

GCE 2005

January Series



Mark Scheme

History Alternative G Units 1 and 4 *(Subject Code 5041/6041)*

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

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

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

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specifications. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

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

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

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

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

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

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

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

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

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:*Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

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

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

Alternative G: Germany from Unification to Re-Unification, 1871-1990

AS Unit 1: Imperial and Weimar Germany, 1871-1925

Question 1

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

Explain briefly the significance of the “Kulturkampf” in the context of Bismark’s rule in Germany to 1879. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that the Kulturkampf created a bond between the liberals and the Chancellor. There was apparent co-operation over the issue although Bismarck did not fully share their (the liberals’) views. A simple definition – that Kulturkampf was an anti-Catholic campaign, should also be placed in this level. 1

- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. aware of some of the details of the Kulturkampf (e.g. the May laws, 1873) and/or of the broader reasons for the campaign (the need to weaken the Centre Party, hostility to Papal interference and the need to retain the support of the National Liberals to complete internal unification). 2-3

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

Explain how **Source B** challenges the views put forward in **Source A** about the influence of liberalism in Bismarckian Germany. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain ‘own knowledge’. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to ‘pieces’ of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source B says “liberal values remained strong in Bismarckian Germany” and “Bismarck did not succeed in smashing liberal ideas” whereas Source A says “The Iron Chancellor’s dominance left little room for liberal influence”. 1-2

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. develops the points about the continuation of liberal values made in Source B with reference to the growth of parliamentary (Reichstag) government, the spread of socialism or the development of the economy. Candidates might also explain Source A with reference in Bismarck's political scheming, his anti-liberal attitude and his clear move in 1879 towards a protectionist economy and anti-Socialist policies, in alliance with the Conservatives. **3-5**

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. a candidate might develop the information above and point out that the two sources are at least partly reconcilable. Source B claims that Bismarck did not succeed in smashing liberal ideas – suggesting a similar intention to that expressed in Source A about Bismarck's failure to share liberal views and his attempts to curb liberal influence. While Feuchtwanger speaks of “little room” for liberal influence, he does not claim that liberal influence was entirely eclipsed. Candidates might point out that the picture created in Source A is very much the sort of picture referred to as “misleading” in Source B and they might draw their own conclusions from this. Reward at this level any comments which provide a convincing and evaluative overall appraisal of the views given in these sources. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of Bismarck's conservative views, in relation to other factors, in explaining the difficulties he faced in governing Germany in the years 1871 to 1890. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

L2: ***Either***

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

Or

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

Or

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

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

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

The sources all provide material on Bismarck's conservative views, e.g. Source A tells us that Bismarck did not share the views of the liberals – that he changed course in 1879, was known as the “Iron Chancellor” and was personally dominant in government, “ordering” people's affairs. Source B refers to Bismarck's attempt to smash liberal ideas and, while questioning the extent of Bismarck's success, refers to the traditional picture of the conservative Bismarck who, by implication, tried to create a passive population repressed by authoritarian policies and indoctrinated by nationalism. Source C explains how his government structure was designed to preserve power for “the traditional forces which Bismarck represented”.

Candidates should show an awareness of Bismarck's conservative views from own knowledge – his Prussian Junker background, his support for the traditional elites, his particularist view of unification and his limited constitution of 1871. His reluctant co-operation with the liberals to 1878 could be explained with relation to the Catholics as “reichsfeinde” and his determination to weaken the Centre Party, destroy the Socialists and curb opposition in the Reichstag from 1879. These show his traditional conservative views in action.

Candidates will need to relate these views to the Chancellor's difficulties – his constant concern to rid Germany of “reichsfeinde” particularly Catholics and Socialists, but also minority groups; his struggles with the Reichstag; and the problems experienced in obtaining support for legislation; his personal difficulty in working with others; understanding the implications of economic and social change; his reliance on the support of the Kaiser and the circumstances of his eventual dismissal.

Candidates should also show an awareness of other factors creating difficulties. These might include: the position of the Reichstag; the influence of economic change; the strength of the Centre party; the growth of Socialism; the attitude of the Kaisers.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points either from own knowledge or the sources alone. They may be excessively generalised and assertive about Bismarck's conservatism or may partially describe policies with scant regard for the question.

Level 2 answers will show a better use of the sources or contain some relevant own knowledge, for example of Bismarck's difficulties and/or policies, but answers will be unbalanced (paying little if any heed to “other factors”), very descriptive or limited in relevant comment.

Level 3 responses will have a greater range of material and draw on both sources and own knowledge to show some understanding of Bismarck's conservatism and how this played a part in the problems which he faced in this period. They will also refer to other factors but answers at this level will not be well balanced.

At Level 4 there will be a clear attempt to balance the importance of Bismarck's conservative attitude against other factors and the answer will show good use of both sources and own knowledge in support of its arguments.

Level 5 responses will show greater analysis and judgement and a more sophisticated understanding of the influences affecting the development of Bismarckian government.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "Social Democrats" in the context of Imperial Germany in the period 1890-1913. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, i.e. "Social Democrats" as the German Socialist Party, or SDP which was growing/seen by the elites as a challenge in this period. Candidates who explain the term with reference to the Bismarckian period only should be placed in this level. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. showing a greater understanding of the nature of the Party from 1890 to 1913. Candidates may show a developed understanding of its policies and/or its growth. Its ranks swelled when Caprivi's New Course allowed it to recruit openly and it adopted the Erfurt programme in 1891. Despite changes of direction in government policy, the Party expanded to win the largest number of seats in the Reichstag in 1912 and became a formidable opponent of the Kaiser's authoritarian style of government. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why, in the 1890s, landowners and factory owners were fearful of any advance made by the Social Democrats. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Landowners and factory owners feared the abandonment of the anti-Socialist laws would lead to mob rule and they were afraid of losing the power and influence which Bismarck had taken pains to protect. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining how industrialisation had created a new working class, challenging because it was numerically superior and united in its social grievances, how the Erfurt programme had established a Socialist commitment to the abolition of class rule and truly representative democracy, and how the elites believed any reduction in the authority of employers (as advocated by the Social Democrats) would lead to a reduction in the power of the State and army. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. develops the points made in Level 2 above and explains how the fears of the landowners and factory owners were not altogether genuine. The Socialist Party was, in fact, split, and the moderates were prepared to work through the existing political framework in order to achieve welfare reform. However, it often suited the elites to use the cry of revolution to avoid concessions which might hit their own wealth. Reward any valid attempt to evaluate the “fear” and to explain the socialist position. **6-7**

(c) “The growth of socialism, as a political force, was responsible for the difficulties faced by the German governments in the period 1890-1914.
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

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

Or

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

Candidates will need to focus on the difficulties of the German governments and consider whether the growth of Socialism was responsible for the difficulties experienced or whether there were other factors at stake.

In support of the given view it was evident that the government struggled to find a policy to curb Socialism as a political force and that this provided a considerable distraction and was responsible for several ministerial changes – not least the fall of both Bismarck and Caprivi. Caprivi's "new course" was brought to an end by Wilhelm's demand for a new anti-Socialist law (1894) and the largely unsuccessful anti-Socialist legislation (1894-9) was a response to the Kaiser's disillusionment at the growth of the SDP. The growth of Socialist political influence caused difficulties in establishing acceptable taxation policies e.g. while conservatives favoured indirect taxation, the socialists argued (unsuccessfully) for inheritance tax in 1909 and 1912. The failed attempt at *Sammlungspolitik*, the growing power of the elites, the tendency of government to by-pass the Reichstag where possible, the pursuit of *weltpolitik* and Germany's aggressive foreign policy, (as a distraction), may all have been the result of the growth of Socialism. It is sometimes alleged that Kaiser Wilhelm II went to war to divert attention from social and political problems at home.

To balance the argument candidates will need to consider other factors which caused difficulties: e.g. Kaiser Wilhelm II's own interventions and inconsistency. His support for the elites and interest in the military, *weltpolitik* and his preoccupation with foreign policy meant that the governments were unable to construct coherent policies to win support away from the socialists and respond to the needs of the country. Candidates might cite the Daily Telegraph affair (1908) or the Zabern incident (1913) or even the moves to war (1914) as examples of the Kaiser's disinterest in working through a democratically elected parliament. The constitution itself might also come under criticism, for the power it left to the Kaiser and Chancellors, while the latter might be cited as uninspired leaders, more concerned to retain the Kaiser's approval and support his views than to lead moves to political reform in Germany.

Answers at Level 1 will either be generalised and assertive, probably agreeing with the given view but offering little, if any, evidence in support, or will attempt to provide "background" material on the growth of Socialism or provide a limited description of German government with minimal reference to the question.

At Level 2, candidates will probably try to describe the growth of Socialism with some limited links to the given view but some may try to respond more directly to the difficulties of the governments, but have a thin support base.

Level 3 answers will have a more explicit focus on the question and show some grasp of relevant material although answers are likely to be uneven or one-sided, probably agreeing with the given view, and the analysis limited.

Level 4 answers will display more balance, looking at points which both agree and disagree with the view and providing an effective conclusion.

Level 5 answers will be argued more effectively and systematically, probably showing a greater conceptual grasp of Imperial Germany, and the contribution of Socialism to these.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by the “sailors’ revolt at Kiel” in the context of Germany in November 1918. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. the sailors’ revolt led to Prince Max’s government collapsing and spread discontent everywhere. Alternatively, candidates may provide a very simple definition, for example that it was mutiny among sailors based at Kiel at the end of the First World War. **1**

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. in November 1918 sailors mutinied when ordered to make a final attack on the British Navy. This was an attempt to salvage German honour, even though the war was already lost. The mutiny developed into an armed rebellion which rapidly spread and led to the setting up of soldiers’ and sailors’ councils in major German cities and ports. This in turn led to the November revolution. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Prince Max was appointed Chancellor of Germany in October 1918, but resigned a month later. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. is aware that Max was brought into power at the end of World War One, when Germany was losing the war and that he resigned a month later because the Kaiser abdicated and/or the Socialists under Ebert assumed control. **1-2**

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining that Prince Max was appointed in the last weeks of war to appease the allies, since it was felt that Germany would get a better settlement with a civilian, rather than a military, government. (The military also wished to avoid association with defeat and the acceptance of peace terms). Max resigned because of the unrest in Germany – the Kiel mutiny, the spread of soldiers’ and sailors’ soviets and the proclamation of a republic under Kurt Eisner in Bavaria. The majority Socialists (anxious to control the “revolution”) pressed for the Kaiser’s abdication and there was a general strike to force change on November 9th. Once Max had announced the Kaiser’s abdication he no longer carried political authority and he resigned in favour of the Socialist leader Ebert. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. Max's position as a "pawn" placed in power because the calculations of the military and entirely dependent on the Kaiser's continuing authority for his position, and prioritises, makes links, or draws conclusions about the relative significance of events, e.g. Candidates may make observations about the "inevitability" of Max's departure or explain with greater conceptual awareness the difficulties of his position. **6-7**

(c) "The 'German Revolution' of 1918-1919 was not a real revolution at all because by 1925 Germany had changed very little."
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

L2: ***Either***

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

Or

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

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

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

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

Indicative content

Answers should identify the changes brought by the German revolution of 1918-1919, assess the degree of change and continuity in the years 1918-1925, and consider whether the changes justify the term "revolution".

The changes brought by the revolution would include: the abdication of the Kaiser, the collapse of the old Imperial constitution, the establishment of a Socialist republic and a new democratic constitution.

Continuity with the imperial regime would include: the preservation of the elites in government (particularly in the civil service and judiciary), the continuing importance and influence of the military (reaffirmed in the Ebert Groener Pact) and the innate “conservatism” of what was in name a socialist government. (Land, industry and public services remained in private hands and the universities were the stronghold of the upper and upper middle classes, many of whom were anti-republican).

The revolution left a good deal of power with the state. The new constitution, although in many respects advanced and progressive, contained reserve powers for the President (Article 48). Furthermore in government and in business, power lay with men who had been appointed under the Empire and favoured its way. For this reason candidates are likely to agree that this was not a true revolution. Those who argue that it was, will probably stress the democratic nature of the new constitution and the way Ebert fought to defend it. This is quite acceptable, but they should be aware of criticisms that can be levelled against this view.

Level 1 answers will make simplistic and undeveloped statements about the German Revolution or will offer a narrative (perhaps largely background) description with minimal regard for the question.

Level 2 answers are likely to be largely descriptive of the German Revolution, making some links, maybe implicit, to the question. Such answers will provide little, if any, assessment of the “revolutionary” nature of events. Alternatively they may attempt some discussion of “revolution” but contain very little supporting evidence.

Level 3 answers will be aware of the need to “agree or disagree” and will make some relevant comment on material presented although the argument will not be fully balanced and the understanding and/or support may not be convincing.

Level 4 answers will show analysis, effective balance, and good use of evidence. Candidate will appreciate both sides of the argument.

Level 5 responses will make reasoned but not necessarily extensive judgements based on a good understanding of the change and continuity inherent in the restructuring of 1918-1919.

Alternative G: Germany from Unification to Re-Unification, 1871-1990**A2 Unit 4: Germany, c1880-c1980****Question 1**

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

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** in explaining how the Nazis brought about an “economic miracle” in Germany between 1933 and 1938? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. **6-8**
- L4: Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will focus on the utility of the sources, primarily with reference to their content. At this level candidates are likely to relate (fairly briefly) what each source says with reference to the Nazi economic miracle. Source B demonstrates the Nazi determination to get men working for the good of the state. It stresses the importance of hard work and the value of the worker. The importance of physical labour, as a “duty to the nation” and ennobling to the individual are also mentioned. Source C speaks of the rise in economic activity brought about by the longer working hours, higher rates of work, female employment and the redirection of the self-employed into wage labour. It also mentions the reduction in consumption brought about by a policy of low wages and raised taxes. This has enabled greater investment in the armament industries. Those providing quite full summaries, or a much shorter description with a relevant concluding sentence (at any point in the answer) can appropriately be placed at the top of this level.

Answers at Level 2 will use own knowledge of the German economic miracle from 1933 to 1938, but, as at Level 1, still largely dependent on what the sources say, or fail to say. These answers will develop the points at Level 1 using own knowledge, e.g. may explain how the high level of unemployment in 1932 was reduced by Schacht’s policies of deficit financing (not mentioned in the sources) coupled with the launch of the public works scheme and propaganda such as that given in Source B.

Answers at Level 3 will have greater focus on the utility of the sources as evidence about the German economic miracle from 1933 to 1938. They will combine the sources and own knowledge. These answers will attempt some direct evaluation of the sources, probably referring to their provenance, purpose and context and commenting, in particular, on the propagandist nature of both pieces. It may be argued that Source C shows a greater range of reasons and more evaluation of success, with its reference to the “guns v. butter” problem, but that the speech of Hitler in Source B shows even more directly (although narrowly, in that it concentrates on only one factor) how this was achieved.

Level 4 answers will show sustained judgement. They will acknowledge that both sources are useful as examples of what Hitler intended and the method he used, but that both are limited by their provenance and that for a full picture, corroboration and more specific evidence, including statistics would be needed. At this level candidates should be precise about “what is missing” and the limitations of the sources as evidence. Candidates might also develop some links or comparisons between the sources and should draw firm conclusions about the place of these sources in any examination of the German economic miracle from 1933 to 1938.

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

“The fundamental factor behind the development of the German economy in the period 1880-1980 was the growth and organisation of the labour force.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

Candidates will need to examine the key factors which promoted the development of a modern and successful German economy between 1880 and 1980, with a particular focus on the growth and organisation of the labour force. Candidates might use Sources A and D to link population growth to economic growth, while Sources A, B, C and D all refer to the organisation of labour – the development of large scale enterprises to 1914 – the Nazi attempt to harness and exploit labour and the East German measures to retain and control its labour force.

Candidates will also need to explain the source references from their own knowledge of the growth of the German economy from the 1880s, perhaps referring to the spread of cartels, state/labour relations, the Nazi German Labour Front, the organisation of labour in war and the capitalist/communist approaches post-1945. The importance of a growing population and a well organised (or controlled) labour force (including the movement of refugees to the West and the importance of guest workers) should be assessed and balanced against the other factors affecting the development of the economy through this period – Germany's raw materials and geographical position, the banking system, education, external aid, e.g. the Dawes and Marshall Plans, government policies (e.g. trade agreements, protection) the demands of war and the changed economic structures of both East and West Germany 1945-1980.

At Level 1 answers may be very limited in timescale, or be based on unsupported general assertions. Alternatively they may be very descriptive, with no explicit attempt to address the question, or relevant, but limited to a few source references.

Level 2 answers may lack any source reference, but will otherwise try to address the question, or they may use the sources but produce an answer which only makes limited links to the question. Alternatively the answer may be assertive in type and very unbalanced.

For Level 3 there should be some awareness of the 100 year period although there may be considerable unevenness and lack of balance. These answers will display use of sources and own knowledge and will try to respond to the question, although the understanding may not be entirely convincing.

For an award at Level 4 there should be reasonable coverage of the whole time scale, and a clear analytical approach showing understanding and some judgement.

Level 5 answers will balance factors effectively, revealing a high level of understanding and displaying sustained judgement.

Section B

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: ***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

“The Nazi political and administrative system was no more than controlled chaos.”
Assess the validity of this view. (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should assess the degree to which the Nazi system of government was “controlled” and balance this against evidence that it was, in some respects at least, “chaotic”. Candidates might well refer to historiographical debate on the topic, but it is more important that they are able to provide supported judgements of their own rather than merely reproducing the views of others.

Control might be explained with reference to the dominance of the Führer, the elaborate system of Nazi administration under the gauleiters, the central government agencies, the supportive (and in many cases long-standing) civil service and the ubiquity of the SS. Against this may be set the “chaos” of a state run by both state and party officials, the incompleteness of many Nazi programmes, the rivalry of Nazi ministers (e.g. Himmler and Goering), and the competition of rival Nazi party structures. Better answers might also consider whether the control/chaos was carefully calculated or happened by chance.

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions. They may fail to see the contradiction between control and chaos and have very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts of Nazi government or policies showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced or largely descriptive with a few links.

At Level 3, answers should show some understanding of the workings of Nazi government, and will offer some limited analysis of the issue of control v. chaos.

At Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis. Answers may attempt to distinguish between the routine administration (controlled) and broader political programmes (chaos). Whatever their argument, these answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate explicit understanding of the question.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and clear conceptual awareness, for example assessing the “polycratic” structure of the regime and analysing whether Hitler’s style of dictatorship was really a sign of political and administrative strength or weakness.

Question 3

“Propaganda was our sharpest weapon in conquering the state, and remains our sharpest weapon in maintaining and building up the state.”

To what extent are Goebbels’ words an accurate reflection of how the Nazis consolidated and extended their power within Germany in the years 1933 to 1944?

(20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers should consider the extent to which effective propaganda enabled the Nazis to consolidate their power in 1933-1934 and to extend that power in subsequent years. Candidates will need to look at the way propaganda was employed in support of Nazi policies, e.g. on education, work and rearmament, in support of Nazi ideology e.g. anti-semitism, and anti-feminism and in developing an all powerful state held together by an adulation for Hitler. They may examine the types of propaganda employed, perhaps suggesting that some, e.g. Hitler’s speeches and rallies, were more effective than others, such as the moves against modernist culture, particularly in art, but the main thrust of the answer must be on assessment of the success (or otherwise) of the propagandist campaigns.

To provide some balance, the importance of propaganda will need to be weighed against other influences which helped build up the Nazi state such as successful policies, an ideology that, at least in part, was already accepted, and the power of the SS police state to enforce obedience. Better answers will consider whether passivity or fear rather than conviction and support were more important in binding the Nazi state. Note that the question is directed to the period 1933-1944 so there should be some reference to both peace and war-time.

At Level 1 answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, probably agreeing that propaganda was extremely important and effective and offering very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts of types of propaganda or of the Nazi consolidation of power showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced or largely descriptive with a few links. They may concentrate more on the consolidation of power than on propaganda.

At Level 3, answers should show some understanding of the effects and success of Nazi propaganda and draw some reasonable conclusions from this.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis examining the relationship between propaganda and other means of consolidating and extending power to provide a balanced assessment. Such answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate explicit understanding.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and a critical awareness of the comparative success and failure of the Nazi methods of consolidating, maintaining and extending power within Germany.

Question 4

“In the years 1949 to 1963, the political and economic systems established in both East and West Germany achieved a remarkable degree of recovery and stability.”
How convincing is this view? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Candidates will need to consider the differing political and economic systems established in East and West Germany from 1949 and will have to assess the amount of recovery and stability achieved in each of the two states. Candidates who deal with one state only cannot rise above Level 2. Better answers will offer an element of comparison.

Variations in political recovery partly stemmed from the differing ideologies of the two regimes, and the attitude of outside powers – in the west and the USSR. Candidates might examine the differing ways the regimes addressed the Nazi past and the differing political arrangements experienced by each state. Candidates should refer to the role of Adenauer (1949-1963) in the West, and explain how his policies enabled West Germany to develop into a prosperous and democratic state by 1963. They should compare this with the role of Ulbricht in the East, his policies and suppression of opponents (riots of June 1953), the need for the Berlin Wall and the slightly more liberal changes established by 1963.

An assessment of economic recovery might examine the differences in natural resources and labour between the two states, as well as the differing nature of the regimes and the attitude of foreign powers. In the West, the injection of foreign capital and the Korean War acted as stimulus, while capitalist policies “freeing” industry (Erhard’s “social market economy”) provided the framework for growth. In the East, reparations destroyed industrial plant, the economy was re-orientated towards the USSR and agricultural output was hit by collectivisation and the break up of large farms. Strict planning (with set targets) and investment in heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods dominated development till the late 50s, although East Germany offered its citizens a better standard of living than that found in the other Soviet bloc states. The Berlin Wall (1961) led to the launch of the “new Economic System” and candidates might assess its success by 1963.

At Level 1, answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, probably agreeing with the quotation but offering very limited evidence in support of this. Alternatively, they may be entirely descriptive accounts covering only part of the period or concentrating exclusively on some developments in one state.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but answers will either be thin or very unbalanced, perhaps addressing one state only or looking at only political or economic systems.

Level 3 answers should show some understanding of the development of both West and East Germany to 1963 and will probably provide some comparison between the two. Answers may not be fully balanced or convincingly argued throughout, but they will address the issues of the question.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis, examining the degree of change and providing a balanced assessment. Such answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate explicit understanding of all aspects of the question.

Level 5 answers will show some depth of evidence and clear conceptual awareness of the differing development of the two states. Answers will reach an informed and comparative judgement.