



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

History

Alternative B

Units 1, 4 and 6

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/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 specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

The revised 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 new 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 AS and 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 and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

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 for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: 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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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 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.

D: 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.

Alternative B: Europe in Transition 1470-1610**AS Unit 1: Religious Change and its Consequences in Sixteenth Century Europe****Question 1**

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

Explain briefly the significance for the Catholic Church of this woodcut in the context of the early Reformation. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source e.g. it is critical of the Church suggesting that the Pope's teaching was not based on Scripture; refers to use of rosaries rather than texts. 1

L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. describes the contrast in detail and makes reference to the emphasis on Scripture, the encouragement of the participation of the audience who are thus taking some responsibility for their spiritual development. May suggest that this indicates that catholic clergy were not themselves well educated and relied on ritual rather than knowledge. May place this in the context of the Lutheran challenge and 'ad fontes'. 2-3

- (b) Use **Sources B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source C** challenges **Source B** in its view of the success of the Index. (7 marks)

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain 'own knowledge'. The effectiveness of the comparison will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to 'pieces' of factual content.

L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context. E.g. Source B suggests that the Index did limit the availability of books, whereas Source C suggests it increased demand. Understands this refers mainly to Protestant literature. 1-2

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources with reference to own knowledge, e.g. both agree that the Index had an impact; Source B suggests it was largely successful; Source C suggests that publication of the Index made readers more aware of the existence of Protestant literature and that printers could make a profit from selling such literature. Source C recognises that this argument applies to Protestants rather than to Catholics. Own knowledge suggests that literature continued to be published by both sides; that Protestants grasped the significance of the power of

the printed word more readily than Catholic authorities and used both woodcuts and books to access all levels of society. Protestants did, however, also attempt to restrict Catholic literature. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as above and concludes that, as the Reformation established itself successfully by the mid-16th century, then the Index was not successful in stopping the establishment of Protestantism although it did limit it; it did not spread to Spain or southern Germany. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the Index, in relation to other factors, in promoting the Catholic Reformation. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based on *either* knowledge *or* sources. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The Index was a negative rather than a positive force – it prevented widespread acquisition of Protestant literature and so enabled the study of Catholic rather than Protestant literature in the places where it operated. However, beyond Spain and Italy, where it tended to come under the auspices of the Inquisition, there was less control. Banning books made them more desirable to have, and restricting them could have made scholarly reply to Protestant propaganda more difficult. There is no evidence that the spate of protestant literature declined. Against this could be set the more positive work of the Council of Trent in defining doctrine, providing guidelines for the better training and education of priests and initiating reform of the papacy and hierarchy of the Church. Additionally, the achievements of the Jesuits in reconverting parts of Germany and the growth of new orders could also be quoted as elements important for the reform of the Catholic Church.

Answers at Level 1 will be limited to brief consideration of the Index only or to generalised statements about catholic reform. Level 2 response will offer more detail and some range. At Level 3, there should be more focused analysis with supporting detail. Responses at Level 4 will consider a good range of methods of promoting the Catholic reformation with some comparison with the work of the Index. Level 5 responses will seek to draw appropriate conclusions to formulate a judgement on ‘importance’

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by the term “simony” in the context of the pre-Reformation Church in Germany in 1517. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. one of the many abuses in the Catholic Church tolerated by Rome. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the purchase of offices in the church rather than gaining them by ability, giving rise to uneducated, worldly clergy with no/little interest in their parishioners. This was just one of the abuses listed by Luther in his invitation to disputation with the Church in 1517. 2-3

- (b) Explain the reasons why Luther was critical of the Catholic Church in 1517. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. there were many abuses in the Church in Germany – perhaps makes further reference to the stimulus. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately material, e.g. refers to Tetzel and the sale of indulgences; refers to a range of abuses such as the appointment of minors, priests

ignoring their vows, priests who could not read, nepotism, pilgrimages etc.; the influence of Erasmus and humanistic thought; Luther's own studies of biblical texts etc. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as above and suggests that Tetzel's activities were the trigger but that other issues contributed; or that Erasmus' work created a critical climate in which Luther felt more free to speak. **6-7**

(c) "The Lutheran reformation succeeded in Germany because Charles V was slow to react to it." Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Charles V can be considered slow to react – it was not until 1521 that Luther was summoned to the Diet at Worms; by then he had published a number of pamphlets, debated with Cardinal Cajetan and gained the strong support of the Elector of Saxony. However, Luther's ideas were popular, he was an excellent speaker and attracted the attention of ordinary people – the movement became a mass movement and as such threatened the power of princes and emperor. The groundwork laid by humanist scholars should not be ignored. It would have been difficult for Charles to have made Luther a martyr.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be brief and limited; they may describe events or make assertions about the success of the Reformation. Level 2 responses will have greater range and some limited support. By Level 3, answers should show evidence of organised thought, although the emphasis may be on Charles V or other factors. Level 4 answers should demonstrate greater balance and an ability to link explanations. Level 5 responses will offer supported judgement based on a wide-ranging survey of possible factors.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by the term “Anabaptism” in the context of the Reformation. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Anabaptists were part of the radical reformation seeking to extend the theology of Luther and Calvin, based on views about baptism. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. they were not one group but a number of splinter groups seeking to create communities separate from others; they were attacked by earlier Protestants as well as Catholics, for their beliefs, e.g. in adult baptism, common ownership of property etc. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the radical reformation emerged in the 1520s. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. they were dissatisfied with Lutheran and Calvinist reform and felt it had not gone far enough, it was not sufficiently Bible based etc. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. they wanted to purify the practices of even the reformed churches, e.g. the fact that Luther, Zwingli and Calvin had broken away from the Catholic Church successfully inspired others to be more radical; they wanted adult baptism rather than infant baptism which was not advocated in the scriptures; the emergence of leaders such as Mantz, Grebel, Muntzer and John of Leyden who were prepared to take action as in the city of Munster. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. as L2 and concludes that the success of the Protestant Reformation was the most influential factor in the emergence of the radicals, creating what were, in effect, splinter groups. **6-7**

- (c) “The radical reformation failed because it lacked the support of the princes.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

A range of factors may be quoted to explain the failure of the radicals, e.g. they were immediately condemned by Luther, Zwingli and Calvin who feared splintering of the Reformation movement, although some reformers like Bucer did accept them. As they sought safe havens the groups became even more diverse and sometimes extreme; the concepts of communal property/living/polygamy/pacifism were regarded as threats to existing society by many municipal as well as princely authorities particularly after Munster. Adult baptism meant that individuals chose to belong to a church rather than being baptised into it as babies thus challenging the reformed faiths as well as Catholicism. For many radicals the state was an irrelevance and they would not do armed service or take oaths of loyalty; these issues were important to princes who wanted loyal and obedient subjects. Many of them were ordinary people with no particular claim to scholarship. As they became more marginalised they ceased to have real impact. They did not gain support from princes or authorities as Luther, Zwingli and Calvin did, but neither did they gain widespread support from ordinary people; it could be argued that the very nature of the movement militated against that.

Level 1 answers will describe the movement or deal with simple explanations for failure. At Level 2, the answers will be more wide ranging and at Level 3 there will be some detail to support the analysis. Responses at Level 4 will balance princely concerns and actions against

those of other groups in society. For Level 5 answers will need to make some assessment of the relative significance of princely attitudes and actions against other possible factors.

Alternative B: Europe in Transition, c1460-1610**A2 Unit 4: The State, Authority and Conflict****Question 1**

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

Explain what is meant by “ecclesiastical discipline” in the context of the Spanish Church before the Catholic Reformation. (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. the church keeping itself in order, e.g. by ensuring that priests were not corrupt. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. from the source, relating this to religious orders who may not, for example, keep their vows, but go unpunished; or from own knowledge, shows understanding that the Crown in Spain considered that sufficient leadership was not given from the top to ensure that all clergy were religious, honest, committed and loyal. **2-3**
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge, e.g. understands that this was a major issue for the Crown in their reform of the Church to ensure that it was well run and that stricter enforcement of the regulations was required, for example, of the ecclesiastical courts, and that Ferdinand and Isabella tried to ensure that this happened throughout their lands. **4-5**

- (b) Use **Sources C** and **D** and your own knowledge.

How fully do **Sources C** and **D** explain the ability of Spain to resist the influence of the Protestant Reformation? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both sources and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers should recognise that both sources see the implementation of the decrees of the Council of Trent as being significant. Answers at Level 2 will understand some limitations, e.g. Source D comments that the implementation of the decrees was dependent on the will of the King, whereas Source C sees the role of the bishops as significant: Source C offers detail about specific reforms implemented whereas Source D offers more of an overview. This may be supported by reference to, e.g. the work of specific individuals such as Quiroga, the formation of new orders such as by St Theresa of Avila, the creation of new archbishoprics etc. A response at Level 3 may bring in the role of the Inquisition (Source D) and the issue of ‘personal drive’ as identified in Source C as well as awareness of the work of Ferdinand and Isabella and Charles I in reforming the Church and searching out heresy to conclude that the sources offer only a partial explanation. By Level 4, answers should assess sufficiency by considering the relative importance of the factors drawn from the sources and from their own knowledge, e.g. the sources focus on the reign of Philip II but the work of previous monarchs provided secure foundations which enabled the work of Trent as outlined in Sources C and D to be readily implemented.

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

“The reform of the Church in Spain was the result of internal political factors rather than of external religious influences.”

To what extent do you agree with this judgement in the years 1469 to 1598?

(15 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. **1-4**
- 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. **5-8**
- 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. **9-11**
- 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.

12-13

L5: As L4, 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.

14-15

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

From the sources: Source A suggests that only the monarchy could bring about reform because the church, and even Rome, was too lax to do this; Source B implies that the monarchy was the motivator although indicating that it was the Inquisition which did the work; Source C quite clearly states that the Council of Trent and the work of individual clergy were largely responsible and Source D indicates that the monarchy supported reform proposed by Rome as long as it did not infringe the rights of the monarchy. Own knowledge might suggest that, in the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella, religious reform was part of the steps taken to gain control over their kingdoms and enhance their power, e.g. the right to appoint clergy, finally agreed by the Pope in 1523. However, there was a general internal movement for reform, particularly of religious orders which was part of a wider external movement, e.g. the formation of the Jeronimites. The work of Cisneros is also important as was that of St Teresa of Avila and St John of the Cross. Consideration of the effects of Lutheranism elsewhere may also have motivated the Spanish Church to reform itself. Philip II's support of the Spanish Inquisition resulted in persecution of Lutherans, Moriscos and conversos which brought greater unity to Spain and enhanced monarchical power. Philip II did accept the religious reform proposed by the Council of Trent but preserved his independence from Rome; internal reform brought him continued revenue from the Church.

Level 1 responses may provide limited information about reform of the Church or simple statements about its causes. Level 2 responses may offer lists of factors with links to external and/or internal issues. By Level 3, the focus should be more clearly on political and religious motivation for reform with some possible comment on the relationship between these factors. Answers at Level 4 should be wide ranging both in terms of the time scale and of the issues discussed, leading to supported conclusions about the comparative influence of internal political and external religious factors. Level 5 responses should consolidate this, offering securely based judgement on relative significance.

Section B

Candidates answer **one** question from the following (2-10). **Note:** these questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidate's responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of

response mark scheme and by the indicative content in each specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

L1: *Either*

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

Or

Answers implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply almost to any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *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 will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: 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. **12-15**

L4: 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. **16-18**

L5: As L4, 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. **19-20**

Option A: The Netherlands 1565-1609

2 Compare the relative significance of the political and religious issues which led to the outbreak of the Revolt of the Netherlands. **(20 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring extended responses without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content:

Political issues which could be explored: the seventeen provinces each had their own particular interests and privileges to maintain against what they saw as a foreign power especially after the accession of Philip II to Spain; each wanted to preserve their local privileges and identity; each state sent representatives to the States General but meetings were held only every 3 years; merchant oligarchies dominated the towns and there were rivalries between towns and clashes within towns; Philip II was an absentee monarch: there were concerns that he would not listen to the representatives of the Netherlands but only to his Spanish advisers; there was resentment at the presence of Spanish troops in the Netherlands; Margaret of Parma was an inexperienced ruler who co-operated closely with Granvelle; success in removing Granvelle in 1564 made the Dutch nobility more determined to press for continued influence; the arrival of Alva in 1567. Answers should not be penalised for considering his subsequent actions to establish Spanish control, e.g. the Council of Troubles and the imposition of the Tenth Penny etc. Religious issues might include: the growth of heresy in the Netherlands, especially of Calvinism; the official policy of repression of heresy and the rejection of this by some of the nobility, (Les Gueux/Beggars); the outbreak of iconoclasm and hedge preaching in 1566 and its consequences; the scheme to establish new bishoprics; the Segovia letters and their consequences; the issue of the Accord and the reduction in Calvinist militancy. Answers might argue that either of these sets of issues were the more important, e.g. the political issues because the Netherlanders questioned Philip II's fundamental authority as ruler; the Netherlanders were afraid of what was perceived as a significant difference to the way in which Charles V had governed, and Philip's absence generated distrust. Religious issues might be supported because they were the trigger to the arrival of Alva; more Calvinists were in the country as a result of the French religious wars etc. Answers might also note the connections between the two aspects, e.g. the reform of the bishoprics annoyed the Dutch nobility because of the secretive manner of its planning and introduction and this made them more anxious to assert their rights; Philip II interpreted opposition to the bishopric scheme as a challenge to his political authority as head of state.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to make very brief observations about one aspect or both or generalised arguments in support of one or the other aspect. For Level 2, some knowledge of the issues and supporting factual material would be expected; answers are likely to focus on either religious or political issues. Level 3 responses will be better directed and have better balance and focus on issues; at Level 4 sound analysis of both issues will recognise some of their interconnections. Sound comparative discussion leading to a well supported conclusion should be a hallmark of Level 5.

- 3** “William the Silent was motivated more by political than religious concerns in his work for the Netherlands up to 1584.”
How far do you agree with this view? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring extended responses without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Aspects of William's work could include: opposition to the bishopric scheme; resistance to Alva and Tenth Penny; military leadership of the revolt until his death in 1584; his political role as ruler of Holland, Zeeland and Utrecht, and in formulating and promoting negotiations as in the Pacification of Ghent 1576, the Union of Utrecht 1579, the Act of Abjuration 1581 and the issue of the sovereignty of the Netherlands.

Political motivation might be demonstrated through William's steadfast resistance to Spanish control at a governmental level, his willingness to become Stadholder and to act as Governor-General, (alternative leadership in this last capacity was organised, but incumbents were leaders in name only, e.g. the Archduke Matthias in 1577, the French duke of Anjou in 1578); some of the changes he made in the government of the provinces to restore and extend the principle of parliamentary rule, especially in Holland and Zeeland. However, when Holland and Zeeland signed the pacification of Ghent they asserted their allegiance to Spain, possibly so that there could be a basis for further negotiation; William always maintained that he was fighting against evil advisers rather than against the kingship of Philip II. Religious motivation could be seen through Orange's own change of religion to Lutheranism in 1567 and Calvinism in 1573. He also appeared intent on gaining religious toleration within the states (although this was undermined when William of Orange had some of the Sea beggars arrested in 1573), and the refusal of Requesens to offer toleration in 1575 led to renewed fighting instead of peace. Later, the Union of Utrecht 1579 expressed the hope that Catholic worship would be allowed within the Confederation. Additionally, William refused to allow his troops to persecute Catholics or Anabaptists. It could therefore be argued that freedom of conscience was important to William but, alternatively, it was also convenient in that it gave him the most support to pursue the conflict with Spain.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and assertive with limited comments on either or both aspects. For Level 2 some reference to specific examples which might illustrate motivation could be expected and at Level 3, a wider ranging and balanced response should lead to limited conclusions. Level 4 responses will have a clear focus on motivation and should be aware of some of the arguments for and against "political rather than religious concerns". At Level 5, answers will have balance and an appreciation of the complexity of the issues and may be prepared to draw variable conclusions relevant to events and circumstance.

- 4** "External assistance rather than the efforts of the Dutch alone determined the outcome of the revolt of the Netherlands by 1609."
To what extent do you agree with this opinion? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring extended responses without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

External assistance in the early stages of the revolt could be perceived in terms of, e.g. the fact that Spain was struggling against the Turks and was in financial difficulty resulting, e.g. in the mutiny in Antwerp in 1576 which hardened resistance within the Netherlands. However, it is more likely that answers will focus on the military intervention of Anjou in 1578, John Casimir in 1578 and the Earl of Leicester in 1586-8. All but one of these failed: Anjou was not successful militarily, the States-General limited his power and he retreated to France after a failed coup. Casimir led an army paid for by Elizabeth I but failed to engage the Spanish troops and focused on harrying Catholics; this had a negative effect on the Dutch effort. In 1585 Elizabeth I offered more direct help through Leicester, troops and finance; initial failure was followed by success in the 1590s. The efforts of the Dutch are likely to be analysed through the work of William the Silent and Maurice of Nassau, his son. Both operated in military and political spheres. William was as important for his propaganda statements as for his military prowess. William was ultimately responsible for the creation of the Union of Utrecht and Maurice for the secure establishment of the United Provinces. Maurice's achievement might be set against the fact that Spain was diverted in the late 1580s and 1590s by the Armada and campaigns in France. Additionally Spain was bankrupt and the army often mutinous. However, Maurice ensured his army had regular supplies, was well-disciplined, and fought a war that was suitable to the terrain.

Answers at Level 1 will offer a brief survey of the war, or limited focus on one country or leader. To achieve Level 2, a recognition of some of the main issues or an account of the main events of the struggle with some links will be appropriate. Level 3 responses should offer some range and some comparison. Answers at Level 4 will provide more detailed comparison and be aware that 'assistance' is not just a reference to military action. Level 5 responses will offer a well founded discussion of the issues leading to a considered judgement.

Option B: Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire, 1519-1556

- 5** "It is not our will to have many lords, but one."
How successful was Charles V in asserting political and religious authority over the princes in the Holy Roman Empire? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring extended responses without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

This statement was made by Charles V at the Diet of Worms 1521 expressing his desire to rule firmly and keep the princes in check. Answers may consider that Charles was unsuccessful politically because, e.g. he had to agree to the Capitulation before he could get the support of the princes for his election; he had, under pressure from the princes, to reform the Imperial Chamber Court but could no longer pay its members who therefore became more independent and many princes refused to send cases to it; he agreed to restore the Regency Council most of whose members were appointed by the princes; he was often an absentee ruler and had to rely on those who governed for him. However, the future of the Habsburg dynasty was assured in Germany through the Augsburg agreement in 1551. In religious terms, e.g. some princes converted to Lutheranism, eventually forming the Schmalkaldic League fighting against Charles. Although they were initially defeated at Muhlberg, this victory could not be sustained and further conflict led eventually to the Peace of Augsburg which divided Germany religiously in 1555 and contributed towards Charles V's eventual abdication. The Peace of Augsburg gave the princes the right to decide matters of faith.

Level 1 responses may make general assertions about Charles' relations with the princes; at Level 2, some focus on political or religious issues with the princes should be evident. Answers at Level 3 could provide an analysis of both aspects although not necessarily of equal weight. Level 4 responses should demonstrate some breadth and depth of understanding of the outcomes and at Level 5 an assessment of comparative success should be the focus, e.g. that Charles failed equally in both political and religious spheres; however, his authority was variable in both respects, with the high point at Muhlberg. Consolidation of this victory was elusive and both Catholics and Lutherans resisted any further move which might enhance the Emperor's power and authority. Alternatively, the position of the Holy Roman Emperor was quite weak throughout and it was largely in the religious sphere that the Emperor failed to establish his authority effectively, whereas the political role of the Holy Roman Emperor continued through Ferdinand.

- 6** To what extent can Charles V's failure to overcome the threat posed by the German princes be explained by fear of Turkish invasion of the Holy Roman Empire?

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring extended responses without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The threat posed by the princes was both political and religious; the one reinforced the other. At various crucial points in the struggle for power the threat from the Turks undermined Charles's attempts to deal with the princes, e.g. at the Diet of Speyer 1526 when princes refused to enforce the Edict of Worms and Ferdinand, (acting for Charles), was unable to prevent the princes claiming the right to decide the faith in their territories because money and troops were needed to deal with the Turks in Austria and Hungary; in 1532 and in 1539 he virtually agreed to toleration in the Holy Roman Empire for the same reason; although he was successful at Muhlberg in 1547, this was shortlived as the Ottomans advanced again. Against this, answers could assess other reasons for Charles' failure, e.g. the Habsburg-Valois rivalry which strengthened the Turkish threat through the alliance between the French and the Turks; the papacy gave little help in resolving the religious issues until Trent was convened; constitutional issues meant he had little power to enforce his wishes, (as compared with Spain); financial problems meant he did not always have the capacity to fight; the alliance between the Protestant princes and the French after 1552 led Charles to authorise Ferdinand to make peace with the princes which led to the Peace of Augsburg etc. Some answers might argue that Charles only belatedly realised the seriousness of his situation and could have acted more vigorously in the 1520s.

Level 1 responses may focus on the threat of the princes or make generalised assertions about Charles' handling of the situation. A Level 2 response should make some general links between events in Germany and the effects of the threat of the Turks. By Level 3 some awareness of a range of reasons for Charles' failure in Germany should provoke a stronger analytical response and at Level 4 some conclusions might be drawn. Level 5 responses will show understanding of the interaction of events and generate a balanced evaluation of the extent of the influence of the Turkish threat as opposed to other issues in Charles' failure.

- 7 Which had the greater significance for Charles V's ability to fulfil his aims as Holy Roman Emperor - the Diet of Worms 1521, or the Sack of Rome 1527?
Explain your answer. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers need to consider Charles' aims which included maintaining the Holy Roman Empire under his leadership, defending the faith and securing his dynasty. This question focuses on the conflict between Charles' internal problems and the international struggle as factors in Charles' failure as Holy Roman Emperor. The Diet of Worms is representative of the religious division which weakened Germany as well as the conflict with the princes, whereas

the sack of Rome in 1527 is indicative of Charles' extensive external commitments and his relationship with the Pope, whose support he needed if he was to suppress the protestant princes. Although the Diet of Worms declared Luther a heretic, too many princes failed to support Charles V in practical terms; once some of them became Lutheran it was difficult to retrieve the situation. This was compounded by Charles' absence fighting the French and their allies in Italy, leading to the sack of Rome. Although this was not an action ordered by Charles, it hardened opinion against him in Europe and generated further conflict with France until the truce of 1529 which left Charles with the upper hand in Italy. The Diet of Worms might therefore be seen as significant as it set the tone for the reign; this conflict was never fully resolved until the Peace of Augsburg which clearly demonstrated that Charles V had not defended the faith. The sack of Rome and its consequences saw Charles crowned as Holy Roman Emperor but it did not strengthen his position within the Holy Roman Empire and its consequences led to further conflict with France and eventual abdication.

Level 1 responses are likely to give some, but not extensive, information about each of these two events. By Level 2 descriptions of events will be fuller and any conclusions are likely to be assertive. Level 3 answers will show some ability to offer analysis of the two events and their outcomes and this will be developed at Level 4. Answers which offer debate re: 'significance' based on a careful analysis of the incidents and draw well evidenced conclusions should reach Level 5.

Option C: Suleiman the Magnificent, 1521-1566

- 8** "Far from being omnipotent, Suleiman the Magnificent had constantly to ensure that he had military and religious support within his state."
How accurate is this view? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Traditionally the Ottoman ruler is regarded as an absolute ruler, heading an elaborate court, making law, leading the army, administering justice, running an elaborate court and not hesitating to order the execution of his sons when he thought they were plotting against him etc. However, his authority was also based on military success – the Janissaries and the timar system were the core. The timar system meant that land had to be continually available to supply the flow of troops, ensure loyalty and discipline etc.; this in turn affected local government and, through taxation, the finances of the empire. There is some evidence that, by the end of Suleiman's reign, this system was collapsing - territorial conquest was slowing and there were fewer good soldiers to whom the land could be granted. Similarly, the Janissaries, the standing army, also extended their role often acting more as provincial

governors and removing power from the centre. In religious terms, the Turks were outwardly tolerant - other faith groups lived in the empire in their ‘millet’ or legally recognised communities. The Sultan was expected to enforce religious law (the shariat) and to consult the ulema and its head, the chief Mufti, as appropriate. The Sultan chose the Mufti, but was then expected to abide by his advice. Sultans were expected make public displays of their own faith to keep the people loyal and faithful. There is evidence that Suleiman sought the advice of the Mufti before executing Bayezid. In attacking the Holy Roman Empire, Suleiman was perceived as fulfilling a significant part of his religious role; similarly he had a duty to deal with the Sh’ites and, as a consequence wars with Persia disrupted his campaigns against the west. Answers could suggest that the religious issue was a greater challenge to the Sultan’s omnipotence because it challenged his internal power. Alternatively, the military ensured that Suleiman had the physical power to rule. Good answers will understand the enmeshing of the two aspects; Suleiman was both a great military leader but also renowned as an able interpreter of Islamic law; this duality appeared to pose no issues of conflict for him and together contributed to, rather than detracting from, his omnipotence for the majority of his rule.

Answers at Level 1 will make generalised statements about military/religious influence showing limited conceptual understanding. A Level 2 response might offer description/simple analysis of the role of one or both influences in varying depth. By Level 3 clear understanding of the threat posed by these two factors and some reference to the concept of ‘omnipotence’ should be made. By Level 4, answers should be offering some comparisons of, and debate on, the negative and positive influences of these factors on Suleiman’s authority, and at Level 5, a well supported judgement should be provided.

- 9 “The alliance with France rather than Ottoman naval and military strengths was the key to Ottoman victory in Europe.”
To what extent do you agree with this opinion? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring extended responses without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The alliance with France, formalised in 1536, was probably an alliance of convenience for both sides. It was important to the Turks because it allowed them to attack the Holy Roman Empire and Habsburg possessions without fear that Charles V/Ferdinand would get help from France. It also gave them freedom of trade in the Mediterranean and diverted Charles V to maintain the struggle with France in Italy, e.g. Suleiman’s navy besieged Venetian ports in 1537; by 1538 the Turks under Barbarossa controlled the Mediterranean and enabled Suleiman to secure Hungary as vassal state. The psychological effect of this alliance might also be considered important; Charles V and Ferdinand had enemies to both west and east

and on both land and sea; this compounded with internal problems such as the religious and princely opposition may well have contributed to Ottoman success in eastern Europe. However, Ottoman naval and military strengths should be evaluated, e.g. the intrinsic strengths such as the organisation of the army, discipline, role of the Janissaries and the sipahis, in comparisons to western troops; a well organised navy, good ships and excellent leaders such as Barbarossa and Dragut who were undefeated at sea until Lepanto. Answers might also point out that the Turks had successes before 1536, e.g. the capture of Belgrade in 1521, the battle of Mohacs in 1526, the attack on Vienna in 1529, the division of Hungary in 1532, a last campaign in 1566 shortly before Suleiman's death. The evidence demonstrates that the duration of the Ottoman threat to Europe was constant; victory at sea might have been the result of co-operation with the French but on land this is a less valid explanation.

Answers at Level 1 may volunteer limited information or comment of a general nature on the themes of the question or particular events. For Level 2, more detailed knowledge and some relevant comment to link to Ottoman success might be anticipated. Responses at Level 3 should be framed more analytically and make precise links to success. At Level 4 there should be some attempt to compare the arguments on both sides, although this may not necessarily be fully balanced. Level 5 responses should, in addition, exercise judgement regarding 'extent'.

- 10** To what extent was the domestic success of Suleiman the Magnificent the outcome of the structure he inherited rather than of his own skills and policies? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use A2 mark scheme for questions requiring extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

A significant element of the inherited structure was that the Sultan had absolute power – he was the secular head of state, made all government appointments, controlled the army and could make laws. Once a Sultan was accepted, he was also the head of the religious institutions. A number of systems were also in place which worked effectively during his reign, e.g. the *dvershime* who either became the army or the civil service, toleration of differing religious groups through the millet system, the administrative system, e.g. the Divan. This was basically an autocracy and there was no effective opposition; the Sultan would stand or fall by his own capabilities. Domestically, Suleiman's skills lay in his ability to control the court and the harem, raise the prestige of the sultanate through ceremonial, handle the succession etc. Policy making was largely a matter of generating administrative and legal reform (the latter earning him the title of 'the lawgiver'), economic development, e.g. he created an effective civil service, implementing an efficient system of raising taxes, ensuring that his army was paid and fed well, building impressive mosques, bridges and roads (raising prestige and improving communications), developing Constantinople as his

administrative base and developing its commercial potential, as well as encouraging the arts. Suleiman's qualities as a leader should form part of the discussion, e.g. sound choice of officials, promotion by merit, effective delegation etc. Some answers may show awareness that by the end of his reign, the system was under strain, particularly because of a rising population; had he lived much longer his skills may not have been adequate to the task.

Answers at Level 1 may describe the Ottoman state; by Level 2 some breadth and depth of knowledge will be expected about the strength of the regime, although there may not be sustained differentiation between inherited structures and Suleiman's policies. At Level 3 coverage should be more balanced and at Level 4 links should be made to the issue of success although comparison may not be sustained. Level 5 responses will evaluate 'structure' against 'skills and policies' to arrive at a well supported judgement.

Alternative B: Europe in Transition 1470-1610**A2 Unit 6: Henry IV of France: A Modern King?**

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

How valid is the interpretation offered in the source of the significance of Sully's work in introducing the paulette tax? (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

At Level 1, answers will be confined to the extract; Rady believes that Sully's imposition of the paulette tax was a long lasting achievement and an important change because it provided steady income for the crown, allowed the middle and upper classes to hold significant office, and made those who held office reliant upon the crown for their job rather than their local seigneur. Level 2 responses will also be aware of the reasons for this change and/or the consequences and use this to show understanding, e.g. the government's need for cash, the rivalry created by clientage systems which had been demonstrated during the Wars of Religion and Henry's own struggle for the throne, more new families/individuals moved into posts after its introduction, as the tax rose so did the turnover, providing a steady income for the crown. Answers at Level 3 will offer some limited comment, e.g. Rady ignores the fact that the paulette did not end corruption (it merely created a kind of formalised corruption). Level 4 responses will offer a more balanced assessment which could be based on issues relating to the paulette only or to the broader view, e.g. in relation to the paulette, as for Level 3 but also noting that offices were still traded but through the treasury rather than through private individuals; they were much sought after and the proceeds did provide a steady flow of income to the crown which covered payments of pensions and salaries. Answers which consider the wider view and whether this was Sully's most enduring achievement may conclude that his promotion of industry and development of the economic infrastructure was his most significant and long lasting achievement.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of Sully's methods and achievements as Superintendent of Finances? (10 marks)

Target: A011, 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 reliability/utility. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the reliability/utility 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 will recognise that the source suggests, e.g. Sully paid great attention to detail and expected good work from those responsible to him. At Level 2, answers may refer to Sully's apparently detailed knowledge of the situation re: Caen and the general tone which is critical and indicates his willingness to use duress to achieve his aims; also his willingness to hold seniors to account for the failures of their juniors and to take the matter further. Some may say this is useful because it indicates that Sully was not achieving his aims or that alternatively it is evidence of a change in attitude and approach to efficiency. A Level 3 response could suggest that this is just one example of Sully's methods and general conclusions would be difficult; the outcome of this demand is not known. At Level 4, answers should be based in a broader context of Sully's methods and achievements; that he was not afraid to tackle laxity, that he did have the confidence of the king and that royal finances were improved during his period in office, therefore in this broader context the source may be useful in explaining Sully's success in improving revenue through personal intervention.

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

“Sully was single-handedly responsible for the financial and economic regeneration of France in the reign of Henry IV.” 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**

The sources certainly suggest that Sully had some responsibility for the financial and economic regeneration of France, e.g. Source A suggests that he made a strategic change in the source of taxation, placing more on office holders than on the Third Estate. Source B suggests that he was far more vigorous in pursuing information and checking on efficiency than his predecessors, (particularly as this kind of checking would have helped to weed out corruption), although this is only one letter written by Sully and we do not know its specific outcome. Source C asserts his involvement in both finance and the economy and suggests that from 1600 he asserted his individual control in both areas with the support of the King. There is little doubt that France did become more financially and economically secure in Henry IV's reign, but this may have been due as much to the cessation of the Wars of Religion and the limited involvement of France in European affairs up to the death of Henry IV. Baumgartner is a little more cautious in his appraisal than the sources represented in the question; he claims that Henry IV had 'a good head for figures' and that he personally also made proposals about ways of raising money and balancing the books and that much of the work he did to enhance royal authority, e.g. reducing the power of the provincial estates, placing royal tax officers in some of the provinces. Rady is probably the commentator most enthusiastic about Sully's role; the crown was deeply in debt on Henry's accession but solvent by the end of his reign. This was achieved through a systematic overhaul by Sully, which was not necessarily innovative but thorough. Even Rady, however, notes that the support of Henry IV was invaluable in demanding obedience from parlement, local estates and municipal councils, and Sully was never allowed to dominate the royal council. The issue of regeneration might also be tackled; in finance, the paulette might be seen as the only innovation, but Sully was also bold in repudiating Henry's debtors and regularly appointed royal commissioners to check up on the activities of the localities (sometimes seen as the precursors of the intendants). There may be a stronger case with regard to economic development, e.g. Sully attempted to encourage nobles into trade, fostered an early concept of

mercantilism and organised a programme of investment in new roads, bridges and canals, and supported a programme of industrial expansion and building (which included parts of Paris).

Level 1 responses may focus mostly on the sources or give a very general outline of Sully's work. At Level 2, more detailed information from either sources or own knowledge is anticipated with some brief statement about the validity of the opinion in the question. Level 3 responses should have a more thorough approach, perhaps looking at finance and economy separately and drawing conclusions with some reference to the provided sources and others. Level 4 answers should respond to the concept of 'regeneration' and provide an effective synthesis between sources and own knowledge. At Level 5 the argument will be well sustained and supported, arriving at a clear and logical conclusion using a good range of evidence from sources and own knowledge.