



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative T Unit 5

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 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:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's 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 specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at A2 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 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.

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 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 AO 1.1, 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 (AO 1.2), 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 (AO 2, 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 characteristic: 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 the 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.

C: 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 2008

Alternative T: Liberal Democracies, c1787–c1939

A2 Unit 5: The Development of Democracies

Question 1

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

To what extent do these two sources agree on the reasons why some women were enfranchised in 1918? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Extracts simple statements from the sources or refers to own knowledge to demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of aspects of agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate, with reference to either sources and/or own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of similarity and difference of interpretation in relation to the debate and offers some explanation. **6-8**
- L4: Uses appropriately selected material, from both sources and own knowledge, to reach a sustained judgement on the extent of similarity and difference in interpretation in relation to the debate. **9-10**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will summarise the sources.

At Level 2 explicit understanding of agreement is likely. Source A argues that the war has 'confirmed the intense belief' of Lord Selborne that women should be enfranchised; Source B argues that the war 'clearly led to reform' and points out that it transformed Asquith's attitude. Own knowledge may be used to explain concerns about the residency qualification disenfranchising soldiers, to point out that Asquith had also been replaced in 1916 by the pro-female suffrage Lloyd George and that by 1918 all major parties thought they had something to gain from reform.

However, for Level 3 answers, candidates should understand there is some disagreement between the sources. Source B believes in the principle of further enfranchisement as being in the interests of fairness. Selborne disagreed with decisions of the masses, but he accepts them. Source C is less positive in the reasons for granting women the suffrage, referring to the age limitation that would exclude women who would not vote the same as their husbands. Furthermore, Source B intends working women to be enfranchised, while Source C points out that this group was excluded. Own knowledge may be used to explain fears that militancy had aroused on enfranchising all women over 21, or to point out that Selborne was expressing a personal opinion that was not shared by many decision makers.

Judgement for Level 4 may take the form of pointing to the fact that both sources saw enfranchising women as desirable for the country, but that Source C points out the limit to this enfranchisement.

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

'Extensions to the franchise were meant to restrict rather than to increase democracy.'
Assess the validity of this view of the democratic developments in Britain in the years 1867 to 1918. (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

Answers are assessing the intentions behind the 1867, 1884 and 1918 Reform Acts in relation to one of the aims of the acts, to increase democracy.

Answers at Level 1 may describe some aspects of the Reform Acts.

Answers at Level 2 may focus entirely on the sources to provide evidence or use their own knowledge. Analytical answers may be limited to assessing female suffrage.

Answers at Level 3 should provide balance by using sources and own knowledge and covering all three Reform Acts, though it is not expected (or necessarily desired) that the three Acts should be tackled separately. Furthermore, balance requires some consideration of both arguments, namely to increase democracy and to restrict democracy.

Answers at Level 4 will show synoptic understanding, showing an appreciation of the inter-relationship between ideas and pragmatics, or challenging arguments, or by demonstrating which motive was most important in relation to the other. Answers at Level 5 will demonstrate independent judgement perhaps by arguing that reform was inevitable a balance between those who sought to conserve and those who sought to change, with the consequence that incrementally reform created democracy.

A valid argument may be made using appropriate selection of material from the following.

Evidence extensions of the franchise were to restrict democracy:

- 1867 increased the franchise to only 30% of the adult male population.
- 1884 increased the franchise to only 60% of the adult male population.
- Younger sons living at home, those with no fixed abode (often from seasonal employment), the very poorest parts of society all were not enfranchised until 1918.
- In 1918 it was the fear of disenfranchising soldiers under the residency clause that led to reform, not commitment to those currently excluded.
- Women were only enfranchised in 1918; amendments were defeated in 1867 and in 1884 women campaigners were focusing on repeal of the Contagious Disease Act.
- In 1918 only women over the age of 30 were enfranchised, to prevent more radical younger women from voting. Older women were considered more likely to vote as their husbands did. Working women's interests were ruthlessly sacrificed (Source B). Male voters were still the majority (Source C).
- The 1884 Act was only accepted by the Tories because of the addition of the redistribution bill and its gerrymandering to prevent working class majorities in all boroughs (Source A).
- Proportional representation was rejected in 1884 (Source A).

Evidence extending the franchise was to create democracy:

- 1867 and 1884 Reform Acts enfranchised workers and agricultural labourers, who frequently did not own property, attacking the fundamental connection between property and the vote.
- The case for further reform was undeniable (Source A) and accepted by both Liberals and Conservatives in 1867; hence the aristocratic party who resisted progress enfranchised the working class.
- The addition of lodgers in 1867 through the Torrens and Hodgkinson amendments added 500,000 further voters.
- Universal manhood suffrage in 1918.

Section B

Questions 2-7 are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the generic A2 Levels of Response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (without reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *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 responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost 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**

OPTION A: FRANCE, 1848–1905**Question 2**

How far do you agree that Louis Napoleon became Emperor of France in 1852 because of the French people's desire for a monarchy rather than their dislike of Republicanism?
(20 marks)

Use standard mark schemes 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**

Answers will consider the motives of French people in supporting the elevation of Louis Napoleon. They should also consider if other factors were relevant.

Answers at Level 1 may describe the events of 1848 to 1852.

Answers at Level 2 should consider the French desire for a monarchy or their dislike of Republicanism.

Answers at Level 3 should offer balance by considering both synoptic factors.

Synoptic understanding at Level 4 could be demonstrated by explaining the link between the desire for a monarchy and the dislike of Republicanism.

Judgement at Level 5 might be demonstrated by arguing that it was the desire for a 'Napoleon' that was critical, rather than views on monarchy and Republicanism.

Evidence of the desire for a monarchy:

- The restoration of the monarchy had been popular and the fall of Louis-Philippe reflected his lack of majesty rather than dislike of the monarchy.
- The decisiveness of Louis Napoleon was consistent with the perception of decisive Monarchy.
- Louis Napoleon's successful policies led to public pressure for his re election (which would require a change in the constitution).
- Plebiscites returned huge majority in favour of the Empire.

Evidence that there was actually little dislike of Republicanism:

- Part of the French political culture.
- Belief amongst the disenfranchised social elite that only Republicanism would give them democratic rights.
- Belief that only Republicanism could solve economic problems.

Question 3

‘Personalities were more important than issues.’

To what extent do you agree with this explanation for the survival of the Third Republic in the years 1870 to 1905? (20 marks)

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

Level 1 answers may describe some aspects of the Third Republic, typically the crises.

At Level 2, answers should consider either personalities for example, positive forces like Waldeck-Rousseau, Clemenceau, even Zola, and/or those who failed to destroy the 3rd Republic because of their personality defects for example Boulanger. Alternatively issues may be the focus, e.g. strength of Republicanism, church-state relations.

At Level 3, answers will provide balance by covering both synoptic factors.

At Level 4, answers should demonstrate synoptic understanding, perhaps by arguing that when the issues threatened the Republic, strong personalities emerged. Alternatively, the role of personalities may be challenged.

Judgement at Level 5 may take the form of arguing that some of the personalities never intended to destroy Republicanism, for example Dreyfus and Boulanger in very different contexts.

Personalities ensured survival:

- Waldeck-Rousseau’s government of national defence, with its commitment to Republicanism in the face of forces of reaction.
- Clemenceau’s popularism in support of Dreyfus and in his attacks on the Church.
- The support of Zola, an influential figure in French society.
- Boulanger had popular support to challenge the republic, but lacked the commitment to act.

Personalities made survival unlikely:

- Dreyfus divided the Republic and seemed likely to bring about its downfall.
- Boulanger was the greatest threat to the Republic.

Issues ensured survival:

- Republicanism was the system of government that ‘divides us least’.
- Divisions between the monarchist candidates created a stand off. The Comte du Combarb refused to deal with the Orleanists.

- The right was discredited by the Dreyfus Affair.
- Church reform was popular.

Question 4

To what extent do you agree that France was both liberal and democratic by 1905?
(20 marks)

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

Answers at Level 1 may describe some aspects of democracy or describe generally some of the crises with very limited understanding of the concepts.

Answers at Level 2 may consider evidence of liberalism and/or democracy, or argue that there was little liberalism and/or democracy.

Answers at Level 3 will offer balance by considering evidence of liberal democracy and evidence of a lack of liberal democracy.

Answers at Level 4 will demonstrate synoptic understanding by demonstrating how democracy and freedom are inter-related and how one fed the other. Answers will show conceptual understanding by showing a clear appreciation of the two concepts of liberalism and democracy.

Answers at Level 5 will offer sustained judgement, perhaps considering the context of assessing liberalism and democracy, or by appreciating economic and political freedom.

Evidence of Liberalism:

- Release of the Communards
- Freedom of the press
- Defence of Dreyfus and Waldeck-Rousseau's government of national defence
- Economic liberalism – limited taxation and restrictions on business until Millerand.

Evidence of Democracy:

- The system 1871–75 (effective republic, bicameral)
- Constitution of 1875 (Wallon Amendment, limits to presidential powers)
- 'Bottom up' system that developed with government by the deputies and senators with ministers and merely administrators.
- Accountability of ministers also suggests high levels of democracy

- The popularisation of Boulanger may be argued to be the ultimate expression of democracy, whilst his refusal to seize power and establish military rule suggests a vibrant democratic culture.

Evidence of a lack of Liberalism:

- The crushing of the Paris Commune
- Restrictions on the rights of the clergy
- The initial treatment of Dreyfus
- Economic intervention (tariffs, social insurance, minimum wages, 8 hour day etc.)

Evidence of a lack of democracy:

- It became custom to allow all chambers of deputies to serve their full four years.
- There was no sense of accountability of representatives when they schemed to remove ministers.

OPTION B: THE UNITED STATES, 1840–1890

Question 5

To what extent was the outbreak of civil war in America in April 1861 caused by the North's desire to abolish slavery rather than its desire to preserve the Union? (20 marks)

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

At Level 1, answers may make general statements about slavery or describe some events from 1840 to 1861.

At Level 2, answers should consider one of the two synoptic factors.

Answers at Level 3 should demonstrate balance by considering both of the synoptic factors.

Answers at Level 4 should demonstrate synoptic understanding perhaps by challenging one of the factors, for example that the North actually desired to abolish slavery, or by showing the inter-relationship of the two factors, for example the desire to abolish slavery would necessitate war to preserve the Union as the southern states would not accept abolition.

Answers at Level 5 will show independent judgement, possibly recognising that the South started the war and therefore it was their perception of the North's desire to abolish slavery that was important.

Evidence it was the desire to abolish slavery:

- The Kansas-Nebraska Act, the 1850 Compromise and the accession of California all made abolition more likely.
- The election of Lincoln appeared to be a victory for abolitionism. Lincoln believed a 'house divided' could not stand and he saw no role for slavery in the USA's future. The Anti-Slavery Society backed him in the 1860 Presidential Election and he was elected without the support of a single southern state.
- South Carolina seceded stating that their state rights were under threat. The state right wished to protect was slavery.

Evidence it was not the North's desire to abolish slavery that started the war:

- The North had no real desire to abolish slavery; rather they wished to stop it spreading.
- Lincoln was not an abolitionist.
- The Emancipation Proclamation came after the war had been fought for two years; Lincoln had already ordered General Hunter to rescind an offer of freedom to slaves who escaped and joined the Union Army.

Evidence it was the North's desire to preserve the union:

- Fort Sumter was the spark; Lincoln decided to assert the Union's right to its property in the face of secession.
- Lincoln's decision to force the seceding states back into the fold due to his belief in 'majority rule democracy'.

Question 6

To what extent do you agree that new technology was more important than the encouragement of Federal governments in enabling the westward expansion of the United States in the years 1840 to 1890? (20 marks)

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

Answers at Level 1 will describe some aspects of western expansion, or consider the synoptic factors generally.

Answers at Level 2 will consider one of the synoptic factors in detail, or cover both with thin supporting evidence.

Answers at Level 3 will provide balance by considering some examples of new technology, for example, railways, barbed wire, iron ploughs etc. and some examples of government intervention, for example, the 1862 Homestead Act, the promotion of Manifest Destiny etc.

Answers at Level 4 should show understanding of the inter-relationship between the two synoptic factors, for example, government subsidies to the railway companies enabled the new technology to open up the continent. Alternatively, the primacy of one factor over the other will be considered.

Judgement at Level 5 may involve considering the different importance of the different types of technology and forms of government intervention.

Evidence of new technology:

- Barbed wire
- Windmills
- Wind pumps
- Steel bladed plough
- Western Pacific and the Pacific Union railway companies.

Evidence of government intervention:

- 1862 Homestead Act
- Use of the Federal Army to destroy Native American threat – Battle of Wounded Knee and the reservations policy
- Promotion of Manifest Destiny
- Subsidies to the railway companies

Question 7

To what extent do you agree that the USA was both liberal and democratic by 1890?
(20 marks)

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

Level 1 answers will be limited to generalisations about rights and freedoms and the system of election, perhaps based on knowledge from the AS module, relating to the US Constitution as written in 1787.

Answers at Level 2 may consider the position of African-Americans or only liberalism or democracy. Answers at Level 2 may consider evidence of liberalism and/or democracy, or argue that there was little liberalism and/or democracy.

At Level 3, answers will offer balance by considering evidence of liberal democracy and evidence of a lack of liberal democracy.

Answers at Level 4 will demonstrate synoptic understanding by demonstrating how democracy and freedom are inter-related and how one fed the other. Answers will show conceptual understanding by showing a clear appreciation of the two concepts of liberalism and democracy.

Answers at Level 5 will offer sustained judgement perhaps considering the context of assessing liberalism and democracy, or by appreciating economic and political freedom.

Evidence of Liberalism:

- 13th, 14th and 15th amendments relating to the abolition of slavery and equal rights for African-Americans.
- Success of Black congressmen.

Evidence of democracy:

- The impact of public opinion on officials – resignation of Richardson (1874) Belknap (1876).
- The new constitutions for the southern states during reconstruction.
- The attempts by federal government to control big business when it acted undemocratically (1877 Interstate Commerce Act & the 1890 Sherman Anti-Trust Act).
- Civil service reform (Pendleton CS Act, 1883).

Evidence of Lack of Liberty:

- Treatment of American Indians – reservations, destruction of bison, Americanisation and the cultural imperialism it implied, culminating in the Battle of Wounded Knee.
- The effect of immigration on the dominant WASP population.
- Mormons movement to Utah.
- Role of the KKK and the backlash against reconstruction after 1877.

Evidence of Lack of Democracy:

- The franchise and African-Americans (intimidation of Negro voters in the south, poll tax and the 'grandfather clause', exclusion from votes in democratic primaries, literacy tests in 1880s, to the continued exclusion of women from voting).
- Powers of patronage that culminated in the formation of the Civil Service Reform League in 1881.
- The power of big business.
- The use of the veto 413 times by Cleveland.