



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative C Unit 6W

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June series

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

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

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

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

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

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

Level 1:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

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

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

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

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

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

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

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

C: **DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

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

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

June 2008

Alternative C: Absolutist States in Europe, 1640–1790

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

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

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about Joseph II's influence during the co-regency. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will be based entirely on the source. They will be a simple summary reiterating points about Joseph's lack of influence in most matters as indicated in the source. Level 2 responses will be much more than a simple summary and will show a more comprehensive understanding of the source and its views and provide some supporting knowledge but this will be undeveloped. Thus, candidates may explain occasions in which Joseph's role as co-regent was weakened by either Maria Theresa or by Kaunitz, most obviously own knowledge of Maria Theresa's reluctance to consider Joseph's more tolerant views on religious minorities. Kaunitz's control of the council of state, or the conflict over the nature of peasant labour duties, and especially the problem of the Bohemian peasantry, might be used to support the notions to Joseph's lack of influence. Reference in the source to Joseph sometimes getting his way may likewise be supported by material drawn from foreign policy or from Joseph's Urbarial Law of 1775. However, the source seems to make clear that Joseph was little more than a junior partner during the co-regency. At Level 3, having understood the interpretation of lack of influence given in the source, candidates will begin to assess its validity in relation to sound knowledge but judgement will be only partial; e.g. there may be some support for the notion of lack of influence. This in itself was partially due to a divergence in political philosophy: Maria Theresa's conservatism was directed to the gradual strengthening of the state especially in response to Prussian aggression, whilst Joseph had an almost obsessive desire for immediate reform dictated by a personal impatience and an adherence to enlightened ideas. Maria Theresa's reluctance to grant any real power to Joseph stemmed from a fear of his dangerously novel plans for reform. However, there were areas of policy in which Joseph had considerable influence. Both Joseph and Kaunitz believed that church power and wealth should be reduced, and in 1769 called jointly for state control of the church lands and education – despite Maria's objections she was forced to allow most of the reforms. The patrician of Poland again opposed by Maria Theresa might be cited as evidence of Joseph's influence, as might his persuasion of his mother to challenge Prussian power in the War of Bavarian Succession 1778–9. Reform of the obligations of serfdom might be used as evidence of influence, especially the Urbarial Law of 1775, although Maria Theresa's conservatism and desire not to antagonise the

nobility held back many of Josephs social policies. Level 4 responses will offer a more balance, well-supported assessment, reaching a reasoned conclusion on the degree of influence.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of the effectiveness of Maria Theresa and Joseph II in reforming the administration of the lands of Habsburg monarchy? (10 marks)

Target: A01.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

Level 1 answers are likely to summarise the source or to make simple statements related to the context in what amounts to little more than assertion; e.g. Joseph continued the effective reforms of his mother that became a victory for absolutism with little said of what Maria Theresa actually did. At level 2 there may be a much fuller summary of the content of the source in relation to some limited contextual knowledge, with some attempt to indicate the omissions, strengths and weaknesses of the source; or there may be some attempt to consider both the strengths and weaknesses of the source but with much less comprehension. Candidates might mention that Maria Theresa had begun a programme of administrative reform as suggested in the source but that this was limited to a few provinces as she saw little point in reform that might antagonise the nobility. Joseph II continued these reforms but tried to extend their scope. The source assumes that the reforms were a success but does not mention the opposition that Joseph faced. Answers at Level 3 will consider both the strengths and weaknesses of the source and relate this to sound contextual knowledge, perhaps illustrating with knowledge how Maria Theresa introduced a number of effective reforms such as the loss of some provincial estates' control over taxation; the extension of the power of the Austrian civil service; the establishment of the Directorium in 1749 and the Council of State. To this extent the assertion in the source that Joseph continued Maria Theresa's policies is correct; however, she confined her reforms to Austria and Bohemia, leaving Hungary and the Netherlands largely alone – this is not mentioned in the source. Joseph did much more than simply continue reform, he attempted to expand it across the lands of the monarchy – this again is not mentioned in Source B. Such reforms seemed to border on the obsessive, such as the 1784 decree that German would be the official language of administration, further undermining any support he might acquire in the provinces. In both Hungary and the Netherlands he had to witness the dismantling of his administrative reforms. At Level 4 explanation will be developed and will have a sustained argument. Conclusions might suggest that whilst Joseph's efforts at administrative uniformity had some success in Austria, they failed in Hungary and in the Netherlands. The source alludes to this in suggesting that he strengthened the autonomy of Hungary but does not make clear

that this was most certainly not his intention. Even the assertion that this was a victory for absolutism might be questioned considering the depth of opposition he encountered from his own civil service. Maria Theresa's success is not really considered by the source, but it was clear that she limited her ambitions to the achievable and this largely meant Austria itself.

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

'Joseph II failed because he was too ambitious and lacked the moderation of Maria Theresa.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1765 to 1790. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

This question allows candidates to consider a range of policies to either support or challenge the assumption, and there is ample scope to integrate the sources with own knowledge to attain the higher levels. Source A illustrates the inconsistencies of the co-regency and especially the lack of a shared belief in the direction of reform. Some candidates might use this information to challenge the assumption of the statement and suggest that Maria Theresa's limited reforms were due at least in part to dissension amongst the triumvirate of rulers. Candidates might also use own knowledge to identify that many of the disagreements of the co-regency occurred over the pace of reform. Source B suggests a degree of continuity between the reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph and certainly seems to indicate that these reforms were a success achieving an administratively unified monarchy and a victory for absolutism. This might be used

to challenge the assumption of the question, although own knowledge would counter this by making it clear that Joseph went much further in his area than Maria Theresa had dared. Source C reinforces this notion by stating that the aim of Joseph was to integrate the provinces, but here makes it clear that this was not a task initiated by Maria Theresa. The source makes clear that to do so was to court the opposition of the nobility and as such was explicitly avoided by Maria Theresa. The opposition of the nobility referred to in Source C clearly implies that this policy failed. This may be used as clear evidence in support of the statement in the question. Source D might also be used in conjunction with own knowledge to suggest that the largely damaging reforms to the labour services were begun on Joseph's initiative; the failure of these reforms was a reflection of Joseph's inability to moderate his ambitions and especially his methods.

The main focus of the question should be an analysis of the extent to which Joseph's failures were due to excessive ambition. In support of the statement candidates may comment on Joseph's efforts to create a unified state and especially the opposition led by the nobility in the provinces. The attempt to achieve something so ambitious and in the face of concerted opposition was clearly unrealistic, however balance might be achieved by suggesting that most opposition came from the exceptionally small class of nobility, and that moreover it was not the actual content of his reforms that many found objectionable, simply the methods he deployed in trying to enforce them. In religion there are good grounds for suggesting moderation on the part of Joseph, for example the Edict of Toleration for Protestants failed to give full equality, as did a similar edict for the Jews, yet these Edicts also provoked opposition and fear that Joseph was attempting to destroy the Church. It was not the ambition of his religious reforms that provoked most opposition and led to failure, but rather Joseph's lack of sensitivity to the concerns of peasants steeped in ritual and custom. Joseph's failure to reform serfdom may be linked to the opposition that his methods, rather than ambitions, provoked. Whilst Joseph certainly lacked the moderation of Maria Theresa when he attempted to reform peasantry service, other factors might well be attributed to failure. The poor timing and sheer misfortune of introducing the Tax and Agrarian Law in 1789 was a factor but mainly the opposition of the nobility can be blamed. However, it is easy to argue that Joseph was attempting the impossible when trying to realise a goal that no other European monarch had dared to attempt. Other failures such as the omissions of the education reform, had little to do with over ambition, but it might be argued with a lack of willingness to go far enough, or indeed a lack of the means to implement such reforms. The failure to abolish the stocks, flogging and branding seems an odd oversight for a supposedly enlightened monarch and such failings can be attributed not to the ambition of the individual reforms, but simply to trying to achieve too much in too limited a period of time. The failure of at least some of Joseph's economic and financial reforms can be ascribed to Joseph's decision to attack the Turks in 1788.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to be limited descriptions of a few policies and assertions lifted from the sources without background knowledge. In this case there will be little explanation. Level 2 answers will include a fuller description of a greater range with at least some passing link to the focus of the question. Those answers that use both sources and own knowledge will have a more limited range and little development. At Level 3 there will be an analytical response with evidence of assessment of degree of ambition and its effects on Joseph's success. At Level 4 there should be a challenge to the assumption of the question with some suggestion of other factors that may have played a role in the failure of Joseph's policies. At Level 5 there will be a much more balanced case across a range of policies arriving at a sustained conclusion.