



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative L Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – June series

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

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

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

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

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

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

June 2007

Alternative L: The United States, 1877–1991

AS Unit 1: United States' Foreign Policy, 1890–1991

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of 'unrestricted submarine warfare' (line 2) in the context of US foreign policy in the years 1914 to 1917. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. sinking of American ships. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the Lusitania was sunk and it was considered very important to public opinion, which in turn helped to push the US into World War I because the Germans called off submarine attacks for only a short space of time. **2-3**

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

Explain how the views expressed in **Source B** challenge those of **Source A** about the annexation of the Philippines in 1898. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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

- L1: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. can get trade and markets without conquering, against annexation in Source A but in Source B the President says America must not leave or give Philippines back to Spain. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. Source A is part of the debate at the end of the 1890s about expansion versus imperialism. Source B is from President McKinley who was a reluctant Imperialist but ultimately he did preside over some Imperialist moves in the Pacific. **3-5**
- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source A, e.g. the Imperialists won the argument because the Philippines was annexed and the US

acquired Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Therefore there is quite a lot of disagreement between the sources. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of US Presidents, in relation to other factors, in the rise of the USA as a world power in the years 1890 to 1920. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* sources. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

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

Indicative content

From Source A candidates should understand that trade and markets were very important to the rise in power of the USA. This is a separate factor. From Source B candidates should be able to understand the influence of President McKinley in not allowing self government in places like the Philippines and so are powerful enough to control other smaller nations. Also the importance of trade is here and rivalry with Europe. From Source C candidates should be able to understand that President Wilson saw himself and the US as the guardian of the Western hemisphere and hence very powerful. Candidates will need to go beyond the sources with knowledge of their own connected to the rise in Imperialism and Expansionism. The role of the Presidents must be considered. The information in the sources can be supported with further consideration of Taft and Roosevelt. For example, political diplomacy and downright interference under President Teddy Roosevelt is a consideration in the rise of the USA as a world power.

Other factors to consider include:

The use of force and the rise of the US Navy as a weapon may be mentioned as a factor at the end of the nineteenth century; end of the frontier as a factor; social Darwinism as a factor; religion as a factor because it is used as an excuse to annex; hence a variety of reasons can be evidenced by reference to some key events such as the annexation of Hawaii which begins in the early 1890s. Cuban war against the Spanish meant taking over Cuba and the importance of this and Hawaii for sugar is an important issue; the development of the Panama Canal was important, i.e. strategic factor and this can be linked to trade; the Mexican issue in 1916 and the use of threats and force; entry into World War I and events at the end of the War including the role of the USA in the signing of the Versailles Treaty and the attempt to set up the League of Nations; the strength of the US economy compared to war torn Europe.

Candidates will need to assess what was the most important; there is no hard and fast rule as to which event or issue was the defining one but the role of the President is very important but so were beliefs of superiority and the use of the navy as a way of becoming a global power were important. Trade is also a major reason and especially after World War One.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Lend Lease' (line 3) in the context of US foreign policy in the years 1939 to 1941. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. aid to Europe at the beginning of World War II. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. it was the lending of goods, especially to Britain such as aircraft, which would be returned at the end of the war or would be paid for, i.e. not loans. It allowed the USA to stay out of the war and not violate their neutral stance. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why President Roosevelt signed a series of Neutrality Acts in the 1930s.(7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to try to stop the USA favouring one side or the other. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the first neutrality act stopped shipments of arms and hence stopped any form of military involvement in what was happening in Europe. Economic reasons dominate Roosevelt's thinking on the second and third acts because he stops loans and he makes conditions for trade with the USA. **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. range of reasons are economic/political which ensure neutrality and that Roosevelt cannot be accused of taking the USA into another war. **6-7**

- (c) 'President Roosevelt's decision to take the USA into the Second World War in December 1941 was the most important turning point in US foreign policy in the years 1921 to 1945.'
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

Answers are expected to cover a range of turning points in the years 1921 to 1945. The decision by Roosevelt to go to War is very important because it is a major change to isolationism and this will need to be explained. It marks the active participation of the USA in another world war. However, some may argue that the signing of the Atlantic Charter earlier in 1941 was a turning point because Roosevelt sides with the allies. It is important that a balanced approach is taken and that other turning points are discussed. The decision not to participate in the League of Nations is a major turning point of the 1920s because it is at the root of isolationism which persists as official foreign policy through the 1920s and 1930s. The USA turned away from active involvement in Europe although it does keep involvements in South America. Some candidates may say it is less important because trade carried on and debate how isolationist the USA really was. Another major turning point is the decision in 1945 to make the USA into a nuclear power which effectively ends the Second World War and also puts the USA on a collision course with Eastern Europe. Candidates may make a case for any turning point as being the most important and credit needs to go on how well this is argued and entry into the Second World War is likely to be very popular.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Star Wars' in the context of US foreign policy in the years 1983 to 1985. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Strategic Defence Initiative which was using satellite technology. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. development of global fighting capabilities against the Soviets using the latest satellite technology. This is linked to Reagan's macho views and aggressive foreign policy against the Soviet Union when he comes into office. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why there was a debate in the USA over military spending in the years 1985 to 1991. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. it was expensive to spend so much money on weapons and/or military technology. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the hawks saw the USA as under threat from the Soviet Union and wanted to beat them into submission using the power of the dollar by excessive spending. Others argued that the Soviet Union was not a threat because their economy could not keep pace. Also it was far too expensive and unnecessary. Events such as Afghanistan meant some saw this as aggressive and threatening. After the Berlin wall comes down some argue that there was no more threat. **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. most importantly, the cost of the weapons/technology/research and development is crucial and world events which involve the Soviet Union and the USA in Asia. **6-7**

- (c) 'In the years 1945 to 1991, relations between the Soviet Union and the USA grew steadily worse.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: **Either**
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Answers are expected to cover a range of issues that affected the relationship between the Soviet Union and the USA. They have grown steadily worse in different time spans, e.g. over events in Berlin during the period after 1945. Also, the threat of the nuclear bomb and the joining of creation of NATO meant a significant deterioration in relations. The nuclear bomb is a very significant moment because it left the Soviets vulnerable. However, even when the Soviets tested their own nuclear bomb there was not a thaw in relations under Stalin. They got very cold over events in Korea since the USA was acting with the UN. Relations worsened over Cuba, and especially over the missile crisis and Soviet support for Cuba in the American back yard. Vietnam represented another worsening of relations. The invasion of Afghanistan was another low point and Soviet intentions in the Middle East were also a worsening of relations. On the other hand, there have been moments where they got better, such as détente with JFK and later Nixon, when talks were held and relations did not worsen but got slightly better. This is open to interpretation as to how much better. They worsened again under Reagan because of his personality but ultimately got better with Gorbachev. Then much more of a thaw when the Berlin Wall came down and of course the development of Glasnost. Therefore at the end of the period there is not a worsening at all and hence did not grow steadily worse.