



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative E Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – January series

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

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

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

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

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

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

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

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

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

Explain briefly the importance of 'the right to leave the village commune' (lines 2 and 3) in the context of peasant farming in Russia. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. to move away from the *mir* and consolidate their land. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. explaining how, in the past, the collective responsibility of the *mir*, especially in relation to land allocation, had inhibited any changes in agriculture. With the authority of the commune now reduced, peasant farmers could become more independent and more productive. **2-3**

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

Explain how the views in **Source B** differ from the views put forward in **Source A** about the reasons for the failure of the Dumas. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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

- L1: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. provides only a basic or general contrast, mentioning the limited powers of the Dumas in Source A, and the failure to produce reforms in Source B. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. Source A emphasises the limited legislative powers – the assembly was essentially controlled by the government and the monarchy which closed down the Dumas at the first opportunity. In contrast the Tsar, in Source B, expected the Duma to bring great changes and benefits for all, and blames the members of the Duma for exceeding their authority and forcing the monarchy to dissolve the assembly. Candidates might provide some contextual knowledge by referring to the Fundamental Laws and the combative nature of the first two Dumas. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source A, e.g. as above, but with some developed insight, contrasting the expectations of a Tsar who was not prepared to lose power and become a constitutional monarch, with the expectations of the members of the radical early Dumas, wanting clear political and economic reforms. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of Stolypin's land reforms, in relation to other factors, in maintaining the stability of the tsarist regime in the years 1906 to 1914. **(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: Source C provides a good range of evidence in terms of the question, outlining the potential economic and political benefits of the land reforms, but recognising the conservatism of many peasants in relation to change. 'Order' also provides a link with the alternative approach of repression. The mention of peasant violence in Source B emphasises the urgent need to improve conditions for peasant farmers. Sources A and B concentrate on the political approach to increased stability through the Dumas. The 'schemes of Stolypin', mentioned at the end of Source A, provides scope for developing the range of issues.

From own knowledge, candidates should provide a range of factors, appreciating both the economic and the political contexts of the land reforms, as well as the potential political stability through the constitutional experiment of the Dumas, and also the direct use of repression to maintain control.

Land reforms from 1906 aimed to encourage private ownership, consolidate land and improve agrarian efficiency in order to help stabilise Russia by creating a more prosperous and loyal peasantry. Redemption payments were abolished and peasants were free to leave the village *mir*, with assistance to migrate and buy land. However, in relation to importance, candidates will need to assess the effectiveness of the land reforms up to 1914. Stolypin acknowledged that the reforms would need 20 years to work – by 1914, only 10% of the land had been consolidated, and the strip system still prevailed as peasants became increasingly reluctant to leave the security of the *mir*, especially with the outbreak of war. The land reforms also had an equally important political focus, as Stolypin aimed to de-revolutionise the peasants with his ‘wager on the strong’ – something feared by Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

Candidates should also assess the stability of the regime in terms of political reforms. After the dismissal of the early Dumas, there were the constructive achievements of the full-term 3rd Duma, despite Stolypin’s doctoring of the electoral system to reduce the franchise and produce a more right wing and less critical assembly. Long-term stability remained in doubt, however, given the Tsar’s refusal to accept genuine political reform or relinquish any of his autocratic powers.

In terms of maintaining stability, the use of repression was also important. Martial law was proclaimed with wide-reaching powers and used to quell any disturbances. ‘Stolypin’s necktie’ executed 2500 people between 1906 and 1911, with hundreds of trade unions and newspapers closed down.

Level 1 answers might provide a limited and generalised summary, focused perhaps on either the land reforms or the workings of the Dumas – the events of 1905 are not relevant. There will be more range of evidence at Level 2, but responses will tend to be over-descriptive with little comment. At Level 3, some sources must be included, and there should be some explicit signs of assessment, but the answer will lack balance in terms of the range of issues. Candidates should present a more balanced and developed response at Level 4, with more explanation of other factors. In reaching conclusions at Level 5, there should be some sort of overview, effectively integrating a range of stabilising factors, and perhaps making some connections between the economic and political aspects.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the Dual Alliance' in the context of Bismarck's foreign policy. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a military agreement with Austria-Hungary. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a defensive alliance with Austria-Hungary promising mutual assistance if either were attacked by Russia, and neutrality if attacked by another power. For full marks, some sort of contextual comment is needed; for example, although Germany now had a firm alliance, she risked driving Russia towards France. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Germany signed the Dual Alliance. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Germany needed to find allies to secure her foreign policy. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. after the anti-German feelings from Russia following the Congress of Berlin, Bismarck felt that he needed to place relations with Austria-Hungary on a surer footing. This might also enable Germany to restrain Austria-Hungary in the Balkans. This 'German Kinship', as Bismarck called it, would be popular at home, both with Conservative politicians and the German people. The alliance would also make Russia more aware of her diplomatic isolation and perhaps promote a more friendly attitude. Bismarck used all his powers of persuasion, including the threat of resignation, to convince the Kaiser that the alliance was necessary and desirable. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as Level 2, but with comments in relation to both Austria-Hungary and Russia. Candidates might also observe that historians have found the reasons difficult to unravel, and might consider whether Bismarck actually 'changed his entire approach', as speculated. **6-7**

- (c) 'Bismarck's carefully planned network of alliances was near to collapse by 1890.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view with reference to German foreign policy in the years 1879 to 1890. (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

Bismarck's network of alliances provided peace and security for 20 years, avoiding for Germany the nightmare of a war on two fronts; yet was this diplomatic system played out by 1890? Candidates should provide evidence of the alliance network from 1879 in relation to German foreign policy aims, including diplomacy with Austria-Hungary, Russia and Italy, although the key to the central aim of isolating France seemed to be good relations with Russia. In the early 1880s, the network seemed secure as Berlin became the diplomatic centre of Europe. Russian dissatisfaction with Germany at the Congress and Treaty of Berlin in 1878 seemed to be skilfully neutralised in the Dreikaiserbund of 1881. However, the Bulgarian crisis from 1885 revealed the fragility of Bismarck's alliance network as relations with Russia deteriorated once more. The Reinsurance Treaty of 1887 seemed more of a desperate last throw rather than a diplomatic recovery. Bismarck's instructions in the same year to the Reichsbank to stop further loans to Russia seemed to confirm the break-up of relations with the tsarist regime (with France quickly stepping in with funds for Russia). Whether Bismarck could have retained Russia's friendship any longer is debatable; yet he was capable of further deals and compromises with his multilateral diplomacy, and wanted to renew the Reinsurance Treaty in 1890 – the Russians were also eager to sign, preferring Germany to France. Bismarck's network of alliances was not in ruins in 1890 and clearly still workable, leaving Germany in a powerful position – his successors dismantled it. At the higher levels, candidates should also debate the question of 'carefully planned', considering whether his network of alliances was unnecessarily complex and contradictory, with Bismarck reacting to crises at short notice and merely providing temporary stop-gaps.

Level 1 might be restricted to an assertive, sweeping summary, with minimal supporting evidence. Level 2 will include more range, but will tend to describe and list the main alliances with little comment. There should be signs of some explicit assessment by Level 3, but this may just accept or reject the proposition with little development. Responses at Level 4 will show more balance and development, perhaps considering 'carefully planned' as well as 'near to collapse'. Candidates should provide some overview and reach conclusions at Level 5.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the circumstances of his accession' in the context of events in Russia in 1881. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the assassination of his father, Tsar Alexander II. **1**

- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Alexander III came to the throne prematurely and unexpectedly, when, in March 1881, his father was blown to pieces by a bomb – the work of the 'People's Will' terrorist group. This was a sad end for a reforming Tsar, who, ironically on the same day, had agreed in principle to a limited national assembly. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why both Alexander III and Nicholas II followed repressive policies in the years 1881 to 1905. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to try to reverse the effects of recent reforms and to fully restore autocratic government. **1-2**

- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. a reaction to the assassination of Alexander II, which made a deep impression on both Tsars. This was seen as a result of his liberalising policies, which the Tsar paid for with his life. Repression also aimed to crush all political opposition and to instil again fear of the autocratic regime; and, under the influence of Pobedonostsev, to reinforce the Tsar's God-given duties. The Tsars knew that they would never be able to reverse Alexander II's reforms. **3-5**

- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. as Level 2, but perhaps distinguishing between the more naturally autocratic Alexander III, and Nicholas II – ill-prepared at 26 in both experience and personality, and who continued Alexander III's repressive policies without question, with a blind faith in autocracy and orthodoxy. **6-7**

- (c) 'The policies of repression and reaction failed to crush opposition to the tsarist regime.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion with reference to the years 1881 to 1905. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **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

Overall, the policies of the two Tsars represented a fatal attempt to put the clock back. Alexander III was ruthless, strong-willed and dominant, and was largely successful in imposing repressive policies and crushing opposition. However, Nicholas II was far less assertive and seemed unprepared for the task. He would be faced with the revolutionary turmoil of 1905, although, ultimately, the monarch survived and, for the time being, successfully crushed opposition to the regime.

Candidates will provide evidence of repression and reaction, e.g. emergency state powers from 1881, and the use of Okhrana, censorship and legal constraints on judges and JPs; the introduction of the Land Captains, restrictions in the powers of the Zemstva and in education, and state-promoted pogroms towards national minorities. In terms of opposition, candidates should distinguish between the demands for political reform, especially from the developing middle classes, and the economic and social demands from peasants and the increasing numbers of factory workers.

Under Alexander III, repression was successfully enforced, as revolutionary opposition subsided, with only one significant plot, involving Lenin's brother. Populism virtually disappeared and there was the persecution of national and religious dissidents. Under Nicholas II, such submission could not be maintained, and there were increasing signs of opposition – Zemstva demands for change, student protests, strikes in the growing industrial cities, bitter national antagonism, peasant discontent and land hunger, all exacerbated by the economic slump from 1900. Illegal revolutionary groups and a range of political parties also emerged

around the turn of the century which, though essentially representing small minorities, gained some support from the increasingly alienated proletariat. As evidence of the government's failure, it resorted to the diversions of increasing pogroms and a 'short victorious war' against Japan. All these factors came to a head in 1905, with mass strikes and protests, and opposition from all classes of society.

Answers at Level 1 might be restricted to an assertive sweeping summary, with only partial coverage. Level 2 will provide a broader but still uneven range, and may be descriptive and unbalanced over the period, perhaps dominated by the events of 1905. At Level 3, candidates should show some limited signs of assessment, although there may be little distinction between the two Tsars. Responses at Level 4 will be more balanced in terms of the two Tsars and assessment over the period. Level 5 should reach some conclusions with signs of a broader overview.