

GCE 2004
June Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative E Units 1, 4 and 6 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives and across all the specifications offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1:**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:*Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941**AS Unit 1: Germany and Russia before the First World War, 1870-1914****Question 1**

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

Explain briefly the importance of “humble petition” in the context of events in Russia in 1905. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. setting out the demands of the protesters. 1

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the aim of the march was to present a loyal petition for redress of grievances, including demands for reduced working hours, a minimum wage, an end to the war with Japan, and an elected assembly; candidates might comment on ‘hopeful’ or ‘humble’, and the traditional view of the tsar as “Little Father”. 2-3

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

Explain how the views in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source A** of the events of Bloody Sunday. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. provides a basic contrast, with the unjustified massacre of peaceful demonstrators in Source A, and troops forced to open fire because of serious disorders in Source B. 1-2

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. in a mass demonstration of more than an estimated 150,000 people carrying religious icons and pictures of the tsar, Source A provides detailed evidence of a deliberate attack on unarmed workers and their families as troops acted “like madmen”, but also mentions the panic and confusion as these forces lost their heads faced with the momentum of the vast numbers of protesters. Source B implies that the troops were under threat in several parts of the city, and were forced to carry out their tragic duty to the tsar, who was not present and who seemed clearly out of touch with developments. **3-5**
- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. as above, but perhaps emphasising that this was a misguided demonstration on a scale never seen before in Russia, or commenting on the provenance of the two sources – an eye witness Bolshevik, and an absent tsar writing his diary. The event permanently undermined the allegiance of the common people to Nicholas II. **6-7**
- (c) Use **Sources A, B and C**, and your own knowledge.
- Explain the importance of the use of force, in relation to other factors, in enabling the tsarist government to survive the Revolution of 1905. **(15 marks)**
- Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*
- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* the sources. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the sources, C provides a range of evidence, noting the skill shown by Nicholas (contrasting well with Source B on this), Witte's key role in making concessions, and also the effective use of military force – an approach evident in Sources A and B. From own knowledge, candidates should develop comments on the use of force and on the military, which maintained its loyalty despite the defeat in the Japanese War – outbreaks of mutiny had proved isolated and short-term. In relation to other factors, the government, mainly through Witte, also kept its nerve and a sense of purpose. Evidence should be included on the October Manifesto which divided the liberal opposition – the peasants were bought off by changes in redemption payments, and the industrial workers and the soviets were suppressed. Comment might be included on the nature of revolution itself, which was largely spontaneous, almost accidental; and was not co-ordinated or concerted, with little leadership or role for the political parties. This was the first serious opposition, which lacked experience and confidence; and the liberals, afraid of violence, did not mix well with the workers. Evidence from Stolypin's repression might also be included.

Level 1 might be restricted to a limited summary of the events, with little comment beyond assertion. A narrative approach may be predominant at Level 2 but in more detail and with some broad links to the question. By Level 3, evidence must include both sources and own knowledge, and the focus must be more explicit and analytical, with some attempt to assess the importance of using force by the top of this level. At Level 4, there should be a clear attempt to prioritise the issues and include other factors perhaps commenting on the nature of the Revolution. Level 5 might broaden the context and include some sort of overview – e.g. considering whether tsarism survived unchanged.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “social welfare programme” in the context of Bismarck's policies in Germany. **(3 marks)**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. brief examples of welfare measures without context. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a series of social reforms showing the state accepting responsibility for the welfare of its workers – sickness, accident and disability insurance, and old age pensions. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Bismarck introduced a programme of welfare reforms in the 1880s.
(7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to improve living and working conditions. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. to kill socialism by kindness and outbid the SPD, providing the ‘carrot’ of welfare reforms after the failed ‘stick’ of the anti-socialist measures, as Bismarck realised that oppression was not enough. In broader terms, to head-off the prospect of increasing social unrest and convince the workers of the state’s benevolence. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. was this merely a cynical manoeuvre, combining manipulation and diversion, or a return to Junker paternalism? The “limited value” mentioned in the source perhaps questions Bismarck’s motives, with restricted benefits and insurance schemes riddled with drawbacks, and Bismarck certainly had no wish to alienate industrialists. **6-7**

- (c) “The main result of economic growth in Germany was social and political problems for the government.” With reference to the years 1871 to 1890, explain why you agree or disagree with this view.
(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Economic growth after 1871, although uneven, of course brought many benefits for the government and the country as a whole, and, using natural resources including population growth, started the transformation of Germany from an agrarian society into Europe's leading industrial power, with massive increases in coal and steel production, growth of the railway network, development of the banking system, cartels etc. The social and political problems might include the expansion of the working class and urbanisation, with deteriorating living and working conditions in rapidly growing major cities, and the emergence of the SPD, trade unions and other pressure groups demanding social and political reforms. In particular, Bismarck was appalled by the SPD's long-term plan to bring about a socialist state, and tried two very different methods to deal with this. But he was also pressurised by the elites as social divisions hardened, both into abandoning free trade in the 1870s and promoting a diversionary colonial policy in the 1880s. However, economic growth also brought benefits to the working class, with a rise in real wages, stable food prices, the availability of work and a state welfare policy. Broad links with foreign policy could be used.

Level 1 will only provide partial coverage in probably accepting the proposition. Level 2 will provide more range, but may be descriptive, concentrating mainly on the social and political aspects, and the SPD, or describing economic changes around 1878-79. An explicit focus should be evident at Level 3, with some response to both the social/political and economic aspects by top of level. By Level 4, the analytical insight should be more developed, with some appreciation of the variations in both economic growth and social/political repercussions. Some judgement should be included at Level 5, perhaps commenting that in trying to protect their own interests, the ruling elites merely exacerbated the problems and divisions.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "the League of the Three Emperors" in the context of Russian foreign policy in 1881. *(3 marks)*

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. identifying the Dreikaiserbund of Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. this secret alliance, and extension of the 1872-73 verbal agreement, was supported by the new tsar, Alexander III, promising neutrality in the event of war with a fourth power. Candidates might comment on 'did not survive long' – being impressive on paper, with consultation over Turkish issues, but of little long-term value, given the ongoing instability in the Balkans. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Russia pursued an expansionist policy in the Balkans after 1870. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. territorial gain and developing trade. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the long established religious and racial aspirations of Pan-Slavism, as Russia posed as protector of the Christian peoples as a pretext to extend her territorial influence; there were also economic and strategic motives, aiming to gain control of Constantinople and access from the Black Sea to ‘warm water’ ports, as most of Russia’s trade was now shipped through the Straits. Foreign policy also raised status and prestige, and distracted from domestic problems. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as Level 2, but perhaps appreciating the curious mixture of practical motives and cultural issues, and the opportunities provided for Russia by the power vacuum in the declining Ottoman Empire and the emerging Balkan nationalism. **6-7**

- (c) “Relations with other European powers brought little benefit to Russia.” With reference to Russian foreign policy in the years 1870 to 1894, explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Initial prospects looked promising, as, first with Bismarck's connivance and then with a conference agreement, Russia in 1870 rejected the restrictions of the Black Sea clauses, and an active foreign policy in the Balkans now looked in prospect. Renewed Russian confidence seemed confirmed diplomatically with the early personal contacts made in the informal Dreikaiserbund of 1872-73. However, Russian complaints over Bismarck's rash 'War Scare' with France gave early warning of the choppy diplomatic waters ahead. Candidates will want to focus on diplomatic relations during the Balkan crisis of 1875-78 leading to the Congress and Treaty of Berlin, which marked a serious setback for Russian influence. Yet, Bismarck's network of alliances in the early 1880s seemed to bring benefits to Russia – e.g. the Dreikaiserbund of 1881 supported the union of Russian dominated Bulgaria with Eastern Rumelia, and accepted Russia's demand to close the Straits to warships (especially British). The Bulgarian crisis from 1885 undermined this diplomatic progress, and Bismarck's Reinsurance Treaty with Russia in 1887 seemed a desperate last throw to retain diplomatic support. However, this same year marked a significant diplomatic shift of direction, as Russia now turned to Paris for loans and started to develop a political connection with France. Russia's wish to renew the Reinsurance Treaty with Germany in 1890 was rejected, and French diplomatic initiatives led to the Franco-Russian Alliance, finally signed in 1894, which marked a diplomatic turning point, bringing economic and political benefits to both countries.

Level 1 may be a restricted summary, perhaps concentrating on the 1870s. Level 2 will have more range over the period, but may tend to describe events with limited analytical links. By Level 3, there must be an explicit analytical focus, but this may tend largely to accept the proposition. Level 4 should broaden this analysis and provide more balance in terms of diplomatic benefits and restrictions, perhaps relating Russian foreign policy to the ongoing diplomatic themes – e.g. Bismarck not wishing to take sides. Level 5 should reach some conclusions in relation to this sort of overview.

Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941**A2 Unit 4: Germany, Russia and the Soviet Union in the 19th and 20th Centuries****Section A: Autocracy and Reform in Germany and Russia, 1825-1939****Question 1**

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

Explain what is meant by “social revolution” in the context of Weimar Germany.

(5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. complete change/recasting of German society. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge. The conservative elites feared that the advent of the republic and democracy would bring socialism, and with it social revolution; that the political revolution of late 1918 would be accompanied by radical social and economic change, e.g. some state control of landed estates and factories. **2-3**
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge. There was no social revolution in Germany at the end of the First World War – society was left almost untouched by political events. **4-5**

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

How fully do these two sources explain the reasons for the slow pace of social reform in Russia before 1861 and in Germany during the Second Reich? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 might be restricted to a summary of the sources, describing the slow pace of reform. Responses at Level 2 may also be source-led, providing evidence to explain how the economic interests of the few dictated the pace of social reform for the majority, with only limited supporting own knowledge to develop the contexts, and limited development in terms of 'how fully'. Both range and evaluation should be explicit at Level 3, with some conclusions reached. In tsarist Russia, serfdom also served the political interests of the state, helping to maintain autocracy and resist change. Nicholas I lacked the political conviction to end serfdom despite seeing the need for change. Political reasons were also evident in Germany during the Second Reich as governments, influenced by the Junker aristocracy, were fearful of the growth of socialism and the spread of genuine democracy. However, the paternalist approach of Bismarck's state socialism, whatever the motives, actually set a new pace in terms of social reform. This approach should be developed at Level 4 showing a clear insight into the differing contexts in Russia and Germany. In Russia, serfdom remained the root cause of social and economic backwardness; in Germany, economic growth was spectacular, with inevitable social repercussions.

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

“The influence of the nobility in Russia and of the traditional elites in Germany was a key factor in maintaining autocratic systems of government.”

Assess the accuracy of this view with reference to **both** Russia **and** Germany during the period 1825 to 1939. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **5-8**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **14-15**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content.

The influence of the upper classes is evident in both states throughout the 19th century, having a vested interest in resisting change and bolstering autocratic regimes, especially with reference to the government, civil service, judiciary, military and economic development. However, the influence of the nobility in Russia is undermined by 1914 and virtually obliterated by the end of 1917, whereas the influences of the elites in Germany remains significant well into the 1930s.

Despite the one-off Decembrist conspiracy of idealistic upper-class army officers in 1825, Source A confirms the state's reliance on the nobility in Russia during the reign of Nicholas I. The Emancipation Edict and other reforms of Alexander II, although intended to stabilise and preserve the Tsarist system of government, were arguably achieved against the general hostility of the nobility fearing loss of status and wealth. The reactionary policies of Alexander III and Nicholas II up to 1905 seem to confirm the continuing influence of the nobility, but the beginnings of forced industrialisation which were not matched by equivalent progress in agricultural improvements mark the decline of the land-owning nobility referred to in Source C. This source highlights Stolypin's attempts at social engineering in the key period 1906-14 which aimed to create a broader base of support for the monarchy through a prosperous peasant class. Progress was resisted by the implacable hostility of the narrow-minded and increasingly out-of-touch upper classes. Any lingering influence after the abdication of Nicholas II was removed by the Bolshevik seizure of power and the civil war which followed, creating a new totalitarian system of government.

In the patchwork Germany of 1848, the support and loyalty of the Junker aristocracy, army and civil service enabled Frederick William IV to re-establish his authority over middle-class liberals. Following the Prussian-driven process of unification, Bismarck resisted the pressure of the more reactionary elements to dispose with parliaments and constitutions. The constitution of 1871 was a compromise between Bismarck and the forces of liberal democracy; however, conservative Prussia remained the backbone of the Reich, and the influence of the traditional elites permeated the regime in dominating the political and administrative system, the army and economic development (see Source B for the latter). The nature of Kaiser William II's rule enabled these groups to become further entrenched and resist demands for democratic reform, arguably manipulating the German people into war in

1914. Source D focuses on the remaining issues in Germany from 1918. In Germany's only fully democratic period, the influence of the old elites prevailed, providing vital elements of continuity which effectively undermined the Weimar Republic, as the divisions within the political left played into the hands of the forces of conservatism. The elites latched on to the growth of Nazism as a means of restoring autocratic rule and, so they believed, enhancing their influence. As Hitler's authoritarian state consolidated its control, the political, economic and military elites were gradually absorbed within a different power structure.

Level 1 will include only a narrow range of evidence, perhaps summarising the sources, and clearly lack balance between the states (or only cover one state). Level 2 should provide more balance, but the review of the period will still be limited, presenting mainly a generalised focus in terms of the specifics of the question. By Level 3, there will be some grasp of the issue of the influence of key groups in relation to systems of government, with more balance in terms of range and the use of sources and own knowledge, although knowledge over the period may be limited beyond the context and the content of the sources. Some candidates may also analyse in general (for Level 3) other reasons for maintaining autocracy. At Level 4, there should be some appreciation of the changing contexts over 100 years and balanced coverage of most of the period, perhaps with odd signs of integration. Judgement at Level 5 should reveal clear insight and thorough understanding over the period as a whole and between the two states.

Section B: European Dictatorships in the Inter-War Years

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: ***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

“Stalin won because Trotsky lacked a power base.”

How far does this explain why Stalin, rather than Trotsky, succeeded Lenin as leader of the Soviet state? *(20 marks)*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Even before Lenin's death, the strength of Stalin's political power base is evident, holding several vital posts – as General Secretary and his position within the politburo and triumvirate. He was already more powerful than Lenin, who was increasingly incapacitated by illness. The combination of these offices, with the power of patronage, made Stalin the indispensable link in the party and government network. Stalin took control of the funeral arrangements and joined an unofficial triumvirate to isolate Trotsky. He proved to be a skilful politician with a superb grasp of tactics, whose personal ruthlessness served him well – his ‘divide and rule’ tactics against Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev and the Right Communists. There were also some elements of luck for Stalin: with no clear power structure or formal procedure from Lenin; the bumper 1926 harvest worked to Stalin's advantage in the economic debate; and, most significantly, Lenin's Testament – warning the party against making Stalin leader – was not published. Stalin also benefited from his pragmatic approach to future policy, becoming associated with ‘Socialism in One Country’ which appealed to many in the Party. Against all this are the divisions, errors, tactics, policies and over-confidence of all his opponents, who virtually destroyed each other in fatally underestimating Stalin.

Trotsky had done more than anyone to secure communist control – planning the October Revolution, and leading the Red Army to victory in the Civil War. He was the only leading Communist who could rival Lenin as a speaker and writer about revolutionary ideas and, most significantly, Lenin recognised Trotsky's worth. However, politically, Trotsky lacked a power base with no organised body of supporters; he was also unpopular with many in the Party for his apparent arrogance, and, as a former Menshevik, had questionable loyalties. His personal weaknesses included being highly-strung and prone to moments of indecision in crises. His intellectual eloquence and over-confidence tended to isolate him, and he also suffered from bouts of ill health. By 1924, he was blocked by the unofficial triumvirate. His tactical mistakes included his failure to attend Lenin's funeral and his criticism of the cult of Leninism, his persistent adherence to World Revolution, and his factional collusion with other opponents.

At Level 1, answers will be generalised, having little of this range, perhaps focusing in brief on few key issues, or only on one leader. Level 2 will have more range, but may be descriptive, possibly concentrating predominantly on either Stalin or Trotsky. Level 3 will be more explicitly analytical and better balanced, with synoptic links contrasting Stalin's tactics with those of Trotsky, but development will be limited and judgement perhaps only implicit. These will be evident at Level 4, perhaps commenting on the nature of the Communist system or challenging the notion of a power struggle, as individuals and factions who already had power tried to manipulate events for their own ends. Level 5 would sustain this sort of insight and overview, analysing the personalities and issues in depth, maintaining clear synoptic links.

Question 3

“By July 1933, Hitler already had control of all the key institutions.”

“Hitler did not take full control until the winter of 1937-38 when the army was finally tamed.”

Which of these two statements provides the more convincing assessment of when, if ever, Hitler achieved absolute power in Germany in the years 1933 to 1939?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

There are a number of important stages on the way to potential total power. By the summer of 1933, with the powers of the Enabling Act, the banning of opposition from trade unions and political parties, and the beginnings of Nazification within the civil service, judiciary, teaching profession, press etc – although at this stage, Hitler failed to make any impression on the influence of the Churches, big business and the army, and was clearly wary of antagonising such powerful vested interests. By August 1934, Hitler had secured his own personal political supremacy with the purge of the SA in the ‘Night of the Long Knives’, the assumption of the Presidency on Hindenburg’s death, and an oath of allegiance sworn by the army. By 1936, an enlarged Gestapo and SS consolidated Hitler’s power base; and by 1937-38, big business was brought into line, and the dismissal of Blomberg and Fritsch secured Hitler’s control over the armed forces.

Candidates will of course also need to analyse Hitler's own role. At first sight, the power structure of the Nazi state seemed simple and efficient, dominated by the authority of one man. Hitler had unlimited power in theory, and Führerprinzip formed the basis of state organisation, ensuring unquestioning obedience at all levels; yet he remained remote from day-to-day government, often uncertain or unwilling in decision making, and bored by administrative detail and organisation. Of course there is no way any one individual could ever be in control of all aspects of government – Hitler still depended on subordinates to put policy decision into effect. Furthermore, internal divisions and rivalries were never entirely overcome, and Hitler's Reich presented an array of rival hierarchies, competing centres of power and ambiguous chains of command. Any open opposition was eradicated early on in the regime, but pockets of determined opposition remained, if underground, localised and limited.

Level 1 might simply accept one viewpoint in an assertive and generalised response. Answers at Level 2 will be more detailed, but may be predominantly factual narrative describing how the Nazis established control after 1933. By Level 3, there should be an explicit response, including some focus on the two quotations and some signs that the candidate appreciates the possibility of various alternative viewpoints and perspectives. A range of viewpoints should be evident at Level 4, including some explicit analysis of Hitler's role, and perhaps some response to 'if ever'. This sort of overview, with clear synoptic links, would be evident at Level 5.

Question 4

“The main focus of state propaganda was to promote a cult of personality.”

Assess the validity of this verdict by comparing the dictatorships of Hitler in Germany and Stalin in the USSR. (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

The cult of personality was a means to an end and the focus of ideology, manufacturing popular support through the marketing of an image. State propaganda (mainly through the press, radio, film etc) was a central and essential instrument of political control and indoctrination, reinforcing attitudes and beliefs, deterring opposition and also the questioning of policies as they became more extreme, emphasising that there are advantages above personal freedom.

In Germany, the cult of personality was a crucial part of the propaganda machine. The 'Hitler myth' was projected for ideological reasons (national community, recall of a glorious past, reinforcing the German tradition of strong leadership) and also because of Hitler's personality – his self-belief, drive, charisma and oratory. His carefully cultivated image became the focal point of popular consensus – Hitler personified the nation, understood the German people and was responsible for all the major successes in government. Such propaganda strengthened the overall support for Hitler and the regime, by reinforcing enthusiasm for a strong leader who was making Germany economically and militarily strong. Propaganda, however, also had other objectives – to stifle any remaining pockets of opposition, to cover repression and the regime's inconsistencies and failures, and to present a cultural straitjacket to the nation.

In promoting the desired image of the leader, there were many similarities in the USSR, with perhaps a stronger ideological focus and Stalin's more unassuming personality. Initially perceived as rather cold and distant, Stalin's image dominated the Soviet Union where he was seen as the omnipotent leader. His image was literally everywhere, and Stalin was presented as the heir of Lenin and the sole infallible interpreter of party ideology. As in Germany, the cult was not just about personal adulation – it was also a response to a period of rapid change which had left many Russians bewildered and confused. Such propaganda was again a means to an end, as the keystone to total state control and the acceptance of communist revolution from above, and a response to the disruption and disorientation brought about by the Five Year Plans, repression and purges.

Level 1 answers might only tackle one dictatorship, or make a sweeping generalised response to both. Level 2 will respond to both states but may still be unbalanced overall, and will tend to describe rather than assess, make links or compare. Level 3 will focus explicitly on the cult of personality in relation to state propaganda, starting to draw out common features and differences in the regimes, and starting to assess and appreciate the different contexts and perspectives. Level 4 will develop this approach in comparative terms and include a range of propaganda aims and motives. Level 5 will sustain a broad conceptual understanding and reach convincing conclusions with clear synoptic links.

Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825-1941**Unit 6W: Hitler and the Origins of the Second World War, 1933-1941****Question 1**

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

How valid is the view in this source of the significance of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. 3-5
- L3: As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. 6-8
- L4: Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. 9-10

Indicative content

Level 1 will summarise the source content: ‘last occasion’... before Hitler turned ‘more offensive’. Level 2 will show familiarity with this interpretation of a decisive turning point, and provide some relevant knowledge in support – e.g. a successful breach of Versailles/Locarno, emphasising the weakness of Britain and France, and promoting Hitler’s other ambitions. Answers at this level will usually be undeveloped. They may also suggest implicit agreement and/or disagreement with the interpretation. Level 3 will present a broader interpretation with signs of evaluation – transforming the whole diplomatic and military situation, and providing a shield behind which Hitler could turn to eastern Europe. It also cut France off from her allies, and showed a lack of will to defend Versailles. Yet such a move had been expected after the allied evacuation of 1930, and there were no further German advances for two years as Hitler remained unsure of Britain’s position. Answers at this level will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2 but not necessarily full in terms of knowledge and/or comment. Level 4 will provide a developed, balanced and well-supported assessment, perhaps emphasising the importance of Hitler’s role in decision making, as future initiatives depended on him. In Germany, Hitler’s critics were silenced and his personal standing and self-belief enhanced.

(b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is this source as evidence of the aims of Nazi foreign policy? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 will summarise the source describing some aims of German foreign policy – e.g. preserving and enlarging the racial community. At Level 2, in terms of utility, candidates will comment either on the strengths or limitations of the source, or briefly on both, or may only comment in general terms or in a broad context in relation to utility. Level 3 will respond to both strengths and limitations in a more balanced and developed way. The source is clearly useful as a record of a key 3-hour meeting in the Reich Chancellery attended by Hitler and Nazi military leaders, providing real clues about Germany's ultimate aims of Lebensraum and the use of military force, as Hitler moves towards implementing his long term aims. In terms of limitations, candidates could observe that this secret memorandum was written 5 days after the meeting itself, and based on notes and memory; it was not a proper record, not signed and no decisions were taken; it was a broad statement of intent, exploring a range of possible scenarios with no specific plans. Level 4 will reach conclusions about the utility of the source in relation to the debate over German policy aims and the significance of the memorandum, which have raised much controversy among historians. Despite Hitler's wide-ranging speculation, this was the first time that his expansionist intentions had identified specific goals and considered possible time limits.

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

‘Hitler’s foreign policy up to 1939 was carefully planned and consistently carried out, making war in Europe inevitable.’

Assess the validity of this opinion.

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

The personality of Hitler dominates the debate: was his fanatical will the driving force behind a consistent programme of aggression, or was he weaker and less decisive, responding to events? There is a clear ideological dimension of Lebensraum, yet Hitler compromised ideology to suit the specific circumstances of events and diplomacy, and perhaps to maintain the momentum of the Nazi regime within Germany. For Taylor, Hitler was not in control of events, and his foreign policy was spur of the moment improvisation, with war resulting from the mistakes of others (Chamberlain etc.) and therefore clearly not inevitable. The interplay of factors and the combination of goals and opportunism are emphasised by Henig, Bell and others. Source C would help structure such an approach. The remilitarisation of the Rhineland in Source A can be assessed as the gamble which triggers Hitler’s foreign policy,

and this source could be used to comment on Hitler's ambitions in relation to his generals. Was the Hossbach Memorandum in Source B just Taylor's verdict of insignificant 'day dreaming' or an important step forward on the inevitable road to war? Candidates must obviously harness these themes to a detailed analysis of the main events of foreign policy up to the outbreak of war to assess planning, consistency and the inevitability of war.

Level 1 might just concentrate on the sources in response to the question, or provide a brief narrative summary of events. Answers at Level 2 might simply and broadly accept the proposition with little challenge, and with limited supporting evidence from sources, knowledge or reading. Such range should be evident by Level 3, and there should be signs of an attempt to broaden the argument, drawing on the views of specific historians, with some focus on all three aspects of the question, although this is likely to be unbalanced. Some explicit reference to the sources provided on the question paper must be evident for the award of Level 3 and above, and expect reference to all relevant sources for award at the highest levels. Candidates' knowledge is not just factual knowledge but also knowledge of the relevant ideas, issues, arguments in the debate and of differing interpretations, including reference to some of the specified texts. Level 4 will develop the debate, presenting a more balanced assessment of the three aspects with some effective integration of sources. Level 5 will include a full range of evidence, and a convincing analysis and evaluation.