

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS1K Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

## **AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers**

### **General Introduction by the Chief Examiner**

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

### **Unit 1**

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

## Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

## GCE History HIS1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

### Responses to June 2009 Questions

#### Candidate 1

- 1 (a) Explain why there was rapid industrial growth in Germany in the years c1890 to c1910. (12 marks)

There was rapid industrial expansion in Germany for a number of reasons, some to do with population growth, some to do with state intervention and some to do with the education system. Overall the reason why it industrialised so rapidly was to make it stronger.

Population growth was important because more people provided the labour to produce goods and the market to sell them, this meant Germany became strong industrially and fast because population growth was so rapid, Germany had a population of 67.5 million in 1914 second only to Russia. The result was Germany became competitive and thus stronger.

State intervention was also important because tariffs, for example that of von Bulow, protected German industry and agriculture from cheap imports, for example grain from Russia, as a result Germany became more self sufficient and thus became stronger industrially developed as industry was allowed to thrive without competition.

The education system was also important it was deemed the best in the world and had many technical students, the result of which German industry became more efficient and thus developed faster thanks to innovations of workers, for example the dynamo, as a result Germany became stronger.

Although rapid industrial growth had many reasons the main aim was to make Germany stronger.

#### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*In this answer the candidate has attempted to explain a range of factors. The role of the state is highlighted, both education and tariffs are explained as factors leading to industrial growth with some supporting evidence. Population growth is explained thoroughly. There could be some debate on whether this answer should be rewarded at the top of Level 3, however it reaches Level 4 because there is an attempt to prioritise factors and to link them both by implication throughout the answer and specifically in the first and last paragraphs. However the linkage and the prioritisation is limited and needs to be far more explicitly supported, hence the answer is rewarded at the bottom of the level. Level 4 – 10 marks.*

**Candidate 2**

- 1 (a) Explain why there was rapid industrial growth in Germany in the years c1890 to c1910. (12 marks)

In the years 1890 to 1910 there was rapid industrial growth in Germany. One reason for this is the movement of the working class. As there were developments in the farming of agriculture the labouring working class needed new places to earn a living and survive. At the time this meant moving to the cities to look for work and the influx of peasants meant industry boomed as there were people to work in the industrialised factories. This had a knock on effect as with more workers drawing a steady wage, there was more people to buy the manufactured products so the industries increased their profits and could expand.

Another reason for this industrial growth was the advances in technology. More and more people had electricity in their homes, so there was a demand for certain new goods and the advances meant that the products could be made faster and in better quality. There was also an increase in the types of products available.

**Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer cover two factors with some explanation, a greater range of factors would improve the answer but the main reason why this answer is only rewarded at Level 2 is because the factors given are generalised descriptions of why industrial growth occurs, there are no specific references to Germany or to the time period covered. The explanation lacks any support. Level 2 – 6 marks.*

**Candidate 3**

- 1 (b) How successful were the rulers of Germany in dealing with social change in the years 1890 to 1914? (24 marks)

During the period of time from 1890 to 1914 along with the rapid change in industry there was change in the society of Germany.

Industrialisation of Germany had happened so rapidly that society didn't have time to evolve, instead traditional class barriers were reinforced. This produced problems as urbanisation happened and the urban proletariat were seeing industrial cities get rich unlike they lived in squalor. A feeling of discontent and increased class consciousness spread. This increased support to the SPD.

To counter this the Government introduced anti-socialist laws and state socialism. To a certain extent these measures helped as some of the working class were pleased with the state socialism measures. However, many felt they did not go far enough and the anti-socialist laws did little in the long run to contain the growth of socialism as in 1900 25% of Reichstag seats were held by the SPD.

In Germany, however, there were no major uprisings or riots, unlike in Russia. This suggests that social changes were being dealt with well. However the living conditions in the cities were bad and while they were improved, working hours were still longer than British workers and wages were lower. This caused discontent to spread.

The unwillingness of Kaiser Wilhelm II to concede any power to the Reichstag or

his chancellors also caused problems as it made people feel that they did not have any power. This was reinforced by the power of the army. The Ranbern Affair highlighted the Kaiser's unwillingness to listen to the complaints of the Reichstag or to popular opinion. However things were improving, there was better opportunities than there had been for skilled workers and the increased links between town and country had improved the lives of some skilled workers.

In all the social situation in Germany was complex some positive attempts in dealing with social change had been made but the Kaiser's desire for personal rule and the growing polarisation of society showed that more needed to be done.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer reaches a high level because it directly attempts to answer the question. The candidate deals with a range of social issues such as the living conditions in the new industrial towns, the threat to establish social elites such as the army, the rise of the SPD and the opportunities available for workers in the New Germany, the answer is focused on whether these social problems were resolved. The answer also provides a balance between success and failure, all points are supported with relevant evidence across the time period covered. The answer reaches the top of Level 4 because of these features but fails to reach Level 5 because it lacks firm judgement and could have more comprehensive support. Level 4 – 21 marks.*

### **Candidate 4**

- 1 (b) How successful were the rulers of Germany in dealing with social change in the years 1890 to 1914? (24 marks)

Leo Caprivi (elected chancellor in 1890) brought positive action towards social change (under the influence of the sympathetic Kaiser Wilhelm II) by reducing the maximum working hours for women to eleven, abolishing labour for children under 13 years old and introducing a minimum wage.

This helped to quieten the SPD (formed in 1875 by the combination of the German Worker's Association and the Social Democratic Workers Party) which included better working conditions in its party aims.

Although Bülow (elected chancellor in 1900) initially continued this more towards dealing with social change by increasing accident insurance during his first year of office and increasing health insurance in 1903, he failed to increase military funds for *weltpolitik* brought on by an increased sense of nationalism in Germany and after a homosexual scandal in 1902, resigned.

The introduction of polling booths also helped to smooth relations with the socialists after Bismarck's attempts at crushing them (communal obligators voting had been another of their party aims).

Good relations with the papacy (which began in 1878, in 1885 Bismarck even recommended the Pope Leo XIII as mediator between Germany and Spain) continued keeping the Centre Party in good favour, despite the election Hohenlohe as chancellor (in 1894) who was very conservative and one of the few ministers who refused to stand against *Kulturkampf*. Kaiser Wilhelm II helped to establish unity in the Reich through *weltpolitik*.



In conclusion, the rulers of Germany between the years 1890 and 1914 were pretty successful at dealing with social change, which they focussed on more than foreign policy.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer has some relevant material dealing with the social problems for example legislation affecting working hours, which enables it to reach Level 2. There is also an attempt to answer the title question although this is quite descriptive and lacking in focus, tending to be a listing of evidence with a very limited attempt at assessment. Overall the answer is very limited in both content, range and assessment, but does include some material relevant to the question. Level 2 – 11 marks.*

### **Candidate 5**

3 (a) Explain why the *Dreikaiserbund* was formed by 1873. (12 marks)

The Dreikaiserbund was formed so that Germany, Russia and Austria-Hungary would have an alliance. Austria had for a long time been Germany's closest ally and was greatly dependent on Germany. But Bismarck wanted to keep close with Russia at the same time. This however would prove very difficult as Russia and Austria did not like each other very much because of the conflict in the Balkans. Bismarck saw that the only way to make his way was by getting the two countries to talk and set up the Dreikaiserbund.

Russia, although hesitant decided that this would be a good idea. Russia wanted to maintain good relations with Germany and it thought that maybe the conflict could be discussed and settled through talking to Austria, as well as the fact that Russia wanted naval access through the Straights.

Austria entered the alliance because that's what it had been told to do by Germany and it was almost powerless to say no.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*Has a range of explanations focused on why each country agreed to join the Dreikaiserbund, this is done in the manner of one reason, per country. There is an attempt at explanation with some supporting detail, for example Germany wished to keep the peace between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans, however this is rather vague and could be supported by more explanation. Some of the language is rather simplistic and generalised. Level 3 – 8 marks.*

### **Candidate 6**

3 (b) How successful was Bismarck in managing Germany's relationship with Russia in the years 1873 to 1890? (24 marks)

Bismarck was reasonably successful in keeping relations friendly with Russia, despite the fact that they had to choose regularly between Russia and rivals Austria-Hungary (AH).

The Dreikaiserbund was nothing more than a front to an increasingly strained



relationship between the three countries. AH and Russia were rivals over influence in the Balkans and Germany, under increasing pressure to pick sides expertly avoided doing so. This resulted in an uneasy peace (but still peace) thanks to Bismarck's excellent diplomacy and juggling between the two. Russia was held at arms length, but kept close enough to prevent an alliance with France.

However this all change in the Congress of Berlin 1878 in which Bismarck sided with Austria over Russia over an issue in the Balkans. Russia felt let down by the 'honest broker' Bismarck and this created a gulf between the two states. Although Bismarck had to side with one country a little more than the other, he still retained a civil relationship with Russia despite the disastrous effect Bismarck's ruling had had on their relationship.

The following year Bismarck consolidated relations with Austria by forming the Dual Alliance, which specifically promised AH Germany's help in the event of a Russian attack. Understandably this pushed Russia further away and as a result Russia grew more mistrusting of their German neighbours. Tariffs on all imports, enforced by Bismarck angered Russia, who could not sell their cheap grain there anymore. Germany had been pressured to pick sides, and they had done. The year of 1879, irreparably damaged Russo-German relations yet fear of isolation allowed Bismarck to renew the Dreikaiserbund in 1881.

It was obvious this would not work as it conflicted with the AH alliance – Russia were not equal partners in the Dreikaiserbund. Because of Bismarck's diplomacy Russia grew more mistrustful of Germany and they got friendlier with France.

The signing of the Reinsurance Treaty in 1887 was Bismarck's final attempt at keeping relations friendly with Russia, but it was clear they could not work together with such conflicting interests over AH.

Bismarck was very successful in keeping Russia no further away than arms length up to 1890 despite Germany's alliance to AH. Bismarck did what he had to do in his alliance to AH and he successfully managed to not lose Russia to France during his time in office, despite it happening 4 years later anyway. Considering the obvious preference to AH, conflicts of interest and diplomatic wounds suffered by Russia during 1878–79 they remained peaceful with each other.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer has a clear understanding of the question and attempts a balanced and well supported response. The candidate gives ways in which Bismarck was successful in managing Germany's relationship with Russia, balanced against evidence that suggests that he was not successful. The underlying problem of the relationship with Austria-Hungary is well understood. The answer achieves the middle of the level rather than the top because there are elements of description and also a lack of depth in the support given to the arguments. Level 4 – 19 marks.*