



# **General Certificate of Secondary Education**

## **History 3042/7** *Specification B*

### **Paper 2      Governments in Action in the First Half in the Twentieth Century**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2007 examination - June series*

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

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

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

### HISTORY SPECIFICATION B

---

#### A: *INTRODUCTION*

- **Consistency of Marking**

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a choice of specifications and a choice of options within them. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply this marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of all the other History specifications and options offered by the AQA.

- **The Assessment Objectives**

The revised specifications have addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages all candidates, but particularly the more able, to make judgements grounded in evidence and information. For this reason, assessment objective 6.1 (recall, select and deploy knowledge) underpins candidate attainment in the other two objectives, 6.2 and 6.3.

The schemes of marking for the revised specifications reflect these underlying principles.

- **Levels of Response Marking Schemes**

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. All candidates take a common examination paper – there is no tiering. Consequently, it is reasonable to expect to encounter the full range of attainment and this marking scheme has been designed to differentiate candidates' attainment by **outcome** and to reward **positively** what the candidates know, understand and can do.

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 and in deciding on a mark within that particular level.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. This mark scheme provides the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in a subject like History, which in part relies upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content.

---

**B: QUESTION TARGETS & LEVELS OF RESPONSE**

- **Question Targets**

The mark scheme for each question is prefaced by an assessment objective 'target'. This is an indication of the skill which it is expected candidates will use in answering the question and is directly based on the relevant assessment objectives. However, it does not mean that other answers which have merit will not be rewarded.

- **Identification of Levels of Response**

There are several ways in which any question can be answered – in a simple way by less able candidates and in more sophisticated ways by candidates of greater ability. In the marking scheme different types of answers will be identified and will be arranged in a series of levels of response.

Levels of response have been identified on the basis that the full range of candidates entered for the GCSE examination will be able to respond positively. Each 'level' therefore represents a stage in the development of the candidate's **quality of thinking**, and, as such, recognition by the assistant examiner of the relative differences between each level descriptor is of paramount importance.

- **Placing an answer within a Level**

When marking each part of each question, examiners must first place the answer in a particular level and then, and only then, decide on the actual mark within the level, which should be recorded in the margin. **The level of response attained should also be indicated at the end of each answer.** In most cases, it will be helpful to annotate the answer by noting in the margin where a particular level has been reached, e.g. Level 1 may have been reached on line 1, L3 on line 5 and L1 again on line 7. When the whole answer has been read and annotated in this way, the highest of the Levels **clearly attained** and **sustained** should be awarded. Remember that it is often possible to reach the highest level **without** going through the lower levels. Marks are **not cumulative** for any question. There should be no 'totting up' of points made which are then converted into marks. Examiners should feel free to comment on part of any answer if it explains why a particular level has been awarded rather than one lower or higher. Such comments can be of assistance when the script is looked at later in the awarding process.

If an answer seems to fit into two or more levels, award the higher or highest level.

- **What is a sustained response?**

By a **sustained response**, we mean that the candidate has **applied** the appropriate level of thought to the **particular issues** in the sub-question.

A response does not necessarily have to be sustained throughout the whole answer, but an answer in which merely a few words seem to show a fleeting recognition of historical complexity is not sufficient to attain a higher level.

In some cases, as you read an answer to a sub-question, it will be clear that particular levels have been reached at certain points in the answer. If so, remember

to identify them in the margin as you proceed. At the end of the sub-question, award the highest level that has been sustained.

In other cases you may reach the end of the sub-question without having been able to pinpoint a level. In such cases, simply record the level awarded at the end of the sub-question.

### **C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

A particular level of response may cover a range of marks. Therefore, 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 that level covers more than two marks. If the range covers an even number of marks, start at the higher mark, e.g. start at 3 in a 4-mark range, or at 2 in a 2-mark range. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment. The more positive the answers, 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. At all times, therefore, examiners should be prepared to use **the full range of marks** available for a particular level and for a particular question. Remember – mark **positively** at all times.

Move up or down from this mid-range mark by considering whether the answer is:

- precise in its use of supporting factual information.
- appropriately detailed.
- factually accurate.
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others.
- set in the historical context as appropriate to the question.
- displaying appropriate **written communication skills** (see Section D).

Note about Indicative Content.

The mark scheme provides **examples of historical content** (indicative content) which candidates may deploy in support of an answer within a particular level. Do bear in mind that these are **only examples**; exhaustive lists of content are not provided so examiners might expect some candidates to deploy alternative information to support their answers.

This indicative content must **not** however determine the level into which an answer is placed; **the candidate's level of critical thinking determines this**. Remember that the **number** of points made by a candidate may be taken into account only **after** a decision has been taken about the quality (level) of the response.

- **Some things to remember**

Mark positively at all times.

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from that lowest point.

This will depress marks for the question paper as a whole and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification or with those of other specifications.

Do **not** be afraid to award maximum marks within a level where it is possible to do so. Do not fail to give a maximum mark to an appropriate answer because you can think of something (or the marking scheme indicates something) that **might** be included but which is missing from the particular response.

Do **not** think in terms of a model answer to the question. Every question should be marked on its merits.

As a general rule, give credit for what is accurate, correct or valid.

Obviously, **errors can be given no credit** but, at the same time, the existence of an error should not prejudice you against the rest of what could be a perfectly valid answer.

It is important, therefore, to use the full range of marks where appropriate.

Do not use half marks.

**D: QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS**

There is no longer a separate mark to be awarded to the candidate for accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar. Instead, as outlined in Section C above, the candidate's quality of written communication skills will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark within a level of response the examiner will award an answer – particularly a more extended one. In reading an extended response the examiner should therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, i.e. is the answer:

- **presenting relevant information in a form that suits the purpose**
- **legible, with accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar**
- **in an appropriate style with a suitable structure?**

**E: SOME PRACTICAL POINTS**

- **Answers in note form**

Answers in note form to any question should be credited in so far as the candidate's meaning is communicated. You must not try to read things into what has been written.

---

- **Diagrams, etc**

Credit should be given for information provided by the candidates in diagrams, tables, maps etc., provided that it has not already been credited in another form.

- **Answers which run on to another sub-section**

If a candidate starts to answer the next sub-section in an earlier one, by simply running the answer on, give credit for that material in the appropriate sub-section.

- **Answers which do not fit the marking scheme**

Inevitably, some answers will not fit the marking scheme but may legitimately be seen as worthy of credit. Assess such answers in terms of the difficulty/sophistication of the thought involved. If it is believed that the “thought level” equates with one of the levels in the marking scheme, award it a corresponding mark.

Make sure you identify such cases with an A (for alternative) in your sub-total, e.g. as L2A/3. Also write a brief comment to explain why this alternative has been awarded.

If in doubt, **always** telephone your Team Leader for advice.

**F: THE PRE-STANDARDISING AND STANDARDISING MEETING**

- **The review of the mark scheme between the examination and standardising meeting**

After the examination but before the main Standardising Meeting, the Principal Examiner and the Team Leaders will have met to discuss the mark scheme in the light of candidates’ actual responses and re-draft where necessary. The re-draft of the mark scheme will be made available to Assistant Examiners at the Standardising Meeting. Through this *post-hoc review procedure* the marks will have been allocated in the expectation that candidates will achieve all the levels identified and no others. Adjustments will have been made to cater for candidates reaching higher levels than those provided for, to remove marks allocated to levels which candidates have not reached, or to enhance discrimination in cases where large numbers of candidates are bunched at the same level.

- **Prior Marking**

It is important that all examiners scrutinise at least 25 scripts before the main standardising meeting and note such things as: alternative interpretations of questions made by candidates; answers which do not fit into the mark scheme; levels which are not reached by the candidates; additional levels which have not been included in the mark scheme, etc. To familiarise themselves with a variety of responses, examiners should sample the range of questions, scripts from several centres and across the full range of ability in so far as practicable. Any preliminary marking **must** be completed in pencil and reviewed following the standardising meeting in the light of the revised mark scheme and advice given.

- **The Final Mark Scheme**

The final mark scheme will be decided at the standardising meeting after full discussion of both the mark scheme and the scripts selected by the Principal Examiner for marking at the standardising meeting. At all stages, care will be taken to ensure that all candidates are treated fairly and rewarded for their positive achievements on the paper.

- **Post Standardising Meeting**

After the examiners' standardising meeting, examiners may encounter answers which do not fit the agreed mark scheme but which are worthy of credit. These should be discussed with the Team Leader over the telephone. Such answers should be assessed in terms of the difficulty/sophistication of the thought involved. If it is believed that the "thought level" equates with one of the levels in the mark scheme, it must be awarded a corresponding mark, with a brief note provided on the script to explain why.



**Paper 2: Governments in Action in the First Half of the Twentieth Century**

**Section A**

**Question 1**

- (a) Explain what you can learn from **Source A** about the government of Russia just before the First World War. **5**

**Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)**

**Level 1: Answer that takes information from source** **1-2**

e.g. Tsar Nicholas II was an autocrat. (+ any other phrases taken straight from the source).

**Level 2: Answer contains basic understanding, and draws a simple inference** **3-4**

e.g. the Tsar made all the decisions; the Tsar controlled everything. The Russian people had little freedom (with examples).

**Level 3: Answer develops an understanding based on complex inference from the source** **5**

e.g. the Tsar made all the decisions at the national level, and in theory through censorship and the Okhrana he controlled everything, but at the local level the villages were run by local councils.

- (b) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source B** about the reasons why Tsar Nicholas II gave up his throne in February/March 1917? **10**  
 Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Comprehension of the source, accepting the interpretation at face value** **1-2**  
 e.g. yes, because the source explains how the Bolsheviks stirred up anger against the Tsar, helped by his military defeats.
- Level 2: Simple explanation/description of how the interpretation came about based on the attribution or content** **3-5**  
 e.g. no – because the source was published in the USSR during the Cold War and will therefore be biased.
- OR**  
**Simple explanation based on own knowledge**  
 e.g. no – because the Bolsheviks were very few in numbers and had little to do with the events of February/March 1917.
- Level 3: EITHER** **6-8**  
**Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author**  
 e.g. the source was published in the USSR during the Cold War. It would have been written to show that the Bolshevik party had had a major role in the events of 1917, and would therefore exaggerate the degree of support that the Bolsheviks enjoyed prior to the seizure of power. It was important during the Cold War era to emphasize in Soviet writings that the Bolsheviks directed all the events of 1917 because of their popularity, not because they had seized power.
- OR**  
**Analysis of the content of the source and using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation**  
 e.g. no, the interpretation is very selective in its choice of evidence, and exaggerates the extent to which the Bolsheviks directed events in early 1917. Lenin was in hiding in Switzerland, and the Bolsheviks were disorganised and few in number. The Tsar was forced to abdicate because of mutinies in the army and chaos in the streets of Petrograd caused by immense suffering from food and fuel shortages and hatred of what they believed to be the stupidities of the Tsar's government.
- Level 4: Combines both aspects of Level 3** **9-10**  
**(If both strands are attempted, with one at Level 3 standard, and the other at good Level 2 standard, give a low Level 4 mark of 9. If both strands are at Level 3, give 10 marks).**

- 
- (c) How does the content of **Sources C** and **D** differ? **6**
- Target: Comparison of sources to detect similarities and differences (AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Answer selects details from the sources to describe the content** **1-2**  
 e.g. Source C says that the working people of Russia have got control of their country. Source D says that the Bolsheviks have brought famine and war to Russia.
- OR**
- Answer focuses only on provenance**  
 e.g. Source C is from the viewpoint of the Reds; Source D is from the viewpoint of the Whites.
- Level 2: Answer provides details from sources to make simple comparisons** **3-5**  
 e.g. Source C emphasises the achievements of the Russian people in throwing off the rule of the Tsar, landlords and capitalists, and getting control themselves. Source D says that the Russian people have lost their freedom at the hands of the Bolsheviks who are causing famine and war.
- Level 3: Answer provides comparison of the sources and explains how they differ** **6**  
 e.g. in addition to Level 2, Source C is written by the Bolsheviks to praise the people for their achievements so far in getting control of their country. However, the Tsar, the landlords and the capitalists are working to get back this control. However, Source D, written by the Whites, is addressed directly to the workers and peasants to warn them of what the Bolsheviks were really like. The Whites promised to restore Russia to the status of the mighty country that it had been.

NB Answers which miss out the factual comparison needed for Level 2, but combine the complex thinking of Level 3 with the “OR” of Level 1 should be given an alternative Level 2 mark – probably L2A/4.

- 
- (d) How useful is **Source D** for studying the actions of the Bolsheviks in the Civil War, 1918-1921? **9**  
Use **Source D** and **your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**  
**Accepts the content of the source at face value**  
e.g. it is useful because it describes how the Reds were behaving.
- OR**  
**Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source**  
e.g. it is from a description written at the time, and so it is useful.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-5**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. the source is useful because it shows the violence of the Civil War and how the Bolsheviks were accused of acting dictatorially to remain in power. (Undeveloped argument based solely on content).
- OR**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source in terms of provenance or reliability or bias**  
e.g. the source is limited in use because it was written by the Whites to get the support of the workers and peasants against the Reds. (Undeveloped argument on purpose).  
e.g. The source is not useful because it is not reliable (followed by own knowledge which shows the biased nature of the content). (Argument based on reliability).
- (NB – Use 5<sup>th</sup> mark for answers that attempt several aspects -usefulness, limitations, own knowledge – but at undeveloped level)**
- Level 3: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using the source and/or own knowledge** **6-7**  
e.g. the source is useful because it shows how the Whites were willing to appeal to the peasants and workers right at the beginning of the Civil War (July 1918) before most of the atrocities had started. (Developed argument based on purpose).  
e.g. The source is useful for explaining how the Bolsheviks acted in the Civil War, even though they had given basic freedoms to the people in November 1917. They argued that they had to act like this in order to preserve the revolution. (Developed argument based on knowledge).
- Level 4: Develops arguments about the usefulness/ limitations of the source using the source AND own knowledge** **8-9**  
e.g. both of Level 3 exemplars.
-

- 
- (e) The Bolsheviks took power from the Provisional Government in October/November 1917. **15**  
**Use your own knowledge** to explain why the Bolsheviks succeeded in doing this.
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**  
**Simple, descriptive narrative of part of the topic**  
 e.g. the Bolsheviks stormed the Winter Palace and seized key places in Petrograd.
- OR**  
**Simple, generalised statements of causation**  
 e.g. most of the Russian people saw the Provisional Government as a failure, especially with continuing defeats in the world war.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**  
**Narrative implying analysis of causation**  
 e.g. description of some events in 1917 (e.g. Provisional Government continuing with the war, Kornilov revolt, Bolsheviks seizing of key places in Petrograd) with only minimal reference to why Bolsheviks were able to take over the government.
- OR**  
**Multicausal explanation which lacks development**  
 e.g. answer mentions reasons such as the growing unpopularity of the Provisional Government over the war and the failure to give peasants the land, and the roles of Lenin and Trotsky, but the reasons are not developed or detailed.
- OR**  
**Developed monocausal answer**  
 e.g. developed answer on one aspect, such as the role of Lenin and Trotsky in organising and carrying out the actual seizure of power in October/November 1917.
- Level 3: EITHER 9-12**  
**Developed multicausal answer**  
 e.g. several points are developed from the list in Level 2.
- OR**  
**A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**  
 e.g. answer provides detailed narrative and description of events, and it does lead to some explanation of reasons for the Bolshevik success.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical, multicausal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**  
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer argues that one reason was more important than the others; or the answer links reasons together.
-

---

**Question 2**

- (a) Explain what you can learn from **Source E** about how the Nazis treated the Jews in the years 1933 to 1935. **5**

**Target: Comprehensive and inference from a source (AO 6.2)**

**Level 1: Answer that takes information from source** **1-2**  
e.g. the Nazis called for a boycott of all Jewish businesses and used a law to keep Aryans and Jews separate.

**Level 2: Answer contains basic understanding, and draws a simple inference** **3-4**  
e.g. the Nazi policy against the Jews developed in stages. First of all it was against Jewish businesses but with little organised persecution.  
This started in 1935 with the law to keep Aryans and Jews separate

**Level 3: Answer develops an understanding based on complex inference from the source** **5**  
e.g. in addition to Level 2, the answer emphasizes that the Nazis proceeded cautiously, developing anti-Jewish propaganda to convince ordinary Germans that persecution was justified. Hitler needed to ensure that he had substantial support before he passed actual laws against the Jews.

- (b) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source F** about the cause of the Reichstag Fire of February 1933? **10**  
 Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Comprehension of the source, accepting the interpretation at face value** **1-2**  
 e.g. yes, Goering did not expect the Reichstag to be burnt down.
- Level 2: Simple explanation/description of how the interpretation came about based on the attribution or content** **3-5**  
 e.g. yes, because Source F is from the conclusions of an expert writing two generations later. There would have been ample opportunity to study all the available evidence to reach a conclusion.
- OR**  
**Simple explanation based on own knowledge**  
 e.g. no – the Nazis were keen to use the Reichstag Fire to destroy the reputation of the Communists by blaming a Communist sympathiser for starting the fire.
- Level 3: EITHER** **6-8**  
**Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author**  
 e.g. Source F is taken from an account written over 50 years after the event. It is by a German historian who might be expected to blame the Nazis, especially as he is left-wing in his own views, and therefore might have been expected to sympathise with the Communists.. This source does not follow this trend, and can therefore be taken seriously as it dismisses the commonly-held belief in a Nazi conspiracy theory. Therefore, I agree with the interpretation.
- OR**  
**Analysis of the content of the source and using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation**  
 e.g. no, I disagree. The author uses circumstantial evidence to argue that Goering was innocent. Goering later boasted of organising the fire. Other experts have argued that van der Lubbe could not have started the fire by himself, and that the Nazis were quick to announce a Communist plot to burn down the Reichstag.
- Level 4: Combines both aspects of Level 3** **9-10**  
**(If both strands are attempted, with one at Level 3 standard and the other at good Level 2 standard, give a low Level 4 mark of 9. If both strands are at Level 3, give 10 marks).**

- 
- (c) How does the content of Sources G and H differ? **6**
- Target: Comparison of sources to detect similarities and differences (AO6.2)**
- Level 1: Answer selects details from the sources to describe the content** **1-2**  
e.g. Source G states that there was no plot by Roehm. Source H states that Roehm and the SA were hunted down by Hitler and the Nazis.
- OR Answer focuses only on provenance**  
e.g. Source G is from a German historian in the 1970s; Source H is Goebbels' version spoken on the radio immediately afterwards.
- Level 2: Answer provides details from sources to make simple comparisons** **3-5**  
e.g. Source G explains that there was no plot by the SA, and that there was no resistance to arrest. Source H states that Hitler and the Nazis were taking action against the conspirators in order to foil a plot by the SA.
- Level 3: Answer provides comparison of the sources and explains how they differ** **6**  
e.g. in addition to Level 2, Source G stresses the methodical and clinical way in which the murders were carried out. Source H emphasizes the sudden decision to act immediately and the personal courageous role of Hitler

**NB** Answers which miss out the factual comparison needed for Level 2, but combine the complex thinking of Level 3 with the "OR" of Level 1 should be given an alternative Level 2 mark – probably L2A/4



- (d) How useful is **Source H** for learning about the events of the Night of the Long Knives, June 1934? **9**  
Use **Source H and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**  
**Accepts the content of the source at face value**  
e.g. it is useful for showing how the Nazis acted against Roehm and the SA.
- OR**  
**Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source**  
e.g. it was written at the time and so will be useful.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-5**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. it is useful for showing us how Hitler acted impulsively and decisively. (Simple comments based on content).
- OR**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source in terms of provenance or reliability or bias**  
e.g. it is of limited use, because it is taken from an account by Goebbels, who was in charge of propaganda. (Simple argument based on bias).  
e.g. It is of limited use because I know that Hitler was worried about Roehm and the SA being a possible threat to his dictatorship.. (Simple argument based on knowledge) (perhaps making use of Source G).
- (NB – Use 5<sup>th</sup> mark for answers that attempt several aspects - usefulness, limitations, own knowledge – but at undeveloped level)**
- Level 3: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using the source and/or own knowledge 6-7**  
e.g. it is useful for showing how the Nazis portrayed the event, with the intention of blackening the reputation of the SA in order to justify the growing Nazi dictatorship. Hitler could then control all of the armed forces directly. (Developed argument based on purpose).  
e.g. It is limited in use because Roehm had built up the SA to a huge size and its members were not directly under Hitler's control. Hitler wanted this direct control with a personal oath of obedience from all the armed forces. (Developed argument based on knowledge).
- Level 4: Develops arguments about the usefulness/ limitations of the source using the source AND own knowledge 8-9**  
e.g. both of Level 3 exemplars.

- 
- (e) **Use your own knowledge** to explain how the Nazis were able to use propaganda and censorship to strengthen their dictatorship, 1933-1939. **15**
- Target: Analysis of key features (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**  
**Simple, descriptive narrative of part of the topic**  
 e.g. Hitler censored newspapers and books, and published propaganda against the Jews.
- OR**  
**Simple, generalised statements**  
 e.g. the Nazis deliberately used censorship and propaganda to justify their dictatorship
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**  
**Narrative implying analysis**  
 e.g. outline description/narrative of what the Nazis did. Propaganda through the radio, cinema, books, parades, posters; censorship of books, newspapers, the arts.
- OR**  
**Multifactorial explanation which lacks development**  
 e.g. answer mentions some ways in which the Nazis developed their dictatorship using censorship and propaganda.
- OR**  
**Developed monofactorial answer**  
 e.g. developed answer on one aspect, of propaganda.
- Level 3: EITHER 9-12**  
**Developed multifactorial answer**  
 e.g. several points are developed from the list in Level 2 to provide an explanation.
- OR**  
**A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**  
 e.g. answer provides detailed account of how Hitler and the Nazis established censorship and/or used propaganda, leading to an explanation of how he strengthened his dictatorship.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical, multifactorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**  
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer provides a reasoned argument about how Nazi censorship and propaganda were cumulative and therefore increasingly difficult to resist.
-

**Question 3**

- (a) Explain what you can learn from **Source J** about the quota system in the Immigration Act of 1921.

**Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)**

**Level 1: Answer that takes information from source** **1-2**  
e.g. few immigrants were allowed from S. Europe.

**Level 2: Answer contains basic understanding, and draws a simple inference** **3-4**  
e.g. the Quota System encouraged immigrants from N. Europe, and discouraged those from S. Europe and East Asia.

**Level 3: Answer develops an understanding based on complex inference from the source** **5**  
e.g. in addition to Level 2, the quota system reflected the prejudice of the American government.

- (b)** Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source K** about the life of Black Americans in the 1920s? **10**  
 Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Comprehension of the source, accepting the interpretation at face value** **1-2**  
 e.g. yes, Blacks did remain a cruelly treated minority in the 1920s. They had no legal powers.
- Level 2: Simple explanation/description of how the interpretation came about based on the attribution or content** **3-5**  
 e.g. yes – because the author is sympathetic in tone, and is not afraid to explain the inequalities in the USA earlier in the twentieth century.
- OR**  
**Simple explanation based on own knowledge**  
 e.g. yes – because Blacks did suffer discrimination, as we know from the activities of the KKK with lynchings of black people.
- Level 3: EITHER** **6-8**  
**Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author**  
 e.g. the author is writing to emphasize the inequalities of the 1920s from a critical British perspective. He can contrast this with the situation later in the century when substantial progress had been made towards racial equality.
- OR**  
**Analysis of the content of the source and using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation**  
 e.g. the content of Source K is accurate, but exaggerated. What is described was true of the southern states of the USA, but not true for all of the north. It is true, however, that Blacks who moved north to escape the segregation in the south did tend to gain only the less desirable jobs. The exceptions were those who escaped via sports such as boxing or entertainments such as jazz.
- Level 4: Combines both aspects of Level 3** **9-10**  
**(If both strands are attempted, with one at Level 3 standard and the other at good Level 2 standard, give a low Level 4 mark of 9. If both strands are at Level 3, give 10 marks).**

- 
- (c) How does the content of **Sources L and M** differ? **6**
- Target: Comparison of sources to detect similarities and differences (AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Answer selects details from the sources to describe the content** **1-2**  
e.g. Source L says that the League of Nations will fail without the USA. Source M says that America should not join an organisation which gets involved in disputes in which the USA has no direct interest.
- OR**  
**Answer focuses only on provenance**  
e.g. Source L is from a speech by Wilson trying to convince Americans to support the League; Source M is from a speech by a Republican opponent who is trying to convince Americans that they should stay isolated from Europe.
- Level 2: Answer provides details from sources to make simple comparisons** **3-5**  
e.g. Source L says that the League cannot succeed without the USA. Source M says, if the USA joins the League, the USA will lose her power for doing good.
- Level 3: Answer provides comparison of the sources and explains the differences** **6**  
e.g. in addition to Level 2, Source L argues that American power is best used in the League of Nations because members promise to avoid war against each other. In Source M the speaker argues selfishly that US interests are best served by not being involved in overseas disputes.
- NB** Answers which miss out the factual comparison needed for Level 2, but combine the complex thinking of Level 3 with the “OR” of Level 1 should be given an alternative Level 2 mark – probably L2A/4.
-

- (d) How useful is **Source M** for studying American attitudes in 1919 towards the USA joining the League of Nations? **9**  
Use **Source M and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**  
**Accepts the content of the source at face value**  
e.g. it is useful for telling us why the USA should not join the League.
- OR**  
**Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source**  
e.g. Source M is useful because it is from a leading American politician at the time who will reflect the view of the American public.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-5**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. it is useful for showing the arguments used to criticise Woodrow Wilson's policy of internationalism. (Simple argument based on content).
- OR**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source in terms of provenance or reliability or bias**  
e.g. it is of limited use because it is biased. It only criticises Wilson's policy from the point of view of the Republican Party. (Simple argument based on bias).  
e.g. It is useful because it does reflect the views of many Americans. They thought that entering the war had been a bad mistake.(Simple argument based on knowledge).
- (NB – Use 5<sup>th</sup> mark for answers that attempt several aspects - usefulness, limitations, own knowledge – but at undeveloped level)**
- Level 3: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using the source and/or own knowledge 6-7**  
e.g. it is intended to be extremely biased with the purpose of blackening the reputation of Woodrow Wilson and the Democrat Party a year before the next Presidential elections. Cabot Lodge is seizing on the fears of the US people – and he succeeded. (Developed argument based on purpose)  
e.g. Many Americans were themselves recent or fairly recent immigrants. They had left Europe to set up new lives and did not wish to become politically entangled with the continent they had left behind. Also many returning soldiers reinforced these sentiments.(Developed argument based on knowledge).
- Level 4: Develops arguments about the usefulness/ limitations of the source using the source AND own knowledge 8-9**  
e.g. both of level 3 exemplars.

- (e) **Use your own knowledge** to explain whether ‘The Roaring Twenties’ is an accurate description of life for all White Americans in the 1920s. **15**

**Target: Analysis of key features (AO 6.1)**

***NB – There is a range of different approaches possible – concentrating on either economic or social history. Reward all relevant arguments, and do not expect a full range for high levels/marks. Prohibition and resulting crime can be used if made relevant as an argument.***

**Level 1: EITHER 1-3**

**Simple, descriptive narrative of part of the topic**

e.g. some limited description of the Roaring 20s. e.g. cars.

**OR**

**Simple, generalised statements**

e.g. the Roaring 20s provided lots of rapidly-gained wealth and was a decade of huge expansion.

**Level 2: EITHER 4-8**

**Narrative implying analysis**

e.g. answer describes some aspects, such as mass production of cars and household goods, developments in the cinema, changing attitudes to dress, etc.

**OR**

**Multifactorial explanation which lacks development**

e.g. several aspects outlined, perhaps attempting to provide a balanced response – some groups benefiting, others, such as those in rural areas, not seeing much change.

**OR**

**Developed monofactorial answer**

e.g. developed answer on one aspect, such as details on mass production of cars and its consequences for life as a whole.

**Level 3: EITHER 9-12**

**Developed multifactorial answer**

e.g. several points are developed, for example balancing the huge changes for some as a result of mass production and credit facilities, with the lack of impact on some other groups, such as in rural areas, and in the older industries.

**OR**

**A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**

e.g. answer describes some aspects of the Roaring 20s, and leads to conclusions about the accuracy of the label for this decade in the USA.

**Level 4: A sustained, analytical, multifactorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**

e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer argues that, within the groups whose lives changed substantially, there was a huge difference between those just affording a Model T and the multi-millionaires.

---

**Question 4**

- (a) Explain what you can learn from Source N about the health benefits of the National Insurance Act of 1911. **5**
- Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Answer that takes information from source** **1-2**  
e.g. free medical attention was given to those in the scheme.
- Level 2: Answer contains basic understanding, and draws a simple inference** **3-4**  
e.g. in return for paying 4d a week, poor workers got free basic medical attention.
- Level 3: Answer develops an understanding based on complex inference from the source** **5**  
e.g. in addition to Level 2, the National Insurance Act of 1911 was designed to provide a basic level of health care for poorly-paid workers. It was not comprehensive for all workers.



- (b) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source O** about the reasons why women gained the right to vote at the end of the First World War? **10**  
 Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Comprehension of the source, accepting the interpretation at face value** **1-2**  
 e.g. Yes – some women worked hard to get equal rights for women before the First World War.
- Level 2: Simple explanation/description of how the interpretation came about based on the attribution or content** **3-5**  
 e.g. yes - the source was written by someone who would have studied the subject thoroughly before writing a book on women and the First World War.
- OR**  
**Simple explanation based on own knowledge**  
 e.g. yes – the interpretation is correct. The Suffragettes and Suffragists did a lot to get the subject of votes for women debated in Parliament, and some male politicians were converted to the cause.  
 e.g. No – the actions of the Suffragettes put off many male voters from the thought of giving women the vote.
- Level 3: EITHER** **6-8**  
**Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author**  
 e.g. the author was writing for a publishing company supporting women’s rights. She is clearly likely to be in favour of women getting the vote, and will be assessing the situation pre-1914 in the most favourable light. She will view the actions of the suffrage groups positively. This view has clearly been reinforced by her research as she says in lines 2-3.
- Or**  
**Analysis of the content of the source and using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation**  
 e.g. the source is biased in its exaggeration of the impact of the cause of women’s rights before 1914. Many of the actions of the Suffragettes actually put men (and women) off the idea of votes for women. By 1914 Parliament had voted against extending the franchise. It was actually what happened as a result of the war that was significant in causing the law to be changed.
- Level 4: Combines both aspects of Level 3** **9-10**  
**(If both strands are attempted, with one at Level 3 standard and the other at good Level 2 standard, give a low Level 4 mark of 9.**  
**If both strands are at Level 3, give 10 marks)**

- 
- (c) How does the content of **Sources P and R** differ? **6**
- Target: Comparison of sources to detect similarities and differences (AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Answer selects details from the sources to describe the content** **1-2**  
e.g. Source P says that the Government should represent the true wishes of the people. Source R says that the House of Lords hates the Budget.
- OR**  
**Answer focuses only on provenance**  
e.g. Source P is designed to persuade the public that the House of Lords has the true interests of the country at heart in defeating the Budget. Source R is intended to persuade people that the Conservative Party has an unfair advantage.
- Level 2: Answer provides details from sources to make simple comparisons** **3-5**  
e.g. Source P argues that the House of Lords has an important function to protect the people from a government with a temporary majority in the House of Commons pushing ahead with unpopular laws. Source R argues that the Conservatives benefit from having a permanent majority in the House of Lords, whereas a Liberal Government's wishes are blocked by the Lords.
- Level 3: Answer provides comparison of the sources and explains how they differ** **6**  
e.g. in addition to Level 2, Source R argues that the Conservatives having a permanent majority in the House of Lords is undemocratic, whereas Source P argues that the Lords do a valuable job in protecting the people from a government trying to wield too much power.

**NB** Answers which miss out the factual description needed for Level 2, but combine the complex thinking of Level 3 with the "OR" of Level 1 should be given an alternative Level 2 mark – probably L2A/4.

- 
- (d) How useful is **Source R** for explaining attitudes in Britain in 1909 towards the House of Lords? **9**  
Use **Source R and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**  
**Accepts the content of the source at face value**  
e.g. the source states that the Liberal Government is not against the House of Lords.
- OR**  
**Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source**  
e.g. the source was written by the Prime Minister at the time and he will therefore understand the issues involved.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-5**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. the source is useful for explaining that the Conservative Party has an unfair advantage by having a permanent majority in the House of Lords, regardless of which party has won the election. (Simple argument based on content).
- OR**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source in terms of provenance or reliability or bias**  
e.g. the source is clearly biased as it is taken from a speech from the Liberal Prime Minister who was totally hostile towards the permanent Conservative advantage in the House of Lords. Therefore, it is of limited use. (Simple argument based on bias/provenance).
- (NB – Use 5<sup>th</sup> mark for answers that attempt several aspects - usefulness, limitations, own knowledge – but at undeveloped level)**
- Level 3: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using the source and/or own knowledge 6-7**  
e.g. the source is of use for understanding the purpose of Asquith in getting the British public in support of the Liberal government on the grounds that a permanent Conservative majority in the House of Lords was unfair. It doesn't necessarily reflect attitudes in Britain as a whole.  
(Developed answer based on purpose).  
e.g. The source is of use for understanding attitudes in Britain. These were, in fact, split between those who supported the Liberals with their democratic platform and those who respected the traditions of the Lords.(Developed argument based on knowledge).
- Level 4: Develops arguments about the usefulness/ limitations of the source using the source AND own knowledge 8-9**  
e.g. both Level 3 exemplars.
-

- 
- (e) **Use your own knowledge** to explain why there was a General Strike in 1926. **15**
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER **1-3****
- Simple, descriptive narrative of part of the topic**  
e.g. limited description of immediate events leading up to May 1926.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of causation**  
e.g. the coal industry could not run at a profit without government subsidies.
- Level 2: EITHER **4-8****
- Narrative implying analysis of causation**  
e.g. a description of events after the First World War in the coal industry, with only hints of causation. (see details in Level 3).
- OR**
- Multicausal explanation which lacks development**  
e.g. answer mentions various reasons, but not developed.
- OR**
- Developed monocausal answer**  
e.g. developed answer on one aspect, such as government determination to end all subsidies on coal and the Samuel Commission.
- Level 3: EITHER **9-12****
- Developed multicausal answer**  
e.g. several points are developed to explain why a General Strike broke out, in relation to the world economic situation, the attitude of the government and the hard line taken by the unions.
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**  
e.g. answer gives detailed account of the events post-1918. with some analysis contained within the narrative framework. (e.g. post-war problems, Sankey Commission 1919, Black Friday 1921, government subsidy 1925, Samuel Commission 1926, miners called on TUC, breakdown of talks).
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical, multicausal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question **13-15****
- e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer specifically argues that the primary blame should not be on one particular group.
-

---

**Section B**
**Question 5**

- (a) What does **Source S** tell us about why Russia agreed to sign the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk? **3**
- Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Mark on a penny-points system – up to a maximum of 3** **3**  
 e.g. Lenin feared the war would lead to Communism being overthrown; the Russian army was weak; the army could not stop the Germans invading.
- Count any explanation or inference as an extra point**  
 e.g. Lenin was acting to protect his new Communist government.
- (b) Describe Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP) introduced in Russia in 1921. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1**  
 e.g. NEP gave Russian peasants more freedom.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-4**  
**Detailed description of limited aspects**  
 e.g. NEP was introduced to rescue Russia from the effects of Civil War. It was intended to provide incentives for the peasants and/or industrial workers to produce more by allowing them to keep part of the profits.
- OR**  
**Limited description of wider range of aspects**  
 e.g. limited detail on the free markets and profits allowed for smaller industries; the peasants were allowed to keep surplus grain and sell it; State control was reserved for large industries. The intention was to gain support from the workers and peasants for the new Communist government.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5**  
 e.g. Detailed description of at least two aspects listed in Level 2.

- 
- (c) Using **Source T and your own knowledge**, explain why Stalin forced the policy of collectivisation of agriculture on the USSR, 1928-1941. **7**
- Target: Use of source and knowledge to explain causation (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Use of source OR own knowledge to state basic reasons** **1-2**  
e.g. as shown in Source T, large fields could benefit from the use of new tractor technology.  
e.g. Stalin realised that the USSR had to produce more food.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-5**  
**Developed monocausal answer, using source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. explanation of backwardness of agriculture, in spite of the effects of NEP and the emergence of the kulaks. Most farms were still small, and peasants were still using old-fashioned methods.
- OR**  
**Multicausal answer that lacks development, using source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. USSR was backward. Increased agricultural production could allow the export of grain in order to purchase foreign machinery. This would allow industrialisation, without which the USSR would not be able to withstand future foreign invasion.
- Level 3: Developed multicausal answer, using source and own knowledge** **6-7**  
e.g. detailed, using source and knowledge, on both the backward agricultural situation in 1928 and the need for urgent change (hence collectivisation) to allow transformation of the country into a modern industrial state within the next decade.
-

Answer **either** part (d) **or** part (e)

- (d) How successful was Stalin's policy of modernising industry in the USSR, 1928-1941? **15**
- Target: Analysis of extent of change (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**  
**Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic**  
 e.g. the USSR was very backward before Stalin, and Stalin's policy led to many new industries and factories.
- OR**  
**Simple, generalised statements of extent of change**  
 e.g. Stalin's policy was successfully carried out - the USSR did become a lot stronger industrially.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**  
**Narrative implying analysis of extent of change**  
 e.g. description/narrative of how the Five Year Plans were imposed, with no emphasis on evaluation of extent of success.
- OR**  
**Multifactorial answer which lacks development**  
 e.g. answer mentions success of industrial production, effects on people, effects on USSR's strength, effect on Stalin's reputation - but lacks details.
- OR**  
**Developed monofactorial answer**  
 e.g. one of the above items developed in detail with appropriate conclusion.
- Level 3: Developed multifactorial answer 9-12**  
 e.g. Some of items listed in Level 2 discussed in detail.
- OR**  
**A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**  
 e.g. detailed narrative and description of the process of industrialisation, using the narrative to make points about the degree of success of Stalin's industrial policies.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multifactorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**  
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer contrasts the short-term extreme hardships of the earlier 1930s with the benefits of successive Five Year Plans which allow greater strength for the USSR and, for some, a rise in living standards. i.e. a differentiated response.

---

<b>(e)</b>	How was Stalin able to become a dictator in the USSR in the 1930s?	<b>15</b>
<b>Target:</b>	<b>Causation (AO 6.1)</b>	
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic</b> e.g. Stalin got rid of his enemies and this allowed him to be a dictator.  <b>OR</b> <b>Simple, generalised statements of causation</b> e.g. the purges of the 1930s removed Stalin's rivals for power.	<b>1-3</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Narrative implying analysis of causation</b> e.g. outline description of the purges and role of the secret police.  <b>OR</b> <b>Multicausal answer which lacks development</b> e.g. several reasons mentioned, but not developed – such as purges; lack of free elections; censorship; propaganda; secret police.  <b>OR</b> <b>Developed monocausal answer</b> e.g. developed answer on one aspect, such as the purges.	<b>4-8</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Developed multicausal answer</b> e.g. detailed explanation of more than one aspect (as above).  <b>OR</b> <b>A selective and structured account establishing some arguments</b> e.g. answer is mostly narrative/descriptive, but it does lead to analysis about the reasons for Stalin successfully developing a dictatorship. (see list in Level 2).	<b>9-12</b>
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>A sustained, analytical multicausal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question</b> e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer produces detailed analysis of the inter-relationship of the various factors allowing Stalin to develop a dictatorship. Answer may put the analysis into the context of long-term Russian autocracy.	<b>13-15</b>

---



**Question 6**

- (a) What does **Source U** tell us about why Germany hated the Treaty of Versailles? **3**

**Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)**

**Mark on a penny-points system – up to a maximum of 3**

e.g. Germany lost 13% of its territory. Germany was only allowed to have a small army of 100,000 men. Germany had to sign the treaty or face invasion.

**Count any explanation or inference as an extra point**

e.g. the Germans were being threatened.

- (b) Using Source V and your own knowledge, explain the effects of the hyperinflation of 1923 on the people of Germany. **7**

**Target: Use of source and knowledge to explain consequences (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2)**

**Level 1: Use of source OR own knowledge to provide basic consequence(s)** **1-2**

e.g. using the source, paper money was worthless; it was used by children for play.

e.g. using own knowledge, many Germans lost all their savings and were ruined.

**Level 2: EITHER** **3-5**

**Developed monoconsequential answer, using source and/or own knowledge**

e.g. answer explains in detail how ordinary German families were ruined by the effects of hyperinflation – wages paid twice a day, rushing out to buy items for later bartering, loss of savings, etc.

**OR**

**Multiconsequential answer that lacks development, using source and/or own knowledge.**

Answer mentions, in outline, several effects – e.g. loss of savings, wages losing real value, pensions losing value; some Germans gaining from the crisis - for example those with debt; some losing faith in the new Weimar Republic.

**Level 3: Developed multifactorial answer, using source and own knowledge** **6-7**

e.g. as in Level 2, but specific differentiation between groups of Germans.

- 
- (c) Describe how the Dawes Plan (1924) and Young Plan (1929) were intended to help the recovery of Germany. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1**  
e.g. the Plans provided money to help Germany recover financially.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-4**  
**Detailed description of limited aspects**  
e.g. details on the Dawes Plan – USA lent Germany 800 million gold marks. This could be used to build factories, etc, to help industry and trade. Reparations payments were also scaled down according to ability to pay.
- OR**  
**Limited description of wider range of aspects**  
e.g. brief description of both Dawes and Young Plans.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5**  
e.g. detailed description of both.
- (NB** Young Plan extended payments of reparations for a further 59 years – i.e. until 1988 – but this all became irrelevant with the consequences of the Wall Street Crash).

Answer **either** part (d) **or** part (e).

- (d)** In the years 1919 to 1923 Weimar Germany faced many problems. **15**  
Do these problems suggest that the Weimar Republic was doomed from the start?  
Explain your answer.
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1-3**  
**Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic**  
e.g. unemployment and lack of homes led to despair.
- OR**  
**Simple, generalised statements of causation**  
e.g. Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles.
- Level 2: EITHER** **4-8**  
**Narrative implying analysis of causation**  
e.g. some outline description of social and economic conditions in Germany in the years after the First World War: unemployment, homelessness, flu, inflation, etc.  
e.g. description of the political situation which led to problems in Germany with coalition governments and problems between left and right.
- OR**  
**Multicausal answer which lacks development**  
e.g. answer mentions political problems (coalition government, Spartacists v Freikorps); social problems concerning unemployment, homelessness and inflation; international problems following Treaty of Versailles and over Ruhr in 1923.
- OR**  
**Developed monocausal answer**  
e.g. one of the above items developed in detail.
- Level 3: Developed multicausal answer** **9-12**  
e.g. several items listed in Level 2 discussed in detail.
- OR**  
**A selective and structured account establishing some argument**  
e.g. answer is basically descriptive/narrative (as in Level 2) but with some analysis in relation to the suggestion of “doomed”.  
(NB – Full discussion of hypothesis of question not expected until Level 4).
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multicausal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question** **13-15**  
e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer argues that experience of later 1920s under Stresemann proves that the Weimar Republic could have thrived if the Wall Street Crash had not occurred.

<b>(e)</b>	To what extent were the Nazis important in politics in the years 1919 to 1929?	<b>15</b>
	<b>Target: Analysis of key features (AO 6.1)</b>	
	<b>Level 1: EITHER</b>	<b>1-3</b>
	<b>Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic</b> e.g. some description of Nazi Party– e.g. Munich Putsch.	
	<b>OR</b>	
	<b>Simple, generalised statements of key features</b> e.g. the Nazis were a minority party until the time of the Great Depression.	
	<b>Level 2: EITHER</b>	<b>4-8</b>
	<b>Narrative implying analysis of key features</b> e.g. outline description of founding of Nazi Party up to 1923, the Munich Putsch, Hitler in prison, and the lean years for the Nazis 1924-1929.	
	<b>OR</b>	
	<b>Multifactorial answer which lacks development</b> e.g. Nazis appeared strong and gained national publicity in November 1923 and in Hitler's subsequent trial, but were otherwise weak numerically and in their influence. One of many political parties.	
	<b>OR</b>	
	<b>Developed monofactorial answer</b> e.g. detailed on one aspect such as the Munich Putsch and Hitler's trial.	
	<b>Level 3: Developed multifactorial answer</b>	<b>9-12</b>
	e.g. details on some of items listed in Level 2.	
	<b>OR</b>	
	<b>A selective and structured account establishing some arguments</b> e.g. detailed description, leading to some conclusions about the overall level of importance of the Nazis in the 1920s.	
	<b>Level 4: A sustained, analytical multifactorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question</b>	<b>13-15</b>
	e.g. in addition to Level 3, a differentiated answer – perhaps according to sections of society, perhaps according to chronology, perhaps according to the future potential of the Nazis – with the Nazis developing local strength in some rural regions of Germany in the later 1920s.	

---

**Question 7**

- (a) What does **Source W** tell us about how President Roosevelt's government solved the banking crisis of 1933? **3**

**Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)**

**Mark on a penny-points system – up to a maximum of 3**

e.g. all banks closed for 8 days; hopeless cases not allowed to re-open; stable banks allowed to re-open; Banking Act of 1935.

**Count any explanation or inference as an extra point**

e.g. Roosevelt's government acted quickly and decisively.

- (b) Using **Source X and your own knowledge**, explain why Roosevelt was elected in 1932 as President of the USA. **7**

**Target: Use of source and knowledge to explain causation (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2)**

**Level 1: Use of source OR own knowledge to state basic reasons** **1-2**  
e.g. Roosevelt was more popular because Hoover had failed.

**Level 2: EITHER** **3-5**  
**Developed monocausal answer, using source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. Detailed answer on effects of Great Depression and how Hoover had failed to solve the economic and social crises that resulted.

**OR**

**Multicausal answer that lacks development, using source and/or own knowledge**

e.g. brief details on Hoover's failures; hoovervilles, etc; the appeal of Roosevelt; his style of campaigning; his promises of a New Deal.

**Level 3: Developed multicausal answer, using source and own knowledge** **6-7**  
e.g. detailed answer on several points listed in Level 2, using source and own knowledge

- (c) Describe the opposition to the New Deal in the 1930s. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1**  
 e.g. the New Deal was opposed by those who said that it was costing too much money.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-4**  
**Detailed description of limited aspects**  
 e.g. detailed description of Republican Party's policy of rugged individualism and how this conflicted with the principles of the New Deal.
- OR**  
**Limited description of wider range of aspects**  
 e.g. outline description of rugged individualism; cost of New Deal; government interference in people's lives; Supreme Court finding some laws unconstitutional; some such as Senator Huey Long arguing that that the New Deal was not going far enough to help the poor.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5**  
 e.g. detailed description of at least two items mentioned in Level 2.

Answer **either** part (d) **or** part (e)

- (d)** To what extent did the New Deal help the American economy to recover? **15**
- Target: Analysis of key features (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**  
**Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic**  
 e.g. some basic description of the New Deal.
- OR**  
**Simple, generalised statements of key features**  
 e.g. the USA had recovered a lot by the late 1930s
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**  
**Narrative implying analysis of key features**  
 e.g. some description of some of the agencies of the New Deal, implying that they helped the economy to recover.
- OR**  
**Multifactorial answer which lacks development**  
 e.g. answer mentions several agencies and their effects e.g. on unemployment and morale.
- OR**  
**Developed monofactorial answer.**  
 e.g. Detailed analysis of one aspect/agency – e.g. TVA
- Level 3: Developed multifactorial answer 9-12**  
 e.g. developed answer on several aspects, which may include an attempt at a conclusion about the extent of recovery achieved by the New Deal.
- OR**  
**A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**  
 e.g. more descriptive/narrative approach but with some arguments established, including perhaps the (undeveloped) point that America's involvement in the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War had a more immediate effect on economic recovery than the New Deal.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multifactorial answer clearly linked to demands of question 13-15**  
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, emphasis on the extent of recovery linked to the New Deal and the onset of World War 2.  
 e.g. In addition to Level 3, differentiation among the New Deal agencies – some had more effect/success than others.

- 
- (e) Was the Wall Street Crash of 1929 the main cause of the Depression in the USA? **15**  
Explain your answer.
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER **1-3****  
**Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic**  
e.g. some description of the Wall Street Crash.
- OR**  
**Simple, generalised statements of causation**  
e.g. the Wall Street Crash led to people losing their jobs and caused poverty, leading to the Depression.
- Level 2: EITHER **4-8****  
**Narrative implying causation**  
e.g. narrative/description of how the Wall Street Crash led to Depression.
- OR**  
**Multicausal answer which lacks development**  
e.g. several factors mentioned e.g. Wall Street Crash, financial speculation, tariff policy, unequal distribution of wealth, overproduction.
- OR**  
**Developed monocausal answer**  
e.g. detailed on one of the factors above.
- Level 3: Developed multicausal answer **9-12****  
e.g. detailed argument based on some of the items listed in Level 2.
- OR**  
**A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**  
e.g. detailed narrative and description of the US economy, including the Wall Street Crash, leading to some analysis of the main cause(s) of the Depression.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multicausal answer clearly linked to the **13-15** demands of the question**  
e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer sees inter-relationships.
-



**Question 8**

- (a) What does **Source Y** tell us about the Education Act of 1944? **3**

**Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)**

**Mark on a penny-points system – up to a maximum of 3**

e.g. free secondary education for all; leaving age raised to 15 and later to 16; children left primary school at age of 11; depending on their ability, children went to different secondary schools.

**Count any explanation or inference as an extra point**

e.g. education was seen to be important because more money was to be spent.

- (b) Using **Source Z and your own knowledge**, explain what the New Towns Act of 1946 was intended to achieve. **7**

**Target: Use of source and knowledge to state basic features**

**Level 1: Use of source OR own knowledge to state basic features** **1-2**

e.g. in the photograph the new town is laid out well with modern buildings

**Level 2: EITHER** **3-5**

**Developed monofactorial answer, using source and/or own knowledge**

e.g. detailed answer on the bomb damage in the Blitz, and the shortage of housing and overcrowding in some cities.

**OR**

**Multifactorial answer that lacks development, using source and/or own knowledge**

e.g. outline answer on the housing shortage and overcrowding; new towns to be built with green belt separating them from old cities; carefully planned with good amenities; industry attracted to these areas through grants; create smaller communities.

**Level 3: Developed multifactorial answer, using source and own knowledge** **6-7**

e.g. as Level 2, but detailed explanation, of several aspects, and using source as well as own knowledge

- (c) Describe the changes made by the National Health Act of 1946. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1**  
e.g. Set up free health service for all.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-4**  
**Detailed description of limited aspects**  
e.g. detailed description of what was free – medical, dental, hospital and eye; no charge for spectacles, false teeth and medicines.
- OR**  
**Limited description of wider range of aspects**  
e.g. less detailed description on what was free; most hospitals under control of government; local councils provided “care” services such as health visitors; all paid for by taxation.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5**  
e.g. detailed description of some of items mentioned in Level 2.

Answer **either** part (d) **or** part (e)

<b>(d)</b>	To what extent did Britain suffer an economic depression in the 1930s?	<b>15</b>
	<b>Target: Analysis of key features (AO 6.1)</b>	
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic</b> e.g. simple description of huge unemployment in parts of Britain.	<b>1-3</b>
	<b>OR</b> <b>Simple, generalised statements of key features</b> e.g. many people were poor; many factories closed down.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Narrative implying analysis of key features</b> e.g. description of some aspects of life in the 1930s, perhaps contrasting the extreme poverty of many with the wealth of the few; or the huge unemployment in some areas contrasted with the thriving new industries in other areas – but with little development.	<b>4-8</b>
	<b>OR</b> <b>Multifactorial answer which lacks development</b> e.g. outline of some aspects of the 1930s, with falling exports, rising unemployment, and lower standards of living; but with no explicit assessment in relation to the question.	
	<b>OR</b> <b>Developed monofactorial answer</b> e.g. detailed analysis of employment and unemployment in the regions of Britain.	
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Developed multifactorial answer</b> e.g. some of items listed in Level 2 discussed in detail.	<b>9-12</b>
	<b>OR</b> <b>A selective and structured account establishing some arguments</b> e.g. more descriptive/narrative approach but reaching relevant conclusions.	
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>A sustained, analytical multifactorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question</b> e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer clearly addresses the issue of extent of the depression, perhaps contrasting the later 1930s with the earlier 1930s.	<b>13-15</b>

- 
- (e) Did the governments of the 1930s deal successfully with the economic problems facing Britain? Explain your answer. **15**
- Target: Analysis of extent of change (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**  
**Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic**  
e.g. governments tried to find jobs for the unemployed.
- OR**  
**Simple, generalised statements of extent of change**  
e.g. unemployment remained high in the 1930s, suggesting that governments were not very successful.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**  
**Narrative implying analysis of extent of change**  
e.g. some description of the poverty that afflicted many areas of Britain in the 1930s with little improvement being experienced.
- OR**  
**Multifactorial answer which lacks development**  
e.g. answer mentions various points, such as unemployment continuing, but with government trying to improve the situation with the Means Test, Special Areas Act, setting up new industries in Midlands and parts of the south, etc – but with few details.
- OR**  
**Developed monofactorial answer**  
e.g. detailed on one factor, such as the Means Test.
- Level 3: Developed multifactorial answer 9-12**  
e.g. some of items listed in Level 2 discussed in detail.
- OR**  
**A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**  
e.g. more descriptive approach of what governments tried to do, with some analysis of degree of success.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multifactorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**  
e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer highlights the degree of success, or differentiates between areas.
-