



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative J Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 2008 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 2008

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848–c1956

AS Unit 1: The Origins and Consolidation of Totalitarian Regimes, 1918–1939

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the significance of 'Left Opposition' (line 1) in the context of Stalin's struggle for power in the years 1924 to 1927. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. the Bolsheviks from the left side of the Party who resisted Stalin's policies/bid to become sole leader. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the opposition from the left of the Party especially Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev with possible reference to policy, e.g. Permanent Revolution v Socialism in One Country, NEP. Source reference might include 'socialism, 'well-known' or 'bourgeois intellectuals'. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Source A** and **either Source B or Source C**, and your own knowledge.

Explain how Stalin's attitude to opposition expressed in **Source A** differs from the attitude to opposition expressed in **either Source B or Source C**. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source A refers to 'isolate the Left Opposition', Source B to 'Weimar parties', Source C to 'those who criticised Fascism'. **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. Source A will not tolerate political opposition: 'renounce their anti-Bolshevik view'; while Sources B and C are less intolerant – Source B: is positive, apparently inclusive 'we in the new government' and Source C: 'coalition government'. Source A has a strong ideological, class-based, theme to opposition 'bourgeois intellectuals' while Sources B and C refer to other political parties – Source B: 'Communists' and Source C political 'enemies'. **3-5**

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. Source A is rooted in Bolshevik ideology and stresses the workers while Sources B and Source C are based in nationalist, anti-democratic ideology. Source A is clear about its political purpose – Stalin plans to establish his personal dictatorship by removing opponents from the Left while Hitler and Mussolini are hiding the true nature of their ambitions as they are still building a one-party state; Source B – ‘the government will carry out the following plan’, and Source C – ‘I thank all those who have worked with me’. Some very good answers may well balance the differences with a similarity, e.g. all the sources refer to will/power. **6-7**

(c) Use **Source A** and **either Source B or Source C**, and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of the promise of progress, in relation to other factors, in explaining the coming to power of dictators.

You should refer in your answer to the USSR in the years 1924 to 1929 and **either** Germany in the years 1928 to 1933 **or** Italy in the years 1918 to 1922. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

L2: ***Either***

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

Or

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

Or

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

From the sources: for example, all sources have material on each man's promise of progress. Source A uses phrases, e.g. 'progressing towards socialism' and, by implication, that the Party has progressed towards 'dictatorship of the proletariat' with successful 'economics and politics'. In Source B, phrases for example, 'progress in developing political and racial unity' also offering economic recovery and action against the 'Communists'. Source C refers to 'force for national development and progress', and that he will 'renew the State'. This will need to be supplemented with own knowledge about the promise of progress within the time span of the question, e.g. Stalin's support for continuing Lenin's revolution; Hitler's promise of 'Brot und Arbeit'; Mussolini's pledge to restore national power and prestige.

The sources also indicate other reasons for the dictatorships coming to power. In Source A 'submit to the will of the Party' indicates willingness to use force. Source B also repeatedly states 'determined' and Source C refers to 'firm and decisive will'. Candidates may well contrast

the openly stated force in Source A with the implicit in Sources B and C, and link this to the contrasting political control of the dictators – the one-party state in the USSR with the surviving multi-party states in Germany and Italy.

Candidates will examine other factors to explain the coming to power. These might include:

- the importance of the personality and drive of the leader in building his own power base: the cult of the leader and Führerprinzip. Again, this may well be supplemented by reference to the sources.
- reference to the mistakes made by the other leading politicians: in the USSR, Trotsky and the rest of the Politburo; in Germany, Hindenburg and Papen; in Italy, the King, Giolitti and the Pope.
- economic conditions: in the USSR, the lack of progress under NEP; in Germany, the impact of the Depression after 1929; in Italy, the post-War economic crisis and the growth of socialism.
- the 'removal' of political opponents, e.g. in the USSR, the subsequent defeats of Bukharin and the right wing; in Germany, Hitler's actions against the KPD after the Reichstag fire; in Italy, d'Annunzio's mysterious fall from a balcony.
- the use of propaganda to push the interests of each emerging dictator. This may well be supplemented by reference to the sources.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of unconnected points about each dictator; there will be greater range and selection of factors at Level 2. Candidates who make no reference to the sources cannot score higher than Level 2. Level 3 answers will have greater accuracy, range and depth and will make some links to the 'importance' of the factors identified, although this will not necessarily be sustained or may lack depth of understanding. Level 4 will argue the case more strongly, possibly analysing the idea of 'promise of progress' in more detail and identifying different explanations for the rise of each man to dictatorship. Level 5 answers will engage in debate, cross-referencing sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the relationship between the promise of progress and other factors in the coming to power of two dictatorships.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'police terror' in the context of the Soviet Union in the 1930s. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the regime used police to enforce its authority. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Stalin conducted purges through the OGPU (to 1934), then the NKVD. The official organisation relied heavily on a network of spies and informers. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Stalin used terror against Party members from 1934. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Stalin used terror to control the way Party members thought and behaved with some

understanding that the terror escalated after Kirov's death in 1934 (given in Question 2(c)). **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. offers several reasons. Answers might give more specific detail to develop Level 1, e.g. terror removed Party members whose opinions differed from Stalin's, or people who Stalin perceived to be a threat to his power, e.g. Kirov, old Bolsheviks. Answers might explore terror against Party members at local level as well as central. This is valid given Stalin's signature on so many execution orders. **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. explains that terror against Party members became more frequent as the USSR faced greater challenges – threat to defence, lack of progress in industry/agriculture. **6-7**

- (c) 'Stalin had secured complete power in the USSR after Kirov's death in 1934.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to the years 1934 to 1939. (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

The assassination of Kirov removed Stalin's greatest rival in 1934. Before the assassination Stalin had purged small numbers but afterwards the scale of purges grew exponentially.

The answers need to show understanding of the extent of his control through terror after 1934:

- he had powerful state terror apparatus. He conducted the purges through the OGPU/NKVD, secret police that reached through Soviet society. The police removed real and perceived opposition to Stalin from all levels of society.
- the assassination of Kirov became an excuse for extended Party purges and introduction of severe laws against many political crimes.
- the public confessions of the three great show trials 1936–1938 reinforced the power of the regime (links to the role of propaganda in moulding new society).
- the enlargement of the gulags to include any opposition elements from society including writers and academics.

All the material on terror needs to be balanced with other methods used to build Stalin's complete power especially propaganda and indoctrination.

- the expansion of education and the Soviet youth movements were intended to mould youth into good Soviet citizens.
- propaganda promoted the new society, e.g. Stakhanov's achievements.
- the role of culture in promoting Stalin, e.g. Socialist Realism.

Answers need to question the extent of his power. Candidates might develop any of these considerations, or introduce their own balancing factors.

- the evidence that he had to conduct the purges suggests opposition persisted.
- his control was further extended in 1936 with the Constitution.
- the immense scale of the USSR made it very difficult to control the whole country
- results from the 5 Year Plans and collectives indicate limitations to Stalin's control.
- the actual State became weaker the more power was concentrated at the centre – it created an impossible bureaucratic structure.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on the extent of Stalin's power. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways that he did have complete power over the USSR after 1934 perhaps balancing the use of terror against other methods, and may also consider evidence that he did not have complete power. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and detailed, questioning the extent of Stalin's power. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on an understanding of the debate about how much power Stalin had in the USSR after 1934.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Führer' in the context of leadership in Germany after August 1934. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Hitler was the leader of the Nazi state not just leader of the Nazi party. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the death of Hindenburg gave Hitler the opportunity to pass Führer Law – so that he combined the roles of President and Chancellor. It was followed by the Army Oath in which Hitler again extended his power over Germany. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the *Führerprinzip* was so important to National Socialists in Germany. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. the idea that the leader would not be challenged. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Nazis thought their state was very hierarchical and that Hitler was at the peak of the structure. Hitler, to the Nazis, was the supreme power who could make decisions without being questioned. This structure was much stronger than the democratic Weimer Republic. 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. understands that the *Führerprinzip* was anti-democratic and based on a return to the German authoritarian past. 6-7

- (c) 'Hitler's dictatorship was complete in Germany after the death of Hindenburg in 1934.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to the years 1934 to 1939. (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

Candidates can approach the question from a variety of dates. Some might date his dictatorship from September 1934, after the death of Hindenburg and the introduction of Führer Law; while others may debate when, if ever, he had established a complete dictatorship. Any approach is valid if the purpose is to debate the extent of Hitler's dictatorship. Such a debate might be a route to a very high-level mark

Answers should identify actions taken by the end of 1934 to establish Hitler's dictatorship.

- destruction of democracy, e.g. Enabling Act.
- Gleichschaltung: action against all other political parties and Trade Unions; control of the legal system, civil service, churches, and media; removal of political opposition within the Nazi Party, e.g. SA and the Night of the Long Knives.
- the role of terror, e.g. the first concentration camps.
- the implications of Hindenburg's death and subsequent Army Oath.

Answers may examine how he extended his control over subsequent years to 1939

- the army: opposition from various Generals, e.g. Beck, the evidence of Hossbach, and taking the date to 1938, e.g. Fritsch and Blomberg
- the economy: the need to prioritise economic recovery, guns or butter crisis
- lack of control over policy towards Jews – boycott, Nuremberg Laws, Kristallnacht.

Answers also need to consider whether he did have a complete dictatorship.

- candidates may consider the problems of evidence when assessing the completeness of Hitler's control over Germany, e.g. passive opposition, church resistance, non-compliance with Nazi expectations.
- the conflict between Nazi and inherited government systems led to administrative chaos that arguably undermined Hitler's power (weak dictator argument).
- dependence on terror suggests power was not complete.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on evidence of completeness of Hitler's dictatorship. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways the dictatorship was complete, and will also examine how he did not have complete dictatorship. At this level, candidates may well be balancing their answer around 1934 or another date, possibly 1938. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad paying attention to the nature of Hitler's dictatorship. At this level, candidates will be making clear links between actions taken by Hitler/Nazis and their control over Germany. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on a conceptual understanding of the completeness of Hitler's dictatorship.

Question 4

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by '*Il Duce*' in the context of Italy after 1922. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the title taken by Mussolini as leader of Italy. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the title gave the sense that Mussolini was a great leader who would make no mistakes. It was part of the cult of the Duce. Mussolini came to believe in this image. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Mussolini created a single party state in Italy. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Mussolini wanted personal power so suppressed the opposition parties. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. offers several reasons. Answers might give more specific detail to develop Level 1, e.g. his policies were developed on an ad hoc basis. He saw the multi-party liberal state as weak and held it responsible for Italy's poor war performance and the mutilated victory. **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. Mussolini did not create a single party state until 1926 when the other parties were suppressed. For several years, he worked within the existing political system rather than destroying it. He wanted to create a personal dictatorship but could only remove rival parties once he had sufficient power. **6-7**

- (c) 'Mussolini's dictatorship in Italy was complete after the murder of Matteotti in 1924.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement with reference to the years 1924 to 1939. (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

The Matteotti affair was the turning point of Mussolini's regime. He used it to set up his personal dictatorship. Before the affair Mussolini had consolidated his position and moved towards authoritarianism, e.g. he was granted emergency powers, he created the Fascist Grand Council and a new Fascist militia (MSVN). He passed the Acerbo Law 1923 to strengthen his position over the other parties.

After the affair, he was able to move more decisively so securing greater executive powers, increasing terror, extending control over the judiciary and press, suppressing other parties etc.

Candidates might explore the nature of Mussolini's dictatorship. He had immense personal power. He relied on the ministry for Press and Propaganda to construct the cult of the leader presenting him as a role model for Italians, stressing his power and genius as a man of action and the saviour of Italy. In newspapers he was infallible 'Mussolini is always right'. Some historians have written that Italian Fascism was nothing more than Mussolinism. He was president of the Fascist Grand Council, Head of Government and headed many ministries.

Candidates should balance their answers with understanding about the limitations to Mussolini's, e.g. he was always answerable to the King and he had to consider the interests of the Catholic Church. The police and civil service remained non-Fascist organisations. The army owed loyalty to the King who refused to allow the army to use the Fascist salute.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may only generalise on the nature of Mussolini's dictatorship. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive of relevant examples. By Level 3, answers will identify particular ways that he was able to strengthen his dictatorship after the murder of Matteotti. By Level 4 the analysis will be balanced and broad; paying attention to the whole time period in the question (1922–1939), perhaps arguing that Mussolini's personal power was growing before 1924 but dictatorship was not complete until 1926–1927. Level 5 answers will draw conclusions soundly based on the precise and wide-ranging evidence presented, and on an understanding of the debate about when Mussolini secured his dictatorship. Some candidates, often good ones, might underpin their whole answer with a definition of dictatorship and/or Mussolini's personal power.