



**General Certificate in Education**

**AS History 5041**

**Alternative E Unit 1**

**Mark Scheme**

*2008 examination – June series*

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

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

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

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **AS EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners**

---

#### **A: INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

Answers at this level will

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

**Level 2:*****Either***

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

***Or***

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 3:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 4:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 5:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

---

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

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

**June 2008**

**Alternative 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 B** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of 'foreign capital' (line 2) in the context of economic developments in Russia after 1881. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. loans from abroad. **1**

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and the context, e.g. financial investment in Russia especially from Germany, France and Britain to kick-start the development of heavy industry and railways. In terms of importance, candidates might comment on the need for foreign capital to make up for the lack of available finance within Russia, or comment perhaps on the resulting indebtedness or on the political implications of financial links with other powers. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source B** differs from the views put forward in **Source A** about the impact of Witte's economic policies. (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. describing the impressive results in Source A, and the limitations in Source B. **1-2**

- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. bringing out the contrast between the sources, emphasising in positive terms in Source A Witte's impressive energy and appreciation of the benefits for Russia of industrial modernisation, resulting in the 'great spurt' of the 1890s with 8% growth per annum. Source B highlights the main criticisms of Witte's policies, but perhaps merely reflects Witte's priorities. Given the scale of the problems he faced, the urgent need for economic development and the resistance to change, any deficiencies need to be seen in perspective. **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 perhaps commenting on Witte's insight and sense of urgency, appreciating the economic and possible political and social benefits of speedy industrialisation in Source A which would outweigh the reservations and drawbacks in Source B. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of economic problems, in relation to other factors, in explaining popular unrest in Russia by 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, based *either* on own knowledge *or* sources. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***

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

***Or***

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

***Or***

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

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

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

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

### Indicative content

From the sources: Witte in Source A believed that economic changes would actually 'ease social tensions', although mention of an 'irreversible process' perhaps implies possible future problems. The last sentence of Source B highlights the issue of reform undermining tsarism, especially in relation to the problems of tax burdens and agrarian poverty for the majority of Russians. Source C emphasizes the key turning point around 1900, as a Europe-wide depression erased the benefits of economic changes for working-class Russians, as the authorities in towns and cities found themselves facing large numbers of rootless and disaffected workers who had their expectations of a better life dashed by harsh economic realities.

From own knowledge, candidates should know that economic grievances presented a central focus for unrest by 1905. Industrial workers provided the context for 'Bloody Sunday', reacting to their living and working conditions with a wave of strikes (some with political overtones). There were also growing waves of unrest resulting from economic factors from the peasant majority – poverty, famine, taxation, redemption payments and land shortages. Candidates should have little difficulty drawing other factors into the debate. There was the continued repression of Nicholas II's government, with emergency state powers and the use of the Okhrana, censorship and legal restraints, restrictions in education and the powers of the Zemstva, and repression towards national minorities through pogroms and Russification. Candidates might comment on the lack of political reform from a blinkered and inflexible monarchy and government, and increasing support for the emerging illegal political parties. The non-Russian nationalities also sought greater autonomy, and cultural and religious equality. All these factors came to a head with military and naval defeats in the Russo-Japanese War, and especially with 'Bloody Sunday' which provided the spark and catalyst for revolution.

Level 1 will provide only partial coverage or a limited summary. More range will be evident at Level 2, but some responses may tend to describe the events of 1905, rather than assess the causes, or merely restate the source content. By Level 3, some source evidence must be included, with some explicit focus on the question. Candidates might appreciate the economic problems of the majority rather than the political aspirations of a minority. Answers at Level 4 should provide both balance and development in terms of the question, with some attempt to prioritise the causes, reaching some conclusions for Level 5.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by an 'enemy of the state' in the context of Bismarck's domestic policy after 1870. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a group disloyal to Germany and opposed to its success and unity. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. an almost ideological policy pursued by Bismarck following unification in order to isolate particular political groups (such as the Catholics or Socialists) that he wanted to defeat. Accusing these groups of disloyalty to the state, Bismarck aimed to rally public support against them and behind his government. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Bismarck introduced anti-socialist legislation in the late 1870s. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. fear of socialism and revolution. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the SPD was a working-class organisation with a Marxist tone, a fast growing party in 1877 with almost half a million votes, 9% of the electorate and 12 MPs. The Junkers were appalled at its long-term plans for a socialist state with international links, which would undermine the

constitution, the economic structure of Germany and the dominance of the Junker elite. Candidates might also refer to the two assassination attempts against the Kaiser and to Bismarck's changing political agenda around 1878. **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 also commenting on the almost obsessive over-reaction of the German leadership. **6-7**

- (c) 'In the years 1878 to 1914, German governments consistently failed to control the growth of the Social Democratic Party.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. **(15 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

***Or***

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

- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some 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

Following the Exceptional Laws of 1878, there were many arrests and an initial drop in support for the SPD; but the party itself was not banned and support grew again in the 1880s. Bismarck had failed in his political purpose but formed the foundations of a paternalist state through state socialism in the 1880s (health and accident insurance, old age and disability pensions) and the most progressive welfare reforms in the world at this time in an attempt to outbid the SPD for workers' support. Arguably, Bismarck defused the threat of large-scale working class opposition for the moment, but the attempt to impose new anti-socialist laws in 1890 were perhaps an admission of defeat and in part led to his resignation.

There was more integration than confrontation after 1890, and, with less repression, the party went from strength to strength, including a cultural and education network, and was largely law abiding. In spite of William II's hysterical outbursts that socialists could not be good Germans,

there was further social legislation from Caprivi (reducing Sunday working and hours for women and children) and Posadowsky (extending social security). *Sammlungspolitik* can be regarded as an attempt to limit the appeal of the Social Democrats, and to rally the masses away from social and political reform. This nationalistic platform halved SPD seats in 1907 from 81 to 43, but with a rising cost of living, this rebounded in 1912 as one in three Germans voted SPD; with 4.25m votes and 110 out of 397 seats, the SPD were the largest party. Yet in 1914, the SPD loyally supported the government and millions of workers did their patriotic duty.

Level 1 will provide a restricted narrative, perhaps limited to Bismarck's regime and with limited evidence. Level 2 will have more range, but might be mainly descriptive with only general or implicit links to the question and may still concentrate on the early part of the period. Level 3 should include both pre- and post-1890 evidence by the top of the level (but may still be unbalanced), and at least signs of some qualified explanation beyond a bland acceptance of the proposition. Level 4 might develop the explanation to consider the changes in approach of the government over the period, and whether the SPD was reformist or revolutionary. Level 5 should attempt some judgement on such issues.

### Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Slav nationalism' in the context of the Balkan Crisis of the 1870s (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. a movement for independence among the Balkan states, supported by Russia. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. a movement among the Christian states within the Ottoman Empire (especially Serbs, Croats and Bulgars) for independence or at least autonomy. Economic and religious grievances led to a series of revolts from 1875 which triggered the Balkan Crisis. There was a real danger of conflict among the major powers, with Russia posing as protector of the Slav Christians, and Austria-Hungary fearing that Slav nationalism would increase demands for self-government in her own multi-racial empire. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Russia pursued a policy of Pan-Slavism in the Balkans after 1870. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. territorial gain and developing trade. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the long established religious and racial aspirations of Pan-Slavism, as Russia posed as protector of the Christian peoples as a pretext to extend her territorial influence; there were also economic and strategic motives, aiming to gain control of Constantinople and access from the Black Sea to 'warm water' ports, as most of Russia's trade was now shipped through the Straits. Foreign policy also raised status and prestige, and distracted from domestic problems. **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 appreciating the curious mixture of practical motives and cultural issues, and the opportunities provided for Russia by the power vacuum in the declining Ottoman Empire and the emerging Balkan nationalism. **6-7**

(c) 'Russia failed to achieve its aims in foreign policy in the years 1870 to 1894.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this opinion. (15 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

***Or***

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

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

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

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

### Indicative content

Russian aims in foreign policy from 1870 focused on two major related issues – firstly, she looked for increased diplomatic security in response to the growth of a new united Germany, a more powerful neighbour than it had ever had before; and secondly, Russia aimed to pursue a more expansive policy in the Balkans with the continued decline of the Ottoman Empire, wary of the rival ambitions of Austria-Hungary. This search for prestige in the face of domestic difficulties was given extra spice by the doctrine of Pan-Slavism.

Russian fear that a powerful and newly unified Germany might have ambitions to expand eastwards were eased by Bismarck's more conciliatory foreign policy objectives and his attempt to exert diplomatic control over other major powers, including Russia. Although Russia would be reluctant to take the diplomatic initiative to achieve her objectives, she was willing to enter into alliances and agreements promoted by Germany which offered a greater chance of preserving the security of her borders and possessions. The prospect of diplomatic relations with the strongest state in Europe seemed certain to have some positive benefits for Russia. Renewed Russian confidence seemed confirmed with Bismarck's early personal contacts made in the informal Dreikaiserbund of 1872–1873, with promises of monarchical solidarity and a stand

---

against revolutionary socialism. However, Russian complaints over Bismarck's rash 'War Scare' with France gave early warning of the choppy diplomatic waters ahead.

In relation to Russia's aims in the Balkans, initial prospects looked promising with immediate benefits, as, with Bismarck's connivance and then with a conference agreement, Russia in 1870 rejected the restrictions of the Black Sea clauses, and an active foreign policy in the Balkans now looked likely. Candidates will want to focus on Russia's diplomatic relations with other powers during the Balkan Crisis of 1875–1878, leading to the Congress and Treaty of Berlin, which marked a serious setback for Russian aims in foreign policy. However, it was mainly the opposition of Britain and Austria-Hungary which brought Russia to heel after the Treaty of San Stefano. Ideally, Bismarck wanted to avoid taking sides and, but for Britain, would have preferred to partition the Ottoman Empire.

Yet, Bismarck's network of alliances in the early 1880s seemed to bring clear gains for Russia – e.g. the Dreikaiserbund of 1881 supported the union of Russian dominated Bulgaria with Eastern Rumelia, and accepted Russia's demand to close the Straits to warships (especially British). The Bulgarian crisis from 1885 undermined this diplomatic progress, and Bismarck's Reinsurance Treaty with Russia in 1887 seemed a desperate last throw to retain diplomatic support. In 1890, although Tsar Alexander III wished to renew the Reinsurance Treaty with Germany, the new Kaiser, Wilhelm II, slammed the diplomatic door firmly shut against Russia. However, ironically, this would lead to important diplomatic achievements for Russia by 1894 with a significant change of direction. Bismarck had already denied Russia access to the Berlin money market for loans to finance her industrialisation, and Russia now turned to France for foreign capital. In the end, Germany's rejection of Russian overtures would lead to a ground-breaking alliance with France, as Germany's more aggressive form of diplomacy began to polarize international attitudes. This diplomatic turning point marked an important achievement in Russian foreign policy, bringing clear economic and political benefits.

Level 1 may be a restricted summary, concentrating only on part of the content. Level 2 will have more range over the period, but may tend to describe events with limited analytical links. By Level 3, there must be an explicit analytical focus, but this may tend largely to accept the proposition. Level 4 should broaden this analysis and provide more balance in terms of diplomatic benefits and restrictions, perhaps relating Russian foreign policy to the on-going broader diplomatic themes – e.g. Bismarck not wishing to take sides. Level 5 should reach some conclusions in relation to this sort of overview.