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INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.
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MARK SCHEME

Marking guidance for examiners for Question 1

Summary of assessment objectives for Question 1

Question 1 assesses assessment objective 2. This assessment objective is a single element focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate contemporary source material in its historical context. The mark awarded to Question 1 is 30.

The structure of the mark scheme

The mark scheme for Question 1 has two parts:

- advice on the specific question outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.

- an assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses which demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.

Deciding on the mark awarded within a band

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.
INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 1

NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.

With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the causes of the French Revolution 1781-1789.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of primary source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the primary sources in their historical context. To judge value to an historian, there should also be analysis and evaluation of the content and the authorship of the primary sources to discuss.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying the causes of the French Revolution 1781-1789. Understanding of the historical context should be demonstrated to analyse and evaluate the value of the sources to the particular enquiry. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include:

- Source A offers a vivid picture of rural France in the early 1780s where the overwhelming majority of the population lived. The unflattering picture which emerges is of a country dominated by large estates and landowners who use the feudal system to exploit their tenants. The author expands his analysis to include a critique of those nobles surrounding the court who simply wish to maximise their own positions. Mercier was a leading social commentator and dramatist who used the medium of the theatre to criticise the ancien regime in general and in this instance the feudal system in particular. An historian studying the causes of the French Revolution would find this source of considerable value as Mercier can be seen as an interesting and insightful observer who given his rather obvious sympathies with the peasantry would be far from impartial, but who does highlight a number of key issues and tensions which afflicted the ancien regime in the years preceding the Revolution.

- Source B provides an historian with a private letter written by the Austrian Emperor Joseph II to his sister Queen Marie Antoinette. In the letter he reproaches her for her interference in French politics and perceptively foretells that ultimately it can only cause her great unhappiness. The content of the letter lists some of her 'interventions'. Given the nature of the source as a private letter it would provide valuable evidence of the reasons for the unpopularity of the Queen, who was suspected of exerting a baleful influence over her husband. This would offer any historian studying the causes of the French Revolution a good understanding of the impact of the queen on political life.

- Source C offers valuable evidence to an historian of one of the most fundamental causes of the French Revolution - namely the crisis in government finances. Calonne was at the heart of French government and as controller general had been responsible for finances up to 1787. He provides in his open letter an analysis of the failings of the system and emphasises the chaotic nature by which finances were collected and apportioned within France. The bankruptcy of the State brought to a head a number of other long standing deep rooted problems. The nature of the source and its origin would offer accurate and reliable evidence of value to an historian investigating the causes of revolution and who would be aware of the crucial role played by financial chaos in the outbreak of revolution in 1789.

Overall, candidates will assess the value of the sources to an historian studying the causes of the French Revolution 1781-1789. They are able to demonstrate that value through consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the presented sources with appropriate reference to the historical context linked to the sources.
# ASSESSMENT GRID FOR QUESTION 1

**Target: AO2**

**Total mark: 30**

**Focus:** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 6</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of the given sources involving full and valid consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the sources; full understanding shown of the correct historical context associated with the set enquiry; reaches a full and substantiated judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying a particular issue.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 6</th>
<th><strong>CHARACTERISTICS</strong></th>
<th><strong>B6H</strong> 30</th>
<th><strong>B6L</strong> 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The response shows accurate and sustained source evaluation using the content and attributions to deal with the strengths and limitations of each of the three sources, setting the response in the correct historical context and covering all of the period set in the enquiry. There will be a sustained and fully substantiated judgement on both the individual and collective values of all three sources to an historian studying the particular issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 5</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaningful analysis and evaluation of the given sources involving valid consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the sources; understanding shown of the correct historical context associated with the set enquiry; reaches a valid judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying a particular issue.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 5</th>
<th><strong>CHARACTERISTICS</strong></th>
<th><strong>B5H</strong> 25</th>
<th><strong>B5L</strong> 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The response shows accurate source evaluation using the content and attributions to deal with the strengths and limitations of each of the three sources, setting the response in the correct historical context and covering most of the period set in the enquiry. There will be a valid judgement on the value of all three sources to an historian studying the particular issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 4</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clearly attempts an analysis and evaluation of the given sources in relation to the historical context of the set enquiry with some consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the sources; a sound judgement is seen regarding the value of all or some of the three sources.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 4</th>
<th><strong>CHARACTERISTICS</strong></th>
<th><strong>B4H</strong> 20</th>
<th><strong>B4M</strong> 18</th>
<th><strong>B4L</strong> 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The response is able to discuss the strengths and limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions, content and the historical context. The judgement on value will be clear and supported on all three sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **The response is able to discuss the strengths and limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions, content and the historical context. There will be some issues with imbalance in the treatment of the sources. The judgement on value will be clear on some or all of the three sources but with some general comments.** |

| **The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 4. Value to the historian is seen here but the reference will be limited and not sustained.** |
### Band 3 CHARACTERISTICS

Mechanistic use of the content and attributions of the given sources to discuss their utility; begins to show some general awareness of the historical context relating to the set enquiry; limited judgement on the utility of all or some of the sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B3H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The response is able to discuss the strengths and/or limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions and content. Any reference to the historical context will be limited. There will be a judgement on the utility of all of the sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The response is able to discuss the strengths and/or limitations of some of the three sources by focusing on their attributions and/or content. Any reference to the historical context will be limited. There will be a limited judgement on the utility of some of the three sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3L</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 3. Also use if only one attribution is attempted to show utility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Band 2 CHARACTERISTICS

Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content of the given sources to show their utility; little understanding of the historical context is seen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The response is able to discuss the strengths and/or limitations of some of the three sources by focusing on their content mostly; any references to the historical context will be general and vague. There will be a limited judgement on the utility of at least one of the sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The response is able to discuss the strengths and/or limitations of some of the three sources by focusing on their content and omissions with some imbalance; any references to the historical context will be very general and vague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2L</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The response trawls through the sources only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Band 1 CHARACTERISTICS

Copies or paraphrases from content or attributions of the given sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paraphrases from all of the three sources and/or attributions or plain narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Copies from one or two of the sources and/or attributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Use for incorrect answers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marking guidance for examiners for Question 2

Summary of assessment objectives for Question 2

Question 2 assesses assessment objective 3. This assessment objective is a single element focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate how and why different historical interpretations have been made. The mark awarded to Question 2 is 30.

The structure of the mark scheme

The mark scheme for Question 2 has two parts:

- Advice on the specific question outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.

- an assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses which demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 3.

Deciding on the mark awarded within a band

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.
INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 2

NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.

How valid is the view that France's involvement in the war of 1792 against Austria and Prussia mainly stemmed from internal divisions and conflicts?

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Answers will consider the provided extracts and use their own understanding of the historical context and of the wider historical debate in making their judgement regarding the validity of the view that France's involvement in the war of 1792 against Austria and Prussia mainly stemmed from internal divisions and conflicts.

Candidates are invited to enter into a debate about whether France's involvement in the war of 1972 against Austria and Prussia mainly stemmed from internal divisions and conflicts. Learners will consider different interpretations of the issue within the wider historical debate about the reasons for going to war in 1792. Some of the issues to consider may include:

- Interpretation 1 argues that from early in 1792 there were deep divisions and rivalries within the Legislative Assembly and that various parties for their own self-interest called for war. The King and his supporters were hoping that if the war went badly then they might have the opportunity to restore dictatorial power.

- In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 1 answers might argue that this is a valid interpretation because the complexities and divisions within French political life threatened to paralyse government and there was an opportunity to regain the initiative particularly from the monarchist perspective. The author of the extract, an authority on the French Revolution, would have had access to a wide range of primary sources. Yet his position as a leading left-wing thinker in the 1920s may well have coloured his interpretation and led to a negative view of the role of the monarchists.

- Interpretation 2 argues that the main motive behind the war was to spread the ideals of the revolution and that it was led by supporters of Brissot and the Girondin. Their motives were rooted in idealism, liberty, equality and fraternity.

- In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 2 answers might argue that this is also a valid interpretation because the author does suggest ideology was a central part of some of the beliefs of leading revolutionaries. In addition the Girondin firmly believed that the interests of France would be best served when other countries had similar benefits to those won by the revolutionaries in France. The author, as a leading academic and specialist in French history, would have delved in depth into the topic and produced a balanced work of considerable integrity. As a Marxist he would be inclined to support the spread of democratic values and libertarian beliefs as a valid reason for going to war.

- Candidates may show awareness of the wider historical debate surrounding this issue. An alternative view might be that the decision to go to war was to neutralise the threat from the counter-revolutionaries and their sponsors Austria and Prussia.

Overall candidates will analyse both interpretations using their own understanding of the debate over this issue, offer an evaluation of the validity of the given interpretations and provide a judgement on the issue in the question of whether France's involvement in the war of 1792 against Austria and Prussia mainly stemmed from internal divisions and conflicts.
**ASSESSMENT GRID FOR QUESTION 2**

**Target:** AO3  
**Total mark:** 30

**Focus:** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 6 CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>Sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of the provided extracts which is used effectively to show understanding of how and why different interpretations have been formed in relation to the set enquiry; sustained judgement seen regarding validity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B6H 30</td>
<td>The response fully integrates discussion of the content and authorship of both extracts together with knowledge and understanding of other possible interpretations of the set issue to reach a valid and substantiated judgement regarding the interpretation set in the question. The response should show a firm grasp of the wider debate and how interpretations have been formed in relation to context and authorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6M 28</td>
<td>The response accurately discusses the content and authorship of both extracts together with understanding of other possible interpretations of the set issue to offer a substantiated judgement in relation to the interpretation set in the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6L 26</td>
<td>The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 5 CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>Meaningful analysis and evaluation of the provided extracts to show how and why different interpretations have been formed in relation to the set enquiry; clear judgement seen regarding validity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B5H 25</td>
<td>The response discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a clear judgement on the validity of the given interpretation; shows clear understanding of other possible interpretations of the issue. The response will show a clear grasp of the wider debate regarding the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5M 23</td>
<td>The response discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a clear judgement on the validity of the given interpretation; shows clear understanding of other possible interpretations of the issue. The response needs to indicate how and why interpretations are formed based on the content and especially the authorship of the extracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5L 21</td>
<td>The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 4 CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>Some valid analysis and evaluation of the provided extracts with some knowledge of other possible interpretations to reach a judgement on the specific enquiry.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B4H 20</td>
<td>The response discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a valid judgement on the given interpretation and shows understanding of other possible interpretations of this issue. The response needs some reference to both interpretations and discussion of why the authorship of at least one extract helps to explain any differences in interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4M 18</td>
<td>The response discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a valid judgement on the given interpretation and shows awareness of other possible interpretations of the issue. The response will have some general reference to the authorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4L 16</td>
<td>The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Band 3 CHARACTERISTICS

Mechanistic focus on the content and authorship of the extracts to identify and compare interpretations; should show awareness of other possible interpretations; any judgement will be limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 3</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B3H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The response attempts to compare the content and authorship of both extracts to identify different interpretations; will show some awareness of other possible interpretations; will offer a limited judgement on validity in relation to the interpretation set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The response attempts to compare the content and authorship of both extracts to identify different interpretations; will offer a ‘bolt-on’ judgement on validity in relation to the interpretation set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3L</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Band 2 CHARACTERISTICS

Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content of the given extracts only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 2</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The response attempts to consider the content of both extracts to show differences between interpretations and provides a judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The response either begins to use the content of both extracts to identify some of the differences between the presented interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2L</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 2 such as considering the content of only one of the extracts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Band 1 CHARACTERISTICS

Copies or paraphrases from the content of the extracts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band 1</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Basic comprehension and paraphrasing from the content of both extracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Basic comprehension or copying from the content of one of the extracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Use for incorrect answers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>