



General Certificate of Education

A2 History 2041

Unit 3: HIS3L

From Defeat to Unity: Germany, 1945–1991

Mark Scheme

Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards
This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)

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 operational exams.

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

Copyright © 2010 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 A2

The A2 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 a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. 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 low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, candidates will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to '*think like a historian*' and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 candidates will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able candidates.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 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:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- 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)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards

A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

HIS3L: From Defeat to Unity: Germany, 1945–1991

Question 1

- 01** 'The American gift of Marshall Aid brought about an economic miracle in West Germany after the Second World War.'
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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 demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**

L5: Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written.

38-45

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to assess the contribution of Marshall Aid to West German economic growth and balance this against other factors that helped bring economic change. They may also question whether this change was an 'economic miracle'. Candidates may refer to some of the following material:

- The early massive investment by the Americans through the Marshall Plan was certainly linked to the 1950s 'economic miracle'. It was not only the money, but the climate of confidence that this aid engendered that encouraged investment. The link to the USA also solidified Adenauer's position and helped provide the political stability needed for economic growth to occur

Nevertheless there are a number of other factors to consider:

- Adenauer's work for political consolidation and rehabilitation, in particular Germany's involvement in the European Coal and Steel community and membership of the EEC from 1957; the government's social programme, including the integration of refugees and the provision of housing
- Erhard's work for social/economic recovery with the promotion of the Social Market Economy, which encouraged American industrial techniques and helped maintain good labour relations. There was a trouble-free strike record with the spread of co-determination in the coal and steel industries and a sense of responsibility from the unions and the 1952 workers' consultative councils
- West Germany's inherent advantages, including cheap raw materials (especially in the Ruhr), a large workforce (increased by the influx of refugees) and German skills stemming from a strong technical/scientific tradition developed before the First World War. The survival of the economic infrastructure from before the Second World War also provided a basis for recovery
- The careful monetary policies of the Bundesbank which, fearful of a repeat of 1923, took pains to avoid inflation, and the stimulus of the Korean War in 1950

Candidates may question the extent of the 'economic miracle' and point out that by 1958 economic growth had begun to slow down.

Question 2

- 02** To what extent did the people of East Germany form a 'niche society' in the years 1949 to 1989? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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 demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to explain what is meant by a 'niche society' and consider its extent in East Germany across this period. Candidates may refer to some of the following material:

- The term 'niche society' was coined by Günter Gaus, the FRG's first representative in the GDR. He suggested that the East Germans came to terms with the regime and got on with life as best they could. They managed to disassociate themselves from the less pleasant aspects of Communism and forged a life centred on their family, work, friends and leisure activities. This theory has been used to explain why there was so little criticism and dissent in these years
- Material to explain and support the idea of a 'niche society' could include details of state welfare provision and employment (the GDR came to enjoy comparative economic prosperity within the Soviet Bloc) as well as indoctrination and repression. The activities of the Stasi could be cited to explain why people might retire into themselves and avoid criticism of the regime, whilst the propaganda surrounding athletic success and space travel in 'Mother Russia' might explain East Germans' pride in their country
- Organisations such as the Communist Unions, the Communist Youth Movement and the women's societies helped maintain a degree of supportive participation in the regime
- It suited the professional classes (particularly those in scientific/technical fields) to conform in order to advance their careers, and the new business opportunities brought about by the West's recognition of the regime encouraged people to accept and believe in their state
- The position of the Church is ambiguous. It remained openly hostile until the late 1960s but the new constitution of 1968 brought about a new period of 'cautious partnership' which culminated in the Church/State agreement of 1978. This would support the niche society, but the relationship was not always easy and the growth in Church discussion groups in the 1980s played a part in the events of 1989
- Countering the idea of the 'niche society' would be examples of discontent, for example the troubles of 1953, the problem of emigration to the West and the 'flashpoints' of 1961 (Berlin Wall), 1968 and late 1987 onwards. Records discovered since the fall of the GDR also suggest there was widespread underground discontent, particularly among the churches, the labour force and the youth. The numbers preferring Western television, and irritation over travel restrictions, grew in the 1980s
- The emergence of the citizens' movement of 1988 and the rapid crumbling of the regime after the opening of the Hungarian border is also suggestive of a discontented society, although the extent of this discontent may be questioned

Candidates may conclude that what changed in the late 1980s was not the fact of political discontent but the goals and the opportunity to express concerns more openly in the face of political inertia. Others may argue that the longevity of the regime supports the fact that its citizens must have been happy within it. Indeed, it could be argued that the regime was clearly so ingrained that, after 40 years, those who instigated the 1989 revolution thought of reforming, rather than overthrowing, the regime.

Question 3

- 03** How far was Helmut Kohl responsible for the reunification of Germany in 1990?
(45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They 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, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. 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 demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to identify and evaluate Kohl's particular contribution and balance this against other reasons for the reunification in 1990. Material on Kohl's contribution might include:

- His work to further Brandt's Ostpolitik policy during his time as Chancellor of Germany from 1982
- His 10-point plan for reunification, November 1989
- His reaction to the enthusiastic reception he received in East Germany, December 1989, which convinced him reunification would come sooner than he had expected
- His initiative and tireless devotion to the cause from the beginning of 1990. He rejected the East German Modrow's plan for a militarily neutral reunited Germany and negotiated (with much hard bargaining) the 'two plus four' agreements (February-September 1990). He won over the USSR (crucial meeting with Gorbachev, July 15 1990) with promises of cash
- He made endless speeches to the East Germans promising them prosperity and a better life, politically and economically
- He created the currency union in July 1990 and led the official reunification in October 1990

However, his personal contribution might be criticised and other factors leading to reunification cited to balance the argument:

- Reunification would never have taken place outside the context of events in Eastern Europe in 1989–1990 (particularly Gorbachev's reforming ideas, *glasnost* and the end of the Cold War) and the work of the reform movement in the GDR
- Kohl could be criticised for being slow to develop an effective relationship with Gorbachev
- Kohl's achievement was dependent on the earlier work done by Ostpolitik policies and the co-operation between the two states developed since 1969
- Kohl did not act alone. His success rested on the co-operation and support of the USA (who, it could be said, provided a greater momentum) and to a lesser degree, the goodwill of Britain and France
- Kohl was aided by the needs of the USSR – its desire to disentangle itself from commitments to the GDR and its dire financial weakness which made it ready to support any viable plan which brought cash rewards
- Modrow produced his own plans for reunification which might have been successful without Kohl
- Once the borders between east and West were open there was little hope the East could survive on its own so reunification was an inevitability