

GCE
AS and A Level

History

AS exams 2009 onwards
A2 exams 2010 onwards

Unit 1J

Specimen mark scheme

Version 1.1





General Certificate of Education

AS History

Unit 1: HIS1J

The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Specimen Mark Scheme

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams.

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

Copyright © 2007 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.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

Specimen Mark Scheme**GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation****HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925****Generic Mark Scheme****Question 1(a), Question 2(a) and Question 3(a)**

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Question 1(b), Question 2(b) and Question 3(b)

- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Question 1

(a) Why did Bismarck co-operate with the National Liberals until 1878? (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

Answers should include a range of reasons to explain Bismarck's co-operation and should appreciate that the partnership came about through personal self-interest rather than as a result of political conviction. It suited Bismarck to work with a party that favoured unity and the consolidation of the Empire. The party was also useful to Bismarck in his *Kulturkampf* against the Catholic Church, and National Liberal support enabled Bismarck to weaken the Centre Party. Bismarck co-operated with the National Liberals in their support for free trade, since the strong economic growth of Germany appeared to benefit from cheap imports. Furthermore, since the party was strong in the Reichstag, it could be used to pass legislation which Bismarck favoured.

(b) How successful was Bismarck in controlling the political opposition he faced in the years 1879 to 1890? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that Bismarck was successful against others which do not.

Factors suggesting he was successful might include:

- He prevented the Socialists from adopting an extreme position using the Anti-Socialist Law of 1878 which remained in force until his own departure in 1890
- Poles and Jews were controlled through a policy of Germanisation
- The Liberals were split and unable to threaten his dominance
- He got his own way in the Reichstag as parties were too divided to form a united front against him
- He worked successfully to uphold authority in combination with Prussian conservative elites

- He brought about an effective Kartell in 1887 – bringing together some National Liberals and Prussian Conservatives in the wake of tensions abroad
- He retained the support of Kaiser Wilhelm I which enabled him to override most of the Reichstag opposition which he faced

Factors suggesting he was unsuccessful might include:

- The split of 1878/9 turned many Liberals against him and, until 1887, Bismarck had no clear majority in the Reichstag
- The Centre Party, smarting from the earlier *Kulturkampf*, continued to use every opportunity to oppose Bismarck
- Following the 1881 elections, over three-quarters of the Reichstag deputies opposed Bismarck's policies
- Despite the law the Socialists were allowed to stand in Reichstag elections and they grew in strength in the 1880s. By 1890 there were 35 Socialist deputies
- Bismarck had constantly to adjust tactics to keep in control and even threatened to change the constitution. His authority was tenuous by 1890

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Caprivi resigned in 1894 as Chancellor of Germany. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Caprivi fell from power in 1894 and should appreciate that Caprivi's position was dependent upon the Kaiser. At first Wilhelm II supported Caprivi's 'New Course', believing that it would kill Socialism with kindness but when it failed to do so he lost favour. His measures were met with opposition from the Right and he became the focus of intrigue in court circles. His tariff reductions and commercial treaties displeased the landowners and the Agrarian league (set up 1893) lobbied against his policy. The military disliked his reduction in the length of military service from 3 to 2 years. The Kaiser grew alarmed by Socialist gains in the 1893 election (increase in SPD from 35 to 44 seats) and a spate of anarchist attacks in Europe in 1894. Caprivi's refusal to pass an anti-Socialist Subversion bill undermined his relationship with the Kaiser and although he dissuaded Wilhelm from attacking the Reichstag and setting up a more autocratic regime, he felt obliged to resign over the failure of his policies and because he had lost the Kaiser's confidence.

- (b) How successful was Kaiser Wilhelm II in maintaining personal control over the German government from 1894 to 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest the Kaiser was successful against others which do not. Note that the dates given relate to the period after the fall of Caprivi until the outbreak of war.

Factors suggesting he was successful might include:

- Wilhelm controlled all major political and military appointments. He was never reliant on an individual for support
- He appointed 3 Chancellors after Caprivi, none of whom was able to achieve dominance. After Caprivi's resignation, because of the Kaiser's pressure to curb Socialism, Bülow ('the eel') and the elderly Hohenlohe were sycophants whom the Kaiser could control, while Bethmann-Hollweg was more interested in foreign policy and was largely excluded from decision-making.
- He intervened directly in policy-making, e.g. the naval bills and emphasis on the military and *weltpolitik* were largely of the Kaiser's own making
- He took independent action, ignoring Ministers, e.g. Kruger telegram, 1896; *Daily Telegraph* interview 1908; Zabern Affair, 1913

Factors suggesting he was unsuccessful might include:

- Ministers often acted independently and ignored the Kaiser, who like to go 'on his travels'
- After 1905 he became so absorbed in foreign policy that he allowed ministers more control at home
- The Kaiser's power was never absolute. He had to get majorities in the Reichstag (and Prussian Landtag) for legislation
- Despite his influence and concerns, the Socialist Party grew, causing considerable difficulties for the passage of legislation and the raising of taxes (necessary to support an aggressive foreign policy)

Question 3

- (a) Why did Communist rebellion break out in Germany in 1918 and 1919? (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

Answers should include a range of reasons for the outbreak of Communist rebellion. Candidates should appreciate the timing of the rebellion – following closely on from the example of revolution in Russia (1917) and the economic and political disaster of Germany's defeat in World War I (1918). The soldiers' and workers' councils of late 1918 were an attempt to offer an alternative form of government at a time when the Kaiser was discredited for the failure of

the war effort. The acknowledgement of defeat in October 1918 brought ever-growing support for left-wing activity and the breakdown of the old system of government prevented police measures to stop it. The Spartacist Rebellion which followed in January 1919 was a desperate attempt to advance the cause of Communism at a time when it was felt the workers were being betrayed by the SPD which had set up a Republic in close alliance with the army (Ebert-Groener Pact) and the old forces of the Right. The brutal crushing of this rebellion led to further KPD-inspired rebellion outside Berlin. Communist rebellion in Bavaria was partly the product of the peculiar circumstances of the region – its semi-independent status as well as a reaction to the assassination of Kurt Eisner (February 1919), who had forced the deposition of the Bavarian King.

- (b) How far were the Weimar governments able to bring political stability to Germany between 1919 and the end of 1925? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that they were able to restore stability against others which do not.

Factors suggesting that they were able to bring stability might include:

- A constitution was established and maintained that provided wide-ranging democratic governments with a strong centre and limited radicalism
- The governments were responsive to the people and addressed issues such as welfare reform
- Unrest was overcome. Communist rebellion was crushed with the help of the army, the Kapp Putsch was defeated by a workers' strike, and the Munich Putsch was controlled by the prompt action of the Bavarian authorities. After 1923 there were no major coups or political assassinations
- Political stability mirrored the economic situation and recovery from late 1923 with a new currency, and the Dawes Plan encouraged greater political contentment and stability
- Ebert was an effective president who used Article 48 appropriately. Hindenberg's election as President in 1925 reassured some of the right-wing conservatives and made the regime appear more respectable in their eyes
- Germany's international position aided stability through fulfilment and the Locarno Pact (October 1925)

Factors suggesting that they were not able to bring stability might include:

- The problems associated with the Weimar Constitution and proportional representation which meant that governments were coalitions and found protracted agreement difficult
- Anti-republican attitudes were prevalent on both the Left and Right as seen in the political unrest of 1919–1923, the activities of the Freikorps and other private armies and the political assassinations
- Political stability was heavily dependent on economic stability and there was considerable instability in the immediate aftermath of war and during the period of hyperinflation in 1923
- The invasion of the Ruhr strained government stability to breaking point as ministers failed to agree on how to address the situation

- Animosity was never fully overcome among those on whom the republic depended - industrialists, landed aristocracy, the army, judges, civil servants – and to some extent President Hindenburg