surrender of the last of the Leaguer nobles in 1597; overall he appears to be in control.

(b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the work of the *Chambre de l'Edit* in relation to the Huguenots? (10 marks)

Target: A01.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

Responses at Level 1 could focus on the fact that the document is recording only successful prosecutions against those who opposed Huguenots, and the penalties imposed. Level 2 answers will recognise that these are summaries only with no details of the specific crimes, so there is no way of knowing if the punishment was appropriate; nor is there any evidence of the numbers of cases in total brought before the court; nor is it easy to appreciate, for example, whether banning was a punishment for life or for a set period of time or what kind of reparations could be ordered. Level 3 answers may offer similar comments but with accurate references to the source and an attempt to draw some conclusions, for example, the punishment of 'suspension from judicial office' would suggest that some of those who acted improperly in relation to Huguenots were those who were supposed to enforce the law and not break it, i.e. some attacks on Huguenots were institutional rather personal; many crimes involved stealing of money or property. Level 4 responses could comment on the breadth of the work of the 'Chambre', the notion of compensation and making the perpetrator acknowledge guilt (*amende honorable* or admonishment). Answers at this level will offer both positive and critical assessment of utility which will be effectively developed.

(c) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

'Henry IV's reign was full of promise but achieved little.'
Assess the validity of this opinion.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Henry IV is generally seen as a very popular monarch who restored peace to France not only in the immediate term but also in the longer term. He is credited with, for example, ending the Wars of Religion, enabling Catholics and Protestants to live together in the longer term, returning France to some semblance of prosperity, and keeping the nobility under control.

Source A shows Henry's own view of this – he is the rightful king and has resolved the religious issue and defeated France's external enemies. This is reinforced by the actions taken by the Chambre de l'Edit (Source B) in ensuring that Huguenots are no longer persecuted and able to live alongside Catholics without fear of retribution. However, Source A was very much self-propaganda and part of a personal appeal to the nobility to support him in introducing the Edict of Nantes and, although Source B does show a remarkable effort to provide legal support and retribution for Huguenots, it did not enable them to raise taxes or hold their own political assemblies. They were very dependent on the personal support of the king. Source C makes reference to success in securing some financial stability and economic development; protection from external enemies and keeping the nobility under control. Source C also suggests that Sully's work was equally if not more important than that of the king, particularly in rebuilding the finances and developing the economy.

Own knowledge may support the view of the promising nature of Henry's reign, e.g. by his reference to his abjuration and acceptance into the Catholic faith, setting his subjects an example to follow. However, Henry's conversion was influential and Huguenots tended to be marginalised. But they were not eradicated; their assemblies continued to meet and large numbers of publications were produced. Many Huguenots were found working prominently as doctors, financiers and in administration. Although Catholicism was the religion of the realm, Henry left many sees vacant and took no active part in Church reform. He did not accept all of the decrees of the Council of Trent and did not support the Inquisition.

Greengrass suggests, however, that the failure to reform the administrative structure of France was a significant failure, limiting achievement in other areas. However, Baumgartner considers that Henry subtly enhanced royal authority by, for example, never calling the States-General and through his attitude towards nobles like Biron who attempted opposition. Knecht is also positive about Henry's re-assertion of the power and authority of the Crown through the work of Sully which restored some financial and economic stability; also through his own aggressive action against rebel towns, e.g. in Lyons he replaced the existing mayor and officers by his own appointees who were fewer in number, and by the sending of commissioners or intendants who could be despatched and revoked at will and whose job was to enforce the royal will. Buisseret indicates that although there were frequent revolts throughout the reign, they were not normally directed against the Crown. The Biron Plot of 1602 was an exception to this rule. The most common disturbance was the urban uprising, e.g. in Marseilles and Arles in 1601 and Salon in 1608; these are dismissed by Buisseret as endemic, limited and easily suppressed; a feature of all reigns and not just that of Henry IV.

Overall, there is evidence that Henry's reign was a relatively orderly interlude between the Wars of Religion and the difficulties of the regency of his son's reign. He did not resolve the issue of the disloyalty/ambitions of the nobles, and this was to re-emerge in the Frondes. However, few monarchs have achieved this either before or after him. Religious toleration of a sort was now a more accepted feature of the landscape, although it was to come under pressure later in the reign of Louis XIV. Sully's work in relation to finance and the economy was possibly the most successful feature of the reign. Answers will not be expected to go into equal depth in relation to the differing aspects of the reign to formulate their conclusions but should have a grasp of the major issues to draw reasoned conclusions.