

Mark Scheme (Standardisation) Summer 2008

GCE

GCE History (6522)

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

CONTENTS

Paper	Title	Page
	General Instructions on Marking	1
	Generic Level Descriptors	5
2A	Monarchs and their Servants: Henry VIII and Charles I	8
2B	Health, Welfare and the Constitution in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Britain	12
2C	Reformation and the Catholic Challenge in Europe, 1517-63	16
2D	Challenges to Authority and the Struggle for a New Order in France and America in the Late Eighteenth Century	20
2E	A New Nation and the Rise of Fascism: Italy 1848-1925	24
2F	Democracy and Bolshevism in Post-War States: Germany and Russia, 1918-29	28
2G	Social and Political Change in Post-War Powers: The USA and China, 1945-76	32

General Instructions on Marking

Principles of Assessment

Examiners are encouraged to exercise their professional discretion and judgement in the assessment of answers. The schemes that follow are a guide and may at times be inapplicable to answers that tackle questions in an unusual, though acceptable, manner. Where examiners find it necessary to adapt the mark scheme to the needs of such answers, written comments should make clear the basis on which such decisions were made.

Examiners should at all times mark positively rather than negatively, i.e. reward candidates for what they know and understand rather than penalising them for what they do not know or understand. Examiners should bear in mind that the examination is designed for a wide ability range and should therefore make full use of the whole range of marks available.

Date of marking

Do NOT date scripts. Each script should be numbered consecutively and marking should be completed in centre number order.

Addition of marks

Marks for each sub-question should be placed in the right hand margin. The final total for an answer must be ringed and placed in the right-hand margin and transferred to the front sheet. Do not write comments in the right hand margin. The level awarded should be noted in the left-hand margin as L1, L2 etc.

Annotation

The marking of questions is discussed in paragraph 5 below. Examiners must ensure that their marking is not only accurate and consistent, but that it is easy to follow. Marking conventions as described in the mark schemes and exemplified at standardisation must be followed. Every answer must show evidence in the body of the work that it has been marked.

Answers should be analysed as follows:

Underline with a straight line the key points of reasoning and argument, indicate flawed reasoning, irrelevance or error with a wavy line (in the left hand margin if the passages are lengthy).

A cross or encirclement may be used for errors of fact, a question mark may be used to indicate a dubious or ambiguous assertion, an omission mark to indicate the absence of material that might reasonably be expected.

Marking of Questions

(a) Levels of response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained.

Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answers as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Maps and diagrams drawn by candidates

A map or diagram which relates directly to the set question, which is substantially accurate and which suggests (e.g. by location of places and boundaries) firmer historical understanding of the subject matter than is shown by the candidate's written work alone should receive credit. Analytical links indicated in such a way in a final, hurried, part of an answer should be given credit.

Where one word or single phrase answer is appropriate to answer a sub-question, candidates should not be penalised for using note form. If you encounter the use of note form in a sub-question which requires extended writing, treat it on its merits. Unintelligible or flimsy notes will deserve little, if any, credit. If an answer consists of notes which are full and readily intelligible, award it the appropriate conceptual level but go to the bottom end of that level.

Comments by examiners on answers and on scripts

Examiners should feel free to comment on a part of an answer, a whole answer or a complete script to clarify the basis on which marks have been awarded. Such comments are of assistance to Team Leaders and to any others who may have reason to look further at a marked script at a later stage. These comments must represent professional judgements and must be related to the criteria for the award of marks. Negative comments should not be employed as an opportunity to vent the examiner's frustration! For example, 'Irrelevant' may be an acceptable comment, 'hopeless' is not.

Consistency

Examiners should apply a uniform standard of assessment throughout their marking once that standard has been approved by their Team Leader. They should not try to find extra marks for candidates. It is the duty of an examiner to see that the standard of marking does not vary in any particular area of the mark range.

Spread of marks

Undue 'bunching' of marks is very undesirable. In particular, examiners should not hesitate to give high marks, and should go up to the maximum if it is deserved.

Rubric offences

A candidate who offends against the rubric of a paper should have all the answers marked and the best answers counted up to the required number within a particular paper or section of a paper.

An answer that offends against the rubric and that does not score should be indicated thus: QU.
2. RUBRIC OFFENCE. DO NOT SCORE.

Illegibility

Scripts which are impossible to read or which contain offensive or disturbing comments should be marked 'E' on the front cover and forwarded (separately) to the Assessment Leader for History at Edexcel after the script has been marked and the mark recorded. Such scripts will be considered separately by the Principal Examiners at the conclusion of the awarding meeting.

Quality of written communication

The marking of the quality of written communication is embedded within the levels of response of some questions. It forms one of the considerations for deciding reward within a level.

Deciding on the mark point within a level

1. The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at level four, would not by itself merit a level four award - but it would be evidence to support a high L3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.
2. Where the mark range for a level exceeds 5, the level has been divided into 3 sub-bands, high, mid and low. To decide which sub band to award within a level, the following factors should be taken into account:
the range and depth of coverage of issues
the amount and accuracy of supporting information
the consistency with which the standard is maintained throughout the work.

In each case, the mid point of the mid mark band should be considered first and any move up or down from that should only be made if there is evidence in the work to support such a move. A move from the key mark point in a sub-band will be justified if the work has qualities to be considered for the next band up or down.

3. Assessing quality of written communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid level two criteria but fits the level three QoWC descriptors, it will require a move from the key mark point. In that case the quality of written communication will raise the award of marks to the top of the mid level two sub-band. In the case of a borderline candidate, QoWC inconsistent with the 'history' level will raise or lower the candidate into the next sub-band. In exceptional circumstances, *i.e.* where the quality of written communication is clearly better, or worse, than that indicated in the main generic mark scheme by more than one overall level, a larger downward or upward adjustment might be justified, across sub-levels or even *into the next level down or up, where the candidate has first been placed in the low or high band of a level*. In such cases, the examiner should make a brief explanatory note on the script.

Quality of written communication level descriptors

Level 1

Writing will be simple and comprehensible. There may be some evidence of basic organisation. Frequent syntactical and spelling errors are likely to be found.

Level 2

Writing will begin to show some coherence and organisation, but may be disjointed and poorly organised overall. Spelling and syntax will be generally secure.

Level 3

Writing will show some degree of both control and direction, but these attributes may not be maintained throughout the answer. Meaning will be conveyed serviceably, although some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found.

Level 4

Writing will be controlled and coherent, although some stylistic misjudgements may be found. However, the candidate who can analyse historical phenomena of some complexity will also be able to convey that analysis in logical, well-structured ways. Occasional syntactical and / or spelling errors may be found.

Generic Level Descriptors

- (a) Target: Description of a particular development or situation (AO1a and AO1b) (20)

Awarding marks at key mark points and within level bands

- Level descriptors provide the first stage of assessment.
- Using the level descriptions for each question, decide first on the level into which any given response falls.
- If the response is clearly within a particular level, go to the key mark point, of the mid band.
- To decide on the appropriate band within the level, work up or down from the mid-band key mark point according to:
 - the range and depth of coverage
 - amount and accuracy of supporting information
 - the consistency with which the standards are maintained
 the quality of written communication.
 This may mean a different mark within the mid-band, or movement into a different band.
- If the answer is perceived as falling within the high or low band, rather than at mid-level, always go first to the key mark point of the high or low band relevant to the level. You can then move up or down within the band to fine tune the marks awarded
- Reserve the bottom mark of each level for border line responses. If in doubt between levels, award the bottom mark of the higher level.

Level	Band	Key Mark Point
Level 1 (1-6 marks)	Low (1-2 marks)	2
	Mid (3-4 marks)	4
	High (5-6 marks)	6
Level 2 (7-16 marks)	Low (7-9 marks)	8
	Mid (10-12 marks)	11
	High (13-16 marks)	15
Level 3 (17-20 marks)	No Bands	19

Level 1 Simple Statements

Simple statements giving information about the topic indicated by the question. Material will be partial but relevant, and there will be some accurate reference.

(1-6)

Level 2**Developed statements**

Developed statements giving information in some detail about the topic indicated by the question. Material will be selected for its relevance to the question, but links and significance may be implicit rather than explicit as in L3. For low marks within the range, brief or generalised development may be offered, but for 10 marks and above there will be some precise exemplification. The range of material offered may also be limited, with no more than two or three statements depending on the extent to which they are developed.

(7-16)

Level 3 Developed explanation

Developed description of aspects and elements of a situation as indicated by the question. At this level, material should be detailed and candidates should be able to draw out the implications of the material they are selecting, i.e. to indicate reasons for its selection and establish its relationship to the question and/or to other elements in the situation. Range will be reasonable, but candidates cannot be expected to produce an extensive response in the time allowed. Range/depth may be no greater than at the top of L2 - the extra requirement for L3 is the inclusion of explanatory links.

(17-20)

(b) Target: Analysis of causation (AO1a and AO1b)

(40)

Awarding marks at key mark points and within level bands

- Level descriptors provide the first stage of assessment.
- Using the level descriptions for each question, decide first on the level into which any given response falls.
- If the response is clearly within a particular level, go to the key mark point, of the mid-band.
- To decide on the appropriate band within the level, work up or down from the mid-band key mark point according to:
 - the range and depth of coverage
 - amount and accuracy of supporting information
 - the consistency with which the standards are maintained
 - the quality of written communication.

This may mean a different mark within the mid-band, or movement into a different band.

- If the answer is perceived as falling within the high or low band, rather than at mid-level, always go first to the key mark point of the high or low band relevant to the level.

You can then move up or down within the band to fine tune the marks awarded

Reserve the bottom mark of each level for border line responses. If in doubt between levels, award the bottom mark of the higher level.

Level	Band	Key Mark Point
Level 1 (1-8 marks)	Low (1-3 marks)	2
	Mid (4-6 marks)	5
	High (7-8 marks)	8
Level 2 (9-20 marks)	Low (9-13 marks)	11
	Mid (14-17 marks)	16
	High (18-20 marks)	19
Level 3 (21-35 marks)	Low (21-25 marks)	23
	Mid (26-30 marks)	28
	High (31-35 marks)	33
Level 4 (36-40 marks)	No bands	39

Level 1	<p>Simple Statements Simple statements about the reasons for a particular outcome indicated by the question. The treatment is likely to be generalised, material will be partial but there will be some accurate reference.</p>	(1-8)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements Developed statements, which offer predominantly accurate material about the reasons for a particular outcome as indicated by the question. There will be some focus on causation, i.e. a narrative response will include some links to causation, or, a response may present causal factors but with limited support or range. At this level, causal links will be implicit rather than fully expressed. For low marks within the level the supporting material may be generalised, but at 13 marks and above there will be some accurate exemplification.</p>	(9-20)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation Developed explanation of why a particular outcome took place as indicated by the question. The evidence selected should be accurate and reasonably precise and detailed, and arguments should be adequately supported. The response will offer reasonable range as well as depth but coverage of issues and events cannot be exhaustive in the time allowed. High marks within the level require coverage of the major elements of the situation, i.e. a balanced response, but candidates should not be penalised for failing to cover a particular factor unless it is clearly central to the question. Causal links between factors and outcome will be clear and some at least will be explicit, but factors will be treated separately, with links between factors seen as cumulative. A combination of factors (or their relative importance) may be asserted, but will not be analysed or explored fully.</p>	(21-35)
Level 4	<p>Sustained argument Sustained argument, which focuses exclusively on causation and which supports the arguments made with detailed and precisely selected information. As at level 3, expect both range and depth, with all main factors considered, but coverage cannot be exhaustive. At this level, candidates should be able to establish explicit links between factors and outcome, and also explore links between factors, to show how they combined and interacted. Alternatively, the candidate may demonstrate the relative importance of different factors.</p>	(36-40)

6522A - Paper 2A Mark Scheme
Monarchs and their Servants: Henry VIII and Charles I

Option I - The King's Faithful Servant? The Age of Wolsey, 1509-29

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(a)	The focus of the question is on Wolsey's career and the features that illustrated the problems of the Church. The question does not specify 'in England' because reference should be to general tendencies that occurred in England and elsewhere. Candidates do not need to describe wider problems in any depth or detail, only to identify them and use Wolsey's career as an illustration. However, candidates who describe Wolsey's career only briefly, and offer more detailed description of wider problems should also be rewarded. It is unlikely that they will be able to offer both in the time allowed, but those who do are likely to reach a high level. Candidates can consider features of Wolsey's career such as simony, pluralism, absenteeism, lack of celibacy, greed and corruption, but they can also consider the impact of his political role and preoccupation with the king's service as a cause of neglect. Responses that simply describe Wolsey's career should be marked in levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material - for L3 there must be explicit links to the state of the Church in this period.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(b)	The focus of the question is the growing threat to the Church by the end of 1529, as Henry sought new ways to obtain an annulment of his marriage. Candidates are likely to explain the issue of the divorce, and the importance to Henry of the succession, as a reason for his growing frustration and hostility. Responses of this kind are likely to be marked in levels 1 or 2, depending on range/depth of material, but those who explain these matters fully and explicitly can access low L3. However, secure L3 responses and above will also make some reference to wider issues, such as anti-clericalism, protestant ideas, and calls for reform, especially in parliament, as the context in which Henry was able to consider placing the leadership of the Church under pressure in order to get his way. L3 responses require explicit causal links, while those who can explain the interaction of these elements, or assess their relative importance, will access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(a)	<p>The focus of the question is on the relationship maintained by Henry with the rulers of Scotland, which was largely characterised by hostility despite his sister's marriage to King James. This was partly a result of strategic factors, and Scotland's alliance with France, but also arose from both tradition and different personalities. Candidates are likely to refer to the threat of invasion during the French war and to Surrey's victory at Flodden in 1513. Although not fully utilised, this brought the removal of any military threat from Scotland for some years, and candidates who develop this point fully can reach high L2. French influence, however, proved to be a continuing problem, forcing Margaret to leave the country until 1517 and again in 1523 when Henry was preparing for war. Candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of Scottish affairs, except in terms of their impact on relations with England. Those who describe events will be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material. For L3 they need to define key issues, such as traditional hostility, English influence/domination, Scottish resistance, links with France or strategic considerations, and explicitly link material to them to demonstrate that they are 'key'.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(b)	<p>The main focus of the question is on the failures and limitations of Henry's foreign policy in the years following the Treaty of London. The relative term 'so little' does allow some reference to successes, but candidates who describe the successes achieved will need to show that the material is applied to the question, either implicitly for L2 or explicitly for L3 and above. Reasons for failure/limitations can include a range of factors - the relative power and resources of England alongside continental powers, financial problems, the role of individuals including Henry himself, other monarchs, and Wolsey, diplomatic complications and hesitations, and towards the end of the period, the influence of the divorce issue. Those who describe problems or offer a predominantly narrative account will be marked in levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of relevant material. L3 responses require explicit links between factors and failures, with progression based on range/depth of material as well as the development of explanatory links. Those who can demonstrate the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors can access L4.</p>	40

Option II - Personal Rule and the Crisis of Monarchy in Britain, 1629-42

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the financial measures used by Charles prior to the extension of Ship Money in 1635. Candidates can refer to tannage and poundage, wardship, knighthood fines, the Commissions for Defective Titles and the exploitation of royal forests, and the resumption of sales of monopolies. The purpose of the specified dates is to exclude Ship Money, but candidates can be given some flexibility in finding examples to illustrate the method. However, both extended Ship Money and Forced Loans fall outside the period. While it is likely that candidates will focus on financial measures, other policies may be relevant if they contributed to financial security, such as peace with France and Spain. Those who describe a range of measures should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material. For L3 candidates will need to define main features, such as financial antiquarianism, the use of prerogative rights, or the provoking of opposition, and select material to illustrate their importance.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(b)	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the Personal Rule, an issue of some debate among historians. Candidates may refer to different interpretations, but are not required to do so, and those who simply offer historians' views rather than evidence drawn from events and actions will not score highly. Candidates may have some knowledge of the tensions that led to the dismissal of parliament in 1629, and can utilise this as part of a response, but they cannot be required to do so. Other factors include the attitudes, beliefs and motives of Charles himself, the influence of advisers and others, such as the queen, the nature and role of parliaments, and of the royal prerogative, and enabling factors such as his ability to finance his rule and enforce his will through the courts. A narrative or descriptive response will be marked within levels 1 and 2 depending on range/depth of material. For L3 there need to be explicit causal links, with progression dependent on both range/depth and quality of explanatory links, while those who can explain the interaction of factors, or their relative importance, will access L4.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the reactions to Ship Money that were revealed and developed across the specified period. The term 'his subjects' is intended to allow a variety of reactions to be considered, but candidates do not need to differentiate between groups, although they may be rewarded for doing so. Good responses will also show an awareness that reactions changed over the period, especially after the Hampden case and during the Scottish war, when collection of the tax became increasingly difficult. A narrative or purely descriptive response will be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material. For L3 candidates need to focus on impact by considering the nature of the tax and explicitly relate it to reactions and their effect on Charles's relationship with his subjects. There is likely to be a focus on the gentry, and if made explicit and related to political relationships, this can access a high level. Similarly, those who can explain the nature of the tax and methods of collection, to show why it was so deeply resented are likely to achieve high marks.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(b)	<p>The focus of the question is on the significance of Strafford's trial and execution as a cause of the civil war that broke out in 1642. However, the wording of the question means that candidates do not need to explain the outbreak of war in 1642, and should not do so unless it is clearly related to the impact of Strafford's execution. Candidates need to focus on the process by which Strafford was condemned, the use of intimidation, the heightening of tension through the revelation of the Army Plot and the raising of anti-Catholic fears, and for L3 to show how this made a peaceful or negotiated settlement more difficult to achieve. The question therefore has a relatively narrow focus, but candidates can utilise wider issues such as mistrust of the King or the nature of anti-Catholic fears, as a context for explaining the impact of Strafford's death. However, for L3 these issues need to be made explicitly relevant, while links between context and impact can also offer a route to L4. Candidates can also consider the impact of the events on Charles, his anger at being forced to break his promise to Strafford, his distrust of the opposition leaders, and the strategies that he employed thereafter to find a way out of his difficulties. The Act against the dissolution of parliament without its own consent, passed as part of the Strafford crisis, removed one of Charles's legal options, and made a violent or military strategy more likely. In addition, the crisis confirmed the belief of the opposition that they could pressurise Charles into further concessions, while their awareness of his anger convinced them that they needed to do so. A description of events or a narrative response is unlikely to go beyond L2 - for L3 there need to be explicit causal links to the likelihood of conflict, while those who can explain interaction or relative importance will access L4.</p>	40

6522B - Paper 2B Mark Scheme

Health, Welfare and the Constitution in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Britain

Option I - The Health of the People: Public Health and Social Policy, 1832-75

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(a)	The question is focused on the work of John Snow, and in particular, his discovery that cholera was spread and carried by infected water. This was of great significance in the arguments for better public health provision, and in particular the importance of clean water and sewage disposal. Hence it played a significant role in the passing of the 1875 Public Health Act twenty years later. The lack of specified dates allows candidates to refer to developments up to 1875, although Snow had died earlier, because the focus is on the development of policy rather than Snow's actions in themselves. Candidates who offer a narrative response or describe Snow's work and career should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material. L3 responses require explicit focus on his role in the development of public health provision, and therefore to the impact and effects of his work.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(b)	The question is focused on the limited improvements made after the epidemic of 1831-2 and before the introduction of the 1848 Act after the second epidemic of that year. Candidates do not need to address the 1831-2 epidemic itself, although brief descriptions of its impact may well be used to highlight the lack of action that followed and the rapid winding down of the temporary provisions made to deal with it. The main focus, however, should be on the reasons for the lack of action. These can include uncertainty over the causes of the epidemic, the tendency for cholera to hit the poor and non-ratepayers, the reluctance to increase rates and commit resources, lack of central government leadership, the continuing existence of legal obstacles to change, and the role of individuals both for and against the necessary changes. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative account should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material. L3 requires explicit causal links between factors and events and the lack of action taken, , while those who can demonstrate the interaction or relative importance of different factors can access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the improvements that were made in the years following the first great cholera epidemic. The specified dates allow reference to measures taken in 1832, which offered experience and some point of reference, even though they were largely temporary. Consideration can also be given to local initiatives and improvements and to the administrative reforms of the 1830s, which enabled some schemes to be developed. In addition candidates can describe the work of reformers like Chadwick, and the Health of Towns Commission and Association that followed from his work. The Act of 1848 is also within the specified period, and candidates can consider the useful provisions made, although consideration of its impact should not be extensive after 1848. For L3 there need to be explicit links to demonstrate that the provisions reflected a measure of progress. Material relating to the limits of the Act, or to its impact in the 1850s can only be rewarded if clearly linked to progress reflected in its passing.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(b)	<p>The focus of the question is on the reasons why, by 1875, opinion in favour of compulsory public health provision had increased to the point where the 1875 Act became possible. The phrasing and link with part (a) invite candidates to begin with the effects and achievements of the 1848 Act, but this is not a requirement, and the cholera outbreaks of 1853 and 1865-6 as well as the growth of medical knowledge and understanding into the 1870s are also important. Candidates can also consider the role and attitudes of individual politicians, especially Disraeli and Chamberlain, and the effects of the extended franchise after 1867. Candidates may focus on the gradual change of attitudes that followed the 1848 Act and the increased knowledge that it encouraged, or they may focus more specifically on why success came in 1875. Either approach can attain L3 if causal links are explicit, and responses at high L3 and L4 are likely to draw on both. Responses that describe developments will be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range and depth of relevant material. Similarly, those who offer a mainly narrative account will not go beyond L2, although the inclusion of some links to progress can access low L3, and the use of a chronological structure to show interaction can access L4. For L3 candidates will need to develop explanatory links to show why events led to increased support, while those who can demonstrate the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors will access L4.</p>	40

Option II - Welfare and the Constitution: the Liberal Governments, 1905-15

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(a)	The question is focused on the role of Lloyd George in shaping Liberal policies primarily during his years as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Candidates can refer to his role in the struggle with the Lords, his support of social reforms, and his wider political leadership and campaigning. The use of the term 'achievements' allows candidates a measure of flexibility in selecting what they see as achievements, and emphasises positive aspects. It is likely that most will focus primarily on social and constitutional reform, but some candidates may also consider his links with the working-class and the wider labour movement. The specified dates exclude his role in the industrial unrest of 1913, but relevant reference can be made to events in 1911-12.. Those who describe Liberal policies without identifying the role of Lloyd George are unlikely to go beyond L1, but those who describe relevant policies with implicit focus on those influenced by Lloyd George can reach a L2 mark, depending on range and depth of material. Similarly, a narrative account or description of his actions should be marked in levels 1 or 2. For L3 there need to be explicit links between the attitudes and/or actions of Lloyd George and their outcome in terms of Liberal policies.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(b)	The question is a version of a familiar issue, and it is likely that many candidates will concentrate particularly on the years 1911-14, when the attempt to establish Home Rule and its failure was at its most intense and overt. Candidates who dwell only on these years can reach the bottom band of L3, with a maximum mark of 25/40. Secure L3 and above require some response to the term 'governments' and the specified dates, and make some attempt to explain why the issue was ignored until 1910-11. Those who explain the 'deal' of 1910 will be offering brief or implicit reference to previous neglect. Good responses, at 31 marks and above, will need explicit consideration of the failure to act in the first five years of government, by reference to the divisiveness of the issue, concern with other matters, and/or the obstruction of the Lords. However, it is not unreasonable for the balance of a response to lie towards the end of the period. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative account should be marked in levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of material offered. For L3 there should be explicit causal links to show why efforts failed. Factors can include neglect of the issue until 1910, the role of the Lords and the Conservatives, resistance in Ulster and Irish intransigence, mistakes by the government and the outbreak of war. Those who can explain the interaction of certain factors, and/or demonstrate their relative importance can access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(a)	The question has a relatively narrow focus, and candidates will require detailed knowledge of the Act and its provisions to achieve high marks. However, the Act had two aspects - sickness and unemployment - and a range of provisions. In addition, 'key principles and provisions' relates to the nature, purpose and effectiveness of the Act, giving candidates a good range of material from which to select. Candidates are likely to consider the nature of the Act, involving government intervention in personal aspects of life and the principle of state intervention, the recognition of the causes of poverty, the role of compulsion, and/or the limited range and extent of payments made. Those who simply describe the provisions of the Act should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of material offered. For L3 there needs to be explicit definition of 'key' provisions and the principles that informed them, and selection of supporting material with explicit links to show that they are 'key'.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(b)	The question is focused on the nature and impact of the 1909 Budget, both in itself, and in the events to which it gave rise. Candidates need to address the provisions of the Budget and explain why they were so controversial. They are likely to consider the nature of taxation included and the type of expenditure that it was intended to permit. Candidates can also consider the role and attitudes of Lloyd George in provoking opposition, either deliberately or otherwise. Those who offer a detailed explanation of the controversy arising from these events can reach L3, and if interaction or relative importance is clearly established, can also reach L4. However, many responses are likely to extend the nature of the controversy to include the political impact and the crisis that developed between the government and the House of Lords. For reward at higher levels such material must be explicitly linked to the budget and the reactions that it provoked. Those who offer a predominantly narrative account are likely to remain within levels 1 and 2, as are those who simply describe the course of the crisis, but a response using a chronological structure to trace the growth of controversy and hostility or to explain primary and secondary effects, could well access high marks. L3 requires explicit links to show why the Budget caused controversy, while those who explain the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors can access L4.	40

6522C - Paper 2C Mark Scheme
Reformation and the Catholic Challenge in Europe, 1517-63

Option I - Luther and the Reformation in Germany, 1517-55

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(a)	The question is focused on the nature of Luther's criticisms and the extent to which he had already gone beyond the obvious abuses to focus on fundamental issues of faith and justification. Candidates should address the wider complaints against superstition and corruption, made by Erasmus and others, but the phrase 'humanists like Erasmus' means that they are not required to show detailed knowledge of the work of any individual other than Luther. However, those who demonstrate such knowledge can be credited for it. In addressing Luther's criticisms they should focus on the different areas that he addressed, in his consideration of purgatory and repentance, the nature of authority, the role of scripture and the means of salvation. This may include an attack on abuses, since his ideas were in many ways implicit rather than developed in 1517, but those who simply describe his criticisms are unlikely to go beyond L2 and those who select aspects that show similarity to humanist thinking are unlikely to score well. Good L2 and L3 responses will focus on differences, and for L3 candidates need to make the implications of Luther's thinking explicit, in terms of how they suggested ideas not shared by the humanists at that time.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(b)	Although the wording and temporal span of this question is very open, the focus is specifically the reasons for the failure of the Church to meet the Lutheran challenge in this period. Because it is a causal question, candidates are not required to cover precisely the whole period, although good responses will cover a range of factors that do apply across the period as a whole. These can include the political structure of the Empire and German hostility to Rome, the effectiveness of Luther's campaign and the appeal of his ideas, the extent to which, by 1529, Lutheranism was already too well-established to be easily suppressed, divisions within the leadership of the Church, the weaknesses of the Church and its failure to reform until the later part of the period, and the role of individuals such as Charles V. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative approach will be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of relevant material offered. Those who explain a range of factors with explicit causal links can attain L3, with progression within the level based on both range of factors and depth of supporting reference. Candidates who consider the chronological span and are able to relate particular factors to different periods within it are likely to access L4, as are those who can establish interaction or relative importance.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the likelihood and process of the election, and the rivalries associated with it that restricted the freedom of action enjoyed by Pope Leo. His dislike of Hapsburg power and desire to prevent the election of Charles led him to seek the support of Frederick the Wise, and thereby enhanced Frederick's power to protect Luther over a significant period of time. This can include reference to the Augustinian enquiry, his protection of Luther's position as a lecturer, and his support of Luther's refusal to go to Rome as well as the arrangement of debates with Cajetan and Eck. Candidates cannot be required to refer to interventions before 1518, but may choose to do so and can be rewarded if the material is relevant to the situation in 1518-19. Descriptive or narrative responses will be awarded level 1 or 2 depending on the range and depth of material offered. L3 responses require explicit links to show how the prospect of the election protected Luther, not just reference to Frederick, and good L3 responses are likely to draw out the implications of the election process by offering some explanation of Imperial politics or contextual explanation of its significance, the extent of Hapsburg power, the temporal role of the Papacy, or particular impact of the Hapsburgs in Italy and around the Papal states.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(b)	<p>This is a straightforward question and candidates should be able to offer a range of reasons for Luther's ability to rally support. They can consider the context of his protest - the weaknesses of the Church, the complaints already published by other reformers, German sentiment and resentment of Rome, and popular discontent with religious dues and taxation. Mistakes made by the catholic authorities may be relevant, but their relevance needs to be made clear. Luther's ideas and ability to communicate them effectively, his preaching and writings, his deliberate targeting of different groups and sections are all relevant factors. However, good responses should be clearly focused on why he gained widespread support, probably from different social groups and sections, including peasants, urban sectors, clergy, knights, nobility and, to a limited extent before 1525, princes. Those who make significant reference to princely support must relate this to the Peasants Revolt and Luther's reaction for that material to be rewarded at a high level. Those who describe factors or offer a narrative account of the period should not go beyond L2. L3 responses require explicit causal links to demonstrate why different and varied groups supported Luther. While some factors would create an appeal across different groups, others relate to particular groups most strongly. Responses marked at 30 and above should offer some explicit focus on 'widespread', for example by categorisation of support and the factors related to it, while those who can demonstrate the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors will access L4.</p>	40

Option II - Meeting the Challenge? The Catholic Reformation to 1563

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(a)	The question is focused on the achievements of Loyola during the period after he developed his religious inspiration, through his attempt to go on crusade to the Holy Land, his gathering of the first Jesuits in Venice in 1537, and his establishment and leadership of the society to his death in 1556. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of material offered. For L3 candidates need to address the idea of achievements, and offer some explanation of Loyola's aims, purpose and success, offering explicit links to demonstrate how his actions and career fulfilled his aims and/or contributed to the strengthening of the Catholic faith and Church. Candidates who can clearly define his aims in establishing the Jesuit order and demonstrate how his career thereafter fulfilled his purpose, whether or not they address his earlier career, should be awarded L3 marks.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(b)	The question is focused on the failure of the Christian Humanists who had led calls for reform in early sixteenth century to establish their model of tolerant and rational piety as the reformed Church. The election of Pope Julius III to follow Paul III in 1549, combined with the re-assertion of traditional doctrines and Papal authority in the first session of the Council of Trent, symbolises their loss of influence among the leading figures of the Church and a period of reaction to follow. Reasons for this failure can include the influence of other reformers such as Carafa and Loyola, whose vision of reform was both more austere and more repressive, the failure of attempts at conciliation, especially at Regensburg in 1541-2, the power granted to the Roman Inquisition alongside the older Spanish model, the mistakes of individuals and the lack of coherent organisation among the southern humanists. Those who describe these events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of material offered. For L3 there need to be explicit links showing how these factors weakened and eventually destroyed the humanist reform movement. Those who can explain the interaction of different factors, utilise chronology to demonstrate the process of failure, and/or demonstrate relative importance, will access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(a)	<p>The Council met in three sessions, in which clarification of doctrine dominated in 1545-7 (and at Bologna in 1548), and again in 1551-2, with further administrative decisions made in 1561-3. In the first session the decree on authority issued in 1546 placed the Church, as represented by its leader, alongside scripture as the source of authority, and this was reinforced by the decree on Justification issued in 1547, which re-affirmed Papal power over the processes of penance and forgiveness. The session of 1551 achieved little, other than to reveal internal conflicts over the role and powers of Bishops, but did further reinforce traditional attitudes in the decree on transubstantiation. In the final session the question of Bishops' authority was fudged in such a way as to preserve Papal powers, and since the Papacy was placed in control of the interpretation as well as the enforcement of the decrees, the institution was able to consolidate its authority in the years that followed. Candidates will need to select and describe the key decisions made in these meetings, and for L3 to establish explicit links showing how they reinforced Papal authority.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(b)	<p>The question is focused on the growth of repression after the death of Paul III and the decisions made at the Council of Trent. Candidates can consider the nature and implications of these decisions, but the focus should be on their impact after 1549, or on the emergence of new factors in the same period. The failure of the humanists in the election of Pope Julius is relevant, as is the growth of repressive machinery such as the Inquisition and index, the later impact of the Jesuits, and the support of Catholic rulers like Philip II of Spain. A key factor however, is the influence and eventual election of Gian Pietro Carafa as Pope Paul III, and his particular approach to both reform and authority, as well as his anti-Spanish and anti-semitic attitudes. Description of these events and situations, or a predominantly narrative response, should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of material offered. For L3 there need to be explicit links between particular factors and increased repression emanating from Rome. Good L3 responses should address the issue of increasingly' and demonstrate reasons for the growth of repressive tendencies over the decade. Those who can demonstrate the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors can access L4.</p>	40

6522D - Paper 2D Mark Scheme

Challenges to Authority and the Struggle for a New Order in France and America in the Late Eighteenth Century

Option I - From Colonies to Nation: America, 1763-87

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(a)	The question is focused on the attempt to impose the Stamp Act in 1765, the reaction within the colonies, the reasons for its repeal and the effect of that colonial victory. Those who describe these events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material offered. For L3 candidates need to draw out explicitly the impact of events and show how they affected relations between Britain and the colonies. These can include American resentment of the tax, measures of resistance and their success in forcing the repeal of the Act, and British irritation, especially in parliament, at the humiliating defeat of its policy. Candidates may also consider the impact of the Act on colonial politics, the role of the mob and the radicalisation of attitudes, including the Stamp Act Congress, but for reward at L3 these events need to be considered in terms of their effects and legacy on government/colonial relations thereafter.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(b)	The focus of the question is the growth of opposition to British policies in the early 1770s, but it excludes the outbreak of hostilities in 1775. The legacy of 1766 and of the Townshend duties and other events that followed is relevant, both in terms of the emergence and attitudes of the radicals in America, growing confidence in the colonies, and British resentment, and in terms of the experience, political methods and propaganda skills developed by colonial politicians out of the crisis, but the focus of a good response should be on the intensification of feelings and the increase in the scope of opposition that followed the Boston 'massacre' of 1770. Reference can be made to the impact of the massacre, events such as the Gaspee incident, and to British reactions in provoking wider and more intense resentment. Candidates can also consider the activities of the radicals, extremist propaganda, and misunderstandings between colonists, parliament and monarch, as well as the role and character of individuals like Lord North. Those who simply describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material offered. For L3 candidates need to offer explicit causal links to show how different actions and measures caused opposition to increase, and for good L3 marks (30 and above) they should address both scope and intensity to some extent. Those who can utilise a chronological framework to demonstrate a build-up over the period will access L4, as will those who can explain the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(a)	The focus of the question is on the role of foreign powers, especially France and Spain, in helping the colonists to win the War of Independence and end British control outside Canada. Candidates will need to describe their interventions, and for L3 to offer explicit links to show how this contributed to British defeat. The focus should be on the methods used and the practical effect of the intervention, rather than on motives and attitudes, but reference to the effect on colonial attitudes and confidence, and/or to the impact on British morale, can be relevant. A predominantly descriptive or narrative response should be marked in levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of material offered. For L3 there need to be explicit links to the outcomes of intervention in terms of American victory and British defeat.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(b)	The question is focused on the motives and reasons that drove the creation of a Federal state in the years after victory. The question allows candidates to outline briefly the attitudes and forces ranged against it, but the main focus should be on explaining the emergence of a United States. Factors can include the need for self-defence, the economic benefits, the experience of co-operation during the war, the role of individuals like Jefferson, Washington and Adams, the need to maintain control internally, and the handling of the Philadelphia Convention. Those who describe attitudes, actions or events, or offer a predominantly narrative account will not go beyond L2. For L3 there need to be explicit causal links showing how different factors contributed to the emergence of the United States, while those who can demonstrate the interaction, and/or relative importance, of different factors will access L4.	40

Option II - France in Revolution, 1776-94

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(a)	The question is focused on the impact of intervention in America on the situation and attitudes of the French monarchy and people. The war impacted on France in two main ways - its costs and limited gains caused a further deterioration of the already weak economy and finances of the crown, and the ideas of liberty imported by returning soldiers and the propaganda of its ally helped to undermine belief in absolutism and the monarchy. Candidates who describe events and attitudes, or offer a predominantly narrative account of the effects in France, should be marked in levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of material offered. For L3 there need to be explicit links to show how the impact of intervention weakened the existing regime, and a good L3 response should address both aspects.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(b)	The question is focused on the reasons why a country still suffering from economic difficulties chose to go to war again in 1792. These can include the pressure and provocation of hostile powers, revolutionary fervour, the desire to create internal unity, the role of emigres and the royalist faction, and fear of attack. Candidates may choose to emphasise the variety of motives and aims held by different factions, but are not required to do so. However, those who can explicitly relate particular reasons to particular factions may well access high levels. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative account should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of material offered. For L3 there need to be explicit causal links to show why certain factors encouraged France to go to war. Those who can explain the process by which the desire for war built up, or explain the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors will access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(a)	The question is focused on the weakening of Robespierre's power rather than on his fall, and candidates do not need to cover his final days. If they do so, they can be rewarded if the material is made relevant. Candidates are likely to consider the fall of Danton and relations between the different Jacobin Clubs, as well a Robespierre's treatment of other rivals. They may also consider ideological differences, attitudes to the Terror and personal conflicts as well as Robespierre's particular and idiosyncratic views, for example on religion. Fear of further upheaval and instability is also a consideration. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within levels 1 and 2 depending on the range/depth of relevant material offered. For L3 there need to be explicit links to show how internal rivalries weakened his position.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(b)	This is a relatively open question and can encompass both the reasons for the failure of the constitutional monarchy, and the reasons for its abolition and replacement by a Republic, but it is not expected that candidates will necessarily cover both aspects in depth. Those who do address both issues to some degree are likely to achieve high marks within the appropriate level. While candidates would be unwise to address the causes and outbreak of the revolution in 1789, some material of this kind may have implicit relevance, and should certainly be rewarded if there are accurate and explicit links to the growth of republicanism. Reasons for the failure of the constitutional experiment of 1789-92 can include the difficulties of the general situation (the extent of reform needed and the difficulty of satisfying varied demands and interests) and specific mistakes or weaknesses on the part of those involved. These can include mistakes/criticisms of the measures enacted by the Assembly, and the attitude/resistance of the King or other vested interests such as the clergy. Reference can also be made to external pressures, the hostility from other powers, and the effects of war. Candidates who offer range and depth of material relating to these problems can attain secure L3. Good L3 responses, however, should also address the reasons for abolition of the monarchy - mistrust of the monarch, the growth of republican ideas, the role of the people of Paris. It is unlikely that candidates will be able to cover all factors in depth and detail, and L3 should be awarded to those who offer reasonable range/depth and explicit causal links. A predominantly descriptive or narrative response should not go beyond L2. High level responses (at 31 marks and above) should address both the failure of reform and the growth of support for a republic to some degree. L3 requires an explicit causal focus, while those who can demonstrate the interaction or relative importance of different factors will access L4.	40

6522E - Paper 2E Mark Scheme
A New Nation and the Rise of Fascism: Italy 1848-1925

Option I - The Road to Unification, Italy c.1848-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(a)	The question is focused on the economic state of Italy in the 1840s and the social conditions that arose from it. Candidates can describe the underlying structure across the peninsula, the nature of agriculture and industry, the growth of urban centres and the conditions arising in them, and the effects of depression and bad harvests in Italy as in other parts of Europe. They may, but are not required to, differentiate across the different states, and those whose knowledge is sufficiently precise should be rewarded with high marks within the appropriate level. Responses that simply describe conditions should not go beyond L2. For L3 candidates need to demonstrate that social repression and economic deprivation led to demands for political change, primarily in the form of constitutions and/or changes of government, but also in the form of independence as in Sicily, the abolition of feudal dues, the removal of Austrian influence, and/or desires for unification. Candidates are unlikely to cover the full range of demands in the time available, and may well offer only one or two examples, but should be awarded L3 if they are able to establish links between economic/social problems and the desire for political change.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(b)	This is a straightforward and familiar question, and candidates can draw on a wide-range of factors. The phrase 'largely unsuccessful' is included to accommodate the progress made in Piedmont, and there is no reason for candidates to challenge the premise of the question. Reasons can include Austrian recovery and strength, the intervention of France, the internal weaknesses and divisions demonstrated by the revolutionary groups, the role and actions of individuals such as the Pope and Charles Albert, and changes in the wider European context that worked against revolutionary success. Candidates are not required to cover all the revolts in the time available, but responses at good L2 and above should consider at least two or three, depending on the depth and detail offered. Those who cover a good range should be rewarded within the appropriate level. Responses that are predominantly descriptive or narrative should not go beyond L2. L3 responses will require explicit causal links as well as some range and depth of support. Candidates are not required to address both internal and external factors, but it is difficult to conceive that sufficient range will be demonstrated for marks at 30 and above without doing so. Those who can demonstrate the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors will access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the impact and legacy of the Roman Republic, which was both positive and negative. As a democratic republic it demonstrated the need for political reform, and the heroic defence conducted against foreign troops helped to establish nationalist mythology. The experience of government, co-operation between Mazzini and ultimate defeat helped to shape the career and influence of Garibaldi, and encouraged him to support Piedmont in 1859-61. On the other hand, the establishment of the Republic confirmed Pius IX's opposition to reform, helped to discredit democracy, and brought French troops into Italy, with consequences lasting until 1870. Candidates are not required to describe the republic or its history in depth and detail, and a response that offered a narrative of events in 1848-9 would be unlikely to go beyond the L1/L2 borderline. Responses that describe outcomes and effects should be marked in L1 or L2 according to range and depth of relevant material. There is no explicit requirement to consider both positive and negative outcomes, and candidates can reach L3 with either approach if links are explicit and depth /detail sufficient, but those who do address both aspects should be rewarded for the range within the appropriate level. For L3 candidates should be able to establish explicit links between aspects and features of the republic and/or its failure and the nature and outcome of the later unification process.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(b)	<p>The question is focused on the delays and obstructions that affected the unification process in the 1860s, and while the attitude of the Papacy as shown in part (a) can be relevant, good responses will consider a range of other factors. These can include the underlying weakness of the Italian states and the limits of support for unification, but candidates will need to link this material to the unification process, either implicitly for L1 and L2, or explicitly at L3 and above. Hence responses that focus primarily on internal problems and social divisions within the Italian kingdom are unlikely to score highly. Candidates are likely to address the role of Napoleon III in 1859-60 and the presence of French troops thereafter, the continuing presence of Austria, the military weakness of the Italians, including the failures of Garibaldi, and the backwardness of the Italian states as a resource for further action. Those who describe the unification process or offer an essentially narrative account should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of material offered. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit causes of delay and/or reasons for needing foreign intervention. Candidates are not required to differentiate between the two, and a reasonable explanation of foreign intervention will cover the ten-year period. However, those who can utilise the issues of time and allies may well open a route to L4 interaction. Those who can explain the interaction of factors and/or their relative importance will access L4.</p>	40

Option II - Italy: the Rise of Fascism, 1918-25

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(a)	The question is focused on the nature and characteristics of Fascist ideology, from the foundation of the movement in 1919 to the end of 1922. Candidates can utilise the election programmes of 1919 and 1921, as well as the speeches of Mussolini and the actions of the Fascists at all levels to draw out and describe Fascist beliefs and philosophy. Those who describe actions are unlikely to score highly unless they are clearly linked to ideas. Those who describe ideas should be rewarded in levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of relevant material. L3 responses require explicit definition of features, with relevant worked examples to demonstrate that they are 'key'. These can include specific features such as rivalry with the socialists, nationalism, the emphasis on strong government and leadership, justification of violence, dislike of democracy and preference for direct action, or they can focus on flexibility, the lack of coherence, the changing nature of ideology and/or preference for opportunism. For high marks, however, there must be explicit links supported by precise, worked examples.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(b)	The question is focused on the transition from government to dictatorship achieved by Mussolini in 1922-25, and the reasons why opponents were unable to prevent it. This is closely linked to 'the consolidation of power' but a response that focused on how Mussolini consolidated his power would be unlikely to go beyond L2. The actions taken by Mussolini are certainly relevant, but for reward at L3 there must be explanation of their impact on opposition and the inability of opponents to prevent the establishment of a dictatorship. Factors that are directly relevant also include the weaknesses and internal divisions of the opposition parties both within and outside of parliament and the role of elite figures such as the Pope and the King. However, these figures do not constitute 'opponents of Fascism' and therefore, again, their role requires explicit reference to the impact on opposition in order to reach L3 or above. Reference can be made to the weakness of Liberal government before 1922, but a response that focused primarily on this factor would lack balance and be limited to L2. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within L1 or L2, according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit causal links to show how different factors limited the effectiveness of opponents, and those who can explain the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors can access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the economic difficulties experienced in post-war Italy, although reference may well be made to wartime events and conditions to explain their post-war impact. Candidates can refer to inflation, unemployment, land hunger, the transition from a wartime economy and the impact of post-war depression across Europe to explain the state of the Italian economy. Other issues such as popular unrest, the rise of socialism or government mistakes are not directly relevant as economic difficulties, but may well be used to explain the undermining of democracy, with implicit links for L1/L2 and explicit links for L3. Dissatisfaction with the Peace Treaty and 'mutilated victory' and/or the Fiume crisis is not relevant. Reference may be made to the loss of colonial hopes and economic possibilities, but these need to be clearly focused to be rewardable. Those who describe difficulties or offer a predominantly narrative response should awarded marks within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 there need to be explicit links to explain how economic problems contributed to the weakening of democracy.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(b)	<p>The question is focused on the factors that enabled Mussolini to retain his power in spite of the crisis created by the murder of Matteotti and his own inability to deal with it immediately. Descriptions of the murder are not strictly relevant, but may be rewarded as context. However, responses that offer a narrative of the murder will not score highly. Candidates should consider the role and actions of the opposition, the part played by the King and elites, the continuing effect of Fascist propaganda, the concessions made by Mussolini, the lack of alternatives, the role of the Ras and Mussolini's eventual response. The establishment of dictatorship can be relevant, but for reward at L3 and above candidates need to explain how it consolidated and therefore sustained Mussolini's power, since it can also be seen as a symptom rather than a cause. Reference can also be made to the wider context of success, support and the institutional hold over Italy that Fascism had established by 1924, to show the difficulty of removing Mussolini from power, but such material will need clear links to his survival in 1924-25, either implicit for L1/L2 or explicit for L3 and above. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within L1 or L2, according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit causal links to show how different factors helped him to maintain his power, and those who can explain the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors can access L4.</p>	40

6522F - Paper 2F Mark Scheme
Democracy and Bolshevism in Post-War States: Germany and Russia, 1918-29

Option I - The Triumph of Bolshevism? Russia, 1918-29

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(a)	The question is focused on the means used to build up the Red Army in order to meet and survive the threat of civil war. The question specifies the role of Trotsky, but candidates do not need to distinguish his actions as an individual, since he was in overall control. However, descriptions of War Communism are unlikely to be credited, since this was primarily Lenin's policy, although responses that offer accurate and explicit reference to the use of the army for requisitioning and maintaining supplies may be valid. Candidates are likely to focus on the use of conscription, recruitment and control of ex-Tsarist officers, harsh discipline, Trotsky's own presence and leadership, Bolshevik ideology and propaganda. Those who describe measures should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of relevant material offered. L3 requires explicit links to show how such measures contributed to the effectiveness of the army.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(b)	The question is focused on the role of Lenin and the extent to which he dominated communist government in the 1920s. Although the question is focused after 1924, Lenin's career and role before that date remain relevant to explain his authority and respect for his thereafter. Candidates can draw on knowledge of his career before 1917, but this cannot be required at any level. They are likely to refer to his role in the revolution of 1917, but again, this is not a requirement. They can consider his establishment of Sovnarkom, his determined direction of policy over Brest-Litovsk and the Constituent Assembly, his role in the Civil War and his relationship with colleagues like Trotsky. Good responses may also consider his role thereafter and the impact of his illness. They may point out that his influence rested upon past achievements, and they may query the extent of his direct influence in his last years. Candidates should also consider, however, the Lenin cult of 1924-29, and may refer to Stalin's encouragement and exploitation of it. Similarly the continuing controversy over NEP contributed to Lenin's continual influence. Those who describe Lenin's career or offer a predominantly narrative account should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of relevant material. For L3 there need to be explicit causal links to show why Lenin's influence was significant even after his death. Those who can explain the interaction of factors and/or demonstrate their relative importance can access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the ways in which the governments led by both Lenin and Stalin sought to win over the next generation to communism in the 1920s. Reference can be made to the NEP and the attempt to restore prosperity, but this measure was not primarily directed at the young and should not be given too much prominence. Similarly, the use of terror is not central to the question, except in terms of silencing rival groups and ideologies, although reference may be made to maintaining control.. Significant measures include the use of education and the provision of opportunity, the role of youth movements and the attempt to harness idealism, the use of propaganda and the arts (as well as access to the arts for their own sake) and the attack on religion and the family as competing institutions. General descriptions of social policy will not score highly. For good L2 there must be accurate selection of relevant measures, and for L3 the addition of explicit links to show how measures were intended to gain support. Those who describe actions and events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 there need to be explicit links to explain how particular measures related to the young and sought to exert influence and/or gain their support.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(b)	<p>The question is focused on the causes of the power struggle of 1924-9, and on the consequences for Trotsky, rather than the reasons for Stalin's victory. Responses that focus on Stalin's success will therefore not score highly unless the material is used to explain why Trotsky was first dismissed, expelled from the Party, and ultimately exiled from the Soviet Union. Clearly, Trotsky's rivalry with Stalin and the reasons for Stalin's victory have relevance to the question, but good responses will also consider reasons for Trotsky's isolation, the limitations of both his ideas and his political skills, and his failure to build a strong basis of support. Candidates can also consider Lenin's failure to name him as his successor. The question also raises issues regarding the nature of Trotsky's punishment, which was much more severe than the treatment accorded to his allies or other rivals of Stalin. It is therefore relevant to consider the extent to which Stalin feared his influence and intellect, and Trotsky's own refusal to be silenced (except permanently). This relates to the bitterness of their rivalry, which was both personal and ideological. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within L1 or L2, according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit causal links to show how different factors contributed to Trotsky's defeat and disgrace, and those who can explain the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors can access L4.</p>	40

Option II - The Democratic Experiment: Weimar Germany, 1918-29

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the 1923 crisis and its emergence from the reparations problem. Although candidates can refer to underlying weakness caused by war debts and inflation, this can only be rewarded at L3 if it is clearly treated as a context from which the main stages developed. These begin with the setting of the reparations bill in 1921, German default in 1922 and the resulting French invasion of the Ruhr. Candidates can also explain the development of passive resistance and hyperinflation in 1923. Candidates who interpret the question narrowly, and refer only to stages within 1922-23, can reach L3 if the narrow range is balanced by depth and detail. The question specifies an economic crisis, and government policies and actions are only relevant in relation to their economic effects. Measures taken to deal with the crisis such as fulfilment, the withdrawal of the mark and the establishment of the Rentenmark are outside the scope of the question, as are political developments such as the fall of the Cuno government and the Munich Putsch. Descriptions of the crisis or a mainly narrative account should be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to the range and depth of relevant material. L3 responses require the explicit definition of 'stages', supported by explaining the significance of the key events that define them and their impact across the relevant 'stage'.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(b)	<p>The question follows on from part (a) to focus on the resolution of the crisis and the measures taken to stabilise Germany thereafter. These can include economic measures, and candidates are likely to cover the Rentenmark, Dawes Plan, fulfilment and the evacuation of the Ruhr, but for reward at L3 and above there must be explicit links to show how such measures helped to stabilise government. Similarly, foreign policy and improving relations with other powers are relevant, but need to be linked to the stabilising of domestic government. Candidates can also consider the development of party links and alliances, experience of democratic government, the role of Hindenburg in drawing support from the Right, and the influence of Stresemann as causal factors. Reference to events before 1923 can be used for the purpose of comparison, to highlight improvements, but a response that dwelt on earlier events would lack balance and would be unlikely to go beyond L2. Similarly, a response that focused only on Stresemann would be mono-causal. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within L1 or L2, according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit causal links to show how different factors helped to stabilise government, and those who can explain the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors can access L4.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(a)	The question is focused on the early stages by which the Weimar Republic was created, and on the role played by military leaders in the process. This included both negative and positive actions, and some that had a dual effect. Candidates can consider the request for an armistice, support for the revolution from above, the Ebert-Groener Pact, suppression of the Left, the 'stab-in-the-back' myth, and reactions to the Kapp Putsch. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within L1 or L2, according to range/depth of relevant material. Since the question specifies both 'help' and 'hinder', responses at good L2 and above should address both to some extent. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit links to show that actions helped or hindered the establishment of democracy, while those who are able to demonstrate that some actions had both intended and unintended effects should be awarded high marks.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(b)	The question is focused on the reasons why, despite the greater stability and prosperity achieved after 1923, there were fundamental conflicts in evidence by 1929. The divisions besetting Muller's Grand Coalition, strikes and lockouts in the Ruhr and the campaign against the Young Plan revealed both political and economic conflicts that were causing political problems by 1929. Candidates can therefore consider the limits of economic progress, industrial relations, dependence on foreign loans, the problems of agriculture and the costs of welfare as causes of conflict between interest groups and the political parties with whom they were associated. In addition, quarrels over welfare and taxation as well as the campaign against reparations and the Young Plan revealed continuing class conflicts and the resentment of nationalists as political issues. The role of parties such as the KPD, of groups such as the Stahlhelm, and of individuals like Hugenburg and Hitler are also relevant factors. The death of Stresemann can have some relevance, but its importance should not be exaggerated since it post-dated the renewal of conflicts. Candidates can also draw on long-term factors to explain the simmering conflicts, but a response that dwelt only on underlying attitudes should not go beyond low L3. Secure L3 responses will address some of the triggers to conflict of 1928-29, while high marks can be gained by addressing a combination of both or a detailed analysis of the period from 1924. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within L1 or L2, according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit causal links to show how different factors helped to bring about new or renewed conflicts, and those who can explain the interaction and/or relative importance of different factors can access L4.	40

6522G - Paper 2G Mark Scheme
Social and Political Change in Post-War Powers: the USA and China, 1945-76

Option I - Pursuing 'Life and Liberty': Civil Rights in the USA, 1945-68

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(a)	The question is focused on the influence of King and the new ideas that he brought to the civil rights campaigns. Candidates have a good deal of material to choose from, but the best responses will define 'ways' and draw on events for illustration. They are likely to focus on non-violence and the debt that King acknowledged to Gandhi, and many will also consider his awareness and manipulation of the media, his encouragement of white support and relations with the Federal government. The reference to 'extend and develop' allows some comparisons with earlier methods and events, but these are not required in any detail. Candidates are also not required to relate events explicitly and directly to King, since influence can be indirect, but good responses will be able to demonstrate some links between events and King's role and influence, either implicitly at L2 or explicitly for L3. Material relating to the limits of King's influence and/or the role of others must be made clearly relevant to be credited above L1, and a response that predominantly challenges the premise of the question is unlikely to score well - the focus of the question is on King's role and contribution. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within L1 or L2, according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit links to show the ways in which King's ideas and/or actions changed the nature of civil rights campaigning.	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1.(b)	The question has some similarity to 2b but the focus here is on reasons for the emergence of Black Power. Hence the events and actions referred to will be used in a different way, and related to political developments within the black community rather than the social and economic outcomes. Candidates can refer to the slow pace of change, the cycle of poverty and frustration among African-Americans, the impact of Vietnam and the declining influence of King, but it is also relevant to consider the role of individuals such as Elijah Mohammed and Malcolm X, the changing cultural climate of the 1960s, the influence of student activists and the growing confidence of a more prosperous and educated generation as well as the anger of those suffering from continued deprivation. Those who describe developments or offer a predominantly narrative response will be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of relevant material. L3 responses require explicit causal links to show why the factors covered led to the emergence of Black Power, while those who can demonstrate the interaction, and/or relative importance, of different factors will access L4.	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(a)	<p>The question involves a comparison between the ideas of the two leaders, but is on familiar territory and should not be unduly demanding. Candidates are likely to address violence/non-violence, and should be credited for this, but candidates who are able only to summarise the ideas at a general level (“Malcolm X believed in violence”) are unlikely to score highly for this material. They may well consider integration/separation. Candidates may also consider the religious attitudes of the two men, and contrast their Christian and Moslem philosophies and rhetoric, but for marks at L3 there must be some consideration of the implications of this in terms of their relationship with and attitudes to mainstream American society. They are not required to consider similarities, and such material will only be rewarded if it is made relevant to the differences between them. Biographical material can be relevant if it relates to aims and ideas, but for reward at L3 the links must be clear and explicit. Those who describe events or offer a predominantly narrative response should be awarded marks within L1 or L2, according to range/depth of relevant material. For L3 candidates need to establish explicit links to show the differences between the aims and ideas of the two leaders.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2.(b)	<p>This is a familiar question and candidates can be expected to offer a good range of reasons for continuing problems. These can include racist attitudes, the need for time to produce changes, and the legacy of a cycle of poverty in holding back the progress of many black citizens. Candidates can also address the context of the problems, the nature and difficulty of addressing social and economic problems, and the impact of external events such as the war in Vietnam. Political developments such as King’s growing estrangement from the government and white politicians, the divisions within the civil rights movements, the impact of militant campaigning and the attitude of the media are also relevant. Candidates may consider the geographical focus of north and south, but should be aware of social and economic problems in both areas, and are not required to differentiate. Those who can do so with accuracy may open a route to high levels by categorising problems and related factors. Those offering a predominantly descriptive or narrative account will not go beyond L2. In addition, high L2 and L3 responses must include some precise reference and exemplification. Responses at L3 and above require explicit causal links, while those who can demonstrate the interaction, and/or relative importance, of different factors will access L4.</p>	40

Option II - China Under Mao, 1949-76

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the nature of the Chinese economy in 1949, and the problems that it posed for the new government. Responses can include underlying and long-term difficulties such as backward agriculture and industry, traditionalist attitudes, and the influence of the social hierarchy as well as the effects of war, invasion and civil war. It is also possible to relate the attitude of foreign powers to the new government, provided that this is linked to economic problems, but such material is not required at any level. It is unlikely that candidates will cover all relevant aspects in any depth in the time available, but a good response should address at least two or three areas to some extent. Responses that are purely descriptive or offer a predominantly narrative account should be awarded marks within levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of relevant material. For L3 there need to be explicit links to show how particular areas and elements constituted problems for the new government.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3.(b)	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the choice of collectivisation as the basis of agricultural policy. The phrase 'adopt the principle of' allows reference to the range of measures that preceded full-scale collectivisation and laid the foundations of the process. However, the main feature of a good response will be its causal focus and explanation of reasons and motives rather than description of the measures taken. These will clearly include communist ideology and dislike of the landlord class, as well as political motives such as the desire to remove opponents and/or to gain/maintain the support of the peasants. Material related to communism as a wider force and links to Russian experience is relevant and can be rewarded, but is not required. The role and attitudes of particular individuals, such as Mao, will also be relevant. In addition candidates may well be able to discuss Chinese society and the existence of a communal tradition that made collectivisation a preferred option, as well as the experience gained in areas that had been communist-controlled in earlier years. Those who describe developments or offer a predominantly narrative response will be marked within levels 1 and 2 according to range/depth of relevant material. L3 responses require explicit causal links to show why the factors led to the choice of collectivisation as a key policy, while those who can demonstrate the interaction, and/or relative importance, of different factors will access L4.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(a)	<p>The question is focused on the outcomes of communist social policy, and to some extent economic and political factors as they impacted on the social structure. Candidates can therefore distinguish between deliberate actions and unforeseen consequences, but do not need to do so - such categorisation may well make material more manageable and contribute to a high-level response, but should not shift the focus of the response from the changes achieved. It is relevant to consider the nature and structure of traditional society for the purposes of comparison, but this does not need to be explained in great detail and may even be mainly implicit if the nature of 'changes' is clearly explained. While the 'structure' of society may produce fairly specific arguments focused on class and hierarchy, it also allows a wider range of reference to include issues such as literacy and education, the distribution of wealth and the role of women. It is unlikely that candidates will cover all relevant aspects in any depth in the time available, but a good response should address at least two or three areas to some extent. The best will consider some aspects of both character and structure. Responses that are purely descriptive or offer a predominantly narrative account should be awarded marks within levels 1 and 2 according to the range/depth of relevant material. For L3 there need to be explicit links to show how particular outcomes constituted a change.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4.(b)	<p>The focus of the question is on the reasons why, despite some mistakes and difficulties, and the excesses of the Cultural Revolution, Mao remained at the head of Chinese government until his death. The use of the terms 'effective challenge' and 'dominant' does allow candidates to question the extent of his control in his last years, but this should not form the main focus of the response, since any influence wielded by those around him was reliant on his continued exercise of power. Candidates can draw on his career both before and after 1949 to explain his power and prestige, but a predominantly narrative account will not go beyond L2 and those who dwell on the earlier period are unlikely to produce a focused response. Candidates should also consider his strengths of character, his intellect and determination, his successes and the progress made in China, and his political skills, both as public leader and in political in-fighting, in order to explain his lasting dominance. It is also valid to consider what happened to alternative leaders, both in terms of natural wastage and political exclusion, including the impact of the Cultural Revolution. Those who simply describe or narrate his career will not go beyond L2. L3 responses and above require explicit causal links to show what factors enabled Mao to maintain power, and good L3/L4 responses at 30 marks and above should offer some range. A response that focuses only on Mao's character and personality should not go beyond low L3, and must include some precise exemplification to attain that. Those who can demonstrate the interaction, and/or relative importance, of different factors will access L4.</p>	40

