



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative H 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 H: Aspects of Twentieth Century European and World History, 1900 to the Present Day

AS Unit 1: The Emergence of the Super-Powers and the New World Order, 1900–1962

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of 'seizing British markets' (line 2) in the context of Britain's international status by 1919. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. Britain was facing competition from its trade rivals such as Japan and the USA. Britain was falling behind in textiles and shipping. Answers may not necessarily make a direct link between the content of the source and Britain's international status. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. for the higher mark candidates could make a clear link between economic wealth and international status, basically national wealth equals international power. The source identifies a clear economic decline and answers may refer to the decline in military power as a result. Some may refer to the rise of the USA and the implications of this, and the rise of other rivals, for Britain's international status. 2-3

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

Explain how the views put forward in **Source B** differ from those in **Source C** about Britain's attitude towards its empire after the Second World War. (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. Source B outlines the immediate post-war decolonisation process. Reference may be made to the meaning of the final sentence. Source C suggests that the government wanted to hold on to the empire and use it to become more powerful. 1-2
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. candidates may point out the withdrawal from India and Palestine in Source B and outline the contextual background to this. Reference may be made to the pre-war agreement with India on independence and the attitude of the Labour

government. Similarly reference may be made to the problems of the mandate in Palestine and Britain's inability to maintain sufficient resources to enforce the mandate. Source C suggests Britain's willingness to retain parts of the Empire. Candidates may consider Britain's post-war thinking on how the Empire might be economically and politically useful in the post-war quest for international status. **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 C, e.g. much of what is in L2 may form the foundation of this. Candidates may go on to argue that both sources have a degree of accuracy in that different parts of the Empire were given different levels of priority by the government. There was a desire for international status and a reduced dependency on the USA but there was also a pragmatic acceptance that some parts of the Empire were a major liability. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the economic impact of the First World War, in relation to other factors, in Britain's decline as a great power by 1950. **(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 own knowledge answers may establish the scale of the economic impact of the war and refer to Britain's loss of trade and the massive debt owed to the USA that developed. Britain by 1918 was a debtor rather than a creditor nation. Candidates may then link Britain's economic problems after 1918 to its decline as both a military and an imperial power. Answers should progress across the whole period so reference to the impact of the First World War may be made to explore Britain's international status in the inter-war period. Reference to the impact of the Second World War is necessary to establish a balance in terms of the relative impact of the war over time.

From the sources answers may use Source A to suggest that economic decline was a direct consequence of the war while Source B could be used to refer to Britain's post-1945 imperial decline and suggest that World War Two was more significant than the first war for this decline. Source C could be used to suggest that Britain's decline was not so severe even after 1945 and the country had the means to revive Britain's international status, as some politicians believed.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by an 'economic empire' in the context of the Soviet Union's attitude towards the United States by 1947. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Marshall Aid gave money to war damaged European countries and these would then come to depend on the USA. Europe would become a kind of empire controlled by US money. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. answers may make links to containment and suggest that Marshall Aid was the economic arm of containment. They may suggest that the USA had a plan to develop its influence in Europe, particularly western Europe, and economic aid was the fastest and most likely method to succeed in achieving that aim. Reference may be made to US fears of the spread of communism and a strategy to control that. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the Soviet Union blockaded Berlin in 1948. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. they wanted an event, a propaganda victory over the Americans. Stalin was convinced that his cause was just and that the USA and its allies would not see the defence of Berlin as a strategic/political priority. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. answers may suggest that the blockade was a Soviet challenge to containment and the aim was to see if the USA would carry out the promise of containment. The importance of a propaganda victory may also be considered. Stalin was interested in the possibility of supporting pro-communist groups in western European states and a Soviet victory over the USA would strengthen communist popularity in these states. It was also a way of consolidating

Soviet influence in eastern European and finalising Stalin's buffer zone concept for Soviet security. **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. essentially the detail of L2 is the basis of this level but with clear linkage etc. Answers may illustrate the inter-relation of these factors and go on to suggest that the strategic factors were the most significant for Stalin. Equally they may suggest that Berlin was never really a primary strategic issue and that a propaganda objective was central to Stalin's aims. **6-7**

(c) 'It was the United States' monopoly of nuclear weapons that was the main reason for the development of the Cold War in the years 1945 to 1949.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(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

Candidates should consider the range of factors that contributed to the development of the Cold War in this early period. Nuclear technology was a major issue and the context of this could be explored. The Soviets were not told of the technology until it had been used but the decline in East-West relations may have begun before this, e.g. with the arrival of Truman and the Potsdam Conference as early as July 1945. Other factors would include the ideological split and its impact. Candidates may consider the significance of ideological issues in terms of containment. Containment as a US policy is also very significant and the Soviet perception of it is central. The notion that Europe was a strategic, political and economic vacuum after the war, which was open to both Soviet and US influence, may also be considered. The Soviet desire to

protect itself from future threats and the subsequent development of satellite states in eastern Europe may be considered.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by ‘imperialists’ in the context of the Soviet Union’s attitude towards the United States in 1962. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the Soviets saw the USA as a country that wanted to control Cuba as if it was part of a US empire. Candidates may mention the idea of indirect control. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. candidates may refer to the role of the US economic influence in Cuba through major companies that were central to the Cuban economy. Such control would equate to political and strategic influence, or the kind enjoyed by European imperial powers. Some may refer back to the nature of the relationship between the USA and Cuba’s former leader, General Batista. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the US government supported the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the USA wanted to get rid of Castro or they feared the spread of communism into Cuba now that Castro was in power. Answers may suggest the USA was not doing the actual fighting therefore the risks were less. The mistaken belief that Castro’s regime was weak and could easily be defeated. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. once Castro had established a new regime he attempted to seek economic aid from the USA. The USA was convinced that he was a communist as well as a revolutionary and therefore his regime had to be overthrown. Cuban exiles were willing to do this. The wider international context may also be considered, e.g. the propaganda struggle with the USSR and the importance of Kennedy establishing a strong image for himself internationally and particularly in the eyes of Khrushchev. **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. answers may refer to the range of issues in L2 and then illustrate how Kennedy’s image and USA’s national interests in preventing the spread of communism were closely linked. Candidates may suggest that the US chose to ignore the strength of Castro’s regime and the weaknesses of the exiles because the most important factor was to remove a threat, on the USA’s doorstep, to US national interests. Kennedy had to adopt a bullish approach, particularly since he was a Democrat. **6-7**

- (c) 'The Soviet Union's main objective in its relationship with Cuba was to spread communist ideology.'
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

Answers should explore Soviet motives for the placement of nuclear missiles on Cuba. The ideological, strategic and political issues should be considered. The 1950s had seen a major and escalating nuclear arms race between the USA and the Soviet Union. Candidates may suggest that the missiles were a means of strengthening Soviet nuclear status over the USA. Some answers may challenge this and suggest that the USSR's nuclear capability was already a sufficient deterrent against the USA. Some may argue that the missiles were an important bargaining tool against USA missiles in Turkey. Politically a propaganda victory was vital for Khrushchev. This could be considered in terms of the context of Berlin between 1958–1962 culminating in the Berlin Wall in August of 1962. The ideological opportunities were always there and to support a communist state in the USA's 'backyard' was a supreme propaganda opportunity. Some answers may consider the outcomes and suggest that Khrushchev never intended to take the world into a nuclear war. Propaganda and the nuclear arms race and the Cold War were not that important. Essentially Khrushchev acted irresponsibly and his defeat ultimately led to his downfall.