



2009 History

Standard Grade Credit

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2009

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from the Question Paper Operations Team, Dalkeith.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's Question Paper Operations Team at Dalkeith may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

Information for markers

The following general instructions are provided for the guidance of markers at all levels.

It is vitally important that all markers are totally familiar with the candidate performance requirements, as set out in the correct arrangements document, for both assessable elements at each level in terms of: process the place of recalled evidence where this is required.

Marking conventions

Markers must carefully observe the following points:

All marking on candidate scripts must be in red biro.

All marking must be carefully placed **in the correct column** on the right of the script:
KU marks in the left column; ES marks in the right column.

Half marks must not be used.

All of the candidate's work must be marked unless it has been clearly deleted – even when more than one context in a unit has been attempted.

When a candidate has attempted more than one context in a unit the marks for each element must be taken from the better context for inclusion in the total mark. The weighting of marks in favour of Enquiry Skills will usually mean that the better ES mark should be taken. In such a case, **both KU and ES marks must be taken from the same context.**

Where a candidate has attempted more than one context in a unit, and it is not clear which one is better, do not total the marks, but include a note of the marks by element for each context and mark the script for special attention by placing the letters **PA** on the top right hand corner.

Please make good use of the following indications of where marking credit has or has not been awarded. Place the symbol beside the appropriate section of the answer.

A single red line underneath a response indicates that part of an answer is suspect.

✓	indicates a relevant, credited piece of evidence.
R	indicates that recall has been credited.
DP	indicates a developed point of evidence.
P	indicates that the process is apparent.
X	indicates irrelevance.
SE	indicates a serious error.
NP	indicates that process is suspect weak or non-existent.
C	indicates that the candidate has simply copied presented evidence.
PE	indicates presented evidence is present (useful in an ES4, ES6 question)
CO	indicates the candidate has used content only in response to an ES1 item
NR	indicates no relevant recall.
NPE	indicates no presented evidence has been used.
NB	indicates no balance has been provided (useful in an ES6 question)

(NB: A tick in the right hand margin indicates that a misplaced part of an answer has been read.
Marks are not deducted for badly written or barely legible answers.)

Marking at Credit Level

Marks should be awarded to the candidate for:

carrying out the correct process
using relevant recalled evidence
using relevant presented evidence (in Section B, Enquiry Skills, only)

In Section B any item which requires the use of relevant recall is clearly indicated and full marks can only be awarded to these items when such recall is used.

Section A (Knowledge and Understanding)

All questions are based on recalled evidence. A *selection* of possible recall is given in the Marking Instructions. The marker should use professional judgement to determine the relevance of other possible recall.

In a K3 answer (assessing the importance) the candidate should be credited for either explaining the importance of the one-presented factor and/or by assessing the relative importance of relevant recalled evidence. In both cases a judgement should be offered.

Section B (Enquiry Skills)

NB: At Credit Level process in itself is not rewarded.

In an ES1 item in Unit I it is not enough to say that a source is useful because it deals with the issue/investigation under discussion or that it was written at the time etc. The evaluation must make specific reference to the actual source/s as in all ES1 type items.

Examples:

This source is useful as it was written during a period of great changes in farming in the late 18th century = 1 mark

This source is useful as it was written by a reputable historian who will have studied the relevant primary sources =1 mark.

In an ES2 question 1 mark is given for a simple comparison and 2 marks for a developed comparison. Examples are given in the Marking Instructions.

In an ES3 item, candidates should exhibit understanding of the attitudes conveyed in the source. As in all items, straight copying or listing should be penalised.

In an ES4 item asking the candidate to put a source into its historical context full marks cannot be awarded unless relevant recall is given.

In an ES5 item (Question 4 of Unit I) listing or copying of relevant evidence from the presented sources **is allowed** and should be **fully credited**.

Recall or personal judgement *cannot* be credited at all.

If evidence is selected on only one side of the given issue, the maximum obtainable is 3 marks.

In an ES6 item (Question 5 in Unit I) the candidate must:

use presented evidence

show relevant recall

show some balance of answer

If any of the above three requirements is not met, the maximum obtainable is 2 marks.

(NB: There is no need for a balanced conclusion as such but the answer must show balance).

In the Marking Instructions, the abbreviations K1 – K3, and E1 – E6 have been used to indicate the particular sub skills of the extended EGRC to which an individual question relates:

K1: description; K2: explanation; K3: importance;

ES1: evaluation; ES2: comparison; ES3: point of view; ES4: set in context;

ES5: select evidence; ES6: present conclusion.

2009 History – Standard Grade

Credit Level

Marking Scheme

UNIT I – Context A: 1750s – 1850s
--

In answering questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant recalled knowledge.

1. The candidate explains why the death rate in Scotland fell between 1750 and 1850, using **evidence** such as:
 - fewer famines/fewer died from starvation
 - farming improvements led to an increased food supply/better diet
 - food became more varied and nutritious, eg more milk, meat and fresh vegetables
 - decline in alcoholism after higher tax imposed on gin in 1751
 - decrease in infant mortality rate/healthier mothers meant healthier babies
 - some diseases disappeared, eg plague
 - advances in medical knowledge/care; better medicines/hospitals/medical training stopped people from dying
 - inoculation helped control some diseases/some diseases died out naturally
 - some better housing, eg New Town in Edinburgh, model villages reduced spread of disease
 - in the growing towns attempts were made to improve sanitation and reduce deaths from disease/availability of clean water
 - cheaper cotton led to cleaner clothes
 - greater use of soap led to better hygiene and increased life expectancy. **KU2 (4)**

2. The candidate describes the ways some people suffered from changes in agriculture, using **evidence** such as:
 - loss of pasture/common land
 - many tenants faced higher rents which they could not afford
 - poorer tenant farmers lost their farms and became farm labourers
 - new machines, eg Small's plough, meant fewer men were needed on farms
 - some farm machinery led to accidents
 - many cottages destroyed/workers evicted as they were no longer needed
 - introduction of sheep led to many Highlanders being evicted
 - wages dropped for some workers
 - many country people reduced to begging
 - farm labourers forced to move to mill towns to find work/difficulties encountered
 - some Scots villages became deserted. **KU1 (4)**

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate processes and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

3. The candidate makes a balanced evaluation of **Source A** using evidence such as:

- contemporaneity: a secondary source but written with the benefit of hindsight
- authorship: written by an experienced historian who would have researched working conditions in factories
- content: details on impact of factories on working conditions of textile workers, such as ...
- accuracy: matches candidate's own knowledge, eg ...
- purpose: to inform people about the impact factories had on textile workers' conditions
- limitation: only one historian's view, which others may not agree with/ doesn't say anything about improved working conditions in some mills, such as New Lanark, Deanston.

ES1 (4)

4. The candidate selects and organises evidence **for the issue** using evidence such as:

Source A

- wages were better (than farm workers')

Source B

- conditions in the mill were very clean
- each room was spacious and well ventilated
- many windows (so lots of light)
- machines had guards on them/few accidents

Source C

- mills were well ventilated/airy
- Owen reduced children's hours
- didn't employ children under the age of ten.

The candidate selects and organises evidence **against the issue** using evidence such as:

Source A

- machines led to long hours for workers
- workers struggled to keep up with the machines
- strict rules/harsh discipline
- workers laid off when there was no work

Source B

- machinery was dangerous/accidents occurred

Source C

- children regularly worked very long hours
- very young children employed in the mills.

ES5 (6)

A maximum of three marks can be awarded if the relevant evidence is selected for only one side of the issue.

5. The candidate offers a **balanced conclusion** on the issue using **presented evidence** such as that given in **Answer 4** and **recalled evidence** such as:

For the issue:

- new machinery made work easier/machines easy to operate
- machine spinning was easily learned
- had some advantages over the domestic system, eg ...
- Owen paid his workers when there was no work
- Owen wouldn't allow overseers to use violence on workers
- changing rooms provided in some mills
- water was available for workers
- there was decent sanitation in some mills
- temperature was moderate/controlled in some mills
- new factories had good drainage
- working conditions were better than working outside on farms.

Against the issue:

- led to much greater use of child labour
- harsh discipline used against children/children beaten by overseers
- machines created dust which could cause TB
- people lost the freedom they had working at home
- during busy periods mills worked day and night
- worked six days a week/only Sunday off
- workers sacked if they question authority
- terrible noise from machines could cause deafness
- hot/damp conditions in mills led to workers becoming ill
- machines had to be cleaned/repared when they were still running
- no safety laws
- old mills didn't have changing/washing facilities
- some rooms were very low
- some children grew deformed due to their work
- children were pulled into the machines and were seriously injured/killed.

ES6 (5)

A conclusion, which takes account of one side only and/or is based solely on either presented evidence or recalled evidence can be awarded a maximum of two marks.

UNIT I – Context B: 1830s – 1930s

In answering questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant recalled knowledge.

1. The candidate explains why Scotland's death rate fell between 1830 and 1930 using **evidence** such as:

- farming improvements led to an increased food supply/better diet
- impact of railways brought fresh food to towns
- food became more varied and nutritious, eg more milk/meat and fresh vegetables
- decrease in infant mortality rate/healthier mothers meant healthier babies
- disease such as cholera was in decline/smallpox vaccination developed
- improved medical knowledge, eg Lister's antiseptics, Simpson's anaesthetics
- advances in medical care: better hospital/medical training stopped people dying
- improved housing conditions/living conditions reduced spread of disease
- improved sanitation reduced deaths from disease
- clean water supplies reduced spread of disease
- greater understanding of the link between cleanliness and disease/improved hygiene, eg cheap soap increased life expectancy
- improved Public Health: examples of laws
- better welfare provision – Liberal Welfare Reforms
- improved working conditions reduced health visits.

KU2 (4)

2. The candidate describes the ways in which some people suffered from the development of railways using **evidence** such as:

- stage-coach operators went out of business
- decline of canal companies
- coaching inns lost business
- landscape damaged/pollution
- effects on small local business/competition as people could shop further afield
- roads fall into disrepair
- actions of navvies, eg drunkenness, violence
- disruption to farmers
- fatalities/injuries caused to navvies during construction of railways
- financial losses due to 'Railway Mania'
- accidents caused by train/lack of platforms etc.

KU1 (4)

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate processes and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

3. The candidate makes a balanced evaluation of **Source A** using evidence such as:
- contemporaneity: a secondary source but written with the benefit of hindsight
 - authorship: written by an experienced historian who would have researched working conditions in mines
 - content: details on the impact of machines on working conditions in coal mines such as ...
 - accuracy: matches candidate's own knowledge, eg ...
 - purpose: to inform people about the impact new machines had on working conditions for coal miners
 - limitation: only one historian's view, which others may not agree with/ doesn't say anything about other factors improving conditions, eg Mines Act

ES1 (4)

4. The candidate selects and organises evidence **for the issue** using evidence such as:

Source A

- to some extent mining was safer
- use of cages was better than sending men down dangling on ropes
- the Davy Lamp improved safety

Source B

- cutting machines could work for three years without breakdown

Source C

- safety of mines has improved (due to changes in winding gear).

The candidate selects and organises evidence **against the issue** such as:

Source A

- coalmining remained a dangerous occupation
- the threats of floods, explosives, roof falls were ever present
- there was no medical knowledge on effects of coal dust on lungs
- mining remained an entirely manual occupation/machines did not replace picks and shovels until well into the 20th century

Source B

- working on the machine run on the night shift was a particularly nasty job
- machine cutting teams had to contend with high noise levels and much choking dust

Source C

- explosion at Blantyre in October 1877
- Mines Regulation Act has decreased the number of accidents
- prejudice in Scotland to use of safety lamps.

ES5 (6)

A maximum of three marks can be awarded if the relevant evidence is selected for only one side of the issue.

5. The candidate offers a **balanced conclusion** on the issue using **presented evidence** such as that given in **Answer 4** and **recalled evidence** such as:

For the issue:

- new machinery provided easier work/machines easier to operate
- cages prevented accidents on ladders
- wagon ways used underground helped movement of coal
- steam and electrical power for drainage reduced risk of flooding
- ventilation fans made working safer
- metal or concrete pit props reduced risk of cave-ins
- electrical lighting improved visibility
- wire rope/better lifting apparatus made it easier to get coal out
- mechanical conveyor belts made coal extraction easier.

Against the issue:

- new machines meant mines got deeper which were often more dangerous
- new machines were expensive – smaller mines cannot compete, miners lose jobs
- Mines Act 1842 prevented women and children working down mines – improved safety
- mine inspectors appointed – improved safety
- mine managers require a certificate – improved safety
- black spit continued to kill miners
- miners continued to work long hours
- pit ponies pulled coal tubs instead of putters
- early machines were often unreliable and dangerous
- British mines were slow to modernise/use new technology.

ES6 (5)

A conclusion which takes account of one side only and/or is based solely on either presented evidence or recall can be awarded a maximum of two marks.

UNIT I – Context C: 1880s – Present Day

In answering the questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate processes and to use relevant recalled knowledge.

1. The candidate explains the reasons why Scotland's death rate fell after 1880 using **evidence** such as:
- improved diet/better farming/trade/transport of foodstuffs/increased life expectancy
 - rising living standards; more money for food
 - decline in infant mortality rate/healthier mothers meant healthier babies
 - fewer women died in childbirth/maternity clinics set up to help mothers and babies
 - medical improvements: X-Rays, vaccinations, antibiotics, new medicines
 - cures/preventions for fatal/childhood diseases: TB, polio, measles
 - killer epidemics disappeared: cholera, typhoid, diphtheria, smallpox
 - better housing, demolition of the slums/new council houses
 - improved public health: clean water, sewers
 - improvements in hygiene: soap, disinfectant, personal cleanliness
 - impact of Liberal Welfare Reforms: free school meals/medical inspections/pensions
 - National Insurance Act: free medical care for workers before 1939
 - wartime/Labour reforms: Family Allowance, National Assistance, National Insurance
 - the National Health Service: better medical care/facilities: more or better trained hospital staff, improved surgery, new equipment/subsidised prescriptions
 - the National Health Service providing free and comprehensive universal health care in any area.

KU2 (4)

2. The candidate describes the ways that some people suffered as a result of the development of road transport using **evidence** such as:
- traffic jams/congestions
 - road accidents
 - decline of town centres due to out of town stores
 - brought about the closure of local shops which caused difficulties for non-car owners
 - noise pollution caused by motor vehicles
 - dangerous for pedestrians to cross busy roads
 - parking problems
 - pollution from exhaust fumes
 - expense of maintaining a car
 - discouraged people from taking exercise/encourages people to be lazy
 - decline in public transport meant non-car owners suffer/decline in railways and trams
 - demolition of houses to make way for roads and motorways
 - some communities were divided by busy roads
 - increased costs of road/motorway building/maintenance
 - increased social divide with wealthy moving to suburbs.

KU1 (4)

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate processes and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

3. The candidate makes a balanced evaluation of **Source A** using evidence such as:
- contemporaneity: a secondary source but written with the benefit of hindsight
 - authorship: written by experienced historians who would have researched women's employment (during First World War)
 - content: details on impact of First World War on employment opportunities for women, such as ...
 - accuracy: matches candidate's own knowledge eg, ...
 - purpose: to inform people about the impact First World War had on women
 - limitation: only the views of two historians, which others may not agree with/doesn't say anything about other types of jobs women did during First World War, eg ... (other than secretarial/clerical/banking/domestic service)
- ES1 (4)**

4. The candidate selects and organises evidence **for the issue** using evidence such as:

Source A

- shortage of labour opened up job opportunities for women
- new white collar jobs such as secretarial or clerical work
- rise in number of women in banks

Source B

- women flooded into factories
- did engineering and other occupations once dominated by men

Source C

- there were 286 women employed on tramways
- libraries and education also employed large numbers of women
- still employed unmarried women.

The candidate selects and organises evidence **against the issue** such as:

Source A

- at the beginning of the war thousands of women were made unemployed

Source B

- First World War did not change deep seated beliefs about women and work
- women were still destined for marriage and to be homemakers
- trade unions made sure women were paid less
- at end of war many women were sacked
- women in industry regarded as having a bad effect on public morality
- even during the war men resented women workers as sources of cheap labour

Source C

- have not employed any more females since November 1918
- decided to do away with married female workers
- female workers still regarded as only temporary.

ES5 (6)

A maximum of three marks can be awarded if the relevant evidence is selected for only one side of the issue.

5. The candidate offers a **balanced conclusion** on the issue using **presented evidence** such as that given in **Answer 4** and **recalled evidence** such as:

For the issue:

- women got to show they could do many jobs as well as men/gained respect
- First World War made it more acceptable for women to work
- “The Nation Thanks the Women” billboards put up all over Britain displayed changing attitudes to female workforce
- improved working conditions for women: canteens, toilets, nurseries
- women were employed in a range of wartime industries such as munitions/shipbuilding
- women’s wages/salaries did rise during wartime
- some women were promoted/now held positions of responsibility
- women gained new skills which helped some keep their jobs
- war dead and wounded left jobs open for women.

Against the issue:

- returning soldiers demanded their jobs back from women
- women’s wages were cut after the war
- many women who were in promoted positions were demoted
- many women forced to return to domestic service due to lack of work in factories
- many employers removed improved conditions to discourage women workers, eg closed nurseries
- soon after war some newspapers labelled women workers as “parasites” for taking men’s jobs
- new inventions and technologies such as typewriter/telephone opened up more job opportunities for women
- postwar 1919 Sex Disqualification Act made it illegal to sack women on basis of gender alone
- better birth control/Marie Stopes Clinics allowed women to plan families better and follow a career.

ES6 (5)

A conclusion which takes account of one side only and/or is based solely on either presented evidence or recall can be awarded a maximum of two marks.

UNIT II – Context A: 1890s – 1920s

In answering questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant recalled knowledge.

1. The candidate describes the system of alliances and agreements made by the Great Powers in Europe before 1914 using **evidence** such as:

- Dual Alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary (1879)
- Italy joins Germany and Austria-Hungary to form the Triple Alliance (1882)
- France and Russia form the Franco-Russian/Dual Alliance (1893)
- Britain and France sign the Entente Cordiale, where they settle old disputes (1904)
- Anglo-Russian Entente signed by Russia and Britain (1907)
- Britain, France and Russia form the Triple Entente (1907)
- Anglo-Japanese Alliance (1902)
- Treaty of London which guaranteed Belgian neutrality/independence (1839)
- Anglo-French Naval Convention/Agreement (1911)
- Russian/Serbian understanding
- German/Turkish understanding.

KU1 (4)

2. The candidate explains why many people were unhappy with the Treaty of Versailles using evidence such as:

Germany was unhappy because:

- it was far harsher than she had expected
- expected a peace treaty based on Wilson's 14 points
- claimed it was a diktat/dictated peace
- hated the shame of the War Guilt clause
- accused it of being based on revenge
- was alarmed at the prospects of having to pay reparations
- insisted the economic terms were insane/far too harsh
- resented the loss of her colonies
- argued she did not deserve to be punished so severely since the Kaiser and generals were gone
- the new German Government was angry because it felt it had little chance of success after the terms were imposed
- angry at the loss of land containing many Germans
- furious at the reduction in Germany's armed forces which left her defenceless
- German right-wing groups accused the government of betraying Germany by signing the treaty
- angry that Germans were denied self-determination.

Other powers were unhappy because:

- France thought it was too lenient
- France wanted Germany crippled/to lose more territory
- USA was concerned the treaty was too harsh
- USA afraid it would lead to bitterness and a desire in Germany for revenge
- most civilians in Britain thought it was too lenient
- some politicians feared it would cripple Germany and delay the recovery of Britain's economy
- Italy was disappointed at its gains
- many feared it would lead to another war.

KU2 (4)

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate processes and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

3. The candidate makes a balanced evaluation of **Source A** using evidence such as:

- contemporaneity: primary source from the time when German civilians were suffering food shortages
- authorship: photograph taken by an eyewitness (to food shortages/food queues)
- content: shows German people queuing for potatoes in Berlin
- accuracy: matches candidate's own knowledge, eg ...
- purpose: to inform people about the way German civilians were suffering during the war
- limitation: only shows what was happening in Berlin/doesn't mention other ways civilians suffered during the war, eg ...

ES1 (4)

4. The candidate evaluates the degree of agreement between **Sources A** and **B** using evidence such as:

Sources agree that queues/people were orderly.

Source A shows: people standing calmly in line

Source B says: there is no disorder, people patiently stand in line.

Sources agree that people had to queue to get food.

Source A shows: large crowds queuing in Berlin

Source B says: queuing has become widespread.

Sources agree that food rationing had been introduced.

Source A shows: potatoes were rationed

Source B says: the bread ration was reduced in spring.

Sources agree that there was a shortage of potatoes/potatoes were in short supply.

Source A shows: people queuing for rationed potatoes

Source B says: the potato supply had been insufficient.

Sources agree that German people faced serious food shortages.

Source A shows: large crowds queuing for potatoes/food

Source B says: the food situation is unbearable.

Only **Source B** says: the food shortage is damaging people's health/under nourishment is spreading.

Only **Source B** says: bread was rationed.

ES2 (4)

One mark for a simple comparison. Two marks for a developed comparison.

5. The candidate evaluates the completeness of **Sources A and B** using **presented evidence** such as:

- civilians faced food shortages
- rationing was introduced
- to get food people had to queue
- many people were undernourished/hungry
- people's health suffered as a result of the shortages

and **recalled** evidence such as:

- people grew food in public parks
- soup kitchens provided food
- they were war weary/widespread demoralisation
- use of ersatz foods/products
- the Black Market
- the turnip winter of 1916-17
- shortage of coal which led to a shortage of electricity and gas
- outbreaks of influenza/Spanish flu
- inflation/increase in food prices
- air raids
- blackout
- men away at war
- women taking over men's jobs
- strikes and riots broke out in major cities
- war casualties
- loss of loved ones affected morale of civilians
- wartime restrictions
- debilitating effects of disease, eg influenza
- press censorship.

ES4 (5)

Full marks can only be awarded if the candidate refers to the source and uses recall in the answer.

UNIT II – Context B: 1930s – 1960s

In answering questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant recalled evidence.

1. The candidate describes the steps taken by Hitler to prepare for war in Europe using **evidence** such as:

- 1935 compulsory military service announced
- Hitler announces army to expand to 500,000 men
- 1935 Anglo-German naval agreement (German navy to be 35% of size of Royal Navy)
- Luftwaffe increased in strength
- German industries began to produce war weapons
- rearmament expenditure trebled between 1933-1935
- Luftwaffe fight for Nationalists in Spanish Civil War
- forts built along French border/Siegfried Line (West wall)
- Rome-Berlin Axis signed with Mussolini
- Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact signed August 1939
- 1936 remilitansation of Rhineland
- military benefits of territorial gains eg...

KU1 (4)

2. The candidate explains why the Cuban Missile Crisis increased tension between East and West using **evidence** such as:

- Soviet Union planned to place missiles on Cuba – near to USA
- President Kennedy demanded removal of the Soviet missiles
- Khrushchev refused to remove missiles/war of words
- Soviet missiles from Cuba could strike US cities
- Cuba blockaded by US Navy
- missiles were aimed at Washington (US government)
- new missile sites designed to strike cities in Western hemisphere
- US sphere of influence threatened
- US military build up
- threat of nuclear war.

KU2 (4)

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate processes and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

3. The candidate makes a balanced evaluation of **Source A** using evidence such as:
- contemporaneity: primary source from the time Germany was suffering from Allied bombing
 - authorship: photograph of the event taken by an eyewitness (to Allied bombing raid)
 - content: shows devastation of bombing in Hamburg
 - accuracy: matches candidate's own knowledge, eg ...
 - purpose: to inform people about the way German civilians were suffering during the war
 - limitation: only shows what was happening in Hamburg/doesn't mention other ways civilians suffered during the war, eg ...
- ES1 (4)**

4. The candidate evaluates the degree of agreement between **Sources A** and **B** using evidence such as:

Sources agree that civilians suffered from bombing raids.

Source A shows: Hamburg following an Allied bombing raid

Source B says: thousands of tons of bombs.

Sources agree about the extent of the damage.

Source A shows: destruction of buildings

Source B says: thousands of tons of bombs and shells have almost erased the city.

Sources agree that bombing caused a huge number of casualties.

Source A shows: there were 50,000 people killed

Source B says: thousands of bodies still remain beneath the rubble.

Sources agree about the disruption to transport/people had to travel by foot.

Source A shows: people travelling on foot/few vehicles

Source B says: people can only travel by foot across the city.

Sources disagree about roads being blocked.

Source A shows: that the main road is clear

Source B says: that bulldozers are working to clear them.

Only **Source B** mentions the putrid smell.

Only **Source B** mentions the collapse of morale.

ES2 (4)

One mark for a simple comparison. Two marks for a developed comparison.

5. The candidate evaluates the completeness of **Sources A and B** using **presented evidence** such as:

- shows the devastation of Allied bombing
- high casualty figures
- thousands of bodies buried in the rubble/putrid smell
- loss of morale/after a while people gave up
- dislocation of transport

and from **recalled evidence** such as:

- food queues/riots
- ersatz provisions
- food shortages/unavailability
- naval blockade
- thousand-bomber raids
- war shortages
- war casualties
- threats from secret police
- wartime restrictions
- black market
- shelter life
- blackout
- men away at war
- families split up
- persecution of minorities worsened.

ES4 (5)

Full marks can only be awarded if the candidate refers to the source and uses recall in the answer.

UNIT III – Context A: USA 1850 – 1880

In answering questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant recalled knowledge.

1. (a) The candidate assesses how far the outbreak of the American Civil war in 1861 was due to attitudes towards slavery using **evidence** such as:
- North-South Divide: Northern states opposed to slavery/Southern states in favour of slavery
 - Southern slave owning states fighting for the right to manage their own affairs
 - South feared for its distinct way of life/culture
 - Southerners saw slavery as central to its way of life/justified use of slaves
 - slavery was essential to the Southern economy
 - many Northerners felt slavery was morally wrong
 - growth of abolitionists split the country
 - slavery perceived as a moral good/necessary evil by Southerners
 - horror of slave life (Uncle Tom's Cabin) intensified sectional feeling
 - Northern anti-slavery propaganda inflamed Southerners
 - South angry at the North for accepting runaway slaves/actively trying to help slaves escape
 - South was alarmed by election of Lincoln who wanted to halt spread of slavery
 - newly elected Lincoln's views had to be heard – he would not tolerate the spread of slavery
 - election encouraged states to secede from the Union
 - South wanted to expand slavery into new territories – North resented this
 - violence over slavery occurred when states tried to enter the union
 - Kansas Nebraska Act (1854) angered the North who feared slavery may move North
 - South felt their position on slavery was legitimised by the Supreme Court (Kansas Nebraska Act 1854)
 - background to slavery issues played a part (Fugitive State Laws, Dred Scott case, (1859), John Brown's Raid (1859)) in dividing the nation
 - Missouri Compromise
 - fanatical leaders on either side who were unwilling to compromise

and other possible factors such as those given in 1 (b) or the following:

- North-South divide in industrial development – industrial North/agrarian South
- Southerners fearful of modernisation and movement of Southerners to the North
- economic tension with the industrial North/disagreement about tariffs – North benefited to the detriment of the South
- North wanted internal improvements sponsored by the federal government, and the South did not
- Lincoln's promise to possess and hold property of the state
- the Confederate attack on Fort Sumter forced Lincoln's hand/Lincoln gathered an army.

KU3 (8)

1. (b) The candidate assesses how far the outbreak of the American Civil war in 1861 was due to attitudes towards the Union using **evidence** such as:

- Southern states wanted to opt out of the Union/Northern states determined to preserve the Union
- South wanted to become an independent nation
- North wanted greater federal powers which angered the South
- Southern right to secede/opt out of the Union if they wanted to
- North felt that if states were allowed to secede it would threaten the democratic government
- South argued that the North was forcing their will on states and ignoring rights or wishes of individual states
- views of hard line Southern leaders
- Lincoln wanted to preserve the Union
- many believed that North pushed through laws looking after their own interests
- many believed that the Union should be preserved
- issue of Union vs Federalism/right to manage own affairs
- Northern concerns over state rights – Kansas Nebraska Act (1854) – popular sovereignty
- Lincoln believed that no state could lawfully get out of the Union – it was unconstitutional
- Confederate leaders insisted that US officers/soldiers be moved out of the South
- fanatical leaders on both sides who were unwilling to compromise
- Southern patriots feared that a strong central government would interfere in their affairs
- South Carolina seceded from the Union following Lincoln’s inauguration
- other states soon followed and they formed a new Union – the Confederate States of America which angered Lincoln and the North
- Lincoln vowed not to tolerate any act of violence against the USA.

and any other possible factors such as those given in 1 (a).

KU3 (8)

In marking the 8 mark essay, 1 mark should be awarded for each relevant piece of correctly applied evidence, up to a maximum of 6 marks. Each piece of evidence may be developed for a maximum of 1 additional mark. A further 2 marks may be awarded for process, ie whether the response is indeed an “essay”, constructed in paragraphs, at least two and separate from, a valid introduction and a clear conclusion. Such additional marks should be indicated as +1 or +2. A total mark should be written in the appropriate box.

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

2. The candidate discusses the attitude of the author towards Reconstruction using **evidence** such as:
- **negative** attitude to Reconstruction (**holistic**)
 - **shameful** that the right to vote has been denied to many
 - **worried** about/**threatened** by the presence of violent groups
 - **alarmed** at possible loss of land or work
 - situation has become **desperate** for many
 - **“disappointed”** that many have **no choice and must give in to the threats.** **ES3 (4)**

3. The candidate evaluates the degree of agreement between **Sources A** and **B** using evidence such as:

Sources disagree about the extent of the black franchise.

Source A says: it is shameful that our right to vote has been denied

Source B says: by 1868 there were more black voters in the South compared to Whites.

Sources disagree about the level of black representation.

Source A says: we have never enjoyed representation in many states

Source B says: during the Reconstruction period, 18 black men became Congressmen.

Sources disagree on opportunities given to black people during Reconstruction.

Source A says: we have no other options available

Source B says: Reconstruction offered many opportunities and choices to freedmen.

Sources disagree about black ownership of land:

Source A says: threaten to deprive us of (work) or land

Source B says: with many acquiring land.

Sources agree that violent/terrorist groups existed to threaten black Americans.

Source A says: the alarming presence of groups who bring violence

Source B says: the Ku Klux Klan developed into a violent political movement.

Sources agree that black people were murdered.

Source A says: secret murders, lynching, intimidation

Source B says: death (and intimidation) of thousands.

Only **Source B** mentions the development of the Ku Klux Klan.

ES2 (4)

One mark for a simple comparison. Two marks for a developed comparison.

UNIT III – Context B: India 1917 – 1947
--

In answering questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant recalled knowledge.

1. (a) The candidate assesses how far discontent in India was due to the effects of British rule using **evidence** such as:

- discrimination in education/jobs
- discrimination in housing/living standards
- Indians had no vote/few rights
- imposition of taxes
- taxes on essentials such as salt caused hardship to the poor
- British ignorance/disparagement/suppression of Indian culture
- exploitation of Indian natural resources (cotton)
- use of the English language
- British control of civil service/law and order/government
- British interests in charge of railways
- little development of industry except iron and steel (for British benefit)
- Indian political leaders imprisoned
- aftermath of Amritsar Massacre/repression.

and other possible factors such as those given in 1(b).

KU3 (8)

OR

1. (b) The candidate assesses how far discontent in India was due to religious and social divisions between Indians using **evidence** such as:

- Hindu/Sikh/Muslim
- caste/Untouchables (Harijan)
- Northern Aryans/Southern Dravidians
- princes/provinces under direct British rule
- pro West/Indian Nationalists
- political parties Congress/Muslim League
- language differences: 18 official and 200 dialects
- huge differences in wealth.

and any other possible factors such as those given in 1 (a).

KU3 (8)

In marking the 8 mark essay, 1 mark should be awarded for each relevant piece of correctly applied evidence, up to a maximum of 6 marks. Each piece of evidence may be developed for a maximum of 1 additional mark. A further 2 marks may be awarded for process, ie whether the response is indeed an “essay”, constructed in paragraphs, at least two and separate from, a valid introduction and a clear conclusion. Such additional marks should be indicated as +1 or +2. A total mark should be written in the appropriate box.

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

2. The candidate discusses the attitude of the author of **Source A** using evidence such as:

- Mountbatten was **concerned (holistic)**
- Mountbatten **felt/agreed** the situation needed to be resolved **speedily**
- he was **worried** about bloodshed and violence
- he was **open-minded** about Partition
- he was **looking for compromise**
- he **believed** a man was an **Indian** above all else.

ES3 (4)

3. The candidate evaluates the degree of agreement between **Sources A** and **B** using **evidence** such as:

Sources agree about the need for a speedy resolution.

Source A says: the need for speed

Source B says: that there was a need for speed.

Sources disagree about the possibility of compromise.

Source A says: Mountbatten was looking for compromise

Source B says: India had gone beyond the stage at which a compromise solution was possible.

Sources disagree that Partition may bring bloodshed/violence.

Source A says: lest Partition may produce bloodshed and violence

Source B says: once his 'surgical operation' had taken place, all troubles would cease and India's two halves would live in harmony.

Sources disagree about nationhood.

Source A says: a man was an Indian before all else

Source B says: the only thing a Muslim had in common with a Hindu was his slavery to the British.

ES2 (4)

One mark for a simple comparison. Two marks for a developed comparison.

UNIT III – Context C: Russia 1914 – 1941

In answering questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant recalled knowledge.

1. (a) The candidate assesses the extent to which popular discontent with the weaknesses of the Provisional Government was the main reason for the October 1917 Revolution using relevant **evidence** such as:

- the Provisional Government lacked legitimate authority to rule Russia/not elected
- the Provisional Government had few supporters despite its many social and democratic changes
- the Provisional Government had taken too long to organise democratic elections
- the Provisional Government had needed others' help to defeat the Kornilov Coup
- the Provisional Government was unpopular with many important people
- the Provisional Government failed to solve key problems: food shortages/rising prices/unemployment
- the Provisional Government lost popularity as it continued the war
- the Provisional Government lost support of the army
- the Provisional Government was facing growing unrest throughout Russia
- the Provisional Government failed to redistribute land
- the Provisional Government failed to improve working conditions for industrial workers
- Kerensky and the Provisional Government were seen as weak/were taken by surprise at Bolshevik growth

BUT

- the failure of the July Days strengthened the Provisional Government.

and other possible factors such as those given in 1(b).

KU3 (8)

OR

1. (b) The candidate assesses the extent to which the appeal of Lenin and the Bolsheviks was the main reason for the October 1917 Revolution using relevant recalled **evidence** such as:

- had policies which appealed to various groups in Russia
- Bolshevik propaganda was successful in putting over its policies
- promised an end to war
- promised land to the peasants
- promised food to the workers
- promised an end to rule by the rich
- Lenin and the Bolsheviks appealed by being strong and organised
- the Bolsheviks had gained from suppressing the Kornilov failed Coup
- the Bolsheviks had weapons (not handed back) after the Kornilov revolt
- the Bolsheviks had great support from the Industrial workers in Petrograd/Moscow
- the Bolsheviks had gained control of the local Soviets
- the Bolsheviks had some military support to be able to seize key points in Petrograd
- return of Bolshevik exiles/prisoners increased revolutionary fervour.

and any other possible factors such as those given in 1 (a).

KU3 (8)

In marking the 8 mark, extended essay, 1 mark should be awarded for each relevant piece of correctly applied evidence, up to a maximum of 6 marks. Each piece of evidence may only be developed for a maximum of 1 additional mark. A further 2 marks may only be awarded for process, ie whether the response is indeed an “essay”, constructed in paragraphs, at least two and separate from, a valid introduction and a clear conclusion. Such additional marks should be indicated as +1 or +2. A total mark should be written in the appropriate box.

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

2. The candidate discusses the attitude of the peasants to Collectivisation using **evidence** such as:

- **negative** attitude to/**against** the policies of Collectivisation (**holistic**)
- they were **desperate** to hide their grain from the Government
- they **reluctantly** slaughtered their animals/especially their best breeds
- they were **determined** the Government would not get their livestock
- enjoyed a degree of **satisfaction** at resisting.

ES3 (4)

3. The candidate evaluates the degree of agreement between **Sources A** and **B** using **evidence** such as:

Sources disagree about the number of animals.

Source A says: the number of cattle was halved

Source B says: by 1937, the numbers of farm animals had increased rapidly.

Sources disagree about the care of the livestock.

Source A says: they even slaughtered their best breeding animals

Source B says: the peasants looked after their livestock.

Sources disagree about the success of the Government in getting grain.

Source A says: peasants hid as much of their grain

Source B says: government made sure that it got its hands on more grain.

Sources disagree about the feeding of towns.

Source A says: a great deal of grain did not reach the town markets

Source B says: town workers were being fed.

Only **Source A** says: peasants were determined to resist collectivisation.

Only **Source B** mentions: the cost of millions of Russian lives.

Only **Source B** says: fewer peasants were now farming (number of villagers had been cut down savagely).

ES2 (4)

One mark for a simple comparison. Two marks for a developed comparison.

UNIT III – Context D: Germany 1918 – 1939

In answering questions in Section A, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant recalled knowledge.

1. (a) The candidate assesses the extent to which discontent with the Weimar Republic was the main factor in the Nazi rise to power in January 1933 using **evidence** such as:

- Weimar blamed for losing World War One/Stab in the Back
- linked with defeat and humiliation
- blamed for signing the Treaty of Versailles (November Criminals)
- blamed for the reparations imposed on Germany
- blamed for shortages of food/fuel/materials at end of war
- criticised for giving in to foreign powers
- criticised for part in Ruhr invasion
- proportional representation produced weak governments
- inability to curb extremism in politics
- coalition governments lacked authority/seemed unable to solve problems facing Germany
- unable to stop outbreaks of violence
- Weimar was blamed for economic hardships: Hyperinflation/Wall Street Crash
- Weimar could not alleviate mass unemployment
- Weimar weaknesses were exploited by the Nazis
- squabbling among politicians led to people losing respect for/faith in them.

KU3 (8)

and other possible factors such as those given in 1(b).

OR

1. (b) The candidate assesses the extent to which the appeal of Hitler and the Nazis was the main factor in the Nazi rise to power in January 1933.

- Hitler promised strong, decisive leadership
- held large public meetings/parades which excited many
- Nazi use of propaganda eg ...
- use of intimidation/violence which attracted many/intimidated others
- use of SA to impress people/well disciplined in times of chaos
- contribution of Hitler and his oratory skills
- Nazi programme: hatred of Versailles – promised to destroy Treaty of Versailles
- Hitler's promises: eg provision of jobs, reunite all Germans, remilitarisation
- electioneering tactics, eg refusal to join coalition governments
- success in elections brought greater publicity/legitimacy/financial backing
- anti-Communist stance: appeared to be Germany's best defence against Communism
- seemed to offer something to most groups/classes in Germany
- offered solutions to Germany's economic problems
- promised to restore order to Germany after chaos in Weimar period
- offered the prospect of a new, better future for Germany.

PTO for other possible factors

And other possible factors such as those given in 1 (a) **or the following:**

- use of intimidation/violence to suppress opposition
- hardship/suffering caused by Great Depression
- scared people by warning of Communist threat/take-over.

KU3 (8)

In marking the 8 mark, extended essay, 1 mark should be awarded for each relevant piece of correctly applied evidence, up to a maximum of 6 marks. Each piece of evidence may only be developed for a maximum of 1 additional mark. A further 2 marks may be awarded for process, ie whether the response is indeed an “essay”, constructed in paragraphs, at least two and separate from, a valid introduction and a clear conclusion. Such additional marks should be indicated as +1 or +2. A total mark should be written in the appropriate box.

Section B

In answering questions in Section B, candidates are required to carry out the appropriate process and to use relevant presented evidence and recalled knowledge where appropriate. Where **recall is required** in an answer this is stated in the question paper.

2. The candidate discusses the attitude of the writer to the Hitler Youth using **evidence** such as:

- **negative** attitude/**disliked** Hitler Youth (**holistic**)
- **unenthusiastic** about the Hitler Youth
- memories are that it was very **oppressive**
- **bored** with same **monotonous** routine
- **believed** that activities were **more punishment** than fun
- **disliked** the endless marching/drill
- **appreciated/understood/acknowledged** children were being trained to be tough and obedient.

ES3 (4)

3. The candidate evaluates the degree of agreement between **Sources A** and **B** using **evidence** such as:

Sources disagree about enjoying the Hitler Youth.

Source A says: I cannot share their enthusiasm/my memories are that it was very oppressive

Source B says: I was full of enthusiasm when I joined the Hitler Youth.

Sources disagree about marching.

Source A says: endless marching

Source B says: what joy we felt to be able to go on these trips (marches on a Sunday).

Sources disagree about variety of activities.

Source A says: activities consisted almost entirely of military drill/every day was the same monotonous routine

Source B says: there was always something different to do.

Sources disagree about the effects of the activities.

Source A says: it was more punishment than fun

Source B says: it was a means of relaxing.

Sources agree that activities made youths stronger.

Source A says: from childhood onwards we were drilled in toughness

Source B says: as well as building us up physically.

Only **Source A** mentions: drill and shooting practice/military activities.

Only **Source A** mentions: children being trained for the future.

Only **Source B** mentions: handball/football/bathing/fun activities.

Only **Source B** mentions: going on trips.

ES2 (4)

One mark for a simple comparison. Two marks for a developed comparison.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]