



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

## History

### Alternative E

## Units 1, 4 and 6

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

---

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

---

**A: INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

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

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

Answers at this level will

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

**Level 2:*****Either***

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

***Or***

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 3:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 4:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 5:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS**

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

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

**Level 1:***Either*

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

*Or*

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics: they

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

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

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

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

**Level 2:***Either*

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

*Or*

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

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

**Level 3:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

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

**Level 4:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

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

**Level 5:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

**June 2003**

**Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941**

**AS Unit 1: Germany and Russia before the First World War, 1870-1914**

**Question 1**

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

Explain briefly the importance of the Reichstag in relation to political power in Germany from 1871. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. identifying the elected assembly in the German parliament. 1

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. elected by universal manhood suffrage, the Reichstag proved capable of mounting some opposition, and legislation needed its consent. Yet the assembly had little control over the executive, and there was no tradition of party politics in Germany – and commenting perhaps that the working of the Reichstag would reveal the degree of autocracy and democracy within the new Germany. 2-3

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

With reference to Bismarck's political power, explain how the views in Source B differ from the views put forward in Source A. (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, e.g. provides a basic contrast, with Source A accepting limitations on Bismarck's power, while Source B suggests absolute and unlimited power. 1-2

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to own knowledge, e.g. A comments on how Bismarck had to manoeuvre between the political parties in the Reichstag, yet he was not accountable to this assembly which, despite its democratic elements, was restricted in its powers. On the other hand, B confirms Bismarck's political power, passed on from the Kaiser, over

appointments and the Bundesrat – knowledge of the Prussian veto would confirm this view despite representation for all states. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge of the issue and draws conclusions, e.g. as above, but perhaps recognising that the sources represent the two sides of the debate over political power in Germany – in Source A, the façade of a parliamentary regime behind which, as indicated in B, an autocratic system operated. **6-7**

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

Explain why Bismarck was able to retain political control of Germany for almost 20 years. *(15 marks)*

*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 source *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: A refers to the opposition of political parties in the Reichstag and Bismarck's role in manoeuvring between them; candidates should have little difficulty in developing these aspects from their own knowledge. The reference to the 'sovereign' in Source B could be developed to explain Bismarck's relations with Wilhelm I and Wilhelm II.

The statistics in Source C on the main political parties can be used to exemplify Bismarck's changing political relationships over the 20 years in his efforts to maintain a pro-government majority.

From own knowledge, candidates should include some reference to the constitutional context, which enabled Bismarck to consolidate his authority, combined with his political skill in effectively manipulating the various political parties. In a balanced response over the 20 year period, reference could be made to the Liberal Era of the 1870s, and his effective termination of this under pressure from other parties. Bismarck's handling of the Kulturkampf and the perceived threat from the SPD should be included. The change of Kaiser and the political circumstances of his resignation would also be relevant. Foreign policy links valid if related.

Coverage at L1 will be partial or generalised, perhaps concentrating on the constitution or on a particular political party. L2 will provide a better range over the 20 year period, but might be largely a descriptive narrative of Bismarck's domestic policies with little comment. By L3, some source evidence must be included and there should be some explicit focus on the question, but this will lack balance and development. Answers at L4 should show some integration of sources with knowledge, and should explain Bismarck's control both in terms of his political skills and pragmatic manipulation, and also some reference to the constitutional context. These aspects might be developed at L5 and include an overall judgement.

## Question 2

- (a) What is meant by "reform of the agricultural system" in relation to economic expansion in Russia? (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. improving farming methods and the prosperity of Russian peasants. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. reference to the restrictions of the mir and the burden of redemption payments, and the need to modernise and increase production, providing incentives for individual farmers; improved agrarian effectively would encourage the migration of workers and make labour available for industry. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the role of the state was important in the rapid industrialisation of the 1890s. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. commenting that only the state could bring change in a backward agrarian society. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the lack of private initiative within Russia – majority of peasants tied to the mir, small urban workforce, few entrepreneurs to provide capital, poor banking system, untapped

resources etc. The state could provide foreign investment, contracts for railways and heavy industry, taxation and tariff policies 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, e.g. as L2, but recognises that, because of the backward nature of the Russian economy, only the state could oversee the means to achieve rapid industrialisation. **6-7**

(c) “In the years 1900 to 1914, Russia was successfully developing into a modern industrial state.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this verdict on economic development in Russia. **(15 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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**

By 1900, especially under Witte, Russia had experienced 8% growth and massive economic expansion especially in heavy industry, with an industrial labour force of 3 million. Railway development doubled in the 1890s, with the Trans-Siberian Railway as the prestige project stimulating overall industrial development. Placing the rouble on the Gold Standard also established monetary stability. However, dependent on foreign money, Russia became Europe’s largest debtor nation, and the agricultural sector remained neglected and backward. Russia’s poor internal market was further hindered by high taxes and tariffs, as grain was exported while millions starved in the 1890s. Also from 1900, there was an economic slump and a serious recession in international trade, causing widespread unemployment in towns and cities with growing social unrest. After 1906, though, there was further growth and

expansion in heavy industry as Russia finally begins to fulfil her potential, developing her own consumer market, but also an urban working class looking for improved living and working conditions. Stolypin's land reforms tried to promote agrarian modernisation from a new class of wealthier farmers, but in some areas only increased rural tension. By 1914, Russia was ranked 5<sup>th</sup> in the world and was clearly in the process of developing into a modern industrial state, with increasing production and a growing workforce; yet perhaps, compared to other countries, this was still too limited an industrial base, dependent on foreign capital, with more than 80% of Russians still peasant farmers.

Responses at L1 will be partial or provide a generalised review with a narrow focus. Answers at L2 should have more range over the period but may be too narrative based, presenting a largely one-sided verdict with limited explanation. By L3, there should be signs of an explicit response and an attempt to make some assessment. At the top of this level, the explanation should start to link in agriculture as well as industrial growth. This should be more developed at L4, with the links between industry and agriculture clearly understood. The contrast between the earlier state promoted growth and the private initiatives after 1906 might also be emphasised at this level. L5, as L4, but should include some judgement on economic development by 1914.

### Question 3

- (a) What is meant by "Weltpolitik" in relation to German foreign policy from 1897? (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. some reference to overseas expansion. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. a new direction and a change of priorities in foreign policy, focusing not on European affairs, but on German interests throughout the world, for example an empire in central Africa. The lack of a precise meaning might be mentioned at this level. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Germany began the policy of Weltpolitik. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. building a powerful fleet and gaining a colonial 'place in the sun'. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. mentioning Wilhelm II's attitude to Britain and other imperial powers, and his frustration with Germany's position and the restraints of Bismarck's continental policy. This drive for world power was a craving for prestige and status, new economic markets, and to establish the Kaiser's personal control over policy. **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, e.g. as L2, but perhaps seeing Weltpolitik in relation to domestic affairs, as a deliberate diversion to rally the people, or pointing to a new strident nationalism. **6-7**

- (c) “By 1914, it was clear that Weltpolitik was a total failure.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. **(15 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- 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**

Beyond initial meagre gains in the Far East and the Pacific in the late 1890s, little else was added in colonial terms by 1914 except two strips of the French Congo; these few colonies seemed indefensible and vulnerable. Details will be included of the naval rivalry with Britain, which was a serious misjudgement and miscalculation leading to an arms race and an increasing financial burden. Weltpolitik also marked the failure of German diplomacy, alienating Britain, and provoking powers into an alliance system which emphasised Germany’s own encirclement. The Entente Cordiale was a serious setback, compounded by significant failure in the two Morocco crises of 1905 and 1911. Germany’s belligerent tone and mentality of bluster and brinkmanship generated international tension and suspicion, highlighted in the calculated risk-taking of the 1914 July crisis. However, Weltpolitik was not a total failure – from the German perspective, it did lead to the building of an impressive High Seas Fleet, and did successfully unite and rally both politicians (esp. SPD) and people for a war which the generals believed Germany would win, splitting the Entente and achieving world power.

L1 will provide only a partial coverage, perhaps concentrating on the navy, Morocco or 1914.  
L2 will show better range and explanation, but may accept the proposition without

reservation. L3 will be more balanced over the period 1897-1914 with signs of some attempt to assess. By L4, some explicit response to 'total failure' should be included, perhaps including some positive aspects, and perhaps appreciating the links with domestic policies. Judgement at L5 might see Weltpolitik more as a miscalculation than a failure.

**June 2003**

**Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941**

**A2 Unit 4: Germany, Russia and the Soviet Union, in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries**

**Section A**

**Question 1**

(a) Use **Source C** and your own knowledge.

Explain what is meant by “state socialism” in the context of German domestic policy in the 1880s. (5 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. improving the conditions of the German workers. 1

L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge. Despite the state accepting responsibility for the welfare of its workers with reforms providing health and accident insurance as well as pensions, this was essentially an anti-socialist policy. 2-3

L3: As Level 2, with developed references to both the source and own knowledge. This Junker paternalism was clearly an attempt to outbid the Social Democrats for working-class support. 4-5

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

Explain how fully Sources A and B reveal the attitude of Tsar Nicholas I and Tsar Alexander II to the reform of serfdom. (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. 1-2

L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. 3-5

L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both source and to own knowledge. 6-8

L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency etc in relation to the issue. 9-10

## Indicative content

Answers at L1 might merely point out from the sources in broad and general terms that although both monarchs accepted the need for reform, Nicholas I feared change would provoke rebellion while Alexander II feared rebellion without reform. At L2, candidates might provide some contextual evidence: e.g. – despite Nicholas being ‘continuously occupied with the thought of freeing the serfs’, it was Alexander who faced a difficult inheritance with the defeat in the Crimea, and the resultant irrepressible force for change. However, answers at this level might still be restricted to a general context, largely accepting the sources at face value. At L3, candidates should use their own knowledge to reach some conclusions on the content of the two speeches – for Nicholas I, reform was largely wishful thinking, and the proliferation of committees produced only minor improvements which made little difference; Alexander II was more humane and sensitive (Tsar Liberator?), and feared a threat to the social order without reform. At this level, candidates should show some explicit insight into the sources beyond face value, but coverage will either be ‘thin’ for both sources, or developed for one (likely to be Source B). Overall judgement at L4 might accept both monarchs recognising that serfdom was a key factor in Russia’s weakness and that reform was necessary and inevitable, but both were also determined to maintain autocracy and only the crisis of the Crimean War triggered a change of heart. Such insight at this level should be developed for both sources.

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

“Intended merely to bolster and preserve autocratic rule.”

Assess this view of the reforms offered by governments in Russia and Germany during the period 1825 to 1939. (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 a 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 at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content.

Answers should provide a range of factors over the whole period in question, covering Russia and Germany in balanced detail, appreciating for both countries the changing contexts of the regimes in power, and the differing motives and attitudes to reform. The reforms (or lack of reforms) during the tsarist regime should be assessed – Source A could be used to explain Nicholas I's attempt to preserve autocracy by avoiding reform, though recognising the need for change. Source B should enable candidates to raise the debate on the motives behind the Tsar Liberator's major reforms. The important political and economic changes after 1905 under Nicholas II can be effectively harnessed to the question. In the post-tsarist period, the reasoning behind Lenin's NEP concessions in 1921 should be assessed; changes in Stalin's USSR were hardly 'reforms offered', but the enforced consolidation of power reinforced with propaganda. In Germany, the sham democracy and the semi-dictatorship of the Second Reich provide the initial context for debate. The first substantive reforms offered are in Bismarck's regime, in the Liberal era of the 1870s and especially the welfare reforms of the 1880s. Source C should be easily integrated into a discussion of Bismarck's motives – 'kill socialism with kindness'. This context could be extended into Wilhelm II's regime. The Nazi regime provides the other central focus for Germany – economic improvements (esp. reducing unemployment) and the promise of a new national community for all won over the hearts and minds of most German people, and helped to disguise 'the negative features of the regime' (Source D).

L1 will include only a narrow range of evidence and will lack balance between the states. L2 should respond to most of the sources and provide a better balance, but the review of the period will still be limited, presenting a fairly generalised focus. At L3, there should be some clear sign of candidates attempting to assess the motives behind the reforms with links to autocratic rule, with more range in terms of coverage over the period. Answers at L4 should display some effective integration of sources and knowledge, and some response to 'merely' – appreciating a range of motives in the different political contexts over the 100 years. At L5, judgement and conclusions will reveal a thorough understanding and overview of a range of issues over most of the period and between the two states.

**Section B****Question 2 onward**

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 level of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in each specific mark scheme for each question.

**Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)****L1: *Either***

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

***Or***

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

**L2: *Either***

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

***Or***

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

**L3:** Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

**L4:** Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

**L5:** As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

**Question 2**

To what extent did Hitler bring about a political and social revolution within Nazi Germany in the years 1933 to 1939? (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**

In political terms, there seems to be a revolution in the nature of the state with fundamental change – a single-party terroristic state without civil liberties, trade unions, federal authority, intolerant of any opposition and driven by the forces of state security. Yet there are elements of continuity with the past, including strong leadership, and some compromise with the political elites and major forces of the army, big business, the civil service and, to a lesser extent, the churches. The formulation and implementation of policy seems fragmented and inefficient. Hitler's own role should be included in this, seen either in control of the main aspects of government decision making with a deliberate policy of divide and rule, or whose sudden impulses reflected and disorganised confusion of the political system. In terms of social revolution, Hitler aimed to transform German society with the idea of 'Volksgemeinschaft', a community of Germans working together regardless of background or role in society – a revolutionary national consensus overcoming past divisions with a new common purpose in a racial but classless society, offering better opportunities for social advancement. Alternatively, this can be seen as merely reinforcing traditional class alignments and established elites. To assess the degree of social change, candidates could draw on evidence from many areas, including education, youth movement, the role of women and the family, culture, religion, anti-semitism etc. The revolutionary role of propaganda could also be included, specifically in manufacturing and maintaining Hitler's image.

L1 will only provide a partial coverage of this content. L2 will not cover the full range of political and social aspects, and will tend to be descriptive. L3 will show better range and sign of analysis, but is likely merely to accept the proposition of political and social revolution. L4 will present a more balanced debate in terms of 'to what extent', and might respond specifically to Hitler's role. Judgement at L5 would appreciate the varying degree of change across the range of issues and provide a convincing overview.

**Question 3**

Did Stalin's agricultural and industrial reforms in the years 1928 to 1939 betray or fulfil Communist ideals? (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**

Stalinist propaganda projected the leader in heroic proportions as the heir of Lenin and the Revolution and the creator of the modern economy. To criticise Stalin was the equivalent of doubting Lenin, the Party and the Revolution. Alternatively, Stalin's reforms can be seen as the gross misuse of personal power, perverting Leninism and drifting towards a totalitarian state. Stalin aimed to modernise the economy through collectivisation and industrialisation based on socialist values and centralised planning. Candidates will need to analyse the Five Year Plans in terms of the question. The terror against the Kulaks can be defended as enemies of the workers' revolution, but this led to a virtual national famine in the early 1930s as resistance came from all levels of the peasantry. Given the economic backwardness and imbalance of post-revolutionary Russia, however, drastic action was needed to avoid political failure. Lenin's NEP, as a step back into capitalism, was essentially a short-term measure, and Communism needed to reflect collective not individual needs. The debate, of course, is about the brutal and repressive means of achieving this. Progress in industry was impressive, but achieved in an atmosphere of fear, recrimination and administrative chaos, and perhaps Stalin's main motive was the construction of a personal dictatorship. There was little advance in the standard of living, and indeed regression in agriculture, but without enforced industrialisation, the USSR could not have been mobilised for war.

L1 will include only a partial summary of both aspects, or concentrate on one. L2 will cover both areas, but may be narrative in approach, with only restricted or generalised analytical links. L3 will provide better range and balance and some specific focus on betray/fulfil, but may lack a broader analytical framework bringing the two areas of the question together. This should start to be evident at L4, for example, concentrating on Stalin's role – he managed the economy, and maintained the whole system; to what extent did this 'Stalinist' economy conform to Communist ideals? L5 should present a balanced historical judgement, appreciating a full range of viewpoints.

### **Question 4**

“Both in Hitler's Germany and Stalin's USSR, economic success was the basis of popular support.”

Assess the validity of 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**

In Germany, the Weimar governments' economic failure was important in the growth of Nazi support, and the revival of the economy with the fall in unemployment and public work schemes certainly helped to maintain popularity. Although this was hardly prosperity in terms of standard of living, real wages and consumer goods, economic recovery was successfully projected as re-establishing national pride. However, other factors for Nazi popular support need to be considered, including Hitler's personal leadership, the promotion of Volksgemeinschaft, propaganda, indoctrination, revision of Versailles, fear, lack of opposition alternatives, etc. In the USSR, the deaths of millions through famine and economic hardship for all deny economic success for ordinary Soviet citizens. There was an economic revolution and arguably success for the government and the state, but popular support for these changes had to be manufactured through propaganda focusing on national survival not individual advancement. In reference to other factors, the cult of Stalin, indoctrination, terror, etc, created public compliance rather than popular support.

L1 might tackle only one dictatorship, or two in minimal detail without considering both economic success and popular support. L2 will respond to both dictatorships in detail but may tend to be descriptive or unbalanced with limited sign of any direct comparison. At L3, answers will explicitly relate economic success to popular support, drawing out some common features and differences between the states, and starting to compare, although evidence on other factors will lack development. This will be more evident at L4 in a developing comparison with some signs of integration, perhaps emphasising the priority of economic success for ordinary people above political or ideological considerations. L5 will cover a full range of issues with a sustained comparative approach and reaching some clear conclusions.

**Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1939****A2 Unit 6: Hitler and the Origins of the Second World War, 1933-1941****Question 1**

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

How valid is the interpretation offered in this source by Soviet historians to explain why Stalin signed the Nazi-Soviet Pact? (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, but 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**

Level 1 will tend merely to summarise the source content, stating how the USSR tried to maintain a collective response to Hitler, but was undermined by Britain and France, and so reluctantly signed the Pact. Level 2 will show familiarity with this interpretation, and provide some supporting knowledge – Stalin’s defensive approach was hampered by Chamberlain’s delaying tactics and the long-drawn out Anglo-Soviet negotiations which in the end forced Stalin’s hand. Answers at this level will usually be undeveloped and may include general comment. They may also suggest implicit agreement and/or disagreement with the interpretation. Level 3 will provide a broader interpretation with some signs of evaluation and insight – Stalin’s central aim was simply to avoid war, gain time and provide security for the USSR, and he was prepared to be flexible and opportunistic to achieve this. Answers at this level will be more explicitly evaluate than those at Level 2, but not necessarily full in terms of knowledge and/or comment. Level 4 will provide a developed, balanced and well-supported assessment: e.g. although recent Russian archives tend to support the source interpretation, perhaps Munich did sound the death knell for a collective front. ‘A blank cheque for Hitler’ signals an alternative interpretation, with Stalin hoping to divide the capitalist states. There were certainly two distinct groups in the Soviet government, onw supporting collective security and the other promoting better Soviet-German relations.

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

How useful is this source for an historian investigating Hitler’s attitude to the prospect of war in 1939? (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation of either the strengths and/or 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 will summarise the source, or provide vague, brief comments on Hitler's self-confidence and his attitude to the western democracies. At Level 2 in terms of utility, candidates will comment either on the strengths or limitations of the source, or briefly on both, or may only comment in general terms or in a broad context in relation to utility – e.g. focusing on Hitler, clearly talking for effect as a morale boost for his general, with an over-confident and belligerent attitude, dismissive towards Britain and France. Level 3 will respond to both strengths and limitations in a more balanced and developed way, showing some insight or broader assessment – e.g. focusing on the question of Hitler's influence and also his judgement – the issue for Britain and France was not Poland, but Germany: Hitler mistakenly believed that the democracies were simply weak and irresolute. Level 4 will broaden the argument and make a judgement on the utility of the source in terms of Hitler's attitude to the prospects of war in 1939 – despite Hitler's off-the-cuff denigrating comments, there is evidence of his willpower and commitment, relishing the prospect of war (including Russia). There is also valuable insight into the state of the economy and the rearmament programme – pushed into war by economic pressures; the democracies did not know that Germany was faltering.

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

“In the years up to 1939, Germany deliberately provoked war in order to achieve European domination.”

Assess the validity of this claim.

(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**

The debate focuses both on German foreign policy aims and methods: revisionism or Lebensraum, deliberate provocation or effective opportunism. The sources will need to be integrated into the discussion – Overy, in Source C, emphasises the accumulation of crises, but these provoked other powers to declare war on Germany; and the ‘accommodation’ of German aims could only be geared to revisionism. The self-confidence in Source B supports the proposition, but only in a limited war against an isolated and stranded Poland. Source A contrastingly suggests that Stalin rather than Hitler was the key player or at least co-conspirator – a view supported by Taylor, but dismissed by Bell as mere conjecture. Candidates need to analyse the nature of German foreign policy: long-term objectives and a master-plan for war (Mein Kampf, the Hossbach Memorandum, Four Year Plan etc), with Hitler controlling events; or opportunism arising from the initiatives, mistakes and timing of others, not Hitler’s clear intentions (Taylor). Many historians (Bullock *et al*) accept that Hitler did have policy aims, and did try to prepare Germany for war, but he needed and was prepared to be flexible, modifying and developing his aims in the light of circumstances. Bell emphasises Hitler’s active and adventurous policy, taking the initiative and exploiting it, but agrees with Overy (and Henig) that Germany would inevitably be opposed. Candidates must, of course, use the events to focus on and analyse these issues. The remilitarisation of the Rhineland can be seen as a speculative, bold gamble which then gave Hitler the initiative; the Anschluss crisis was forced on Hitler, and his spur-of-the-moment reaction showed little planning or preparation; at Munich, Hitler pulled back from the brink and felt cheated of his ‘entry into Prague’ – his increased urgency from now on stemmed from economic restrictions and rearmament by other countries; the Czech crisis in 1939 once again took Hitler by surprise, and he believed that the democracies would not go to war over Poland.

Level 1 might concentrate on the sources, especially Source C, or provide a brief narrative summary of Events. Answers at Level 2 might simply accept the proposition with little challenge, and with limited supporting evidence from the sources, knowledge or reading. By Level 3, there should be signs of an attempt to broaden the argument using both sources and own knowledge, drawing on the views of specific historians. Level 4 will develop the debate, analysing the events with a range of interpretations from the specified historians and others,

with some effectively integrated source evidence. L5 will include a full range of evidence with a convincing analysis and evaluation.