



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative E Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2007 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 © 2007 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:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS 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 AS level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS 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 AS.

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 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: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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 2007

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 significance of the ‘Liberal Era’ (line 1) in the context of Bismarck’s rule in Germany in the years 1871 to 1878. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. mentioning Bismarck using the National Liberals ‘for his own ends’ 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. explaining perhaps how the Liberal coalition benefited both sides and helped to consolidate national unity. With 155 seats in the Reichstag by 1874, National Liberal support for the *Kulturkampf* was important for Bismarck, and the alliance also led to significant economic, legal and administrative legislation in Germany. 2-3

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

Explain how the views in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source A** about the success of the National Liberals in promoting liberal ideas in Bismarckian Germany. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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 and 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.

- L1: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. provides only a basic or general contrast, describing the lack of success in Source A, and the liberal ideas evident in Source B. 1-2
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. Source A concludes that, despite supporting the *Kulturkampf*, the National Liberals gained little, and failed to advance liberal ideas or appreciate Bismarck’s inherent conservatism. In contrast, despite the political set-back of 1878-79, Source B pinpoints the establishment of strong liberal values which Bismarck failed to undermine. Candidates should also provide some contextual knowledge to draw out and develop the contrast between the appearance and reality of Germany’s political

structure – Bismarck was prepared to grant civil rights to German citizens provided these posed no limits on his control. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source A, e.g. as above, but with some signs of a clear overview in relation to the sources – Germany was governed by a constitution as free and liberal as anywhere in Europe, but, given his *Junker* background, Bismarck would never be a true liberal, and anti-Socialism and anti-Semitism would start to thrive. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of Bismarck's handling of political parties, in relation to other factors, in his attempts to maintain political control in Germany in the years 1871 to 1890. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- 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 *either* on own knowledge *or* 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 descriptions but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from 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 the sources *and* from 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* from own knowledge, 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 and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the sources, Source C gives clear insight into the question and focuses on Bismarck having to use all his skill to manoeuvre between the political parties and avoid any permanent dependence on them – constantly having to adjust his tactics and switch his allies as political contexts changed. The source also provides some context for Bismarck's handling of 3 political parties. Source A highlights the negative purpose of using the National Liberals to control the

Catholic Centre Party, and Source B confirms the contexts of the *Kulturkampf* and of the important political realignment of 1878-79.

From own knowledge, candidates should establish a clear political context in the newly unified Germany with strong executive control for Bismarck, political ascendancy for Prussia, and relatively limited powers for the Reichstag. Yet, in trying to maintain his political control and the *status quo*, Bismarck needed support in the Reichstag and had to, at least, contain political opposition from the main parties, especially as political and economic circumstances changed.

Candidates should discuss Bismarck's skill in the handling of several political parties, especially in relation to the political realignment of 1878-79. The 1870s was dominated by the 'Liberal Era' and the *Kulturkampf*. Bismarck's handling of the National Liberals produced a successful marriage of convenience, followed by a rift over such issues as free trade and the military budget. His handling of the Catholic Centre Party and the *Kulturkampf* was less effective, but Bismarck reached a reconciliation after 1878. The Chancellor's response to the growth and perceived threat of the SPD, through both repression and welfare reforms, proved ineffective and misguided in terms of Bismarck's political motives. However, he maintained the support of the Conservatives throughout the period.

Level 1 will provide only partial coverage or a limited summary. More range will be evident at Level 2, but may tend towards factual narrative with little comment. By Level 3, some source evidence must be included, with some explicit focus on the question and some attempt to assess Bismarck's handling of the political parties, recognising that, at all times, he needed support from some of the major parties and was prepared to change both his policies and political tactics to achieve this. There should be more development and some balance at Level 4, perhaps appreciating the inter-relationship of different issues, the crucial turning point of 1878-79, and Bismarck's capacity for *realpolitik*. Some overall judgement should be evident for Level 5.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'protective tariffs' in relation to the Russian economy in the 1890s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. customs duties strengthening and protecting the Russian economy. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. tax duties which helped to produce a favourable balance of trade and safeguard Russia's infant industrial growth against the competition of stronger nations. Yet tariffs also led to the higher costs of imported goods such as tea and salt which reduced the purchasing power of the rural majority, and duties on raw materials raised manufacturing costs. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Witte wanted to promote industrialisation in Russia in the 1890s. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. commenting on the agrarian and backward economy, or to improve Russia. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Witte saw industrialisation as the salvation of Russia, leading to the creation of a strong, modern state – otherwise, Russia would become a vast market unable to supply its own needs. Witte also wanted to catch up with the West using Russia's undeveloped resources, and improve the infrastructure increasing trade and investment, and encouraging the movement of workers to the towns and cities. This would present a more forward-looking regime to the Russian people and other governments, and also improve military efficiency, political control and potential government revenue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as L2, but including a range of motives designed to emulate the industrial revolutions in western Europe and match the economic development of Russia's rivals, but also to buttress tsarism and maintain Russia's position as a great power. **6-7**

- (c) 'In terms of economic progress in Russia, the achievements of Stolypin after 1905 were more important than the reforms of Witte in the 1890s.'
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 generalisations 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, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant 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 and 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

Answers reaching the higher levels should present a balanced and developed analysis, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the work of both Witte and Stolypin.

Real economic progress started in the 1890s with Witte as Minister of Finance. During this 'great spurt', there was 8% growth per annum, with massive economic expansion in heavy industry, and an industrial labour force of 3 million. There was a key role for the state, achieving mass foreign capital as a substitute for internal investment. Witte himself injected a new imaginative energy and urgency into economic affairs. Railway development doubled during this period, with the building of the Trans-Siberian Railway as the prestige project stimulating overall industrial development. Witte also established monetary stability, placing the rouble on the Gold Standard in 1897. However, dependent on foreign money, Russia became Europe's largest debtor nation, and the agricultural sector remained neglected and backward, as the peasants remained controlled by the *mir* and tied to the countryside. Russia's poor internal market was further hindered by high taxes and tariffs – grain was exported while millions starved.

After 1905, agriculture becomes the centre of government policy and economic progress. Stolypin's reforms were designed to establish a prosperous peasantry by abolishing redemption dues, encouraging private ownership outside the *mir* and improving efficiency. These reforms, which were the most important attempt since emancipation to tackle agricultural backwardness and rural over-population, needed 20 years to work, and by 1914 only 10% of the land had been consolidated, with the strip system still prevailing as peasants became increasingly reluctant to leave the security of the *mir*. Stolypin's economic reforms remain controversial, but agricultural production reached record levels by 1913. After 1906, Stolypin also continued to build on

Witte's work, and there was further growth in heavy industry as Russia finally began to develop her own consumer market. By 1914, Russia was ranked fifth in the world as an industrial state, yet, compared to other countries, this was still too limited an industrial base, dependent on foreign capital, and with more than 80% of Russians still peasant farmers.

Level 1 might only include one economic minister or be restricted to a generalised summary. Both Witte and Stolypin should be included at Level 2, but coverage may be descriptive and unbalanced with little sign of assessment. There should be some signs of explicit evaluation of both ministers at Level 3, perhaps just accepting the proposition, but this may still not be balanced, and will not be developed. By Level 4, there should be some developed insight into the importance of both industry and agriculture in terms of economic progress, as Witte successfully kick-starts the economy in the 1890s with state-sponsored industrialisation, and Stolypin tries to respond to the needs of the rural majority after 1905. In reaching conclusions at Level 5, candidates should emphasise how both agricultural and industrial development are indispensable for economic progress.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'naval race' in the context of German foreign policy after 1890. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a contest to build the biggest navy. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the escalation of naval rivalry between Germany and Britain from around 1900. It centered on the construction of heavy battleships – *Dreadnoughts* – and contributed greatly to the mistrust between the two countries. It also engendered much popular patriotic fervour which in turn heightened tensions. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Germany embarked on naval expansion after 1890. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. part of *Weltpolitik*, trying to make Germany a bigger and stronger nation. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. an assertion of Germany's growing status and prestige, to promote new markets and an outlet for heavy industry. The expansion might force Britain into an alliance by challenging her naval dominance. It also highlighted the Kaiser's influence over policy, as well as his mentality and personality, showing his frustration at Germany's limited colonial expansion under Bismarck. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as L2, but perhaps linking naval expansion to domestic politics, as a deliberate diversion to rally the people with a new strident nationalism. **6-7**

- (c) 'Kaiser Wilhelm II's influence on German foreign policy significantly increased the tension between Germany and the other European powers in the years 1890 to 1914.' Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- 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. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant 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 and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Candidates will need to assess the influence of the Kaiser on foreign policy and also consider any other relevant factors which may have led to increased tension between Germany and other European powers.

The accession of Kaiser Wilhelm II certainly marked a significant change in the exercise of state power, with his determination to impose his personal authority and control based on his strong executive powers. Wilhelm was also ambitious, giving preference to the army and navy commanders rather than to civilian ministers or the Reichstag. No major decision could be taken without his concurrence, and Wilhelm increasingly tried to influence and perhaps dictate policy after 1897, especially in relation to Weltpolitik and naval expansion. His temperamental instability provoked some diplomatic initiatives which certainly increased international tension, such as the 'Kruger Telegram' in 1895 – an ostentatious but inept gesture of protest – and the 'Blank Cheque' to Austria-Hungary in 1914. The Emperor also led a separate military hierarchy, and the army remained the monarch's personal weapon. After 1908, the influence of his military entourage was unrivalled.

However, perhaps the Kaiser tended to meddle rather than influence foreign affairs, with occasional flights of fancy such as the Daily Telegraph interview in 1908. He was subsequently persuaded by the Reichstag and Bulow to adopt a more restrained approach to public pronouncements. There are a number of examples in foreign policy where Wilhelm's influence was limited – despite the Kaiser's assurances to the Russians over the Reinsurance Treaty in 1890, the Foreign Ministry forced Wilhelm to back down in this crucial change of policy; the

Kaiser's Tangier speech in 1905, during the first Morocco crisis, was instigated by Bulow and Holstein against Wilhelm's wishes; in the important War Council of 1912, the military general staff pressurised the Kaiser towards war; and Tirpitz remained the driving force even in the pet project of the navy. Wilhelm lacked political experience and seemed more interested in court ceremonies and parades than day-to-day business. An additional layer and possibly the key issue is the Kaiser's complex personality – volatile, unpredictable and contradictory. Wilhelm did have executive power in theory, but perhaps lacked political ability and personal stability in practice.

In order to provide balance and development, candidates might conclude that the policy of Weltpolitik was more important than the personality and influence of the Kaiser in causing tension between Germany and other European powers. The impact of Weltpolitik on international relations should be assessed. Details should be included on the naval rivalry with Britain. German expansion posed an unmistakable threat to British naval domination, and proved a serious misjudgement and miscalculation, starting a naval arms race which ultimately helped to force Britain into the Franco-Russian camp. The two Morocco crises of 1905 and 1911 could be used to exemplify the impact of colonial rivalry. The mentality of bluster and brinkmanship depicted by Weltpolitik, and highlighted in Germany's calculated risk-taking is also important in generating international tension and suspicion up to 1914. The hardening of two European alliances and also events in the Balkans could be included to explain the escalating international tensions, especially between Austria-Hungary, Russia and Serbia, and candidates might provide evidence of various crises from Bosnia in 1908 to the July crisis of 1914, including Germany's role.

Level 1 is likely to be partial, providing generalised assertion with little evidence, perhaps simply accepting or dismissing the proposition. Level 2 will include more range but will lack balance over the period and may be mainly description, possibly concentrating on Weltpolitik or the navy. By Level 3, there should be some signs of assessment, with some focus on the Kaiser's influence in relation to some foreign policy issues, although this will be undeveloped and unbalanced. Level 4 will begin to develop the analysis and should provide some balance, perhaps commenting on the impact of Weltpolitik in relation to the Kaiser's unpredictable personality. Level 5 should reach some conclusions, with a convincing overview of the Kaiser's influence in foreign policy.