



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

History

Alternative C

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 uses 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 C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640-1790**AS Unit 1: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640-1725****Question 1**

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

Explain briefly what was meant by the “so-called reformed religion” in the context of religious beliefs in France in the seventeenth century. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. the so-called reformed religion means Calvinism/what Huguenots believed in. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the edict had given rights to the Huguenots/Calvinists but Louis wanted complete uniformity in his church so he did away with Huguenot rights. 2-3

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

Explain how **Source B** is challenged by **Source C** in relation to the immediate effects of Louis XIV’s Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. (7 marks)

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

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context. This may consist of bold assertion, e.g. Source B praises Louis’ action and Source C condemns it 1-2
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source B is dealing with the Catholic reaction, Source C is dealing with the Huguenot reaction. The answer is likely to contain some summaries, the challenge will only be partially met. In a sense, it might be argued the reaction given in each extract was to be expected. Louis’ boast he was a great Catholic King who exterminated heretics. To him the Huguenots were the heretics. 3-5
- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge of the issue and draws conclusions. Thus whilst Source B gives the view

which Louis would wish to hear, approving of the Divine Right King's actions, Source C having listed a number of Huguenot protests also criticises Louis 'religion depending on despotic power of a mortal prince'. 6-7

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

Explain the importance of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes for Louis XIV and for France both at home and abroad. (15 marks)

Level descriptors for response *with* use of sources and own knowledge

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO3

- 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 own knowledge or the 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 description, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* 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 sources *and* 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* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands 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

From the sources candidates will no doubt recognise the bias – Sources A and B being pro-Catholic and Source C pro-Huguenot. Source A supplies the official view of revocation, representing it as a logical move which eliminated a measure which was already redundant. Source B seeks to show Louis' actions as popular, as Bossuet a Catholic bishop praises Louis for exterminating heresy. The contrasting view given in Source C represents Louis' actions as

preventing liberty of conscience and freedom of movement for Huguenots – a viewpoint which might be developed from own knowledge. From own knowledge, too, candidates should be able to develop some of the above points to show the importance of revocation for Louis – to further his desire for religious uniformity, his wish to restore religious splendour, to bring peace within his church, remove religious diversity and give social and political harmony especially necessary in the light of the many wars in which Louis had been engaged in. Some candidates may comment on the adverse economic effects on France which are viewed by historians in different degrees of importance, some regarding revocation as a blunder.

Answers at Level 1 may be limited information on revocation or on Louis XIV's treatment of the Huguenots. Level 2 answers may be fuller but along the same lines. At Level 3 candidates will show they have appreciated the question. They will begin to examine revocation and whether it was important from a number of viewpoints – religious, economic, social and in the light of foreign policy. These answers will be unbalanced. At Level 4 some of the historical debates may be introduced but the candidates will be expected to use their material only in relation to the question. Level 5 answers should show clear evidence of cross reference between sources and own knowledge and should at least reach a partial conclusion on how important the revocation was.

Question 2

- (a) Briefly explain what is meant by “the junkers of Brandenburg” in the context of the social classes of Brandenburg. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. they were nobles, the most important class. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context. They were large scale entrepreneurs who ran their estates on serf labour, made their profit from sale of corn and beer – not like the landed aristocracy of Europe (they were a working nobility). They dominated the economy, the administration and the politics of Brandenburg. They paid no taxes. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Frederick William, the Great Elector, found the junkers difficult to deal with. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. they had too much power, they wanted to control the Elector not let him control them. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material. These might include:

- the extent of their power – social, economic and political;
- their dislike of warfare – only interested in own lands, hence refusal to support the Elector, e.g. in war against Sweden over Pomerania;
- their domination of the Diets;
- their refusal to pay taxes. 3-5

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance and setting the difficulties into the context of the Elector's desire to bring his territories together into an administrative unit which is suggested by the stimulus. 6-7

- (c) “The skilful management of the nobles in Brandenburg-Prussia was the most important factor in enabling Frederick William, the Great Elector, to establish absolute control.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Level Descriptors for responses *without* reference to sources

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. 5-8

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

Candidates should make it clear what they understand by skilful management and why it was important for an absolute ruler, e.g. because the nobles were a wealthy, privileged class,

traditionally respected and they did have some influence, e.g. in the Diets. Skilful management might be seen in showing respect for their position, in allowing them their privileges, e.g. tax exemption and in following policies of conciliation and compromise rather than confrontation, e.g. as seen in the Recess of 1653. At the same time the nobles had to be controlled as seen when Kalkstein revolted. In return for their privileges the nobles gave service to the Elector, e.g. in the army and because known as ‘service nobility’. The arrangement helped the Elector’s absolutism by ensuring their help and loyalty. However, there should be discussion of the other factors which helped the Elector establish his absolute control such as his character and determination, his administration and the army.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited information on the Elector and his nobles but without valid links to the question. Level 2 answers will be wider ranging. They may be narrative accounts of some policies with links or limited analysis and limited support on why a good relationship with the nobles was important. Level 3 answers will clearly discuss the nature of the relationship between the nobles and the Elector’s attempts to gain absolute control but make only passing reference to other factors. The answer will therefore be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and having examined the prime focus, i.e. the skilful management of the nobles will then discuss the other factors. Level 5 answers will begin to prioritise and reach a partial judgement.

Question 3

- (a) Briefly explain what is meant by “geographical circumstances” in the context of the territories ruled by Frederick William, the Great Elector. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. it refers to the scattered nature of his territories. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context. Might refer to differences between the territories, the lack of unity, each state being a separate entity with its own institutions, interests, traditions etc. **2-3**

- (b) Explain how geographical circumstances influenced the domestic policies of Frederick William, the Great Elector. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements. Might simply adopt the information in the stimulus, e.g. it affected the development of the army, religious toleration policies – without saying how. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material. Looks at areas of policy which were affected. Likely to be: the development of the army – build up of numbers, organisation etc., in order to defend the scattered territories; the policy of

religious toleration to encourage immigration, raise money to pay for defence etc.

3-5

- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance. Answers will at least cover the policies mentioned in the stimulus or deal with a range of policies affected by geographical circumstances. **6-7**

- (c) “Although Brandenburg-Prussia possessed great military strength, the foreign policy of Frederick William, the Great Elector, had only limited success.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Level Descriptors for responses *without* reference to sources

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or 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

The question implies that, given the military strength of Brandenburg-Prussia, he should have achieved more but his only two victories, at Fehrbellin 1675 and Stettin 1677, may have enhanced his reputation but were not regarded as great victories. Moreover his policies were usually helped by French support, e.g. the gains at Westphalia, which were out of proportion to the part the Elector played in the Thirty Year War, were the result of support from Mazarin. By the 1660s changes in Europe also helped the Elector, e.g. the decline of Sweden, the advent of Russia, the wars of Louis XIV. However, it has to be recognised that the Elector did have some successes, e.g. he freed East Prussia from Polish suzerainty at the

Treaty of Wehlau, 1659 and was recognised as an independent prince in East Prussia by the Treaty of Oliva, 1660. By 1686, when he joined the League of Augsburg, he had secured his state – this was no mean achievement.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be patchy information on parts of his foreign policy with little attempt to link to the question. Level 2 answers may be chronological narrative which works through the policies but does not analyse achievements or limitations. Level 3 answers will analyse these and will concentrate on either achievements or limitations. Level 4 will look at both and produce a fairly balanced account. Judgement, which may be partial, will be reached for Level 5.

Question 4

- (a) Briefly explain what is meant by “the Patriarch” in the context of the Russian Orthodox Church. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. he was the head of the Russian Orthodox Church. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. as head of the Orthodox Church in Russia he was considered to be the Tsar’s spiritual counterpart. He dealt with anything connected to religion and was the supreme judge of all ecclesiastical cases – the Tsar would then command his orders be put into force. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Peter the Great decided to take over the administration of the Russian Orthodox Church. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. he was jealous of the Patriarch’s power, he (Peter) wanted to control the church. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. recognition of the advantages of having full control, no division of authority, clergy preached loyalty to Tsar. Saw the advantages of having the church organised as a state department – priests could be used as civil servants. The prikazy controlled church revenues (especially valuable monastic revenue). Peter was now able to introduce his own reform programme without much opposition and westernisation could advance – church had been an ultra conservative, insular and backward organisation. The organisation of the church could now be brought in line with the state college system, so by the Ecclesiastical Regulations Act 1721, the Patriarch was abolished and replaced by the Most Holy of All Synods. 3-5

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance. **6-7**

(c) “Peter the Great’s reform of the central, local and church administration brought no fundamental improvement to the Russian Government.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Level Descriptors for responses *without* reference to sources

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

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

The issue is whether Peter created a modern and centralised system by his reforms or were the changes he made superficial, leaving a system which remained hopelessly corrupt and inefficient. Examination of the changes in central and local administration may lead to the conclusion that maladministration, corruption, nepotism and incompetence remained and this together with the shortage of suitable, educated personnel dogged both the central and local systems. Moreover with the creation of so many institutions confusion prevailed, especially when the regimental districts were created in 1724 thereby bringing in the military. The argument against the statement lies with the Ecclesiastical Regulations Act 1721 which abolished the Patriarch, placing the church under the Tsar, and absorbing its government into state administration. This was a fundamental and lasting change.

Answers at Level 1 may consist of general assertions such as ‘the church was still corrupt’ or may be limited information on the reform of just one or two institutions but unlinked to the question. Answers at Level 2 may be description of the reforms carried out, e.g. 1699 the Ratusha instituted; 1708 the establishment of the Gubernii; 1711 the founding of the Senate; 1718 the founding of the Colleges; 1721 the Holy Synod established, but there will be only passing opinions to link, e.g. statements to the effect that they were overworked, badly staffed, corrupt, just like the institutions they replaced. Level 3 answers will discuss the reforms in an analytical way and will relate to the question. They may be unbalanced and mainly agree with the statement, by dealing with central and local Government administration. Level 4 answers will in addition dispute the statement most likely using the reform of the church as their evidence. At Level 5 a judgement will be reached which may be implicit or partial.

Question 5

- (a) Briefly explain “nothing was more fitting than Peter the Great’s burial – not in Moscow but in the new capital” in the context of the choice of location. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. the new capital means St Petersburg the city named after Peter. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. giving a reason for the choice being fitting, Peter’s hatred of Moscow, he had founded St Petersburg – it represented ‘the new Russia’ etc. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why there was relief at the news of Peter the Great’s death both at home and abroad. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Peter was feared. The peasants believed he caused their sufferings etc. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. why most Russians heaved a huge sigh of relief, these might include – at home: misunderstanding of Peter and his policies, hatred of his violence, e.g. to the Streltsi. Resentment at his policies which seemed to deride their forefathers and tradition, dislike of his innovations, the ways in which he had offended the different social groups. Abroad: relief, especially in Poland and Sweden, idea that Russia might now relapse into unimportance and weakness from which Peter had raised it. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance. **6-7**

- (c) “The achievements of Peter the Great in his social and economic policies were limited.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Level Descriptors for responses *without* reference to sources

- L1: The answers is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or 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

Candidates need to be clear on what they consider to be Peter’s achievements in social and economic policies, e.g. agricultural improvements; the developments of industry; the introduction of skilled immigrants; better communications; improved education; improved trade; increased state revenue; some improvement in financial organisation; a degree of westernisation. They should then examine these critically, pointing out where they consider the achievements were limited, e.g. financial policies lacked perseverance, there was over concentration on the needs of war – less done for people, lack of entrepreneurial skills hindered the growth and success of industry, the social system was subordinated to state interests. Not all was achieved by Peter – some work had been begun by predecessors.

Level 1 answers are likely to be thin narrative sometimes on irrelevant policies (which should be discounted), e.g. Shaving of beards. Level 2 answers will be wider ranging narrative with links or analysis with very limited support. Level 3 answers will look at the achievements and comment on whether they were limited (either by examining each policy or in more general analysis of reasons why the achievements might be considered to have been limited). Answers will lack balance. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and may argue that not all

achievements have been exaggerated. Level 5 answers will reach a judgement which may be partial or implicit.

Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640-1789**A2 Unit 4: Monarchy in the Age of Enlightenment**

In the mark scheme which follows the range of material often given in the indicative content refers to the synoptic focus of the question (especially for Question 1(c) whereby candidates must demonstrate an appreciation of the connections between separate historical perspectives and how they inter-relate, e.g. between the individual and the historical context in which he/she operated; the influence of ideas, attitudes and beliefs; between the political and the social or the cultural and the economic, or the religious and technological).

Question 1

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

What is meant by “the ancien régime” as it applies to France in the eighteenth Century? (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. ‘ancien’ means old regime which was the prevailing system in France. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept of the ‘ancien regime’ with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. the source indicates the old system meant that the nobility had both precedence and privileges although they accepted royal service. Own knowledge may indicate that it has become an umbrella term covering social, religious and economic as well as political aspects of pre-Revolution France. **2-3**
- L3: As Level 2 with developed references to both the source and own knowledge as well as clearly placing the ancien regime into the context of French history, e.g. the source clearly illustrates the privileges normally associated with the ancien regime and from own knowledge as Level 2 and perhaps commenting on the misconception of the term that is frequently used. **4-5**

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

How fully do these two sources explain the causes of the huge debts of the French monarchy in the 1770s and early 1780s? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement or disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of the utility/sufficiency, etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**

- L3: Draws conclusions about the utility/sufficiency of the sources in relation to the issue with reference to both the sources and own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4 Uses material selected appropriately from both sources and own knowledge in order to reach sustained judgement on the utility/sufficiency of the sources in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 may indicate by selection of simple statements some brief points on which the sources agree or disagree, e.g. both agree the debt existed, directly or indirectly; disagree on its cause with Source D saying it was not due to extravagant favours etc. but they will not link the two.

Level 2 answers will examine the sources more thoroughly and by so doing show greater insight into them. They may include some summary/description from the sources but will indicate some limited knowledge, e.g. the full focus of Source C is on the Queen's extravagance and wastefulness and leads the reader to conclude that this was the cause of debt; Source D on the other hand categorically puts the blame on the wars and states with conviction that court expenditure only put on an extra burden. Knowledge might be brief examples in support of each claim such as the Diamond Necklace affair or examples of wars.

By Level 3, as well as supporting points with sound knowledge, candidates should begin to draw conclusions on the utility of the sources by considering their sufficiency. Thus Source C does not consider other factors and fails to consider general Court extravagance in comparison to Marie Antoinette's. Source D does do this but is limited in detail on war expenditure.

At Level 4 answers will adopt a critical approach. They will show understanding of the differing interpretations with Source C adopting the rather dated view that the chief cause was court extravagance, a contemporary view which played on the unpopularity of Louis XVI and his wife. Both sources ignore the important fact that the French financial situation had improved prior to the outbreak of the American War of Independence.

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

“It was privilege, rather than the growing financial deficit, which caused the main crisis for the French monarchy.”

Assess the validity of this statement in the period 1688-1789. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the 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 the period of 1688-1789, as detailed in the specification for this particular alternative, and to the range of factors as exemplified in the indicative content given below. The drawing together of knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate understanding is most important. A careful blending of information from sources and own knowledge will help to achieve this. Answers which do not include both own knowledge and reference to the sources cannot be rewarded beyond Level 2.

Initial definition of "main crisis" should enable candidates to develop valid arguments supported by relevant material. Louis XVI accepting that the Crown's finances needed radical reform and Calonne's proposals which set in train the resistance of the privileged from 1786, might be a useful starting point as it establishes the link between the two. There should be assessment of reasons for the growing financial deficit across the period, e.g. in particular the costs of wars from Louis XIV's reign onwards (Source D); Court extravagance (Source C), the complexity and inefficiencies of the taxation system despite efforts at reform such as those of Law. The conservatism of the privileged - nobles, Parlements and Church, perhaps even towns - anxious to preserve their tax exemption (Source A) and the tradition of the Don Gratuit, as well as the monarchy's reluctance to challenge this for most of the period, as privilege was part of the accepted system and served the interests of the Crown (Source A), can be assessed against the financial deficit as the cause of crisis.

Some challenge to the statement can be made - e.g. it is difficult to argue that, in a political sense, the monarchy faced crisis in the reign of Louis XIV; even under Louis XV, whilst there was opposition from Parlement, "crisis" can be argued to be overstatement; there was mutual self-interest between the Crown and privilege; the nobility accepted some taxation,

e.g. under Louis XV, and some were willing to consider reform (Source B). Other factors which contributed to the crisis can be considered, e.g. the decline in acceptance of Divine Right; the character and commitment of the monarchs/Regent; the growing demand for both consultation and a role in decision making from Parlement; the qualities of ministers; the weaknesses of foreign policy leading to a loss of prestige as well as colonies; the issue of Jansenism; the economic situation.

Answers at the two lowest levels are likely to conform with the mark scheme. At Level 1 if narrative style answers occur they could be on one specific section or period, e.g. the general nature of privilege or the financial problems of the 1780s leading up to the Revolution. Alternatively they will rely on general assertions on one aspect, with quotations from the sources.

Level 2 answers will cover a wider period though not necessarily the entire 100 years specified. Narrative answers are likely to have a limited reign by reign focus. In analytical style answers there may be brief discussion of the period of some of the monarchs/Regent followed by some thinly supported analysis of noble and Church privilege and reasons for the growing financial deficit. Thus, although some implicit understanding will be in evidence, the focus of the question will not have been fully appreciated and the coverage will be uneven.

Level 3 answers will show some appreciation of the demands of the question and the focus on “main crisis” will have been appreciated to some extent. The full period should have been covered if not with equal weight. Answers should range over the period using material to demonstrate some awareness of the differing degree of the nature and significance of privilege and financial difficulties in causing crisis, and explore the links between them. All the sources can be used to advantage here.

At Level 4 in addition to the initial focus and the links between privilege and the financial deficit, answers will examine some range of other factors responsible for the Crown’s difficulties. Candidates might also offer some challenge to the statement. Level 5 answers will show their quality by their precise selection of material used in a controlled answer which still ranges across the 100 year period and sustains judgement and relevance to the question.

Section B: The Practice of Enlightenment

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of the candidates’ 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*

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 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, explicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on description 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 L.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. **19-20**

Option A: Brandenburg-Prussia under Frederick II, 1740-1786

2 “The ruler was the first judge, the first general and the first servant of the state” (Frederick II).
How well did Frederick II fulfil these roles? *(20 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (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 synoptic question pinpoints the areas to be discussed. They are the areas where Frederick II was in charge and, from the quotation, he accepted full responsibility for policies and subordinated himself to the interests of the state. Candidates are expected to

look at each area separately and their assessment should be balanced allowing for praise and criticism.

On the law: an area of major achievement in the comprehensive codification of laws which was therefore more unified and gave more protection for the people of Prussia and civil rights for some, e.g. equality under the law; rights to own property and land were protected. Lawyers and judges had to be trained and the legal system was speedier, cheaper and more efficient. However, probably because he was anxious to see justice administered fairly, Frederick interfered personally and used his own powers in an arbitrary way.

On the military: Frederick recognised the importance of the army and continued its disproportionate finance; he gained praise for his abilities as a general, especially with the victories at Leuthen and Rossbach. However, he has been criticised for becoming complacent about the army's quality and failing to modernise later in his reign, e.g. by developing tactics and weapons. By 1786 the army was in serious decline perhaps as a result of his over-reliance on his own reputation.

As first servant of the state: Frederick certainly worked tirelessly for the state but how far this can be equated with the good of the institution or the good of his people is a matter of debate. "Servant" he might have been but he gave his own orders.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited narrative on some of the policies connected with the roles indicated in the question with assertion on success. Level 2 narrative answers will range across the three aspects with some slight attempt at the assessment of Frederick's effectiveness. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably not focusing on all three aspects but it will attempt to assess how well Frederick qualified for his own claim. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. All three aspects will be considered although there may be some imbalance between them and the attempted judgement will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and will also be critical, showing some recognition of the need for definition and evaluation on each aspect and some appreciation of the degree to which enlightenment contributed to Frederick's assessment of his role and his effectiveness. Level 5 answers will sustain an argument both on motive and degree of effectiveness to reach a valid judgement.

- 3** "Frederick II's ability as a military commander rather than favourable circumstances enabled Prussia to survive in the Seven Years War."
How far do you agree with this statement? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Two reasons for Prussia's survival in the Seven Years War are offered for discussion so that a judgment can be reached. The statement obviously favours Frederick's ability as a military leader. In support of this candidates might indicate his ability as a strategist; the pre-emptive strike on Saxony; the ability to fight on three fronts and against overwhelming numbers; the speed with which he could mobilise his army and switch fronts; the oblique battle order and discipline of his troops; key victories such as Rossbach and Leuthen; the ways in which he inspired his troops, leading his men in person and showing considerable bravery during a number of battles; his determination; his reputation made enemies circumspect; recovery against all the odds and victories at Liegnitz and Torgau in 1760; the high regard he has been held in, e.g. by Napoleon. His role as commander was aided by him being both head of state and head of the army thus giving Prussia united command and decisive leadership. These should be linked as reasons for Prussia's survival – e.g. the defeat of the Imperial and French armies at Rossbach brought subsidies from Britain and an army in Hanover protected his western flank; Leuthen regained possession of Silesia for a while; the proportionately larger casualties inflicted on his adversaries in early battles made them more cautious e.g. Daun failing to follow up victory at Hochkirch in 1758, as did Austria and Russia after Kunersdorf; single command and purpose was more effective than the divisions of his opponents.

Possible dispute of Frederick's military abilities: the invasion of Saxony brought the coalition against him into determined effect; defeat at Kolin was the first Prussian defeat since 1740 and had meant retreat into Silesia, if countered by Leuthen; invasion of Moravia in 1758 was quickly negated by Austrian action and Prussian victory at Zorndorf was bought at high cost in casualties, Russian doggedness worried Frederick and he could not regain East Prussia; defeat at Kunersdorf in 1759 led Frederick to contemplate suicide.

Favourable circumstances might be supported by consideration of the geographical advantages of having Brandenburg as the core of his dominions and thus good communications; the disunity of his enemies and their differing aims and reliance on incompetent and cautious generals such as Soubise, Daun and Saltikov; their failure to co-ordinate simultaneous attack on Prussia; Britain's self-interest supplying subsidies; the death of Elizabeth and accession of Peter III in 1762 – Frederick himself described this as "the miracle". Arguably Frederick did enjoy his share of good fortune but what marked him out as a great general was his ability to exploit it.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of the war with assertion on Frederick's ability or luck. Level 2 answers are likely to offer a fuller account of the war with some slight attempt at the assessment of the reasons for Prussia's survival but these will not be well-defined. Where an analytical approach is attempted it will have limited range, probably focusing almost exclusively on either generalship or favourable circumstances. At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach with definite analysis. There will be clear attempt to define and support both aspects although answers will be unbalanced. Level 4 responses will be more balanced and will recognise some degree of integration between the two aspects. Level 5 answers will sustain an argument on both aspects to reach a valid judgement.

- 4 “His well-publicised enlightenment was merely a disguise to cover policies which were selfish and aggressive.”
How far do you agree with this judgement on Frederick II’s domestic policies?
(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (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 question offers candidates the opportunity to examine Frederick II’s claim to be enlightened and whether or not this was a genuine motive for his policies or merely a cloak for more self-interested purposes.

Candidates can consider a wide range of policies in evaluating the degree to which Frederick was genuinely motivated by enlightened principles, e.g. his interest and connections with the Philosophes pre-dated his accession; continued interest in and promotion of literature, art and music all of which were well-publicised, not least by Voltaire. Religious toleration; codification of the laws and reform of the judicial system; economic policies and progress; the welfare of his people, can all be presented as evidence of his genuine commitment to enlightened policies. Yet it is possible to argue that the enlightenment in his purpose and achievements has been exaggerated: a more liberal regime, a greater degree of economic or personal freedom, serious political experiment of any kind were luxuries too dangerous for Frederick to contemplate. Frederick’s primary purpose was the defence of his absolutism and his state, in this way he might well be argued as selfish and aggressive in his determination to consolidate his power and his brutal disregard for the interests of the serfs. Candidates might plausibly argue that his aggression was reserved for his foreign and military policies but these should not be pursued at the expense of focus on domestic policy.

Level 1 answers are likely to be either bland assertion on whether Frederick was enlightened or limited description of a few of Frederick’s policies with no real links to the question. At Level 2, answers may offer a wider range of Frederick’s policies with slight links to the focus of the question or an attempt at analysis without adequate support. Level 3 answers will adopt a more analytical approach on both aspects of the question although this will be unbalanced and there may be some narrative. Some challenge may be offered but not sustained. Level 4 answers will examine both parts of the statement and there should be some attempt to challenge the assumption if not fully developed. At Level 5, answers will draw conclusions on both aspects of the question.

Option B: Russia under Catherine II, 1762-1796

- 5 To what extent did the domestic policies of Catherine II serve the nobles rather than the Crown? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (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 question invites candidates to compare the interests of the Crown and nobility and to reach a judgement on the degree to which these were served in intent and implementation by Catherine's policies. There had been indications that the nobles had been gaining power in Russia since the death of Peter the Great but the extent to which their power increased during Catherine II's reign is open to question. It is possible to argue that this was "the Golden Age of the Nobility" as Catherine did increase their power by a series of concessions, including increasing their power to exploit the serfs, culminating in the Charter of the Nobility in 1785 which agreed their titles would be protected, the right to trial by their peers, accepted noble exemption from taxation, allowed them to travel abroad without permission, the right to assembly every three years and agreed that their commitment to state service was now voluntary. The nobles now had a protected exclusive role in society and controlled local affairs through their assemblies. Catherine's reasons for such a policy can be discussed, e.g. how far this was simply continuation of earlier trends; pragmatic given her early reliance on noble support; realism in recognition of the dangers of abolishing serfdom and the Pugachev Revolt. However, a more critical appraisal would indicate the linkage between the interests of the Crown and nobility in Russia as well as considering the interests of the Crown: any new concessions were minor ones; the Charter was largely a confirmation of the rights acknowledged by Peter III in 1762 and did not increase any significant power of the nobility vis a vis the State; the Governors in the provinces remained firmly the appointment of the Crown and had a supervisory role over the local assemblies. The nobles had their privileges and status assured whilst Catherine had ensured the Crown did not lose power and, indeed, might well have reinforced it.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited accounts of some policies with no clear link to the question or generalisations with assertions on whose interests were best served. Level 2 answers will be either a fuller account of policies or some attempt to link these to the focus of the question but with inadequate substance. At Level 3 there will be some attempt to assess the ways/areas in which it might be claimed Catherine had increased noble or Crown power but this will be unbalanced. Level 4 answers will be more balanced looking at reasons both for agreement and disagreement with the statement based on clear criteria with some acknowledgement of the connections between the two aspects. Level 5 will in addition draw conclusions on the degree to which the interests of both were served.

- 6 What does a study of Catherine II's diplomatic and military exploits reveal about the appropriateness of her title "the Great"? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (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 question should enable candidates to consider the degree to which Catherine II deserved the accolade on one, both or neither ground. Some discussion may be given at the outset on the image of a "Great" ruler in the eighteenth century – e.g. to what extent was it one who brought status and prestige to the country by way of territorial gains, diplomacy, international repute, military achievements? On each aspect there is evidence to support Catherine's claim to the title: territorial gains under the terms of Kutchuk Kainardjii and Jassy and from Poland; diplomatic skills in creating future opportunities for involvement in the Ottoman Empire and in the Partitions of Poland; the maintenance and extension of Russia's international position, e.g. in ending the Bavarian War of Succession; in Russia's leadership of the Armed Neutrality in 1780; in defence against Swedish revanchism; tipping the balance in Eastern Europe firmly in Russia's favour; military victories, e.g. the prestige of defeating the Turkish fleet at Chesme, the victories of Suvorov, Rumyantsev and Repnin for which Catherine took credit.

Other criteria may be applied to judge greatness, e.g. Voltaire praised Catherine's intervention in Poland on the grounds it would bring religious toleration, and her action against Turkey on which he castigated other states for not joining her 'liberation'. Catherine had ruthlessly conformed to the imperialist international norm of the time although modern judgement would be more critical.

Catherine might be argued to have been less astute than Frederick II over Poland, she had not been well-prepared for war with Turkey nor fully exploited her position in making peace, and the Greek Project was an over-ambitious failure.

Level 1 answers are likely to be limited narratives of some aspects of Catherine's foreign policy without links to the question or assertion on the issue of Greatness. Level 2 answers will be wider-ranging narrative with tentative links or some analysis of the achievements of Catherine's foreign policy, but with thin support. At Level 3 a mainly analytical approach will be adopted, which although mainly in praise of Catherine's achievements in foreign policy will be well-organised with a clear attempt to establish some criteria for Great. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and critical although the concentration may still be on her spectacular achievements. At Level 5 candidates will, in addition, reach a clear conclusion on the degree to which Catherine merited the title.

- 7 “She was a true daughter of the Enlightenment.”
How far do you agree with this judgement as revealed by the social and economic policies of Catherine II? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (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 statement comes from G.R.R. Treasure and the synoptic question is designed to ensure a manageable focus on two specific aspects of Catherine’s domestic policies whilst allowing assessment of the degree to which they were the result of enlightenment.

Evidence to support Catherine’s enlightenment can be supported by her wide knowledge and understanding of the works of the Philosophes, her lively correspondence with them, especially with Voltaire. On social policies which demonstrated the enlightenment, candidates might consider her cultural achievements, e.g. the art treasures collected for her country; the fame of the Russian academy and her educational reforms; religious toleration; her aim to be ‘the mother of mercy’ to the serfs, to abolish torture and to humanise the system. Economically she followed the Enlightenment’s prescription for the development of industry and trade.

To what extent, however, was her enlightenment genuine or mere propaganda? To what extent did the policies merely coincide with some of the principles of enlightenment? Catherine was astute enough to recognise the realities of her position and the limitations imposed by the social and economic conditions in Russia, e.g. the impracticality of serf emancipation, the need to maintain the support from the nobility, the limited industrial base and communication problems.

Level 1 answers might be simple accounts of some of Catherine’s policies with no real links to the question and/or assertion on her enlightenment. Level 2 answers may consist of a mixture of more detailed narrative on the two aspects with undeveloped links or lack sufficient substance to support analytical points.

At Level 3 there will be a more direct approach to the question with definite analysis. Answers may still contain some description and may be unbalanced between the two aspects of policy but there will be explicit consideration of criteria for enlightenment and some assessment of Catherine’s commitment to such ideals. Level 4 answers will be more balanced and will also offer some depth in considering the evidence for and against her enlightenment in each aspect. At Level 5 candidates will reach a reasoned conclusion having argued effectively on the issue.

Option C: Enlightenment in Theory and Practice

- 8** Assess the contribution of the Philosophes to the development of the theory and practice of enlightened absolutism. Illustrate your answer as appropriate by reference to the Philosophes and the policies of **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II.
(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (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 Philosophes did make a positive contribution to the concept. Their writings on reason led to the questioning of religious belief and therefore Divine Right. Their ideas on utilitarianism and humanitarianism may have indicated the need for a new role for the monarch as the first servant of the state. On the practical side it can be argued that certain ideas influenced the monarchs in their policies towards the law, religious toleration, the abolition of torture etc. The policies of both Frederick II and Catherine II might have been influenced in practice and they were both well aware of the theories of the Philosophes and had close contact with them. Enlightened ideas were sufficiently widespread by the mid and late eighteenth century to show that they did have some influence on the concept of absolutism.

However, the influence of the Philosophes should not be exaggerated. In many ways their influence on both the concept and the practice were limited. Other factors such as the Scientific Revolution, overseas discoveries, religious persecution also played a part in effecting the change in the theoretical justification of absolutism. On the practical side it can be argued that whilst the monarchs were prepared to welcome the Philosophes to their courts and correspond with them the monarchs would be selective over the ideas adopted. They were under no pressure from the Philosophes to accept the ideas, indeed at times these were modified to accommodate the monarchs' actions. None of the Philosophes listed the so-called enlightened policies often adopted and few of the reforms can be directly linked to a specific Philosophe.

Level 1 answers may attempt to define absolutism and assert that the concept changed or offer some brief consideration of a few policies of either monarch with assertion that this indicated change. Level 2 answers may adopt a variety of descriptive treatments – e.g. the ideas and works of the Philosophes or the policies of either Frederick or Catherine which were 'enlightened' with some brief link to the focus of the question.

Answers at Level 3 will be more explicit in their focus on the terms of the question and will consider the Philosophes' ideas and both monarchs although lacking in balance, perhaps focusing most heavily on the limited influence of the Philosophes on action as this is usually well known. Level 4 responses will be more balanced and will deal with both theory and

practice although as the question is broad great depth of consideration on each monarch is not expected. Level 5 answers will be well-supported and focused with a clear, sustained judgement on the influence of the Philosophes.

- 9 “Practical issues rather than enlightenment alone led the monarchs to reform.”
Assess the validity of this statement with reference to **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II.
(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Practical issues will need to be identified: the need for the monarchs to be realistic in the light of the predominance of noble privilege and influence within the administration and economy; the specific needs of their states; the factors of inheritance and need for continuity. Comparison might be made between the secure foundations inherited by Frederick II and Catherine’s usurpation of the Crown and the effects this had on their policies. Thus the factors of realism, inheritance and circumstances were significant. Reforms were made which might be classified as enlightened – e.g. in the law, administration, the economy, some humanitarian reforms – and both rulers had contact with the Philosophes who praised their endeavours. Candidates may argue that the copious correspondence did have some influence on the monarchs’ ideas but should assess how far this was the primary motive for reform or even if it had any tangible influence in light of the cynicism of both rulers.

Level 1 answers are likely to be brief descriptions of a few of the reforms of either monarch or assertion on the influence of enlightenment. Level 2 answers are likely to be wider-ranging description of policies thought to be enlightened with some links to the focus of the question. At Level 3 answers will be analytical with a clear attempt to analyse the motives of a number of reforms of both monarchs if unbalanced between practical and enlightened. Level 4 responses should offer a more critical and balanced approach, possibly with wider-ranging consideration of practical issues and some indication of differences between Frederick and Catherine’s commitment to enlightenment in their reforms. At Level 5 candidates will reach a well-substantiated conclusion having argued the case for and against the statement on both rulers.

- 10 “Power not welfare had to be the chief concern of an enlightened absolute monarch.”
With reference to the policies of **both** Frederick II **and** Catherine II, how far do you agree with this judgement?
(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (without reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Power: clearly as an absolute ruler power had to be the prime concern. The ruler had to ensure his/her own position as well as that of the State. To this end therefore the policies pursued aimed to secure and increase the monarch's power. In Frederick II's case: increased centralisation; the maintenance of military strength and a strong foreign policy were predominant policies. For Catherine II: securing herself as ruler in light of her initially weak position; taking firm action against others, including her husband; later enhancing her position, e.g. through her imperialistic policies and strengthening control over the provinces because of the Pugachev Revolt. For both monarchs to retain their power skilful management of the nobles was important, again more necessary for Catherine who might be argued to have made greater concessions to the nobility than Frederick.

Welfare: to qualify as an enlightened ruler the monarch needed to address areas such as the economic well-being of his/her subjects, civil rights under the law and religious toleration, education, patronage of the arts. Both Frederick and Catherine can be argued to have pursued reform in each of these areas but all had limitations, above all, over serfdom. Some concern for welfare can be supported but even the philosophes argued that power was the pre-requisite.

The interests/welfare of the State were served more than that of individuals by the reforms undertaken by both monarchs: education provided a more skilled workforce and served to indoctrinate the young into loyalty to the State; the State benefited from increased prosperity and improved communications; religious toleration reduced the danger of internal conflict. So, in some ways, power and welfare were inextricably linked.

Level 1 answers will give limited description of some areas of policy with bland links, or assertions without support on power and welfare. Level 2 answers may also be description of policies focusing heavily on one or other of the rulers but they will be fuller and offer some links with the question.

At Level 3 there will be clear examination of the two aspects with some attempt to show why power and/or welfare were important but they will be unbalanced, analysis will be supported on both monarchs but great depth of material on both is not expected. Level 4 responses will be critical and appreciate the linkage between the two aspects with judicious consideration of the two monarchs' right to qualify as enlightened absolutists. At Level 5 candidates will reach a well-argued conclusion.

Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640-1790**A2 Unit 6: Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1765-1790****Question 1**

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

How valid is the interpretation offered in **Source A** concerning Maria Theresa's attitude towards reform in the Austrian Dominions? (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 with reference 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 Maria Theresa, as a traditionalist, was only prepared to make changes on the practical grounds of necessity.

Level 2 answers will be much more than simple summary: they will show fuller understanding of the source and its interpretation. Thus, they may explain that whilst Maria Theresa is portrayed as a traditionalist who instituted reforms only where and when they were clearly necessary, was sympathetic to any conservative opposition to them but not prepared to exert pressure to overcome it, this was the result of expense, prudence and her genuine desire to preserve as much of the old 'Austrian' way of life as was possible. From own knowledge they may illustrate the point that when she did see the need for reform she would introduce it, e.g. agricultural changes when the Seven Years War was over.

At Level 3, having fully understood the interpretation given in the Source of the over cautious, conservative monarch, candidates will begin to examine its validity. Those who argue in favour of this slightly modified view, having stressed its necessity may point out that Maria Theresa's pragmatism (mentioned in the source) was possibly her greatest strength. She did introduce some necessary reforms in central and local government (though only in Austria and Bohemia), however she did act as a brake on her impulsive son. She did recognise the damage which could be done if tradition and privilege were ignored. They may also point out that the source makes the valid comment that 'progress was slow and uneven' (which might be substantiated from Joseph's comments about the state of the Dominions in 1780).

Some candidates may be more critical of the source saying that to some extent, in line with the historians who favour Maria and consequently criticise Joseph, the source may be biased and Maria Theresa's achievements should not be overrated. At Level 4 some may argue

effectively that the source is valid and fair. Others may see it as typical appraisal with insufficient stress on her weaknesses. The judgement may be partial. Examiners will be looking for the ability to argue the case effectively no matter what conclusion is reached.

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

How useful are the letters quoted in this source to the historian in explaining the different attitudes of Maria Theresa and Joseph II to the granting of religious toleration in the Austrian Dominions? *(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 the 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 make simple statements related to the content in what amounts to little more than assertion, e.g. the source shows Joseph in favour of religious toleration but Maria Theresa was not in favour. Or Maria Theresa believed religious toleration would destroy the state. Alternatively, a few relevant statements might be lifted from the two letters contained in the source but with no effective links to the question.

At Level 2, in an effort to show the source would be useful to historians, there may be a full summary of each of the letters contained within the source and a claim that the forceful language shows the sincerity of the writers – Joseph II, in his efforts to persuade Maria Theresa to be more lenient to the protestant minorities, pointing out the advantageous economic consequences of retaining workers of different religious persuasion, and Maria Theresa defending her views through the Catholic traditional idea of saving souls as well as almost threatening Joseph that toleration would lead to the ruination of the state. At Level 3, as well as understanding of the basic differences and the reasons for them, there should be comment on the limitations and consequent insufficiency of the source, e.g. its failure to place the granting of religious toleration in the context of the nature of the Austrian Dominions, the characters and beliefs of Maria Theresa and of Joseph etc.

The conclusion reached at Level 4 might be that the source is of value to historians but they need to recognise its limitations. They may realise that the picture given of the two rulers in regard to religious matters does not entirely fit their preconceptions and in the case of religion the two rulers may not have acted in the ways historians have come to expect of them, e.g. was Maria Theresa realistic in expelling religious dissidents? Was Joseph so

idealistic in granting toleration? To what extent does Maria Theresa's intolerance over religious matters show that here she did not take into account her usual pragmatic approach?

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

“Joseph II lacked the caution and common sense of his mother, Maria Theresa.”

How far does this explain his failure? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the 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 a 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**

Indicative content

Each one of the sources can be linked to the question. Source A gives insight into Maria Theresa's caution and of the importance of tradition. Source B reveals Maria Theresa's determination to retain Catholicism as a bond of her dominions and not let protestant toleration ruin her 'state'. Source C claims that Joseph's vision amounted to revolution. Source D comments on Joseph's madness in racing ahead with reform at a time of war. All of the sources should give the candidate leads in answering the question but they should be integrated with their own knowledge, not simply summarised.

The initial focus of the question is on the statement and this may dominate the answer as many other causes of Joseph's failure link with it. The lack of caution may be seen as

Joseph's impetuosity, haste, i.e. the way he rode roughshod over those who opposed him. An example is given in Source D of his foolishness in trying to impose reforms at a time of war. His complete disregard of his mother's advice is seen in B.

His lack of communication might be seen in his idealism and impracticality in light of the nature of the Hasburg Dominions, in his desire to institute religious changes which would destroy the one bond which held the dominions together, his disregard of history, tradition and customs in dominions so widespread and different that Source C claims it amounted to revolution as seen in Hungary and the Netherlands. However, the statement may be challenged on various grounds: many of Joseph's policies were continuations of his mother's, if carried out at a great speed, but would the continuation of her 'slow and uneven' progress have been sensible? Joseph has been criticised as being too idealistic but some policies were realistic and some successful.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be patchy narrative on a few of Joseph's policies. This level will also cater for analysis which amounts to little more than assertion or quoting from the sources without explanation, e.g. he could not see beyond his own vision. He went too fast. Level 2 answers will be fuller but will either be limited to comment with some support on the two aspects mentioned in the statement, i.e. Joseph's lack of common sense or will be analysis of the more general points of why he failed. There will be links to the question but they will not be developed. At Level 3 there will be evidence that the candidate is discussing the two main aspects of the statement and an indication of how those extended to many cases of failure (which will have been analysed). Level 4 answers will in addition question/challenge some of the statement, though they may be unbalanced. At Level 5 a thorough and balanced case will be presented, which is well focused, and a conclusion will be reached.