



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative E Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

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.

January 2008

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 C** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of ‘coalition nightmare’ (line 6) in the context of Bismarck’s foreign policy. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. fears of a coalition between France and Russia. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the coalition seen by Bismarck as the gravest menace to Germany’s security, sandwiched between France in the west and Russia in the east, leaving Germany potentially vulnerable to the prospects of war on two fronts. Candidates might also use the source context to comment on Bismarck’s overreaction, given the aversion of the Russian Tsars to any form of republican regime. 2-3

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

Explain how **Source B** differs from **Source A** in relation to Bismarck’s attitude towards France in the 1870s. (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. Bismarck brought about the crisis in Source A; but wanted to co-operate with France in Source B. 1-2
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. in the context of Bismarck’s fear of French revenge, Source A pinpoints a deliberately provocative attitude towards France for no apparent good reason in the ‘war scare’ of 1875, in contrast with Bismarck’s more positive approach in Source B where he seeks to provide a more calming influence on France. 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 clear insight into the different contexts of the sources. Source A
-

arguably reveals Bismarck's over-reaction to France's rapid recovery and military reorganisation. Source B provides a broader perspective with the Balkan crisis which involved all major powers, perhaps showing Bismarck's more measured response to France after his miscalculation over the 'war scare'. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of Bismarck's alliances, in relation to other factors, in preventing conflict amongst the powers of Europe 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 provides the basis of a response in raising a range of issues, with contrasting views of Bismarck's alliances – seeing either 20 years of diplomatic success, or a legacy of failure as Bismarck misread the international climate. Source A highlights Bismarck's lack of a diplomatic approach during the 'War Scare' in 1875, while Source B reveals a more measured approach, appreciating the potential for international conflict and the need for improved relations with the major powers.

From own knowledge, candidates should select from a broad range of evidence over the period to assess the importance of Bismarck's alliances, as he aimed to provide security for a newly unified Germany and to maintain peace in Europe. His diplomatic balancing act sought to reassure other European leaders that Germany wanted no further expansion, but aimed to

prevent international conflict by becoming the focal point of European diplomacy, trying to neutralise existing antagonisms. Bismarck's alliance network focused specifically on the problems of trying to isolate a revengeful France and reducing friction between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans. To highlight Bismarck's skill and expertise as a diplomat, candidates might refer to the early personal contacts of the first Dreikaiserbund, the Treaty of Berlin, which established Berlin as the diplomatic centre of Europe, and the network of alliances from 1879 (Dual Alliance, second Dreikaiserbund, Triple Alliance and Reinsurance Treaty) establishing a comprehensive diplomatic system.

However, to provide range and balance, candidates should emphasise Bismarck's flexible approach to foreign policy beyond formal alliances, constantly adjusting to changing circumstances – e.g. the calculated bluff of the 'War Scare' in 1875, or his efforts to prevent conflict amongst the major powers through the last of the old-style congresses in Berlin in 1878 with Bismarck's role as an 'honest broker'. Responses might also consider whether his alliance network was too complex and contradictory, with Bismarck merely reacting to events rather than controlling them, for example, perhaps rushing rashly into the Dual Alliance of 1879. Similarly, the Reinsurance Treaty of 1887 seemed a high-risk strategy – more a desperate last throw rather than a diplomatic recovery. By 1890, international tension in the Balkans remained, and there was no reconciliation with either Russia or France.

Level 1 might be restricted to an assertive sweeping summary, with minimal supporting evidence. Level 2 will include more range, but will tend to describe and list the alliances with little evaluation. From Level 3, evidence from the sources as well as own knowledge must be included and, at this level, candidates might begin to appreciate the range of Bismarck's variable and flexible diplomacy, with signs of an explicit response to the question. However, any assessment might still be dominated by alliances. Level 4 will develop this broader analytical approach, perhaps questioning Bismarck's diplomatic control in merely reacting to events. Level 5 should debate a range of methods and reach some conclusions.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Bloody Sunday' in the context of events in Russia in 1905. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. when armed guards opened fire on a peaceful demonstration. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. when an estimated 200,000 unarmed factory workers and their families were deliberately attacked, killing and injuring hundreds – imperial troops panicked, sensing that the crowd was a revolutionary mob out of control. The massacre marked the start of the 1905 revolution. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Bloody Sunday led to the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution in Russia. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the massacre provoked a nationwide reaction, with strikes and acts of terrorism, as news rapidly spread to other cities. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. seeing Bloody Sunday as the last straw, changing the popular view of the Tsar, and making some references to the demands of the petition and/or longer-term grievances. **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. examines a broad range of causes, appreciating Bloody Sunday as the immediate spark and catalyst for revolution, perhaps commenting on the marchers' naïve trust in the Tsar, and, for ordinary workers, emphasising social and economic issues more than political grievances. **6-7**

- (c) 'Tsar Nicholas II survived the 1905 Revolution mainly because he issued the October Manifesto.'
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

By October 1905, Tsar Nicholas II was faced with the strongest opposition in Romanov history. At this crucial time, the government, mainly through Witte, kept its nerve and a sense of purpose, and recognised the need for timely concessions. The October Manifesto provided a critical breathing space and took the sting out of the Revolution. Superficially, the manifesto promised a range of civil rights and, above all, the creation of an elected parliament or legislative duma. These concessions succeeded in splitting the liberal opposition, and the Tsar never intended the duma to limit his autocratic powers, as the Fundamental Laws, promulgated in 1906, would confirm. The peasants were bought off by an announcement in November that the redemption payments were to be reduced and then abolished altogether. This led to an immediate drop in the number of land-seizures by the peasants and a decline in the general lawlessness in rural areas.

To provide some balance and development, candidates should also consider that Nicholas survived first and foremost because his armed forces remained loyal, despite defeat in the Japanese war. Outbreaks of mutiny proved isolated and short-term, and the end of the war itself satisfied one of the workers' grievances. Following the October Manifesto, the government felt strong enough to crush the opposition of industrial workers and soviets – Nicholas's policy was not one of concession, but of suppression, which would continue under Stolypin after 1905.

In terms of the Tsar's survival, candidates might include some comment on the nature of the Revolution itself which was largely spontaneous, almost accidental, and was not co-ordinated or concerted, with little leadership or role for the political parties. This was the first serious opposition, lacking both experience and confidence; and the liberals, afraid of violence, did not mix well with the workers, who were more interested in economic rather than political improvements.

Level 1 might be restricted to a limited summary of the events, with little comment beyond assertion. A narrative approach may still dominate at Level 2, but in more detail and with some broad links to the question. By Level 3, the focus must be more explicit and analytical, with some attempt to assess the importance of concessions by the top of this level. At Level 4, there should be a clear attempt to prioritise the issues, or perhaps comment on the nature of the Revolution. Level 5 might broaden the context and include some sort of judgement – e.g. considering whether tsarism survived unchanged, weaker or stronger.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'industrial revolution' in the context of Germany after 1871. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. describing in general terms the rapid growth of heavy industry. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the emergence of a factory system with implications for mass production, foreign competitiveness, large urban workforce, growth of armaments etc., and perhaps including references to the shift away from agriculture and to rural/urban migration. 2-3

- (b) Explain why Germany experienced strong economic growth after 1871. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. references to political unification, strong leadership, a large population. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. commenting on the large potential workforce and domestic market, Germany's range of natural resources and good agricultural land, a developing banking and financial infrastructure, effective education and training, and Prussia's lead and initiative. **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 Level 2, but comments perhaps on how these factors are inter-related and common in successfully developing states. References to communications and large-scale cartels might explain how Germany sustained such growth. **6-7**

- (c) 'The main result of rapid industrial growth, in the years 1871 to 1914, was increasing social and political division in Germany.'
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 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

The social and political repercussions of industrial growth might include the emergence of an urban working class, with deteriorating living and working conditions, and also the resulting

growth of the SPD, trade unions and other pressure groups demanding social and political reforms. After periods of political repression, the socialists became the largest political party by 1912 with more than 4 million votes, yet there was little sign of open social or industrial unrest. With the speed of German industrialisation, traditional class divisions hardened, as the social and political elites, essentially anti-democratic and anti-industrialist, resisted change and tried diversionary tactics towards an active foreign and colonial policy (especially Weltpolitik) to limit the appeal of socialism. The intention was to pull the lower orders to the right to counteract the lure of the left. As a result, the working class became increasingly divided between those looking for revolutionary social and political change and those seeking to reform the existing political system.

Candidates should provide some balance by emphasising the positive results of rapid industrial growth in Germany. The working classes benefited from rising real wages, stable food prices, almost full employment and the emerging state socialism of the welfare state. Economic growth, of course, also transformed Germany from an agrarian society into Europe's leading industrial power, with massive increases in production and trade, both in primary and developing new industries, despite a reliance on imported raw materials and foodstuffs. Germany developed a huge financial and banking infrastructure, and there was impressive state investment in scientific and technical education.

Level 1 will be brief, with an uncritical and assertive acceptance of social and political division. Level 2 will provide more range, but may be descriptive and implicit, concentrating mainly on the social and political aspects, and perhaps on the SPD. An explicit focus should be evident from Level 3, and might include some economic aspects by the top of this level. By Level 4, the analytical insight should be more developed, with some appreciation of the contrasting results in both economic growth and social/political repercussions, and perhaps some comment on the difficulties of adjusting to the rapid and intensive pace of industrialisation. Some judgement should be included at Level 5, possibly commenting that in trying to protect their own interests, the ruling elites merely exacerbated the social and political divisions.