

Mark scheme

Sample assessment materials for
first teaching September 2015

GCE History (9HI0/38)
Advanced

Paper 3: Themes in breadth with
aspects in depth

Option 38.1: The making of
modern Russia, 1855–1991

Option 38.2: The making of
modern China, 1860–1997

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two enquiries may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interrogates the evidence of the source in relation to both enquiries with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Sections B and C

Target: AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. The overall judgement is missing or asserted. There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855–1991

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source to consider its value in revealing the extent of support enjoyed by the Bolsheviks and their attitude to democracy. The author of the extract, Lenin, is named in the specification, and candidates can be expected to know about him and should be aware of the context, namely the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The authoritative position of the author as the acknowledged leader of the Bolsheviks and the driving force behind the October Revolution The document was issued in the name of the Soviet, which the Bolsheviks claimed was now the legitimate authority in Russia, and this is therefore a public and official document There is a clear appeal to public opinion and the verdict of history It is clearly written with the intention of reducing any blame that might fall on the Bolsheviks for 'destroying' democracy. The following inferences and significant points of information could be drawn and supported from the source: <p>Extent of support for the Bolsheviks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fact that the Bolsheviks felt able to dissolve a popularly elected assembly suggests they felt confident they had popular support It admits that the Bolsheviks' opponents have a majority in the Assembly It implies that the electoral lists that formed the basis of the election are now invalid because they were drawn up before October It suggests that the Bolsheviks had powerful sources of support outside the assembly, through the Soviets. <p>Their attitudes to democracy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It suggests that there were different ideas of democracy and the Constituent Assembly represented bourgeois ideas of democracy It suggests that democracy had to be based on class, and the Soviets were more representative of the workers than this Assembly It claims that the pursuit of a socialist ideal justifies ignoring election results if the elected representatives stand in the way of the implementation of socialism It suggests that ultimately Lenin and the Bolsheviks believed they should decide what is best. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the value of the source in revealing the extent of the support for the Bolsheviks and their attitude to democracy. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growing support for the Bolsheviks and the increase in party membership The areas of Bolshevik support in the large cities (particularly Petrograd and Moscow) and the army compared to much wider support for their opponents in the villages and small towns The use of violence to seize power in Petrograd and even more so in Moscow in October The Marxist belief in the primacy of class in determining value judgements and faith in the Bolshevik Party as the vanguard of the working class.

Option 38.2: The making of modern China, 1860–1997

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source to consider its value in revealing the nature of Chinese society in the late nineteenth century and the reasons for the Boxer Rebellion. The author of the extract is not named in the specification – candidates cannot therefore be expected to know about him, but should be aware of the context of the source, namely the Boxer Rebellion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The position of the author as an educated and well-informed observer who had lived in China for many years and was highly regarded at the Chinese Court He appears to be genuinely trying to explain Chinese actions and to enter into their mindset; in this sense he displays sympathy He has knowledge of Chinese history, culture and the political system It was written in the immediate aftermath of the Boxer Rebellion, which should aid accuracy of recollection but might limit reflective analysis. The following inferences and significant points of information could be drawn and supported from the source: <p>Nature of Chinese society:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It suggests a respect for Chinese civilisation and an awareness of the importance of unwritten codes of behaviour It claims there are good reasons for Chinese resentment of foreigners It claims that most Chinese people are ignorant of the outside world but that this ignorance is 'blissful' and almost to be admired He appears to think that many ordinary Chinese are prey to strange superstitions, but these need to be treated with respect, not laughed at. <p>Reasons for the Boxer Rebellion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It claims that there has been 60 years of unequal treatment and foreigners enjoy a position that most Chinese rightly resented It claims that missionaries in particular have been the cause of ill feeling It claims that deeply-held cultural values have been summarily dismissed and this has contributed to the Rebellion. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the value of the source in revealing the nature of Chinese society and the reasons for the Boxer Rebellion. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of the treaties referred to, such as the Treaty of Tianjin 1860 The recent humiliation of China's defeat at the hands of Japan in 1895 Germany's, Russia's and France's behaviour in the years 1895–98, further humiliating China Reasons why the Chinese felt such pride in their civilisation Knowledge of popular belief being outraged by foreign behaviour, such as the belief in Feng Shui, which is alluded to in the source.

Section B: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855–1991

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how extensive the political reforms of Alexander II were in the years 1855–70.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence confirming the extent of the political reforms of Alexander II should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new elected Zemstva represented a break with the autocratic traditions of the past, and they often became centres of 'liberal' influence • The legal reforms marked a clear separation of executive government and justice • There was a major advance in education, which was removed from church control • There was an increase in intellectual debate and freedom, which stimulated the growth of opposition to autocracy • The new military system was far less of a burden on the peasantry. <p>Arguments and evidence that suggest the impact of the political reforms of Alexander II was limited should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The powers of the Zemstva were limited and voting weighted in favour of the nobility • The legal reforms had little impact on the peasantry, who formed the vast majority of Russians • The growing press was still censored • There was no national representative institution and Russia remained an autocracy • The church remained a powerful and deeply reactionary force in the realm of ideas. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which Khrushchev 'de-Stalinized' the USSR in the years 1956–61.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence confirming the extent to which Khrushchev 'de-Stalinized' the Soviet Union in these years should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The worst excesses of state brutality were ended and the powers of the KGB reduced • Millions of prisoners were released from the camps • Fallen politicians such as Molotov were not executed but comfortably pensioned off • There was a considerable increase in literary freedom • There was a sustained attempt to decentralise power. <p>Arguments and evidence suggesting limitations in the extent to which Khrushchev 'de-Stalinized' the Soviet Union should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no challenge to the sole authority of the Communist Party and power was wielded by a very narrow group • Khrushchev continued to behave as an unpredictable autocrat • The closure of churches was particularly severe between 1959 and 1961 • Arrest for purely political offences still happened. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Option 38.2: The making of modern China, 1860–1997

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that it was Chiang Kai-shek's decision to attack the Japanese in Shanghai in 1937 that turned a minor incident in Beijing into all-out war.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the proposition that the Chinese attack on the Japanese in 1937 was key should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Japanese intended to conduct only a limited attack in Northern China in July following an accidental clash • The Japanese misjudged the situation and assumed that China would back down in the face of Japanese aggression and sign an armistice as they had done before • The Chinese decided to attack the Japanese in August in Shanghai with the best-trained part of their army, and this produced a major conflict • The Japanese responded to the Chinese attack with massive reinforcements being sent to Shanghai and the Yangtze Valley, leading to the committal of the best part of the Japanese army to war in China. <p>Arguments and evidence against the proposition that the Chinese attack on the Japanese in 1937 was key should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Japanese hardliners won the debate within the Japanese army and government in July and decided to inflict real humiliation on China, making all-out war difficult to avoid • The Japanese attack around Beijing in July was a massive provocation with demands that the Chinese withdraw all forces from Beijing. This was almost a declaration of all-out war • The Japanese behaved as if all-out war had developed when they occupied several towns in northern China and behaved with great brutality, massacring all civilians in Dongzhou • In the light of Japanese actions, Chiang could not have survived without a major response. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which the Sino-Soviet split was simply the result of a clash of personalities between Mao and Khrushchev.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the proposition that the split was the result of personality clash between Mao and Khrushchev should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mao despised Khrushchev and compared him unfavourably with Stalin • Mao was appalled at Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in 1956 • Mao thought Khrushchev weak in his bid for better relations with the West • Khrushchev thought Mao irresponsible in his attitude to nuclear war • Mao and other Chinese leaders felt patronised by Khrushchev and resented his criticism of the Great Leap Forward • Khrushchev wanted to teach Mao a lesson in 1960 when he withdrew all Russian technicians from China. <p>Arguments and evidence pointing to other causes of the split should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was the Russian demand in 1958 for Russian military facilities in China that sparked hostility • Mao had always been suspicious of the Moscow trained communist leaders, whom he had replaced in the late 1930s and 1940s • After the fall of Khrushchev in 1964, relations continued to deteriorate • The period of maximum tension took place in March 1969 when fighting broke out on the frontier over a disputed border. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Section C: indicative content

Option 38.1: The making of modern Russia, 1855–1991

Question	Indicative content
7	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement as to how far there was a steady improvement in the lives of Russian peasants over the years 1855–1991.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the proposition should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abolition of serfdom in 1861 brought personal freedom • State serfs (the majority) did better than private serfs in the amount of land received • There was considerable progress for the better off peasants in the years before the First World War • There was a general improvement in living standards for most peasants between 1922 and 1929 • Collectivisation brought some benefits in the 1930s in the form of greater technology and also the slow spread of electrification • There was a general improvement from the mid-1950s with the reduction of taxation, and living standards slowly rose. <p>Arguments and evidence contradicting the proposition should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For many serfs on private estates there was less land available after emancipation than before and they paid more • The massive growth in population in the late nineteenth century worsened living standards in many areas and produced famine from time to time • The reforms of Stolypin in 1906–11 worsened conditions for many poor peasants • Collectivisation was a disaster for many peasants and there was widespread resistance and death. Famine may have killed eight million in 1932–34 and rural living standards remained depressed till the 1950s. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
8	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement as to how far the collectivisation of agriculture can be seen as the key turning point in the process of agricultural change in Russia and the USSR in the years 1855–1991.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the proposition should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact was enormous, leading to a vast amount of suffering in terms both of famine and forcible eviction and movement • There was a major shift in the application of more advanced technology to farming, but few of the benefits came to the peasants • The key result was a much greater control of agriculture by the government, which made possible the feeding of the growing urban areas and facilitated industrialisation • It made possible the export of more grain with which to buy advanced technology from abroad, and this continued to the 1950s. <p>Arguments and evidence contradicting the proposition should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were long-term problems associated with the collective farms, which were only acknowledged in the 1950s but even then not fully – Soviet agriculture remained a weak link in the Soviet economy with increasing imports of grain from the 1960s • It became increasingly clear that the most productive part of Soviet agriculture were the small peasant plots, i.e. the land that was not collectivised • The emancipation of the serfs in 1861 brought about as big a change but with less suffering • The 1917 Land Decree was hugely popular with the peasants and marked a major turning point. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Option 38.2: The making of modern China, 1860–1997

Question	Indicative content
9	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far Deng Xiaoping's launching of the Four Modernisations in 1978–79 can be regarded as the key turning point in the development of China as a great economic power in the years 1860–1997.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the proposition that it was the key turning point should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of change after 1980 was unprecedented, with Chinese GDP doubling in 10 years • There was a massive migration to the towns from villages freed from controls: 100 million in the years 1984–88 • There was a massive increase in consumer goods, particularly in Guangzhou and neighbouring provinces • There was a massive boom in Chinese exports and in foreign dollar earnings • The growth after 1978–79 was in sharp contrast to the previous 14 years, which had seen massive disruption to the economy as a result of the Cultural Revolution and Mao's influence and legacy. <p>Arguments and evidence contradicting or modifying the proposition should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There had been previous periods of significant growth and transformation: the development of steam ships and railways under the late Qing dynasty produced significant growth • There had been growth in the late 1920s and 1930s, particularly in the generation of electrical power • There had been impressive growth of heavy industry in the 1950s • There had been a period of real progress from 1962 to 1966, again with Deng exercising considerable influence. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
10	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement as to whether the process of economic growth in China was driven, in the years 1860–1997, mainly by Chinese political leaders.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the proposition that growth was driven mainly by political leaders should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points supporting the proposition may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of such dominant figures of the Self-Strengthening Movement of the late Qing period, such as Li Hongzhang, in furthering growth • The political importance of Mao in furthering growth in the period 1949–58 • The key role of Deng Xiaoping after 1978–79 in promoting economic liberalisation and achieving growth • The leadership of Chiang Kai-shek and his finance minister, T V Soong, brought some growth in the years 1926–36, e.g. coal output more than doubled and electrical power quadrupled. <p>Arguments and evidence countering the proposition should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political leaders did not invariably promote growth – there were serious setbacks to growth in the years 1958–62 and 1966–76 as a result of Mao's dominance • There was a period of rapid growth following the fall of the Qing and particularly during the First World War when annual growth reached 13.8 per cent, and this period was notable for an absence of strong political leadership • The application of newly-developed technology in the 1980s and 1990s helped rapid growth • Container shipping and reduced transport costs facilitated Chinese exports in the late twentieth century. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>