



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2005**

**HISTORY- EUROPE**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IBCA.*

**1. For what reasons, and with what results, was the French Revolution so violent between 1789 and 1794?**

The main periods of violence in the French Revolution were: the storming of the Bastille; Paris mob violence; the Great Fear; storming of Versailles; storming of the Tuileries; September massacres (1792); execution of the king and queen and large scale use of the guillotine; rebellion in the Vendee (1793); continuation and increase of the terror, “Reign of terror” 1793-94; death of prominent revolutionaries. Violence began to subside in 1795.

Reasons for violence could include: hatred of the royal family, nobility, feudalism *etc.*; famine and food shortages; incitement by mob and political leaders; political clubs (Girondins, Jacobins); Robespierre; sansculottes; foreign sympathy with royal family .

Effects could include: the end of the monarchy; breakdown of law and order; individual events noted above; dislike of the revolution and rise of Napoleon.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague causes of the revolution or unsubstantiated generalizations.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for descriptive/narrative account of violence with implicit reasons and results.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit focus on the question.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, focused and structured answers which deal with reasons and results and include specific evidence.

**[17+ marks]** for further development of skills, such as the appreciation of different interpretations.

**2. Compare and contrast the foreign policies of Napoleon I and Louis Philippe.**

Napoleon’s foreign policy could either include campaigns in Austria and Egypt before his virtual seizure of power in 1799, or begin with his wars against the 2nd Coalition, and include the 3rd Coalition, Peninsular War, invasion of Russia, war of 4th Coalition and final “100 Days” with defeat at Waterloo. His policies can be assessed for their effects on France (glory, booty, financial and manpower exhaustion).

In contrast Louis Philippe tended to avoid war. He was more concerned with diplomacy, *e.g.* the Belgian crisis, support for the coalition against Mehemet Ali, the Spanish marriages, but his more peaceful policies (including friendly relations with England for most of his reign - unlike Napoleon) were not necessarily popular.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for inadequate answers or those which only address one of the rulers.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for sequential narratives with implicit linkage.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for good linkage or a comparative framework.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for a comparative structure and good evidence to support the argument.

**[17+ marks]** for balance, analysis and perceptive interpretation.

**3. “It restored peace and stability after a turbulent and revolutionary era.” To what extent do you agree with this judgement of the Vienna settlement (1814-1815)?**

This question addresses the Vienna settlement only, and requires knowledge of the terms and an assessment of them, as well as its omissions, *i.e.* what it failed to address, such as liberalism and nationalism. About half the essay should be devoted to the judgment, focused on the exact wording of the question - that is the nature of the turbulent era, revolution and France’s conquest under Napoleon, which disturbed the equilibrium of Europe, and how far the settlement restored peace and prosperity. Better candidates should also be able to comment on its suitability for the nineteenth century as opposed to the old regimes.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a few general remarks about the settlement.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for either some specific details or a coherent argument which lacks adequate evidence.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for specific details of the settlement and some judgment of the issues involved.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for good details of the settlement and an analytical judgment.

*[17+ marks]* for full details and a perceptive analysis.

**4. Assess the successes and failures of Peel as prime minister of Britain, 1834-1835 and 1841-1846.**

As Home Secretary, Peel had reformed the criminal law and prison system, established the Metropolitan Police, and in 1829, introduced legislation that allowed Catholics to become MPs. These are not relevant for this question except as an introduction. His Tamworth Manifesto (1834) laid the foundation of modern Conservatism. As prime minister, he provided efficient government and improved finance and trade. *e.g.* Bank Charter Act and reduction of import duties. In 1846 the failure of the Irish potato crop led him to repeal the Corn Laws, and split the Tory party. Candidates need to analyse at least some of the above to assess successes and failures and to reach an overall conclusion.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a few general points.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative with implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for specific factual evidence for judging successes and failures.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus, structure, balance and analysis of successes and failures.

*[17+ marks]* for a balanced and critical approach to successes and failures.

**5. Analyse the aims and achievements of Cavour for Piedmont-Sardinia and Italy.**

The full demands of this question could be interpreted as follows: What Cavour sought to achieve for Piedmont internally - in relation to greater Italy, and for Piedmont's external European position - and how far his aims were achieved. Then for Italy, did Cavour aim to unify Italy as a whole, or just its northern part, and what did he achieve for Italy? In other words, what was his contribution to Italian unification and was unification beneficial for Italy? It is doubtful if all candidates will consider all the above areas but specific details must be given to support assertions made.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague general points on Italian unification.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative of some of Cavour's policies in Piedmont and Italy and implicit analysis.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focus, detail and comment on the set question.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus, structure, balance and analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive identification of the problems, such as uncertainty of Cavour's aims and achievements for both Piedmont and Italy, by giving different interpretations.

**6. To what extent was Germany's unification under Prussia due to the weakness of Austria?**

Candidates tend to know and emphasize the positive role of Prussia in German unification. This question is set to try to draw out Austrian weaknesses: diversity of nationalities and lands; lack of modernization in politics and economic development; roles of Metternich and the imperial dynasty. "To what extent" allows discussion and assessment of Prussia, but the main focus should be Austria. Better candidates could point out that the decline of Austria was not readily discernible in Europe at the time.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalizations about German unification, or an answer that ignores Austria and describes Bismarck's wars.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative of German unification with adequate coverage of Austria.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on Austrian problems and weaknesses.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for analysis and balanced coverage of Austrian weakness and some mention of Prussian strength.

*[17+ marks]* for a perceptive approach to "To what extent" and concise attention to Prussian strength.

**7. “A period of consolidation at home and abroad.” To what extent does this statement explain Bismarck’s policies between 1871 and 1890?**

This question demands consideration of Bismarck’s aims and policies, internal and external, after the unification of Germany and pronouncement of the German Empire in 1871. For “at home”, candidates could include the new constitution (modelled on the North German Confederation), the Kulturkampf, economic measures, and relations with Liberals and Socialists. For “abroad”, they could include isolation of France, alliances, and Congress of Berlin. In order to score well candidates must use the policies to form a judgment on the quotation.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalities or pre-1871 material.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/descriptive accounts of some policies.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focused use of policies.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers focused on the quotation and which reach a verdict on it.

*[17+ marks]* for good balance between “home and abroad” and critical analysis.

**8. For what reasons, and with what results, did Alexander II try to reform Russian institutions?**

Reasons will no doubt include “the necessity to reform from above”, to preserve tsardom, to modernize in order to strengthen Russia, and perhaps to liberalize. Results are usually well known factually: liberation of the serfs with its successes and failures; reforms of the army, education, judiciary and local government *etc.* Better candidates may then consider the wider results - dissatisfaction and opposition increased because expectations were raised but not fulfilled, *e.g.* no National Assembly, and finally, Alexander was assassinated.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a description of reforms with implicit reasons and results.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit reasons and results.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers focused and structured on reasons and results.

*[17+ marks]* for balance and perhaps a challenge to the usual assumptions.

**9. Evaluate the importance of imperialism for, and its effects on, *one* European country during the nineteenth century.**

Candidates could begin with a definition of imperialism, then explain its practical importance to the chosen country, *e.g.*, where colonial interests were situated, details of trade, financial and material benefits obtained. This could include immigration as a means of overcoming overpopulation and unemployment. Effects could be both positive and negative, such as a drain on the finances and manpower of the mother country.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general remarks not related to a specific country.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive and general material.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focus on importance and results.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for balanced, focused answers.

*[17+ marks]* for a perceptive approach to imperialism.

**10. Assess the importance of *either* nineteenth *or* twentieth century cultural movements in one or more European countries.**

Culture could include any of the arts, and the candidate has the choice of the nineteenth century or the twentieth century, and of a specific country or Europe in general. The answer could be based on an argument if there was a defined European culture, or on the diversity – or even lack – of culture. Candidates would not be advised to tackle this question unless they had undertaken a case study. A study of one aspect of culture, such as music or literature would be acceptable.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsupported general comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a descriptive approach.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for some appropriate assessment.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for intelligent assessment based on specific evidence.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive and thoughtful treatment of cultural movements.

**11. Analyse the political aims of Louis Napoleon’s (later Napoleon III) policies and assess their results on France and on Europe between 1848 and 1871.**

Louis Napoleon regarded himself as heir to Napoleon I and aimed to follow his example and rule France. Candidates could include material before Napoleon was elected president of the Second Republic in 1848 (*e.g.* his failed attempts to mount Bonapartist risings in 1836 and 1840). His exploitation of the “Napoleonic legend” in his successful bid for the presidency and his coup against parliament, after which he was accepted as Emperor would be expected. Thence his domestic and foreign policies were directed to enhance and maintain his power and position, using his name, and carrying on when and where possible what he considered was the Napoleonic tradition. A brief analysis of his active foreign policy would be appropriate and relevant, as would social, economic and constitutional issues.

Results for France could include initial successes with his more flamboyant regime, but final humiliation at the hands of Bismarck, and the end of the imperial interlude.

For Europe, candidates must decide in their analysis how important Napoleon’s policies were in the European context for example unification of Italy and Germany.

The above notes offer some suggestions of how candidates might tackle this question; do not demand or expect that all will follow this line.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general unsubstantiated assertions.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative/descriptive accounts of some aims and connected policies.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on political aims and their policies.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus on the question and some attention to its full demands.

*[17+ marks]* for genuine thought and analysis, with perhaps different interpretations of this complex character.

**12. In what ways, and to what extent, was Spain weak between 1848 and 1914?**

This was on the whole a period of political/constitutional uncertainty and disruption, with the Spanish Marriages and succession problems, Carlist wars (1872–1876), and republican experiments. Both agriculture and industry made little progress, there was widespread poverty and discontent with the Church and nobility.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for some general comments.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with implicit attention to weakness.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for answers focused on weakness.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for focused structured responses.

*[17+ marks]* for pertinent treatment of “to what extent”.



13. **“Scandinavia ignored Europe, and Europe ignored Scandinavia.” To what extent does this statement reflect Scandinavian developments in *either* the nineteenth *or* the twentieth century?**

Candidates can agree or disagree with this assertion, but they must present a clear argument. The question is set for those students who have studied their own history (although it is not technically correct, Finland can be included). All aspects of history – social, economic, cultural, religious and political – could be included. Probably the best known “European episodes” are during the Napoleonic Wars, Bismarck and the duchies and, in the twentieth century, the Winter War and the Nazi era. An interesting answer could be focused upon twentieth century social and economic developments or by challenging the quotation.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a few general assertions.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative with implicit attention to the quotation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for specific focus on the question.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for genuine attempts to address and analyse the quotation.

*[17+ marks]* for depth of knowledge and analysis.

14. **To what extent was the Revolution of February/March 1917, in Russia, due to the nature of Tsarism and the policies of Nicholas II (1894 to 1917)?**

Candidates first need to explain the nature of Tsarism (this phrase is in the History Guide), and show how far it was repressive, old fashioned and illiberal. There is a question on Alexander II on the paper and only a brief mention of his reforms could be considered relevant/necessary. No candidate should be penalized for not mentioning them. The reign and policies of Nicholas II should be the main focus of the question, especially the 1905 Revolution, the October Manifesto, the considered failure or weakness of the Dumas and policies relating to the First World War. Candidates are asked to assess responsibility, therefore they can briefly refer to other factors that were not the responsibility of Tsarism or Nicholas II.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for answers that largely ignore Tsarism and Nicholas II.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative account of the causes which does not highlight those in the question.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for attempts to focus on Tsarism and Nicholas II as causes.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for specific focus and details which assess responsibility.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth analysis of responsibility, and/or perhaps different interpretations of Nicholas II’s actions.

**15. Analyse the social and economic changes caused by the First World War, in *one* European country, up to 1929.**

Although this is always a popular question, few candidates are able to supply sufficient details or argue convincingly that the changes were the definite result of the war or its treaty, (which can be allowed). The question stops at 1929, in order to exclude the effects of the Wall Street Crash. Changes in the franchise could be included, as could gender issues, but they must be specific to score well. Britain or Germany could be suitable choices, and no doubt Mussolini will be presented as a result of the war, and can be allowed. USSR is not a good choice as changes resulted from the revolutions, and it is difficult to argue that the revolutions would not have occurred in some form without the war. Use judgment if USSR is used.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalization, especially if no country is named.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive narrative answers which are connected to the war.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for good structure and convincing linkage to the war.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focused, structured and balanced analysis.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive appreciation of social and economic changes and their causes.

- 16. Lenin wrote, “One step forward two steps back; it happens in the lives of individuals, and in the history of nations.” To what extent can this quotation be applied to Lenin’s revolutionary career and his rule of the USSR 1918 to 1924?**

This quotation (from one of Lenin’s many political works) is meant to give candidates a structure to use, after thinking through Lenin’s career and regime. They should be able to relate the quotation to his revolutionary career – for example, exile, hopes raised and dashed, return to Russia (by kind permission of the Germans) after the first 1917 revolution, then forced to flee, success in the second revolution, but failure in elections to the Constituent Assembly, control by force, then civil war. This theme could be continued. The Civil War was won but War Communism had to be replaced by the New Economic Policy and continued use of terror. Perhaps the greatest step backwards for USSR in Lenin’s eyes was his early illness and incapacitation and knowing the problems of finding a suitable successor.

The above are some suggestions, but of course keep an open mind and credit all attempts according to their worth.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of Lenin’s career and rule with implicit focus on quotation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for better focus on the quotation.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for genuine attempts to apply the quotation, and assess it.

*[17+ marks]* for a critical interpretation and judgment of the quotation in relation to Lenin’s revolutionary career and rule.

**17. Assess the strength and weakness of Weimar Germany between 1919 and 1932.**

On 9 November 1918 a republic was proclaimed in Berlin, under the moderate socialist Ebert. An elected National Assembly met in Weimar in January 1919 and agreed a constitution. Ebert was elected president (1919–25). He was succeeded by Hindenburg (1925–34).

Candidates will probably be more familiar with failure, *e.g.* Treaty of Versailles: weaknesses of the constitution; opposition/extremist parties and revolts *e.g.* Kapp Putsch, Communists, Nazis; cost of reparations; inflation; poor economy; social unrest; invasion of Ruhr (1923) and effects of Wall Street Crash.

Strengths could include: democracy; work of Stresemann, including restoring confidence and Dawes Plan; Young Plan; admission to the League of Nations.

Candidates should give a final judgment on the period.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalizations, and answers which only mention the rise of Hitler.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative of the period and implicit assessment.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit focus on strength and weakness.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structure, focus and balanced assessment.

*[17+ marks]* for critical analysis, judgment and interpretation.

**18. Compare and contrast totalitarian rule in Hitler’s Germany and Mussolini’s Italy, up to 1939.**

Candidates need to do more than state that Mussolini was not as bad as Hitler. The years to consider are 1922 - Mussolini appointed prime minister, or 1925/6 when dictatorship was more or less established - to 1939, for Italy, and 1933 when Hitler was appointed Chancellor, to 1939 for Germany. Some areas to compare and contrast are: nature of fascism; form of rule; nature and strength of opposition; treatment of opposition; finance and the economy; trade unions and big business; education and the arts; terror and the police state; religion; the Jews. Do not expect all the above to be covered.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations, and if only one regime is addressed.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative sequential accounts.

*[11 to 13 marks]* sequential treatment with good linkage, or a comparative framework.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for a comparative structure and detailed factual evidence, with critical overall judgment.

*[17+ marks]* for perceptive analysis which includes different interpretations in the comparison.

**19. What were the results of the Spanish Civil War for Spain and for Europe?**

The Spanish Civil War lasted from July 1936 until April 1939. Its causes and actual events are not relevant for this question, although the devastation, cruelty, death and destruction are, as the result was an embittered and impoverished country. The war cost about 700 000 lives in battle, 30 000 executed, assassinated or murdered and 15 000 killed in air raids. Secondly the result was victory for Franco and the Nationalist forces. Franco established a corporatist, authoritarian state, acting as caudillo (leader), with one political party (the Falange) and favouring the Catholic Church. He maintained Spanish neutrality during the Second World War and presided over Spain's rapid postwar economic development. He was faced with the problem of regional separatism, but arranged for King Juan Carlos to succeed on his death (1975) as a constitutional monarch.

The results for Europe could include: a dress rehearsal for the Second World War, especially for Germany; cementing an alliance of fascist dictators; disarray of left wing parties; encouragement to Hitler to start war; set back for democracy.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for causes and/or events without results.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for descriptive answers which recount results.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for focus on results, perhaps unbalanced.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus on results and attention to both Spain and Europe.

*[17+ marks]* for depth and detail and perhaps different interpretations.

**20. Why did international diplomacy play an important part in Europe in the inter war years?**

The two main reasons for the twenty years of diplomatic activity were to settle problems caused by the First World War, and to prevent another major war. Answers from strong candidates could address the question thematically, with five main points:

Problems caused by the war could include: disarmament of, and reparations from, defeated nations; European boundaries, with losses for defeated nations and independent states formed from former subject nations (*e.g.* from Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman, and German Empires). These problems were dealt with in the peace treaties.

The attempt to avoid another world war was made with the foundation of the League of Nations.

Dissatisfaction with treaties and the inadequacy of the League led to further diplomacy, *e.g.* Locarno and Disarmament Conferences. Attempts to restore economic stability led to Dawes and Young Plans. The rise of dictators caused both supporters and opponents of Hitler and the Nazis especially to engage in diplomatic activity *e.g.* Munich, Pact of Steel, various boundary guarantees and Nazi-Soviet Pact.

Do not expect all the above.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague generalizations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narratives with implicit reasons for the intense diplomatic activity.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for clear attention to “why” based on some specific evidence.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analysis of why there was so much diplomatic activity in Europe 1919-1939.

*[17+ marks]* for in-depth analysis of reasons why or different interpretations of inter-war years diplomacy.

**21. Analyse the effects of the Second World War on the USSR between 1941 and 1948**

There are two distinct parts to this question – the effect of the Second World War from the German invasion of USSR to the end of the war with the Russians in control of Berlin and a large part of eastern Europe, and the effects of the postwar period. The question stipulates “on the USSR” so general Cold War answers will be largely irrelevant. The war period was one of great suffering, hardship, and reorganization of forces and resources in order first to survive, then to expel the enemy and advance. The USSR ended the war with great losses (about a quarter of Russia’s material goods and infrastructure had been destroyed) but in a strong position. Stalin’s ruthless pre-war dictatorship continued. With the help of reparations the economy was restored and the USSR became the second greatest industrial nation in the world. But the high cost of human life and suffering continued. There were more purges (in some ways Stalin’s paranoia had increased) and no freedom.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for unsubstantiated generalizations.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative account of the war with an attempt to explain post war policies within Russia.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for an answer that tackles both the war and post war periods adequately.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for some depth of knowledge and analysis, focusing on both conditions during the war, and the early Cold War in the USSR.

*[17+ marks]* for inclusion of different interpretation of effects.

**22. To what extent was Adenauer responsible for the recovery of Germany in the post Second World War period?**

This question requires candidates to explain and assess Adenauer’s contribution to German postwar recovery, then to note other contributory factors. Adenauer became the first Chancellor of the new German Federal Republic in 1949, and held the position until 1963. He presided over the establishment of a sound democratic system and strong economic recovery. He secured good relations with France and the USA, and thus West Germany was an accepted member of the west. Indeed Germany was considered necessary for the western alliance, hence was admitted to Nato and the European Economic Community. This, as well as Marshall Aid and the work of Erhard (Minister of Economic Affairs) also contributed to German recovery.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inadequate or inaccurate answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative account of Adenauer’s chancellorship, with implicit focus.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more explicit focus on recovery, dealing with both political and economic areas.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus on the part played by Adenauer, and attention to “to what extent?”

*[17+ marks]* for a clear critical appreciation of Adenauer’s responsibility for Germany’s post war recovery.

**23. Assess the view that Khrushchev’s policies were a failure both at home and abroad between 1955 and 1963.**

The main features of Khrushchev’s domestic and foreign policies between 1953 and 1963, when he was First Secretary of the Communist Party, need to be evaluated, and a verdict reached as to the justification for calling him a failure on both counts or on one. Candidates can agree or disagree but must support their verdict with factual evidence and assessment. The main points to consider are: his denunciation of Stalin, 1956; partial decentralization; food and agricultural policies and closure of some prison camps. In foreign affairs he subdued the Poles and Hungarians, based missiles in Cuba, and feuded with Mao, but also eased the international situation slightly with “peaceful coexistence”.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for inaccurate or inadequate answers.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a narrative account with implicit focus.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for explicit addressing of “a failure at home and abroad”.

*[14 to 16+ marks]* for balanced argument based on specific evidence.

*[17+ marks]* for balanced interpretation and overall judgment.

**24. Why was Tito able to achieve power in Yugoslavia in 1945, and maintain control until 1980?**

Candidates need to consider both Tito’s position in Yugoslavia and the manner in which he gained power. The former guerrilla leader was prime minister 1945–53 and president 1953–80. Tito kept firm control of this difficult area, experimenting with different communist styles of economic organization and remaining independent from USSR. He stood for non alignment in the Cold War, but his position in domestic affairs and foreign affairs was helped by the Cold War situation.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a few uncoordinated statements.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for an account of Tito’s career and rule.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for reasons for Tito’s rise to power and maintenance of it.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for focus on and analysis of Tito’s rise and rule, pointing out problems faced and at least partially overcome.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed knowledge and interpretation.



**25. Evaluate the changes in the lives of women in Europe during the twentieth century.**

Candidates need to cover all aspects of women's lives: education, work in the home and the workplace; as housewives and mothers and as career women; health; leisure; political rights; equal opportunities in all walks of life, *etc.* The whole century should be considered and change through time emphasized. Differences in different parts of Europe could also be discussed, but an answer based only on changes induced by wars would not score well.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague general statements, or answers based only on war induced changes.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for description with only implicit evaluation.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for genuine evaluation of some aspects of women's lives.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for structured, focused answers.

*[17+ marks]* for balanced evaluation which covers the whole time period.

---