



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative B 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 B: Europe in Transition, c1470–1610

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

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

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about the reasons for unrest in the countryside in France in the early years of Henry IV's reign. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

The source indicates that the reasons for unrest were twofold; the level of taxation, e.g. the pancarte, and the treatment of the peasants by their local noble landlords. Level one responses will quote both issues in general terms. Level 2 answers will extend this to show understanding of the extent of the dissatisfaction and unrest on a broad basis in both the towns and countryside and across France, although there should be awareness that the main motivation came from the peasants (Croquants) who had suffered during the course of the wars. Many of them assumed that taxes taken from them would go to the towns; they took action through petitions, assemblies and threats to arms. Initially it was agreed that arrears would not be collected and their protests eventually led to the abolition of the pancarte by 1602. Answers at Level 3 will also show understanding of the broader social base of the revolts and are likely to set the unrest in the wider context of popular activity during the Wars of Religion when, for example, towns took on responsibility for governing themselves and appointing their own officials and peasant revolts occurring as early as the 1570s culminated in the Croquant outbursts of the 1590s. These issues gave Henry IV, as a new monarch, a means to court popularity amongst the lower classes. Level 4 answers will, for example, set these events in the context of the greater fragmentation of authority in particular areas, e.g. Brittany, Normandy, the Midi, suggesting political as well as social and economic change.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of religious division in France during the reign of Henry IV?
(10 marks)

Target: A01.1, A02

- 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

At Level 1, answers could suggest that the extract gives the impression that there was very little religious division; Henry is seen as a monarch who 'took care to show equal favour to Huguenots and Catholics'; there was 'never more than a handful of religious malcontents'. This is seen to be the consequence of the king's example and the strength of his rule. Level 2 responses will see some limitations to the content of the source, showing understanding that the Huguenots were reliant on the King's favour and/or knowledge that their ability to worship freely was very limited and was not viewed favourably by Catholics. The King himself had returned to Catholicism; this would reassure Catholics to a degree but would not convince the Huguenots whose opportunities for employment, etc. were therefore more limited; they were totally dependent on the Kings willingness to continue with their privileges. On the other hand Huguenots like Sully were prominent in government. At Level 3, answers will develop this from own knowledge, e.g. the source does not explain that Catholicism continued to gain ground throughout the reign through factors such as the marginalisation of Protestant churches, the effects of the return of the Jesuits to France, as permitted by Henry IV, although this was not until 1601. Jesuits were encouraged to become involved in education and the conservation of Huguenots; many wanted the abolition of the Huguenots faith in France. Huguenots were never allowed to attend the Estates General as delegates to the First Estate as were the Jesuits, suggesting that the king was not impartial in terms of patronage. Level 4 responses will evaluate the source more fully, for example, by showing awareness that a degree of controversy continued throughout the reign; although the protestants were small in number, their polemical publications far exceeded those of other groups, and Catholics were encouraged by Henry's partial acceptance of the Tridentine decrees. The King's assassination in 1610, the last of at least 23 plots, is a clear indication that the religious quarrel had not ended.

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

'Image was more important than reality in explaining Henry IV's success as King of France from 1589 to 1610.'

Assess the validity of this view.

(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

Source A suggests that despite the continuation of unrest, heavy taxation and poverty when Henry IV came to the throne, Henry's image was that of a popular king, based to some extent on his promises to provide for all the people, including Huguenots. Source B suggests that the Edict of Nantes was not all it appeared to be (lacking reality) because the Huguenots were very dependent on the monarchy ensuring the Edict remained in force; the evidence of the source suggests that Henry himself did seek to support the Edict and therefore it only settled matters because he 'wished it so'. This latter point indicates the 'reality' of the situation. Source C promotes the 'legend' of Henry IV, depicting him as a great hero in the Greek mould rescuing the French from the clutches of Catholicism. Image was therefore important and the king promoted this; his rebuilding of Paris, and his 'chicken in the pot' statement are evidence of his wish to present himself as not just a powerful monarch, but also one that was striving to do the best for his people.

Own knowledge will suggest that, in reality, Henry was in a difficult situation. As a previous Huguenot, he was now pledged to support a 'mixed state' and had responsibilities to the Catholic Church. The Edict of Nantes was a clever compromise but still maintained Catholicism

as the religion of the state, albeit with concessions to the Huguenots. These concessions fell far short of Huguenot expectations and in practice/reality, e.g. although freedom of worship was granted, it was restricted to specific places set out in 3 categories; Huguenots could hold office as long as the King agreed, and they had bi-partisan courts to judge cases involving protestants. In other respects Huguenots found themselves subject to many restrictions, e.g. they had to pay tithes and could not possess schools, hospitals: in other words they were a group with particular privileges but in all other respects required to conform to the law of the land. Baumgartner sees them as a stable but not expanding group, fully committed to their faith, and excluded from the mainstream of affairs, apart from one or two individuals such as Sully.

To maintain the peace certain practical measures were followed by the Crown, for example if a Jesuit college was founded then so was a protestant one; when Henry appointed a Jesuit as his confessor, he appointed a Huguenot as his almoner. He encouraged reform in the Catholic Church, but would have nothing to do with the Inquisition and would not accept the decrees of the Council of Trent in full. Greengrass comments that Henry 'was Gallican or ultramontane as the occasion suited and pro-catholic or pro-protestant when the circumstances required it'. Knecht suggests that in real terms, the kingdom remained divided religiously, and, although the edict made the Huguenots a privileged group, they were still dependant on the king's support. Ravaillac considered Henry had failed because he had not made the Huguenots Catholic. Henry's assassination by Ravaillac showed how fragile Henry's control of the situation was. Nevertheless by the end of his reign, Henry had, in reality, often through the image projected as a powerful monarch as much as through his actions, gained much support for the monarchy (Sources A and C) and generated a viable religious settlement (Source B).

The two issues reinforced each other; if Henry presented himself as a powerful monarch, he was then able to make changes, especially in the latter years, which made his rule more acceptable. In some ways, the succeeding monarchies in the 17th and 18th centuries built upon this.