



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative H Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June series

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

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

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

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

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

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

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

June 2008

Alternative H: Aspects of Twentieth Century European and World History, 1900 to the Present Day

AS Unit 1: The Emergence of the Super-Powers and the New World Order, 1900–1962

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the importance of ‘free elections in Poland’ (line 1) in the context of the USA’s relations with Russia in 1945. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. relations between the USA and USSR deteriorated. Each side began to distrust the other. The USA believed the USSR was acting undemocratically. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. the failure to honour the election agreements made at Yalta – clearly a breach of the Yalta Agreement. This convinced the USA that the USSR wanted not only to influence Poland but also to establish a Moscow driven communist regime there. This breach was a major factor in the early origins of the Cold War. The degree of detail and development will contribute to the decision to award 2 or 3 marks. **2-3**

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

Explain how **Source C** challenges the views put forward in **Source B** about the USA’s motives for offering economic aid to countries after the Second World War. (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. Source B refers to the motive as being one of helping countries to recover from the war and become prosperous and free. Source C suggests that the USA was motivated by a desire to expand US influence in Europe and that this could threaten the security of the USSR. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. a possible comparison lies in the declaration in Source B that Marshall Aid was not directed against ‘any country or doctrine’. This is in direct contrast to the view in Source C that it was part of a new plan ‘against the Soviet Union’. There

is also the reference in Source B to the focus of Marshall Aid being on dealing with hunger and poverty while Source C regards US actions as imperialistic in intent. Own knowledge might challenge the idea in Source C that 'democracies' existed in eastern Europe by 1947 and focus on the fact that Europe as a whole was in a state of economic and political crisis after the war and that the US was merely addressing this. **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 C, e.g. the detail found in Level 2 may be developed to consider the notion that the USA was imperialistic in its intentions and by 1947 had clearly decided that communism was taking control of eastern Europe and was determined to halt this spreading into western Europe. Candidates could make use of the timing of the Marshall Plan compared to the declaration of the Truman Doctrine. Useful references could be made to the USSR's paranoia over security. The sources may be examined in terms of the state of the Cold War by mid-1947. Valid conclusions could equally well support either of the views expressed through the sources. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the USA's commitment to protect democracy in Europe, in relation to other factors, in explaining the development of the Cold War in the years 1945 to 1949. (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: Source A illustrates that by demanding that free elections be held, the USA was antagonising the Russians. By lecturing the Russians on their commitments, Truman appeared to have adopted a dominant and aggressive stance in Europe. Source B shows that Marshall Aid not only had a clear economic aim – to enable war-torn Europe to recover, but it also had a clear political aim – to enable free institutions to be created in post-war Europe. There is an implicit suggestion that free institutions and communism are contradictory terms. Source C links to this idea when the Russians suggest that Marshall Aid is a form of American imperialism. The aim of protecting democracy is seen as a device to achieve something sinister and dangerous to Russia.

Candidates may draw on their own knowledge to consider the other factors which contributed to the development of the Cold War. Central to these might be references to Soviet political, strategic and economic ambitions in Eastern Europe. The issue of the USA's control of nuclear technology may also be explored as could the significance of Germany as a focal point for Cold War confrontation, particularly in terms of it being a symbol of the power struggle between East

and West in Europe. Some may consider the notion of the USA deliberately wanting to provoke the USSR in order to heighten Europe's sense of dependency on the USA and thereby strengthen the USA's own strategic, economic and political influence in Europe.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the main threats' in the context of Britain's international status in 1914. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. Britain was a victorious power in the war and the victory had resulted in Germany's defeat and the defeat of its allies. The defeat meant that there was one less rival to challenge Britain's international status. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. Germany had developed as both an economic and a military rival to Britain and her defeat in the war ended that threat. Germany was, in 1914, an economic threat to Britain. The power of the German navy also represented a potential threat to Britain's ability to ensure control over its scattered empire. Defeat by 1919 had apparently removed all these threats. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the USA was an emerging world power by 1919. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. America had contributed significantly towards winning the war and other countries such as Britain had been seriously weakened by the war even though they were on the winning side. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. may suggest that while the economic power of other states had been profoundly damaged by the war, the US economy had actually been strengthened by it. A range of other factors may be considered, e.g. the USA had taken a large share of European trade, the war had been largely financed by the USA through loans which made states such as Britain dependent, and the development of the US as a world power was partly the result of the decline of the traditional Eurocentric power bases. **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. the factors referred to for Level 2, and others, may be developed and some attempt made to suggest an order of relative importance, e.g. the foundation of power was economic dominance and the USA had that. **6-7**

- (c) 'The effects of the Second World War were primarily responsible for the collapse of Britain as a Great Power by 1950.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (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

This may be approached by considering the notion of long-term decline dating back to the First World War or earlier. The war turned Britain into a debtor nation and profoundly undermined trade and economic income for Britain. Links may be made between economic power and international status. Other factors may be linked to the impact of the First World War or be considered as separate issues in Britain's decline. Such factors could include problems within the British Empire in the inter-war years and the impact on status. The Second World War had an even greater economic impact and this happened when the USA was emerging as a superpower. The significance of the rise of the USA may be evaluated in relation to these other factors. Post-war imperial issues are also relevant to this analysis.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what was meant by 'the domino theory' in the context of the USA's attitude towards communism in the Far East in the years 1953 to 1962. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the theory was based on the US belief that if one state became communist then its neighbours and surrounding states would follow. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the theory was founded on the certainty that it was the aim of communist states, particularly the USSR to spread communist influence globally. This had not only been attempted through expansion in Eastern Europe but also in the Far East when North Korea attempted to impose its control on South Korea. The events in Vietnam seemed consistent with this process in that the North was seeking to impose its communist system on the South. **2-3**

(b) Explain why North Vietnam wanted a unified Vietnamese state. **(7 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. may address the question 'why should Vietnam be split into two? Answers at this level may suggest that Vietnam was one country and should not, therefore, be split into two. Other responses may suggest that Ho Chi Minh wanted a united Vietnam. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. North Vietnam regarded the Americans as the new imperialists who had replaced the French since 1954. The creation of a unified Vietnam would not only complete the removal of imperialist control it would also remove the specific presence of the USA, a state that was willing to back corrupt regimes in South Vietnam. The USA was seen as an occupying power and Vietnam was, from 1965, at war with the USA. **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. references developed at Level 2 could be expanded upon here. Candidates may consider the real aims of North Vietnam. Were these to fulfil a purely nationalist objective or to impose a communist regime on the South? Had it become apparent to the leaders in the North that the USA could be defeated militarily therefore it was reluctant to embark on a diplomatic solution? Essentially unification was a means of damaging the USA. Some answers may consider the influence of the French in encouraging the North to remain hostile to the USA in Vietnam. **6-7**

- (c) 'It was the ideological differences between North and South Vietnam that led to the USA's involvement in South Vietnam in the years 1954 to 1962.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (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

Answers may consider each of these concepts in the context of US motives. The Truman Doctrine was founded on the idea that it was the role of the USA to defend freedom. The USA perceived communism from the North as a threat to the freedom that the democracy of the South had created. The Truman Doctrine was the basis of US involvement in Vietnam, certainly up to and beyond 1962. Its involvement was also motivated by a commitment to the Domino Theory and the belief that communism was hostile to democracy. Communism as an ideology was based on the one party state while the USA was seeking to defend multi-party politics. Alternatively, answers may examine the possible 'hidden agenda' underpinning the Truman Doctrine. This may be taken as a US desire to expand its own influence, economically and strategically, globally. The US also prevented the Geneva Accords from being implemented when it stopped elections in 1956 and then went on to support the corrupt Diem regime. By 1962, US militarism was becoming increasingly evident and this may suggest that democracy was a secondary objective compared to the aim of preserving US influence in South Vietnam and south East Asia as a whole.