



# **General Certificate in Education**

## **A2 History 6041**

### **Alternative G Unit 6W**

# **Mark Scheme**

*2008 examination – June series*

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

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

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners**

---

#### **A: INTRODUCTION**

The AQA's 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 specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

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

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

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

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

**B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF 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 AO 1.1, 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 (AO 1.2), 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 (AO 2, 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 characteristic: 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.

---

**C: 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.

---

**June 2008**

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

**A2 Unit 6: The Re-unification of Germany, c1969–1990**

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

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about why there was so little political opposition in the GDR before the summer of 1989. (10 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- |     |  |             |
|-----|--|-------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains.  | <b>1-2</b>  |
| L2: | Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge.   | <b>3-5</b>  |
| L3: | As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial.  | <b>6-8</b>  |
| L4: | Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well-supported judgement on its validity. | <b>9-10</b> |

**Indicative content**

Answers at Level 1 will be based almost entirely on the extract, e.g. points out that ‘the dreaded Stasi employed about one of every twenty five adults’ and that it relied on brute force, imprisonment without charges, police harassment, physical intimidation and psychological manipulation. In short, there was little political opposition because citizens were afraid. At Level 2 candidates will introduce elements of their own knowledge and are likely to suggest that citizens were not simply afraid but accepting and even supportive of their state - proud of its achievements and believers in its ethos. Level 3 answers will contain more extensive own knowledge and will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2. They are likely to balance Fulbrook’s view of the ‘niche society’ against the implication in the source that citizens were forced into obedience. At Level 4, answers will offer sustained argument and convincing judgement. At this level candidates are more likely to question the given interpretation.



(b) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the reasons for growth of opposition within the GDR by September 1989? (10 marks)

*Target: A01.1, AO2*

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well-supported judgement. **9-10**

### Indicative content

Level 1 answers will make simple statements related to the content of the extract, e.g. will refer to the 'doubts and disbelief about the realizability of the goals of our party and government'; about concerns for the 'quality of life' and the 'satisfaction of personal needs'; 'the feeling that developments are not bringing any tangible improvements for the citizens of the GDR'; and concerns that these views are now current among previously supportive citizens too.

Level 2 answers will explore utility at a general level, demonstrating appreciation either of some of the strengths and/or some of the limitations of the content of the source. The strength of the source lies in it being an official Stasi document. Its description of a society that has lost the will to continue can be supported by reference to the protest group's marches and public demonstrations as well as the absence of support for the government when it crumbled. The limitations of the source are in its limited coverage of the factors behind the growth of opposition (e.g. there is no mention of hostility to the lack of freedom of speech or movement). It is the opinion of Stasi observers rather than a broad and balanced analysis.

At Level 3 answers will give more careful consideration to both strengths and limitations (as given in Level 2 above) demonstrating a reasoned understanding of the source in context. At this level candidates are likely to consider the provenance more fully. The source is useful because of its immediacy to the events it describes and the apparent honesty of the Stasi whom one would normally have expected to cover up the deficiencies of the regime. It can also be corroborated from own knowledge of what was happening in the GDR in the autumn of 1989. Its limitations will be assessed more fully, with some indication of the alternative view, that opposition and protest was still limited to a minority.

Level 4 answers will provide a clear evaluation of the source as a piece of evidence and offer sustained judgement. At this level candidates would be expected to offer some questions about the utility of the source and refer to other useful material which could corroborate or question it and broaden the picture to provide a better understanding of the situation at this time. References to the views of the historians, particularly Jarausch and Fulbrook (who emphasised the East German governments 'loss of will to rule') would be particularly useful here.

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

'It was the loss of support from its own citizens which brought about the downfall of the GDR in November 1989.'

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 wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

### Indicative content

The focus of the answer should be on the downfall of the GDR in November 1989. Candidates will need to assess the extent to which this simply resulted from the opposition of its own citizens. They will need to balance this view against other possible explanations in order to reach a balanced and supported conclusion.

**Source A** explains how the East Germans had always had doubts and had long been held in check only by fear and repression.

**Source B** shows how beliefs were undermined by 1989 and how citizens no longer accepted 'the goals of our Party and government' and believed the communist state could not ensure their 'quality of life and the satisfaction of personal needs'. The lack of tangible improvements had caused opposition even from 'such groups of persons who were previously socially active'.

**Source C** shows how resentment and jealousy of Western success, disappointed expectations following Honeker's promises of social reform and concern about the environment all increased the citizens' discontent with their government.

Candidates will have to develop and explain these ideas with reference to their own knowledge. They should display a thorough understanding of the loss of faith in the GDR including not only material deprivation but also the lack of political and physical freedom. They will also need to

---

balance this against factors such as the close proximity of West Germany which promised automatic citizenship entitlement to East Germans; economic breakdown in the GDR bringing stagnation and rising international debt – which also changed the mood of the political elite; perestroika and the attitude of USSR; the example and development of the reform pressure groups in the summer/autumn of 1989; the failure of the SED leadership (including its lack of ideas and commitment, its failure to take decisive action and its ill thought through measures, e.g. the botched decision to allow travel to West Berlin); whatever argument is adopted, the fall of the GDR should be explained and for an award of Level 4 or higher there should be explicit reference to historiography. The authors of the set reading material provide plenty of relevant comment.

Kettenacker emphasises the importance of external factors and suggests that Ostpolitik was largely to blame for the GDR's collapse, boosting the East German leadership's self-confidence and encouraging them to ignore perestroika. However, he comments that after the opening of the Hungarian border, 'change was dictated by the people in the streets'. Garton Ash supports this view and emphasises that external factors forced the pace of change, while Fulbrook places more blame on Honeker's pretence that 'all was well' at this time and the 'loss of will to rule'. She also suggests that the 1980s did not so much witness the growth of political discontent but new forms of organisation with a cultural flavour whose influence was limited. Jarausch suggests that the SED's refusal to tolerate any 'loyal' opposition left critics with no choice but to challenge the whole regime.

The question does not ask candidates to go beyond November 1989 and although some reference to the subsequent reunification in 1990 might be made relevant, this is not expected.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to restrict themselves to describing and defining what the sources say with limited explanation in response to the question.

Level 2 answers will either provide some comment on the statement but have only limited information in support, or they will be primarily narrative/ descriptive of the downfall of the GDR with limited comment.

Level 3 answers will make a genuine attempt to debate the validity of the given opinion, with some range of evidence. Candidates are likely to consider a range of factors, and provide some effective comment on these.

Level 4 answers will integrate argument and evidence and provide a fuller and more balanced picture with some criticism of the quotation. Answers will show a reasonable understanding of both the attitude of the GDR citizens (which may well be broken down into different groups) and other factors.

Level 5 answers will provide a more sustained argument, with supported evaluation throughout the essay. Answers will combine clear understanding with good factual support and make supported judgement about the reasons for the GDR's demise.