



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

History

Alternative T

Units 2, 5 and 6

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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 undiscriminating 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 undiscriminating 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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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 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

June 2003**Alternative T: Liberal Democracies, c1787-c1939****AS Unit 2: The Emergence of Democracies, 1787-1832****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge
Explain the meaning of ‘universal suffrage’ in the context of opposition to the 1832 Reform Act. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Basic explanation of the term using the source – votes for everyone was opposed by opponents of reform. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the term and its significance in relation to the context – reasons for opposition to universal suffrage e.g. refers to the fear of an ignorant electorate, and this fear being used to dismiss any reform by ultra conservatives like Eldon; in fact was not part of the bill, but only a radical demand. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.
How useful is this source as an explanation of the reasons held by those opposed to reform? (7 marks)

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 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.

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Basic evaluation of the utility of the source either from own knowledge or based on provenance – Inglis was a member of the House of Commons and he is typical of the opposition found there. May make general comments about ‘bias’ or fail to link comments on content to the issue of utility. Paraphrase of the source is likely. **1-2**
- L2: Developed evaluation of utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue linking source, own knowledge and provenance. This represents only one reason for opposition, relating to a theoretical view of parliamentary representation. However, it is a clear defence based on virtual representation. **3-5**
- L3: Developed evaluation, drawing conclusions about utility/reliability based on strengths and weaknesses and judged against the context. May refer to the exaggeration in the first sentence and the evocative ‘incompetent’, to the self-interest of Inglis as a

member of the elite, to the misleading references to elections given the unreformed system. **6-7**

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

‘Opposition to reform 1830-1832 was driven by fear of radicalism’.
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, based on either 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 description, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* 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 source *and* 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* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands 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

L1 answers are likely to offer simply agreement/disagreement based on assertion, with vague references to fears of change/losing power perhaps based on the sources.

At L2 answers will be outlines that address the question, or narratives (of 1830/2). This is also the upper limit for answers that do not use the sources, or use the sources but not outside knowledge.

L3 answers should make some use of the sources and show greater accuracy, depth and range, though they may still only agree/disagree and they can lack weight. Fear of radicalism is evident in Source A with opposition to representative democracy (‘we represent not the

particular place for which we are returned'), whilst Source B fears further radical reform with devastating effects. The French Revolution and the violence witnessed in the riots of 1830-2, to Paine's influence, to the Birmingham Political Union etc could also be deployed as evidence.

L4 answers will consider other reasons for opposition as well, though full balance is not required. Source A objects to the slur on the House of Commons's reputation, though there is also a fear of the empire suffering. Source B is generally conservative, with the fear that society will be unhinged, the Monarchy untenable and the constitution unworkable. Source C opposes change on the grounds of practicality – the government will not be strengthened by allowing the ignorant to vote. Furthermore, there may be reference to vested interests, of placemen, rotten and pocket boroughs, landowners fearing industrial interests being promoted, the fear of opening a door impossible to close etc.

At L5 a sustained case should also feature judgement – identification of the theoretical reasons, the practical reasons and the reasons generated by self-interest would represent such judgement, though this is not prescriptive.

Question 2

- (a) Comment on 'ratification of the Constitution' in the context of the USA in the years 1787-1789. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based either on the source or own knowledge – individual states voting to accept the constitution as agreed at the Philadelphia Convention. May paraphrase the source to comment on opposition to the powers of central government. 1
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge – required nine states to vote in favour for the US to be formed. Campaigns by Federalists and anti-Federalists, towns versus back country farmers, Madison versus Henry etc. 2-3

- (b) Explain why some Americans such as Patrick Henry objected to the proposed constitution. (7 marks)

Target :AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements – loss of power for individual states. No need for change. May paraphrase the source to consider opposition from New York and Virginia, or from farmers. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material – the Convention was not called to create a unified state, fear of centrality imposed laws, of taxes raised in the back country being spent on Federal offices, lack of face to face accountability, fear of new tyranny to replace George III's, no sense of being American, concerns over individual rights being ignored. 3-5

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation. Drawing distinctions between practical and theoretical reasons would indicate top of the level understanding, though this is not the only route to full marks. **6-7**

(c) In relation to other factors, how important was solving the practical problems of 1787 for the ‘founding fathers’ when they wrote the US Constitution? *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by 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 or 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

The question suggests one motive that explains the terms of the US Constitution, though a balanced answer (L4+) would need to consider the influence that principle played: individual rights and the need for a government of the people.

L1: assertions relating to need for strong government.

L2: explicit understanding of the question, but focuses on simplistic arguments relating to the lack of voting rights for blacks and women that show lack of concern for principles, or on the great compromise as a workable model for governance, or a narrative of the constitution with basic links.

L3: sustained analysis with reference either to the practical aspects of the constitutions or to the failure to consider freedom and rights, which illustrates practical considerations were

more important. *Practical* considerations could include the need to compromise between big and small states, solved with the bicameral legislature, the calculation of population solved with the 3/5ths compromise, the protection of property with, the property qualification to vote, gender, colour and age bars, Senators appointed by state legislators meaning indirect election at best but more positively stability, President had to be over thirty-five and American. Lack of *freedom* and rights is evidenced by the need for the 1791 Bill of Rights to guarantee freedom, limit to state power, Congresses right to impose direct taxation on the states; the social background of the 55 delegates could also be addressed. Alternatively principles might be discussed rather than practicality.

At L4 balance would be provided by considering some evidence that the founding fathers did consider principles – the Constitution did feature elements of liberalism (no religious tests of office) and especially, democracy: House of Representatives elected by the people every two years, number of representatives is in direct relation to the size of each state’s population, local state government remained, some separation of powers, e.g. the President could not be part of Congress, both Houses had to approve a bill for it to become law, no monarchy or elected positions. Judgement is not necessary, nor is equal treatment of case for and against the statement.

At L5 a coherent, sustained and balanced answer will also reach a judgement – that the purpose was to provide strong government and prevent anarchy that might threatened property, but this aside freedom and popular participation where to be created wherever possible. The fact that property was restricted to landowners, but that land was plentiful and available to all might be used to illustrate this compromise.

Question 3

- (a) Comment on the ‘separation of powers’ in the context of the reforms of the French Revolution in the years 1789-1792. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial explanation of the issue based either on the source or own knowledge – division of different aspects of government to prevent tyranny, introduced by the revolution; source could be used to suggest it guaranteed individual rights. 1
- L2: Developed explanation demonstrating understanding of the issue based on both the source and own knowledge – reference to the King as executive, the power of the Legislative Assembly, the insistence that judicial power could not be employed by the legislative or the King, with some reference to the Civil Constitution. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the terms of the ‘Declaration of the Rights of Man’ of 1789 were considered to be radical? (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1., AO2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements – it set out rights and freedoms and gave power to all. May paraphrase the source with reference to equality and guaranteed rights. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors through relevant and appropriately selected material – the insistence on constitutional government, the rights of voting, religious and political freedom, freedom from arbitrary arrest, the end to the Feudal regime etc. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors, and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions in order to provide an explanation. Clear links between the nature of radicalism and why the Declaration reflected radical thinking. **6-7**
- (c) How important were ideas, in relation to other factors, in the reforms of the French Revolution? **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by 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 or 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

The question directs candidates towards one motive – the ideas of the revolution. These might be expressed as liberalism and democracy, or equality, liberty, fraternity. Reference to Montesquieu etc might be seen. However, for balance and L4+ some reference to practical consideration is necessary.

L1: assertions relating to the significance of equality, with generalised comments on the enfranchisement of the people or may paraphrase the source.

L2: explicit understanding of the question, but focuses on simplistic arguments, lacking evidence. Other answers may describe reforms with basic links to the questions, or little discrimination between different reforms and their relevance.

L3: sustained analysis with reference to the reforms governed by principle or an argument that practical consideration applied. Reforms guided by principle could include the unicameral legislature, elected for two years to prevent tyranny, separation of powers, control of the King, the abolition of the monarchy, secular and rational of the illogical church the abolition of privileges in terms of Feudalism, hereditary titles, Parlements, along with religious toleration. Some direct link between ideas and the reforms should be seen.

At L4 balance would be provided by considering evidence that there were some practical concerns that resulted in restrictions on freedom – privileges were maintained in the short term by the abolition of feudalism with compensation, indirect elections and a limited franchise (by age, occupancy, occupation and level of tax paid. Membership of the National Assembly was restricted to those who paid the equivalent of fifty days labour in taxes). Reference to other motives – need for stable government, response to the ‘grand peur’, abolition of the monarchy driven by King’s actions in 1792, etc, are also likely. Equal treatment of both arguments is not needed, nor is judgement. Mainly consistent direct linkage between reforms and the specific idea should be seen.

At L5 a coherent, sustained and balanced answer will also reach a judgement – principles of equality, freedom and logic were applied, but some reforms were driven by specific circumstances.

June 2003

Alternative T: Liberal Democracies, c1787-c1939**A2 Unit 5: The Development of Democracies****Question 1**

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

To what extent do these sources agree on the reasons for the decline of the Liberal Party?
(10 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

At L1, Source A argues it was the result of the Liberals' failure in an era of class politics, B that decline was due to the war, or B argues decline was due to the war, A argues the war did indeed accelerate decline. For L2, own knowledge could be deployed to illustrate the Liberals' weakness following the 1867 and (especially) the 1884 RA, coupled with the growth of the Labour Party backed by Trade Unions. Own knowledge could be used to expand on B and the problems the war caused, culminating in the split of the Liberal Party in 1916. At L3, both sources agree the war had a role to play in the decline of the Liberals, but A argues it aided a process made inevitable by class based politics in an era of mass democracy, with the need to respond to a w/c electorate who inevitably preferred their own Labour Party, whilst B argues that the key was the war, given the ideological weakness of liberalism regarding the demands of a total war. Judgement at L4 might include comments to the effect that A rejects the notion that the division between Lloyd George and Asquith was significant, whereas B refers to him as a 'symbol of procrastination' to the 'men of action' – by implication, Lloyd George.

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

To what extent was the decline of the Liberal Party due to the growth of democracy in Britain, 1867-1918, rather than to developments during the First World War?

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Indicative content

The question directs candidates towards two synoptic factors, the growth of democracy and the impact of the First World War, requiring them to reach a judgement on short-term versus long-term causes. The question is synoptic and candidates should be rewarded for the range of factors they discuss. There could be reference to the Dangerfield thesis in contrast to Clarke in C, but such an answers would still have to make use of all the sources for the higher levels (3+).

Democracy – The 1884 RA has increased the suffrage to c.60% of the population and led to the establishment of the ILP to represent the newly enfranchised w/c. Reference to Taff-Vale, the Osbourne Judgement, the limits to social reform (e.g. pensions only over 70 with means tests etc) could appear as evidence that class based politics meant the Liberal party was obsolete. Source A should be used to support this view.

Against this, Source C can be used to argue that the Liberal decline was not inevitable – Clarke points to the time lag between class politics and the Liberal decline, and reference to

the future of progressivism should be picked up, considering the social reforms, the 1909 budget, the rhetoric of Lloyd George etc. This should be linked to the Liberals success in three elections in a row, to Labour's loss of by-elections to the Liberals etc.

The role of the war is stressed by Source B, with the problems liberalism faced and the devastating split in the party being crucial. Source A also accepts that this accelerated the process. Reference to the fratricide and the 'Coupon Election' should feature, as should the fact that the Liberals abandoned single party government in 1916.

At L1 answers will be generalised, asserting that the war brought down the Liberals, or that they were in crisis in 1914. General narratives of the Liberal governments 1906-1914 might feature. At L2 answers will make use of Source B and possibly A to support statements about the role of war, or A to argue it was not important. Answers that use sources and own knowledge will be narratives of the period. At L3 a candidate should demonstrate implicit judgement by considering both factors explicitly. All three sources should be used. At L4 there should be explicit judgement, challenging one or both factors suggested, using C to challenge Source A on class politics, or using outside knowledge of the problems the Liberals were facing in 1914 (industrial unrest, Ireland, women suffrage) to argue the war was not the cause, merely the final straw. Such judgement may only be in the form of a conclusion. At L5 there should be explicit judgement throughout the answer, with a clear critique of one or both of the factors. Judgement that the war aided Liberal decline because it intensified class politics (because of the legitimisation of government intervention in industry, e.g. nationalisation of coal) and created a majority working-class electorate for the first time with the 1918 Representation of the People Act would be evidence of L5 understanding, assuming appropriate selection.

Essay questions (onwards)

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the generic A2 Levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in each 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

Answers 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 almost to 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

To what extent was it the North's desire to maintain the Union, rather than its desire to destroy slavery, that explains the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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 question directs candidates towards the debate about the causes of the Civil War.

At L1 answers will be generalised, perhaps stating the North was against slavery, but the South relied on it for their wealth and that this was why the South tried to secede. A narrative approach would be generalised and inaccurate. At L2 answers would be detailed narratives of events, or answers that considered only the role of slavery or the desire to maintain the Union. Such answers would lack balance. Answers covering both factors, but without weight would also be in this level due to their reliance on assertion. An answer showing balance for L3 must consider the relevance of the North's desire to maintain the union, as well as the desire to destroy slavery. However, implicit judgement at this level may consist of no more than awareness of the two different motives. The problems caused by slavery in the period from 1847 (Calhoun doctrine) through to 1861 should be covered, with reference

likely to be made to the 1850 compromise, the Kansas-Nabraska Bill, John Brown's attack on Harper's Ferry in 1859, the election of Lincoln in 1860 etc. The North's position would also be discussed, with reference to their view that secession meant anarchy and their decision to defend federal property. Partial judgement at L4 would be indicated by some form of comparison of the relevant importance of these two factors, though this need only be by offering evidence that slavery was also significant/that the North's desire to preserve the union was in ways not. Explicit reference to the question, whilst comparing the factor, is only necessary in the conclusion. At L5 the judgement should be explicit, demonstrated by frequent comparison and evaluation of the two factors, rather than just in the conclusion. It might take the form of arguing that Lincoln himself thought it might be a hundred years before slavery died and he could not do anything in 1860 to directly threaten slavery – the South did not have to secede to defend slavery, but the North had to act to protect the Union. Alternatively, it might focus on the use of the issue of slavery to gain support with the Emancipation Proclamation, though pointing out that this occurred in 1862, after the war began. Alternatively it might be argued that the two factors are inseparable, given the events of the period 1847-1861 culminated in the South seeing withdrawal from the union as the only option in the fact of the North's desire to eventually abolish slavery by one means or another, and the fear that popular sovereignty would act against the interests of the South.

Question 3

To what extent did the interference of federal government in society and the economy benefit American citizens in the years, 1840-1890? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Candidates are asked to consider benefits and costs to American citizens as a result of state intervention, with the synoptic element provided by the focus on social and economic measures. Recognition of the different definitions of benefit depending on different groups within society would suggest high level conceptual understanding (L4/5), assuming relevant selection, weight and balance.

At L1 answers would be generalisations based on material that is marginally relevant – Civil War etc. At L2 narratives of the period will appear, or analysis with some focus, but limited in weight and balance – perhaps focusing on black civil rights, or westwards expansion. At L3 specific focus on social and economic intervention is required, though judgement might be partial in the form of asserting benefits with little reference to costs. Social intervention may include use of material on civil rights for Black Americans as a result of the 13th, 14th, 7th, 15th amendments, the encouragement to move west provided by the Homestead Act and Morrill Land Acts, but also to the creation of national parks. Economic intervention may include reference to black Americans' right to hold property, but also to government subsidy for stagecoach routes and legislation to prevent private monopolies (1877 Interstate

Commerce Act and the 1890 Sherman Anti-Trust Act). At L4 there will be material on cost/benefit on social and economic intervention, though judgement may be only present in a conclusion that should compare the two synoptic elements. Costs may include reference to intervention at the expense of native Americans, or the intervention by federal government after 1877 that limited Black American rights. At L5 there will be explicit judgement demonstrated by assessing relative benefits throughout the answer. Awareness of the different costs/benefits of different sections of society would be judgement for this level, as would reference to the lack of desire for government intervention in the land of economic liberalism, or the failure of federal government to ‘benefit’ citizens when state government existed to ‘defend’ them from such benefits.

Question 4

How far was the United States of 1890 a liberal and a democratic country? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

L1 answers will be limited to generalisations about rights and freedoms and the system of election, perhaps based on knowledge from the AS module, relating to the US Constitution as written in 1787. L2 answers which are narratives will probably focus on describing the position of African-Americans; the role of slavery in causing the civil war, the reconstruction period and the backlash after 1877. Analytical answers may consider the same material but with clear reference to democracy and individual rights. However, such answers would lack weight unless they looked beyond the position of African-Americans. Equally answers that assess only one of the two factors would also be limited, in this case by their lack of balance. At L3 there will be assessment of both liberalism and democracy. Judgement may consist of nothing more than arguing by the selection of material that there were democratic/liberal and/or undemocratic/illiberal features of the US. Reference might be seen to the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments relating to the abolition of slavery and equal rights for African-Americans (liberal), but also to the treatment of American Indians – reservations, destruction of bison, Americanisation and the cultural imperialism it implied, culminating in the Battle of Wounded Knee. The effect of immigration on the dominant WASP population and the Mormons’ movement to Utah are also examples of illiberalism. US democracy could be discussed with reference to: the impact of public opinion on officials – resignation of Richardson (1874), Belknap (1876), the new constitutions for Southern states during reconstruction, the attempts by federal government to control big business when it acted undemocratically (1877 Interstate Commerce Act and the 1890 Sherman Anti-Trust Act), civil service reform (Pendleton CS Act, 1883). The lack of democracy could be addressed by reference to the franchise and African Americans (intimidation of Negro voters in the south, poll tax and the ‘grandfather clause’, exclusion from votes in Democratic primaries, literacy tests in 1880s, to the continued exclusion of women from voting), but also to the powers of patronage that culminated in the formation of the Civil Service Reform League in 1881, the power of big business, and the use of the veto 413 times by Cleveland. At L4 there will be judgement as to how the US had changed 1840-1890 and to the extent of lib/dem in 1890, though this may only be by considering all four elements above, and some assessment in a

conclusion. At L5 judgement will involve direct comparison of 1840 with 1890, with the judgement being explicit throughout the answer. It might take the form of assessing the extent of change across the period, or of the difference between theoretical rights and the practice. There might also be reference to ‘economic’ liberalism and the ‘rugged individualism’ at the heart of the conception of the US – the Mormons fleeing to Utah because their communal way of life was in contrast to this individualism.

Question 5

“It was the strength of Republicanism rather than the failures of Louis-Philippe that led to the fall of the Orleanist Monarchy.”

How far do you agree with this verdict on the causes of the 1848 revolution in France? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

Answers will consider the strengths of Republicanism in 1848 and evaluate their relative significance compared to Louis-Philippe’s policies. L1 answers will describe the Orleanist monarchy in general terms with no reference to its collapse, or generalise as to reasons for collapse – no-one like L-P, desire for representative government. At L2 answers might focus on the strengths of republicanism, but will not link these to the fall of the monarchy. Reference to the L-P’s failures might appear as part of a narrative. Answers that analyse either of the factors but not both will lack balance for L3. At L3 answers will explicitly identify the strengths of republicanism (part of the French political culture, believe amongst the disenfranchised social elite that only republicanism would give them democratic rights, believe that only republicanism could solve economic problems) and the failures of L-P (personality defeats – did not add to the image of Kingship, unsuccessful foreign policy, lack of progressive/any domestic policy in the face of economic and social change). However, judgement will be implicit, being no more than an agreement that there were strengths of republicanism/failures of L-P. At L4+ alternative arguments might be put forward – that L-P’s personality was the key, or that the fall was inevitable given the weaknesses of L-P (lack of legitimacy/divine right, the fact he was merely a compromise in 1830) once there was any reason for complaint. Judgement at L4 might take this form, or simply evaluating the relative merits of the two key factors, though perhaps only in a conclusion. Some reference to 1848 specifically should be seen. Judgement at L5 would be provided by explicit reference to the relative importance throughout the answer, perhaps by looking at the inter-relation of the two factors – that republicanism was strong in France, but it needed to be spurred on by the refusal of L-P to govern in the interests of the ‘people’. Judgement might also be demonstrated by arguing that L-P had lost support, but that did not mean a Republic was the aim of all reformers, rather that at the critical point in 1848 Republicanism hi-jacked the reformist agenda. It might also be argued that the key was the National Guard’s refusal to back L-P, which caused him to lose his nerve and fail to send in the army. None of these lines of argument are of course prescriptive.

Question 6

To what extent did the interference of governments in society and the economy benefit French citizens in the years 1871-1905? *(20 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Candidates are asked to consider benefits and costs to French citizens as a result of state intervention, with the synoptic element provided by the focus in social and economic measures. Recognition of the different definitions of benefit depending on different groups within society would suggest high-level conceptual understanding (L4/5), assuming relevant selection, weight and balance.

At L1 answers would be generalisations based on material that is marginally relevant – Dreyfus, Boulanger, Panama etc. At L2 narratives of the period will appear, or analysis with some focus, but limited in weight and balance – perhaps focusing on church-state relations. At L3 specific focus on social and economic intervention is required, though judgement might be partial in the form of asserting benefit based on no costs being identified. Social intervention may include use of material on the church and Dreyfus – removing education from the hands of the church, to the benefit of non-Catholics, though to the detriment of RC, Waldeck-Rousseau insisting Dreyfus should be retried and the pardoning of Dreyfus – though also reference to the limited social legislation e.g. divorce laws. Economic intervention may include use of material on ‘crisis’ – e.g. the approval of Lessep’s lottery loan in 1888, which meant more citizens suffered in 1889 when the Panama Company went bankrupt – as well as the limited economic legislation, e.g. 1892 Labour Law cutting women’s working hours, Meline’s tariff law, Milerand’s labour laws (social insurance, minimum wages, 8 hour day for postal workers, maximum working hours set in 1900 and 1904 etc). At L4 there will be material on cost/benefit of social and economic intervention, though judgement may be only present in a conclusion that should compare the two synoptic elements. Catholics lost from the separation of state and church, women did not benefit from the 1892 law as it was not implemented, attempts to introduce income tax by Bourgeois were defeated by the Senate. At L5 there will be explicit judgement demonstrated by assessing relative benefits throughout the answer. Awareness of the different costs/benefits of different sections of society would be judgement for this level (e.g. industrial workers paid high prices for bread, but Meline’s tariffs protected agricultural and industrial producers) as would alternative perspectives (it could be argued the 1905 separation benefited the Catholic church as those priests who now entered poorly paid service were dedicated, raising the image of the church). Equally, reference to the inherent conservatism of the majority and the rejection of interventionism by even radicals on the left meant there was little demand for action, little action and little benefit, but at no cost, would be high level judgement.

Question 7

“Boulangier was a greater threat to the authority of the Third Republic and the unity of society than the Dreyfus affair.”

How far do you agree with this verdict?

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Candidates need to consider the relative threats of Boulangier and Dreyfus, in relation to both the authority of the Republic and the unity of society. Answers which fail to make the distinction between authority and unity would show only implicit judgement and would be limited to Level 3.

Boulangier was a greater threat to authority than unity. His army reforms won over the army and much of society, he appeared to be capable of standing up to Germany and Bismarck, in general he was admired by all society, rather than being loved and feared respectively by different sectional groups (unity). However, Republican politicians who had first sponsored him by making him Minister for War were threatened. They feared war with Germany, or a coup similar to Louis Napoleon's. His success in 6/7 by-elections in 1888 seemed to be the precursor to action (authority). However, ultimately, Boulangier did not challenge authority, carrying out his orders, lacking the convictions to want power for anything other than its own sake. His acceptance of his dismissal and flight to Belgium cost him support. **The Dreyfus Affair** was a threat both to the authority and the unity of France. Initially, authority was not challenged – the conservative elite was united against an outsider. But as evidence emerged that challenged the guilt of Dreyfus, Zola had to be tried, Dreyfus was retried and the government fell. Dreyfus was ultimately pardoned and found not guilty, but the uneasy truce between anti-democrats and republicans was broken. Society was clearly divided after Zola's 'J'accuse' between liberal/socialist republicans and conservatives/church/anti-semites, divisions that undermined the Republic to the war and beyond.

At L1 basic narrative of the two affairs could appear or detailed narratives about one or the other case, but not both, or assertions about Dreyfus dividing society more than Boulangier. L2 answers that only assess one of the two cases, or simply focus on authority or society would lack weight and balance as L2. Detailed narratives could also appear, though they should cover both cases for L2. L3 answers should try to assess the greater threat, though this may only be implicitly by stating problems both caused before asserting/arguing, typically, that Dreyfus was more of a threat than Boulangier. There may be no distinction between the two synoptic factors, authority and unity. At L4 both synoptic factors should be covered, and there should be explicit judgement, though this may be in the form of a conclusion following sections on each case and each factor. At L5 judgement should be explicit throughout the answer, judging evidence for and against the proposition, with clear evaluation of both unity and authority. One possible argument might be that Boulangier's great support from all groups disappeared just as quickly, though he did appear to threaten the very existence of the Republic, whereas the Republic changed government and preserved authority during the Dreyfus case, but divisions opened that existed forty years later.

June 2003

Alternative T: Liberal Democracies, c1787-c1939

A2 Unit 6: Great Britain and Appeasement in the 1930s

Question 1

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

How valid is the interpretation offered by Taylor of the motives of the British government during the Sudeten crisis? (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 evaluated the interpretation with reference to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. | 9-10 |

Indicative content

At Level 1 the extract argues that the government was driven primarily by the belief that Germany had a moral right to the Sudetenland, and they then justified this view by referring to military weakness. Level 2 answers should show greater understanding and interpretation, namely that Versailles was wrong in that it had placed 3 million Germans in Czech hands, contrary to the principle of NSD which had been applied to deprive Germany of territory. Own knowledge on the military position should also be seen – Baldwin’s fear of the bomber getting through, Chamberlain’s fears based on estimates of deaths from German bombing, the lack of Spitfires and Hurricanes in 1938, the Chief of Staff’s advice in 1938 that not by land, sea or air could Britain defend Czechoslovakia. The difference between Level 3 and Level 2 would be the evaluation of the interpretation. There may be questioning of whether public opinion (East Fulham, 1933 & Oxford, 1938 by-elections, Oxford Union debate, Peace Ballot etc) and economic factors (depression, unemployment, etc) were not as important. At Level 4 there would be understanding that morality was an issue for Chamberlain, but so was his fear of war and his concerns over Britain’s position. Judgement might be in identifying the primary reason, or that public opinion was manipulated by the government to support their policy, rather than policy reflecting public opinion, or that Taylor’s interpretation has limited validity as it was written before the release of material under the 30 years rule, though non of these specific examples of judgement is essential for Level 4.

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

With reference to the source and your own knowledge, how useful is this source for the historian studying British public opinion in 1939? (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 answers should show using the extract that the author favours action by the League of Nations in defence of states that are the victims of aggression, even if this means war. May refer to the examples of Republican Spain and Czechoslovakia. At Level 2, candidates should demonstrate some appreciation of the strengths and/or limitations of the source for measuring public opinion in the 1930s – that this is the ideological viewpoint of the left of British politics, who favoured action against the dictators as a result of the Spanish Civil War, or that this is not the view of the majority of the British population who were in favour of any measures to avoid war (support for Munich etc) and certainly cared little for Spain. At Level 3 answers may refer to the date as part of a balanced answer – this does reflect public opinion after the invasion of Prague when there was a mood of defiance and an acceptance that war would be necessary, because Hitler had to be stopped. May argue public opinion was not consistent during the 1939. Level 4 answers may make the point that the source focuses on principle, but that the British people feared war in early 1939 for practical reasons, and changed their mind after Prague because Hitler could not be trusted, not because the case of Poland was ‘just’. Other judgements are of course equally valid.

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

To what extent do you agree that the government’s decision to abandon appeasement in 1939 was a response to a change in British public opinion? (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

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

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

Indicative content

The question directs candidates to one factor, namely the role of public opinion. Reference to the support for Munich giving way to disillusionment after Hitler broke the guarantee, resulting in Chamberlain's Birmingham speech and the guarantees should be seen, though more sophisticated answers may point to the change after Krystallnacht, with the government candidate's defeat in the Bridgewater by-election. Source A could be used to illustrate how initial sympathy for Germany gave way to a determination to fight for 'moral' reasons. Source B stresses this moral position, with reference to 'shame' and 'Nazi terror'. Source C explicitly refers to the role of popular 'discontent' and criticism from the pro-government Observer.

However, to achieve balance at Level 3+ there should be some reference to other factors responsible for the changes. The improved economic situation, the rearmament programme, the diplomatic picture (specified text – Pearce and Stewart) and the change in the attitude of the cabinet and the Conservative Party (Source C) could all be used to suggest that public opinion was not the crucial factor. Furthermore, the government's manipulation of public opinion could be used to suggest it was not a key factor (specified text – Kennedy).

Level 1: General statements using either the sources or own knowledge. Analysis might focus on the role of public opinion, using Source C and examples from the early 1930s only.

Level 2: Answers will not grasp the central issue and instead will narrate events or perhaps produce prepared answers on the topic. Analysis will lack balance, covering public opinion only or other factors only. This is also the limit for answers that do not use the sources and own knowledge.

Level 3: Answers will consider public opinion and other factors and use some of the sources and own knowledge. Judgement may be implicit, consisting of no more than the

understanding that there were other factors. Reference to Dominion support, to positive noises from the USA, to radar, to increased aircraft production and assessments of Spitfire quality might feature.

Level 4: All the sources and own knowledge should be used for wide selection of material. A range of alternative factors should also be covered, though judgement might take the form of a conclusion which considers the relative importance of the different factors.

Level 5: As L4 plus consistent judgement running throughout the essay – this may take the form of explaining why public opinion has been over-exaggerated (lack of real pacifism – Hoare-Laval Pact, government manipulation, limited evidence e.g. government by-election holds in 1934 etc.) as well as assessing the relative importance of other factors.