



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative C 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 C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1790

A2 Unit 6: Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1765–1790

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

Assess the validity of the view offered in **Source A** about Joseph II's motives for religious toleration and Church reform. (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

Answers at Level 1 will be based entirely on the source. They will be simple summaries reiterating the idea that Joseph wanted to use the church as a tool of the state and as a means of furthering the enlightenment/fostering education. Level 2 responses will be much more than a simple summary and will show a more comprehensive understanding of the source and its views and provide some supporting knowledge but this will be undeveloped. Thus, candidates may explain that whilst Joseph is portrayed as a rather Machiavellian reformist, more concerned with improving the interest of the state through reform of the church, these motives of reform were actually matched by genuine enlightened ideals. Joseph saw himself as a loyal member of the church and in some senses he was trying to make the church more accessible to the population. The decrees that regulated church decoration were in part an effort to reduce the 'superstition' of religion, and to modernise it as Joseph saw fit. At Level 3, having fully understood the interpretation given in the source, candidates will begin to assess its validity in relation to sound knowledge but judgement will only be partial, e.g. religious toleration and church reform did have many rational and practical motives as the source suggests; Joseph had no intention of alienating useful minorities, and was keen to encourage immigration. The Catholic Church was in turn weakened but this did not mean necessarily a strengthening of the central authorities, for example the Church's control of censorship was removed, and this can be seen as having an enlightened objective as the source suggests. Monasteries were closed and their land seized – Joseph did not wish anyone to pursue what he saw as a wasteful life. Joseph's almost obsessive desire to control the church, as illustrated by the source, can certainly be supported in his decrees abolishing statues, relics, coffins, etc. Yet this was not about destroying the church – a large number were actually built during this reign. He did want to reduce the power of the papacy but perhaps did not have the conscious motive of making it an instrument of the state. By Level 4, response will offer a more balanced, well-supported assessment and reach a reasoned conclusion.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of the effectiveness of Maria Theresa's and Joseph II's reforms of the peasantry's labour services? (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

Level 1 answers are likely to summarise the source or make simple statements related to the context in what amounts to little more than assertion, e.g. the source shows that during the co-regency there had been very little successful reform, indeed the 1775 revolt proves the depth of unease amongst the peasants, possibly as the result of failed reform. At Level 2 there may be a much fuller summary of the content of the source with some attempt to suggest the omissions, strengths, or weaknesses of the source; or there may be an attempt to consider both strengths and weaknesses but with much less comprehension. Candidates might comment that the source indicates that Joseph's reforms were inconsistent and vague, and that during the co-regency his policy seemed ineffective. However, the source goes on to mention his abolition of serfdom in 1781 which candidates might suggest was successful in part. By Level 3 answers will consider both strengths and weaknesses in relation to sound contextual knowledge, perhaps illustrating that Maria was much more cautious in issues of serfdom than Joseph, and that she blamed the excesses of the 1775 Urbarial Law for the subsequent revolt. In contrast, Joseph considered that reform under the co-regency had not been radical enough and this was the reason for the revolt. Hence when he assumed sole rule, he was keen to introduce radical reform as the source suggests. The source does not however mention the effect of the 1781 abolition of serfdom and the fact that the failure of this reform in part led to the 1789 Tax and Agrarian Law which in turn failed, although perhaps due to circumstance such as the events in France and the absence of troops in Turkey rather than inherent weakness. At Level 4 explanation will be developed and will have a sustained argument. Conclusions might suggest that an evaluation of effectiveness requires some consideration of motivation, and that whilst Maria may have been genuinely concerned for the welfare of the people, Joseph seemed to have many more reasons for weakening the labour duties of the peasants, including the extension of the central authority of the state at the expense of the nobility – although even in this he failed. To this extent the source is not useful as it fails to appreciate the differing motives and concerns of the two rulers and fails to consider any areas of explicit success.

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

‘Joseph II’s failures occurred because he lacked Maria Theresa’s ability to compromise with privileged groups.’

Assess the validity of this statement with reference to the years 1765 to 1790. (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

This question allows candidates to consider a range of policies to either support or challenge the assumption, and there is ample scope to integrate the sources with own knowledge to attain the high levels. Source A illustrates Joseph’s attitude to the church and attempt to circumvent its power and influence, although the mention of disobedient clergy and denunciations might be used as evidence of Joseph’s lack of compromise and headstrong nature. Source B suggests that whilst Maria Theresa did little to effectively help the serfs, and thus to confront the nobility, Joseph sought to transform their relationships with peasants by ending serfdom, yet this was only done after the failure of previous more moderate reform. Source C supports the view of Source B in that he refused to offer the nobles any compensation for their loss, and that he rather sought to confront the nobility and crush them. Source D boardens out this confrontational attitude to suggest that Joseph’s legislomania and flood of edicts, did offend many but counters the claim in Source C by suggesting that the motivation was the welfare of the people and to this extent confirms the view of Source B. Whilst some candidates might wish to question the extent of Joseph’s success, the statement is so phrased as to obviate this as much as possible. Certainly the main focus should be an analysis of the degree of his failure to compromise and an assessment of the extent to which this was a contributing factor to his

failures. Candidates might suggest the most obvious of these was his failure to reform labour dues. This seems a fairly clear cut example of where he failed to carry the opinion of the nobility with him and this method of apparently ignoring their concerns led to the belief that Joseph was deliberately seeking to undermine the nobility. Maria Theresa had not ever seriously considered abolishing labour dues altogether simply because of the fear of depriving landlords of their property rights without compensation. Reductions occurred in the Robot but never attempts at more. Some candidates might suggest such a difference in approach occurred because of a difference in motivation – that Maria Theresa was aware of the link between peasant living standards and state revenue, but she was much more concerned about welfare of the poor than issues of authority or a desire to weaken the nobility – hence a willingness to compromise. It is noteworthy that Joseph II seems to have prevented her initial efforts to actually abolish serfdom. In the church, Joseph did continue Maria's efforts to seize redundant church land – there was little that was new in this, but he went further in trying to assert state control over the church hierarchy and even to humiliate the Pope personally.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited descriptions of a few policies and assertions lifted from the sources without background knowledge, in this case there will be little explanation. Level 2 answers will include fuller description of some greater range with a passing link to the focus of the question. Those answers that use both sources and knowledge will have a more limited range and little development. At Level 3 there will be an analytical response with evidence of assessment of degree of compromise and its effect on Joseph's success. At Level 4 there will be a challenge to the assumption of the question and a suggestion that other factors may account for his failures such as the events in France; the fact that the peasants did not support his reforms either, that religious toleration, e.g. of the Jews, actually infuriated them as it made them liable to conscription. At Level 5 there will be a much more balanced case across a range of factors and privileged groups, arriving at a sustained and reasoned conclusion.