

Mark Scheme (Standardisation) Summer 2008

GCE

GCE History (6526)

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	4
6A	The Crisis of the Tudor State, 1547-58	8
6B	The Quest for Settlement: Cromwell and the Protectorate, 1653-58	10
6C	Radicalism and the British State: the Chartist Experience, 1838-50	12
6D	Decline of the Liberal Party, c.1900-29	14
6E	Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control, 1933-45	16
6F	The Soviet Union After Lenin, 1924-41	18
6G	The Origins and Early Development of the Cold War, 1945-62	20

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.

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.

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.

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.*

Unit 6 (6526) Mark Scheme

Generic Level Descriptors

Awarding marks at key mark points and within level sub-bands

Level descriptors provide the first stage of assessment, i.e. deciding on the appropriate level. 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 first to the key mark point of the mid-band.

- Work up or down from the key mark point according to:
 - the range and depth of coverage of issues;
 - the amount and accuracy of supporting material derived from interrogation and comparison of the provided sources;
 - the consistency with which the standard is maintained;
 - the balance achieved between the use of sources and the candidate's own knowledge;
 - the accuracy and precision with which the candidate's own knowledge is deployed;
 - the quality of written communication.
- If the answer is perceived as being of a higher or lower standard than would be expected for a mid-point response, always go first to the key mark point of the high or low band relevant to the level.
- Reserve the bottom mark of each band for border-line responses.
- Answers relying wholly on the candidate's own knowledge (with no implicit or explicit reference to the sources) or answers that rely solely on the sources for information or evidence, cannot score more highly than the number of marks available for that particular assessment objective.

Part (a)

Target: AO2: Interpret evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to its historical context (15 marks). (20)

AO1a: Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately, and communicate knowledge and understanding.

AO1b: Present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements (5 marks).

Level	Band	Key Mark Point
Level 1 (1-5 marks)		3
Level 2 (6-14 marks)	Low (6-8 marks)	7
	Mid (9-11 marks)	10
	High (12-14 marks)	13
Level 3 (15-20 marks)		18

Level 1 Simple Statements

Responses are likely to be direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources. Some candidates will limit themselves to using only the sources or only their own knowledge. Where a candidate's own knowledge is used, it will be limited and expressed in simple terms. Sources will probably be used at face value and knowledge may be general and only partially accurate. Writing will be simple and comprehensible. There may some evidence of basic organisation. Frequent syntactical and spelling errors are likely to be found. (1-5)

Level 2 Developed Statements
Responses should show an appropriate selection from the sources and the candidate's own knowledge, sufficient to address the question, making explicit judgements with limited support. At this level, responses relying solely on the sources may still be found. 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. (6-14)

Level 3 Developed Explanation
Responses will interrogate the provided material, making confident and balanced use of the sources and the candidate's own knowledge to reach a considered, focused and well supported judgement. 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. (15-20)

Part (b)

Target: A02: The explanation and evaluation of interpretations of historical event and topics studied, with the interpretation, evaluation and use of source material in relation to its historical context (30 marks).

(40)

A01a: Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately, and communicate knowledge and understanding.

A01b: Present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements (10 marks)

Level	Band	Key Mark Point
Level 1 (1-5 marks)		3
Level 2 (6-14 marks)	Low (6-8 marks)	7
	Mid (9-11 marks)	10
	High (12-14 marks)	13
Level 3 (15-27 marks)	Low (15-18 marks)	17
	Mid (19-22 marks)	21
	High (23-27 marks)	25
Level 4 (28-37 marks)	Low (28-30 marks)	29
	Mid (31-33 marks)	32
	High (34-37 marks)	36
Level 5 (38-40 marks)		39

Level 1 Simple Statements

Derived, either wholly or predominantly, from one or more of the presented sources and/or own knowledge. Direct quotations and/or paraphrasing are likely. Sources will be used at face value, and answers will show a predominantly literal understanding of the evidence. Source material is interpreted with some reference to its context. Responses will show limited development and will rely on assertion. Some relevant knowledge will be present but there will be little or no analytical focus. Writing will begin to show some coherence and organisation, but may be disjointed and poorly organised overall. Spelling and syntax will be generally secure.

(1-5)

Level 2 Developed statements

Developed statements that will make reasonably balanced use of some or all of the sources in order to answer the question. Conclusions will be made, either implicitly or explicitly, with limited support from the source material and own knowledge. There will be little, if any, understanding that an interpretation is being considered. Responses will show some understanding of basic historical methods in handling and interrogating sources. Judgements about the value of evidence in a given historical situation will be made. Responses will include some relevant detail but knowledge of the topic overall will be patchy and may include some inaccuracies. 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.

(6-14)

- Level 3** **Developed explanation**
Developed explanation that will make balanced use of most or all of the sources. Selection from the presented sources will be appropriate and deployed to answer the question. Explicit conclusions will be reached and there will be some understanding that an interpretation is under discussion. The evidence will be interrogated with confidence and discrimination to reach substantiated conclusions. The answer will be predominantly analytical and show an understanding of the issues relevant to the question, although the analytical focus may not be maintained throughout. The issues under discussion will be known about in some detail and the analysis will be supported by mostly accurate and precise knowledge, but deployment of that knowledge may not be sufficiently selective. 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. (15-27)
- Level 4** **Sustained argument**
The response will make confident and balanced use of all the sources. Selection from the presented sources will be appropriate and confidently deployed to address the question. Explicit, well supported conclusions will be reached and there will be a clear understanding that an interpretation is under discussion. The evidence will be interrogated with confidence and discrimination, and the weight it can carry considered. The answer will be analytical and show explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Relevant knowledge will be appropriately selected and deployed to produce a developed evaluation of these issues throughout the answer. Writing will be controlled, well-directed, lucid and coherent throughout. The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas will be fully matched by an ability to convey that analysis with confidence and cogency. Syntax will be secure throughout and only very occasionally will spelling errors be encountered. (28-37)
- Level 5** **Sustained evaluative argument**
The response will link all the sources to create a sustained argument. The question will be debated, with a clear demonstration that an interpretation is under discussion. Candidates will sustain their argument by developing their own interpretation based on confident and secure selection of presented evidence and recalled information. The evidence will be interrogated with confidence and discrimination, and the weight it can carry will be considered, with clear conclusions being drawn. The answer will be wholly analytical and offer valid, sustained and appropriately critical arguments showing an explicit understanding of all the issues appropriate to the question. Relevant knowledge will be precisely and critically selected to support developed evaluation of the issues throughout the answer. Writing will be well-controlled, well-directed, lucid and coherent throughout. The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas will be fully matched by an ability to convey that analysis with confidence and cogency. Syntax will show awareness of style and spelling errors will be rare. (38-40)

6526A - Paper 6A Mark Scheme
The Crisis of the Tudor State, 1547-58

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (a)	<p>This question asks candidates to focus on the changes in religious policy as a cause of the rebellions of 1549. Some weaker candidates may simply describe the religious changes brought in by Edward VI's government or, which is the more likely, describe the rebellions. The majority of candidates should be able to link the two, and the question does give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of the causes of the rebellions. Candidates should focus on Source 2 and appropriately contextualise the Act of Uniformity, considering its general impact on Church and laity. Source 1 can be seen as wanting to take the Act of Uniformity still further down the Protestant road and candidates should appreciate the selective nature of the source when considering religious changes as the main cause of Kett's rebellion. Source 3 pulls the two primary sources together by confirming 1549 as a year of upheavals, suggesting that Edward's councils were strong enough enforce revolutionary religious changes in both worship and doctrine and maintaining that the problems of 1549 were caused by over ambitious policies and confused ideology. Better candidates address these two factors and relate them to the rebellions of 1549. From their own knowledge candidates can be expected reinforce the sources and provide additional factors such as the general acceptance of Edward's Reformation (with the notable exceptions of Gardiner and Bonner) making its implementation easier, and thus religious changes being the root cause of the 1549 rebellions less likely. Although an explanation of the causes of the Western (Prayer Book) Rebellion and Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk will tend to dominate, there should be some understanding shown of the geographic extent of the rebellions, affecting as they did some 23 counties and of whether any common underlying causes can be found.</p> <p>At level 3, the relationship between the religious changes and the rebellions will be seen through a web of references both to the sources and to the candidate's own knowledge. Explicit, developed and supported judgements will be made.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (b)	<p>This question enables candidates to address the issues surrounding the supposed mid-Tudor crisis and, by posing the hypothesis that disorder amongst crowns, councils and parliaments threatened the stability of the realm, enables candidates to explore alternative interpretations of the 'Crisis'. At lower levels, answers will start to compare the sources and link them with the candidate's own knowledge. They are likely either to support or challenge the quotation in Source 6. Those supporting the claim will probably begin with Source 6 and find support for Elton's view in Source 4. Care should be taken, however, in relying heavily on the veracity of Source 4 because of its provenance. Source 3 provides an alternative interpretation of the mid-Tudor years to that of Source 6 and candidates may link this, only with care, to the interpretation of Mary's reign given in Source 5 and with Edward's Act of Uniformity, an extract from which forms Source 2. these Sources should be appropriately contextualised, and the roles of Edward and Mary, and their Councils, explored. In particular, the fall of Somerset, the role of Northumberland and the problems Mary had in achieving her aims should be explored. At Level 3 and above, the explanation will be developed and infused with recognition that there are different interpretations concerning the mid-Tudor crisis. For Levels 4 and 5, candidates will present a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the mid-Tudor crisis and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge. They will engage with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 3, 5 and 6. In coming to a conclusion, they will marshal the sources to support their own opinion, but will also recognise the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present. Use of all the required sources will be expected, as will some sense of the merits of the different arguments that will be supported by appropriate reference to material from outside the sources.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	40

6526B - Paper 6B Mark Scheme
The Quest for Settlement: Cromwell and the Protectorate, 1653-58

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (a)	<p>This question asks candidates to focus on the reasons why the first Protectorate parliament failed and, whilst many will simply focus on the events surrounding the ending of the Parliament, the question does give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of the issues surrounding the expectations of Cromwell and of the MPs. Candidates will probably take Source 1 as their starting point and from Cromwell's criticism of parliament make appropriate and informed inferences as why it did not fulfil his expectations. Source 2 provides candidates with the constitutional foundation on which the Protectorate parliaments were based, and this can be linked both with Source 1 to show either that Cromwell's expectations were unrealistic and/or that MPs were/were not working to the Instrument of Government. Source 3 provides candidates with an explanation of Cromwell's attitudes to the parliamentary system and can be linked to Source 1 and 2 to provide an explanation for the failure of the first Protectorate parliament. From their own knowledge, candidates can be expected to reinforce the sources and provide additional factors such as the Parliament's challenge to Cromwell's right to issue ordinances in the intervals between parliaments, Cromwell's insistence that MPs sign a 'Recognition' and Parliament's general suspicions re the army and its refusal to pay for an army of 50,000. At level 3, the issue of the failure of the first Protectorate parliament will be seen through a web of references both to the sources and to the candidate's own knowledge. Explicit, developed and supported judgements will be made.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (b)	<p>This question enables candidates to address the issues surrounding the nature of the Protectorate and, by posing the hypothesis that it was nothing but an army dictatorship, enables candidates to explore alternative interpretations as to the nature of the Protectorate. At lower levels, candidates will start to compare the sources and link them with their own knowledge and are likely either to support or challenge the given interpretation. Candidates are likely to start with Source 5, which contains the given hypothesis, and will find support for this in Source 4. Care, however, must be taken with Source 4 and candidates should show they understand this by making sensible reference to its authorship. Challenge to the interpretation can be found in Source 6 which plays down the military element and implies that Cromwell was desperately trying to find a settlement based on a parliamentary system. This view can be partially supported by Source 3 which seeks to explain Cromwell’s attitude to parliaments in principle and close reference should be made to Source 2, the constitutional basis for a parliamentary government. This Source should be used, too, to show how Cromwell perceived his own role in the Protectorate as well as that of the army and can in some ways be used selectively to support the interpretation given in Source 5. At Level 3 and above, the explanation will be developed and infused with recognition that there are different interpretations concerning the nature of the Protectorate. For Levels 4 and 5, candidates will present a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the nature of the Protectorate, and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and they will engage with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 3, 5 and 6. In coming to a conclusion, they will marshal the sources to support their own opinion, but will also recognise the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present. Use of all the required sources will be expected, as will some sense of the merits of the different arguments that will be supported by appropriate reference to material from outside the sources.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate’s wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	40

6526C - Paper 6C Mark Scheme
 Radicalism and the British State: the Chartist Experience, 1838-50

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (a)	<p>This question asks candidates to focus on the effectiveness of William Lovett as a Chartist leader and, whilst many will simply focus on what Lovett did, or did not, do, the question does give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of Chartist leadership and the ways in which Lovett’s interests and emphases changed over time. Candidates will probably begin with Source 3 because it begins to explore Lovett’s philosophy, and will appropriately contextualise it with reference to his actions and activities within the LWMA and the Chartist movement. Sources 1 and 2 can be used to show a different side of the work and life of Lovett, traditionally regarded as the ‘schoolmaster’ of the movement. Source 1 shows him to be a man of courage and integrity, willing to take sole responsibility for the resolutions of the Convention, thereby risking arrest and imprisonment. Source 3 not only emphasises Lovett’s commitment to the Charter but his determination to seek support from organisations with similar objectives. At Level 3, the issue of the effectiveness of Lovett’s leadership will be seen through a web of references both to the sources and to the candidate’s own knowledge. Explicit, developed and supported judgements will be made.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate’s wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (b)	<p>This question enables candidates to address the issues surrounding the rise and fall of Chartism and, by posing the hypothesis that it wrong to concentrate on social and economic factors, enables candidates to explore alternative interpretations of the phenomenon that was Chartism. At lower levels answers will start to compare the sources and to link the sources with candidates' own knowledge and are likely either to support or challenge the given interpretation. Candidates supporting the given interpretation are likely to begin with Source 6 which contains and explores the hypothesis. This Source provides the basis of the argument for Chartism being primarily a political movement and candidates will develop this using their own knowledge. Candidates could use Source 3 in support of Source 6, with its view that Chartism was a development from the eighteenth century political demands for a form of political democracy. This view would be further upheld by Source 2. The more perceptive candidates may see a link, too, with Source 4 because of the embedded implication that universal suffrage will deliver all the benefits listed there. Candidates seeking to challenge the given interpretation will probably start with Source 5 with its strong focus on economic imperatives and will develop these using their own knowledge. Support for this view can be found by selective use of Source 4. Note may be taken of the provenance of Source 4 and a link could be made with Source 3 and its assertion that Chartist supporters in the north were the casualties of capitalism. At Level 3 and above, the explanation will be developed and infused with recognition that there are different interpretations concerning the rise and fall of the Chartist movement. For Levels 4 and 5, candidates will present a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the reasons for the rise and fall of Chartism, showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and they will engage with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 3, 5 and 6. In coming to a conclusion, they will marshal the sources to support their own opinion, but will also recognise the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present. Use of all the required sources will be expected, as will some sense of the merits of the different arguments that will be supported by appropriate reference to material from outside the sources.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	40

6526D - Paper 6D Mark Scheme
Decline of the Liberal Party, c.1900-29

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (a)	<p>This question asks candidates to focus on the effectiveness of Asquith's leadership in the years to 1916, and, whilst many will simply focus on the achievements of the Liberal; governments under his leadership, the question does give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of his role whilst Prime Minister. Candidates will probably begin with Source 3 which summarises the positive achievements of the Liberal governments under Asquith's premiership, and will develop this using their own knowledge of the Liberal governments' achievements at this time. This can be linked to Source 2, which presents Asquith's own attitude to the provision of Old Age Pensions and with his clear grasp of the need to distance these from benefits obtainable under the Poor Law. Source 1 needs to be taken with care because of the nature of its author's relationship with Asquith, but it does give pointers to Asquith's character and candidates can develop this by citing examples in support, or not, of the view given here. Candidates own knowledge may include an appraisal of the level of support for Asquith within the Cabinet, government and country, and will detail the reasons why he lost the premiership to Lloyd George. At Level 3, the issue of the effectiveness of Asquith's leadership will be seen through a web of references both to the sources and to the candidate's own knowledge. Explicit, developed and supported judgements will be made.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (b)	<p>This question enables candidates to address the issues surrounding the decline of the Liberal Party and, by posing the hypothesis that the decline was due to the Party's failure to understand the needs of the working class, enables candidates to explore alternative interpretations of the reasons for the decline. At lower levels, answers will start to compare the sources and to link the sources with the candidate's own knowledge and are likely either to support or challenge the given interpretation. Those supporting the claim that the Liberal decline was caused by the Party's failure to understand the needs of the working class will probably start with Source 6, which sets out very clearly how the Liberals failed to understand the needs of the working class and suggests that this was the case even whilst they were carrying out their policies of social reform. Source 3 presents the opposite case: that the social reforms of the Liberals made it very difficult for the Labour party to gain a foothold with the electorate. Source 5 stands somewhere between the two. Whilst acknowledging the traditional approach (Source 6) it suggests that this is the product of hindsight. Source 2, whilst showing sensitivity to the pauperising effects of the Poor Law shows a Prime Minister more concerned with the niceties of administration than with the needs of the poor, and could be used selectively to support either of the two main interpretations. Source 4 shows a Minister of Munitions identifying the working man with the state, but candidates should question whether or not this was simply a political expedient. Candidates will use their own knowledge to develop and appropriately contextualise what they find in the sources. There should be some focus on the acceptability of the social reforms to the working class, and particularly their resentment of the national Insurance scheme and those excluded from old age pensions. Post 1919, the focus should be on the newly enfranchised electorate and on the ways in which the Liberal party tried, and failed, to meet their needs. At Level 3 and above, the explanation will be developed and infused with recognition that there are different interpretations concerning the reasons why the Liberal Party declined. For Levels 4 and 5, candidates will present a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the Liberal decline and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and they will engage with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 3, 5 and 6. In coming to a conclusion, they will marshal the sources to support their own opinion, but will also recognise the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present. Use of all the required sources will be expected, as will some sense of the merits of the different arguments that will be supported by appropriate reference to material from outside the sources.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	40

6526E - Paper 6E Mark Scheme
Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control, 1933-45

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (a)	<p>This question asks candidates to focus on the seriousness of opposition to the Third Reich in the years 1938-42 and they should be aware of the time-span of the question and of the significance of starting in 1938. Whilst many will simply focus on describing the extent and / or nature of the opposition, the question does give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of issues surrounding the seriousness of the opposition. Expect some attempt, either implicit or explicit, to define what is meant by 'serious' in this context. Candidates attempting to do this should be placed on or above the key mark point of the appropriate level. Candidates might, for example, consider that opposition could not have been serious because it was not successful; they might consider it was serious because the Nazi regime took it seriously, or they might consider that it had the potential to be serious because of its nature and extent. Whilst these attempts at definition may be addressed simplistically in levels 1 and 2, at level 3 the definition should be explored and issue of the seriousness of the opposition to the Third Reich will be seen through a web of references both to the sources and to the candidate's own knowledge. Explicit, developed and supported judgements will be made. Candidates can infer from Source 1 that any opposition that there was in Germany to the Third Reich could hardly have been serious because even the SPD, who would be anxious to blacken the regime, believed there was no threat. Source 2, on the other hand, could demonstrate the seriousness with which Himmler and, by extension, Heydrich, took opposition from students, their teachers and parents. Note could be made of the difference in dates and that further fear of opposition would necessarily have been generated by WW2. Source 3 might be seen to bridge the gap between Sources 1 and 2. Candidates here should be able to appreciate that the terror regime served at least two purposes - punishment and deterrent. They could link this with Source 1 to explain the apparent quiescence of the population and could draw the inference that would seem to imply that the Nazis were scared of dissent (linked to Source 2) and had as a consequence set up a system of terror either as a deterrent and/or because opposition was serious and they took its threat seriously. Candidates can be expected to reinforce the sources from their own knowledge of the extent, nature and seriousness of opposition to the Nazi regime.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (b)	<p>This question enables candidates to address the issues surrounding the nature of the power of the Fuhrer throughout the period 1933-45 and, by posing the hypothesis that it was comprehensive and total enables candidates to explore alternative interpretations. At lower levels candidates will start to compare the sources and to link them with their own knowledge and are likely either to challenge or support the given interpretation. Those supporting the claim will use Source 6, from which the interpretation is taken, and develop this by appropriately contextualising it using their own knowledge. More able students will be able to engage fully with the complexity of Sources 4 and 6, which can be seen to support each other by their focus, practically and theoretically, on Hitler's own personal power. Candidates should consider that Sources 4 and 6, taken together, are not necessarily contradicted by Source 5. It is, of course, possible to use power deliberately to create a state of the nature analysed by Kershaw in Source 4 and candidates should consider the likelihood of this and the reasons for it. Linkage should be made with Sources 2 and 3 and with their emphasis on terror. Candidates should here consider whether terror, that was inherent in the regime, was used to under-pin a deliberately created shambolic system, or was itself one of the warring agencies described in Source 4. Candidates should use their own knowledge in contextualising the different interpretations and in developing their own, based upon an analysis of the nature of Hitler's power. More able candidate will be able to focus on the time span of the question and will show, through their analysis, how the nature of Hitler's power changed over time. At Level 3 and above, the explanation will be developed and infused with recognition that there are different interpretations concerning the nature of the Fuhrer's power. For levels four and five, candidates will present a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the nature of Hitler's power, and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and they will engage with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 3, 5 and 4. In coming to a conclusion, they will marshal the sources to support their own opinion, but will also recognise the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present. Use of all the required sources will be expected, as will some sense of the merits of the different arguments that will be supported by appropriate reference to material from outside the sources.</p> <p>NB: There is a mistake in the attribution to source 6. Any candidate who tries to reconcile the content of the source with membership of the white rose movement should be rewarded appropriately.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	40

6526F - Paper 6F Mark Scheme
The Soviet Union After Lenin, 1924-41

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (a)	<p>This question asks candidates to focus on the reasons for the show trials of the 1930s, and, whilst many will simply focus on simplistic explanations, the question does give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of motives and ideologies within the context of the USSR in the 1930s. Candidates will probably begin by focusing on Source 3 which firmly links the show trials to the economic situation in Russia at the time. Candidates should appreciate this and evaluate appropriately. Source 2 can be used to support Source 3 in that it links with the ‘temptation to seek scapegoats’ (line 20) and yet the commitment of the accused to the ‘cause’ should not be ignored. Source 1 epitomises this and candidates should be aware of its provenance. From their own knowledge, candidates can be expected to reinforce the sources and provide additional factors such as an appraisal of the true economic position of the USSR at the time, Stalin’s insecurities and the need to purge the Party of dissent contextualised within an understanding of the dynamics of the Five-Year Plans. At Level 3, the issue of the show trials will be seen through a web of references both to the sources and to the candidate’s own knowledge. Explicit, developed and supported judgements will be made.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate’s wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (b)	<p>This question enables candidates to address the issues surrounding collectivisation and the Five-Year Plans and by posing the hypothesis that they brought no benefit to the Russian people, enables candidates to explore alternative interpretations. Better candidates may well make a distinction between collectivisation and industrial policies and outcomes, but overall the thrust should be on an appraisal of the Russian economy, which embraces both aspects. At lower levels, candidates will start to compare the sources and link them with their own knowledge and are likely either to support or challenge the given interpretation. Candidates are likely to begin with Source 5, which emphasises the positive aspects of the Russian economy, though care must be taken here because of the Source's provenance. Source 6 could be seen to support this because it does demonstrate the determination of some elements of Russian society to implement collectivisation at whatever cost because of the promise of a better future. Source 7 presents an alternative interpretation, asserting that collectivisation could not be justified even on economic grounds and in some ways candidates could see this being supported by Source 3, with its emphasis on economic problems and the need to find a distraction / scapegoat with the show trials. This in turn is supported by Source 4. Candidates will use their own knowledge to develop what they find in the sources. Expect reference to the agricultural and industrial aspects of the economy, to the Purges and to the need to gear up the economy to meet the demands of the 20th century, regardless of whether or not the Russian people actually benefited. At Level 3 and above, the explanation will be developed and infused with recognition that there are different interpretations concerning the benefits accrued to the Russian people by Stalin's economic policies. For Levels 4 and 5, candidates will present a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the impact of Stalin's economic policies on the Russian people. They will engage with the different emphases of Sources 5, 6 and 7. In coming to a conclusion, they will marshal the sources to support their own opinion, but will also recognise the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present. Use of all the required sources will be expected, as will some sense of the merits of the different arguments that will be supported by appropriate reference to material from outside the sources.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	40

6526G - Paper 6G Mark Scheme
The Origins and Early Development of the Cold War, 1945-62

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (a)	<p>This question asks candidates to focus on issues surrounding the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. Whilst weaker candidates will focus on the crisis itself, the question does give the more perceptive candidates the opportunity to explore the complexity of issues that surrounded an apparently simple act of provocation by the USSR. Candidates should focus on Source 1, which gives a deceptively simple explanation of the motives of the USSR but should be aware of the partiality of the source because of its provenance. Source 2 gives an overview of the crisis from one who witnessed it first hand, suggesting it was nothing but a power struggle, with the inference that this is why the placing of missiles on Cuba developed into a crisis. Candidates could point out that Lazo's analysis of the situation provides no explanation as to why Kennedy, if he was the more powerful of the two combatants, should make a 'no invasion' pledge to Khrushchev. Again, care should be taken with this Source because of its provenance. Source 3 should be used to show how threatened Kennedy felt the USA to be (and here it links in with Source 1) and hence his need to take immediate action. From their own knowledge, candidates can be expected to reinforce the sources and provide additional factors such as the main thrust of the foreign policy of the US and the USSR, America's previous involvement with Cuba and the issue of US missiles in Turkey. At level 3, the issue of the crisis created by the placing of missiles on Cuba will be seen through a web of references both to the sources and to the candidate's own knowledge. Explicit, developed and supported judgements will be made.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate's wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1. (b)	<p>This question enables candidates to address the nature of the Cold War and what drove it from its inception to 1962 and, by posing the hypothesis that it was dominated by US policy objectives, it enables candidates to explore alternative interpretations. At lower levels, candidates will start to compare the sources and link them with their own knowledge and are likely either to support or challenge the given interpretation. Better candidates will explore the relationship between the development of the Cold War and US policy objectives, and will explain that the one need not impact on the other. Credit should be given for this when it is sensibly explored, not simply stated, and supported by examples. Candidates are likely to start with Source 6, which provides a clear interpretation of the dynamics of US foreign policy. Candidates could link this with Source 3, which clearly hints at Kennedy’s prioritising of elements within US policy objectives and the intention of the USA to wield this power in shaping the post-war world. This will be supported by MacArthur’s upbeat defence of the USA position in Korea in Source 5 and by Source 2 with its belief that the Cuban missile crisis was essentially driven by US policy objectives. Candidates will use their own knowledge to develop what they find in the sources and will introduce the idea of alternative interpretations for what drove the Cold War in the years to 1962. These could include differing ideologies, contrasting economic systems and / or the existence of atomic weapons. At Level 3 and above, the explanation will be developed and infused with recognition that there are different interpretations concerning the nature of the Cold War. For Levels 4 and 5, candidates will present a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the nature of the Cold War and showing an understanding that historians have presented the period in different ways, as exemplified by the sources and reinforced by their own knowledge, and they will engage with the differences of emphasis contained in Sources 3, 4 and 6. In coming to a conclusion, they will marshal the sources to support their own opinion, but will also recognise the existence and merits of alternative views or issues these alternative interpretations present. Use of all the required sources will be expected, as will some sense of the merits of the different arguments that will be supported by appropriate reference to material from outside the sources.</p> <p>Credit will be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contextualisation of the sources • explanation and evaluation of differing views about the issue • making links and connections between the given material and the candidate’s wider understanding of the issues involved in the debate. 	40