



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2003

GCE

History

Alternative G: Units 1 and 4

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

General Guidance for Examiners: AS and A2 examination papers

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 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.

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, 1866-1990**AS Unit 1: Imperial and Weimar Germany, 1866-1925****Question 1**

- (a) **Use Source B and your own knowledge.**
Explain briefly the significance of the term “May Laws” in the context of the Kulturkampf in Germany.

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that the May Laws were a collection of anti-catholic laws promulgated by Bismarck and designed to weaken the Centre Party, or they were laws which Bismarck was prepared to drop if the Centre Party offered its full political support, and he negotiated with the Pope from 1874 to try to arrange this. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the sources and context, e.g. aware that the May Laws (1873) laid down regulations for the training of Catholic priests, placed the state in control of disputes relating to Church affairs and made civil marriage compulsory and that those who refused to accept them were imprisoned or dismissed. The context of the May Laws involves some explanation of Bismarck’s hostility to a group whose allegiance to the new Empire might be considered dubious given their support for a Pope who had recently claimed his infallibility. Bismarck’s wish to curb the Centre Party (which wanted special rights for the Catholic Church in Germany) and his desire to cement an alliance with the National Liberals might also be mentioned. Events leading to the May Laws include the ending of the Catholic section of the Prussian Ministry of Culture (1871) and the campaign led by Falk (from 1872) which banned the Jesuits and gave the government the right to inspect Catholic schools. (The ban on the Jesuits was extended to other non-medical orders in 1875.) The laws were unsuccessful, leading to the loss of many priests while the Centre party doubled its representation in the Reichstag 1874. Most of the Laws were finally repealed in the 1880s. **2-3**

- (b) **Use Sources A and B and your own knowledge.**
Explain in what ways the view of the Kulturkampf put forward in Source A is challenged by that presented in Source B.

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

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source A suggests that Bismarck, with the support of the liberals, decided to take action against the Catholics because of the deep rooted anti-papal feeling in Germany, which had been made stronger by the recent papal decrees of 1869-1870. Source B, however, puts forward the view that Bismarck’s campaign was undertaken to destroy the Centre party, and that it was undertaken to win unquestioning political support. Candidates who show some understanding of the sources, without specifically identifying the challenge may appropriately be placed in this level. **1-2**

- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to own knowledge, e.g. develops the point that the Kulturkampf “had many deep causes” (Source B) and explains some of the factors underlying it. Candidates may comment on the papal decrees (Syllabus of Errors, Papal infallibility) mentioned in Source A and their effect, but should balance the anti-Catholic argument alongside the comments in Source B that Bismarck received support from some Roman Catholics in the Kulturkampf, and was opposed by other protestants. They may explain Bismarck’s campaign in relation to the measures he took against the Catholics and point out that these attacked the Catholic Church’s organisation and political influence, rather than its belief. **3-5**
- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge of the issue and draws conclusions, e.g. develops information above and shows an awareness of the difficulty of gauging Bismarck’s motives for supporting liberal opposition to Catholicism. Is aware that neither source presents the full picture and that the sources are not mutually exclusive. While “anti-papal feeling” as demonstrated in Source A may have played an important part in the liberal hostility to the Catholics and Centre, there were most certainly other factors involved too and many of Bismarck’s supporters and opponents did view the struggle in political terms as exemplified in Source B. **6-7**

- (c) Use Sources A, B and C and your own knowledge.
Explain the reasons why Bismarck changed his domestic policies from 1878.
Level descriptors for response *with* use of sources and own knowledge**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO3

- 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 on *either* 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 description, but will have valid links.
- Or*
Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* 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 source *and* 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* own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands 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

From the sources. The sources can all be used in support of comments about why Bismarck abandoned the Kulturkampf and changed direction from 1878 e.g. Source A shows how the Kulturkampf had tied Bismarck to the National Liberals, Source B explains how Bismarck lacked strong commitment to the Kulturkampf since he had tried to negotiate with the Pope from 1874 and was happy to abandon the May Laws in return for political support, while Source C makes it clear that by 1878 the National Liberal party was in decline and Bismarck had decided to end the Kulturkampf.

From own knowledge candidates should be able to explain the failure of the Kulturkampf by 1878: the Catholics had rallied against the attack which thus weakened the loyalty of a substantial minority within the Empire. It had proved divisive, failed to prevent the growth of the Centre and offended the Prussian Conservatives (who disliked interference at local level and any laws hostile to churches) and the royal family.

The reasons for immediate causes of the break with the Liberals in 1878 might include: Bismarck himself was insufficiently determined to force it through and increasingly disliked the reliance on the National Liberals which it entailed.

Work to “unify” Germany was complete as far as Bismarck was concerned by 1878, so the Liberals were dispensable, and their progressive views about Reichstag control of government (e.g. Reichstag control of government an embarrassment).

Bismarck disliked his heavy reliance on one political party. When the Party fell from 127 to 98 seats in the 1878 elections he felt able to change direction looking to ally with the Centre and Conservatives.

The death of Pius IX and accession of the more conciliatory Leo XIII (1878) provided an opportunity to end the Kulturkampf.

Other factors leading Bismarck to change his domestic policies include:

His decision to introduce protection (tariffs on goods entering Germany). Bismarck wanted the revenue but this also had political implications. Bismarck wanted to support the Conservatives (Prussian Junkers) who were vital in the administration, business and the army. They had disliked the liberal alliance (pro-free trade) and were in a strong position in 1878 with 115 Reichstag seats (up from 78).

Bismarck was also anxious about the rapid rise of Socialism and the success of the Social Democratic Party in the elections. He wanted to introduce an anti-socialist law and therefore needed Conservative and Centre support.

Two Assassination attempts on Wilhelm II provided an excuse to counter Socialism and introduce the 1878 anti-socialist law.

From 1878 Bismarck’s domestic policies therefore followed an increasingly conservative stance, although he was to introduce a programme of state socialism in the 1880s.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points about the Kulturkampf, tariff reform or anti-socialism, or they may describe Bismarck’s policy with little concern for the question. Level 2 answers are likely to be primarily descriptive, although they will make some links to the changes of 1878, or alternatively they may respond to the question but be very unbalanced, perhaps omitting major areas of policy change. They may ignore the sources altogether. Level 3 responses will provide a broader range of reasons to explain the change in domestic policy and will show a fair grasp of material, including evidence from the sources. There may, however, still be some unevenness of treatment and the depth of understanding may be limited. Level 4 responses will show greater analysis and balance, looking at both the reasons for the failure of past policies and the attractions of new ones. Level 5 responses will show a greater conceptual awareness of Bismarck’s position, his relationship with the various political parties and his policy choices. Answers will be analytical and arguments well supported.

Question 2

- (a) **Explain what is meant by “Weltpolitik” in the context of German politics in the 1890s.**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. “Weltpolitik” as World policy implying Germany had ambitions to become a “great” power, by expanding overseas and demanding “a place in the sun”. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. a feature of German foreign policy, by which the Kaiser hoped to raise support for the monarchy and Germany army. It implied imperial expansion and military dominance and is believed by some historians to have been a ploy to distract workers away from protest at home and unite the nation in a period of social and economic change. Conservative elite groups such as the Colonial League and Naval League put additional pressure on the politicians to further the policy. It allowed the Kaiser to take a greater part in decision making and was therefore to have far reaching consequences. **2-3**

- (b) **Explain why right wing groups in German politics became more extreme in the years 1890-1914.**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. right wing groups reacted to the growth of Socialism and the impact of economic change which led to a fall in agricultural prices. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, explaining how internal pressures made right wing conservatives more extreme and split the middle class, e.g. the threat to traditional agriculture encouraged conservative landowners to support the Agrarian League in defence of protection; the expansion of industry and urbanisation and the success of the SPD created a growing fear of the power of the working class and of organised Socialism. Right-wing pressure groups such as the Pan-German League (1891) were aggressively anti-socialist and these views were spread through middle as well as upper class groups, e.g. the German National Commercial Assistants’ Association. Changing economic circumstances also increased anti-Semitism on the right-wing as Jews were made scapegoats for troubles. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance, explains right wing extremism, and prioritises, makes links, or draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. combines the points made in L2 above to examine the radicalisation of right wing politics. Such answers may link the changes to the Kaiser’s personal influence and may stress the consequences of right wing extremism leading to a dearth of political and social change and encouraging patriotism and aggression which culminated in the First World War. Others may emphasise the loss of a middle stance in politics which encouraged the polarisation of politics. **6-7**

- (c) **“It was Germany’s failure in war that destroyed the Second Reich.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement.**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Level Descriptors for responses *without* reference to sources.

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by 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 or 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 examine how the First World War led to political change – the unsatisfactory position of 1914, (a semi-authoritarian constitutional system with a Socialist majority in the Reichstag unable to determine policy); the growing pressure from the left as the war dragged on; the left wing “peace resolution” of 1917, demonstrating the divergence between government policy and the wishes of the Reichstag majority; debates on suffrage, constitutional reform and ministerial responsibility; the dominance of the military, and the pressure for change, e.g. mounting crisis held in check by the “victory” over the Russians (Brest-Litovsk) – the failure of the Ludendorff offensive bringing naval mutiny and Communist style disorder. The particular reasons why a republic was established would include: the military decision to seek an end to the war in 1918 which led to constitutional reform (with Ministers responsible to the Reichstag) so as to present a more democratic face to the Americans, and win a ‘fairer’ peace deal; the declaration of a republic and the abdication of the Kaiser as a response to external failure and internal disorder (mutinies, soviets, breakaway republic in Bavaria), hardship and food shortages and disillusionment with the Kaiser’s leadership.

Answers at L1 will be brief and may focus on one area such as the abdication of the Kaiser and the birth of the Republic, or on one or two generalised points. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive although there will be a limited attempt to link failure in war to the end of the Second Reich. By Level 3 the answer will be aware of the need to “agree or disagree” and will make some comment presented. There will be coverage of a wider range of developments, with links between war and political change. At Level 4 there will be a good understanding of the end of the Second Reich in Germany and there will be more balance in the response. At Level 5 answers will argue more effectively (possibly looking at the failure of the Kaiserreich even before 1914) and will draw conclusions soundly based on the detailed evidence provided.

Question 3

- (a) **What is meant by “passive resistance” in relation to government policy in Germany in 1923?**

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. passive resistance was a form of protest in which the miners in the Ruhr stopped working and this led to a collapse of the German currency. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. in 1923 French and Belgians occupied the Ruhr to force Germany to maintain reparation payments. The workers and local population were encouraged by their government to refuse to work or collaborate with the occupying troops. The policy reduced the amount of coal delivered to Belgium and France, but the currency collapsed as the government tried to compensate those Germans who lost out financially by the issuing of more banknotes, which led to hyperinflation. **2-3**

- (b) **Explain why right wing extremists were able to gain support in Germany during the years 1918-1923.**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. comments on the right-wing’s attitude to the Socialist Republic the “November Criminals” or reference to the “Stab in the back”. Alternatively answers may give a few brief comments on Hitler’s support, or his dislike of the Republic. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, explaining the support for right wing extremists through relevantly and appropriately selected material, e.g. the continuing power of (and respect for) the military (Ebert-Groener pact) and the position of traditional elite groups in, for example, the civil service and law providing sympathy for the right; the impact of Versailles treaty (including reduction of military forces) and reparations; the continuing political trouble from the left and the horror of Communism; the position of the Freikorps and other paramilitaries; continuing financial crisis and hyperinflation particularly after the occupation of Ruhr; the influence of personalities such as Hitler. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, making links or draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. as for L2, and links the right wing activities to specific occurrences e.g. the Spartacists/Kapp Putsch and hyperinflation/Munich rising. May conclude that right wing support was not extensive or constant in these years or that economic variations provided the impetus to extremism of both right and left. **6-7**

- (c) **“By the end of 1924, the economic and political crisis in Germany was over.”**
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement.

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Level Descriptors for responses *without* reference to sources

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisation 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, implicit understanding of a wider range of issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by 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 or 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 economic and political state of Germany by the end of 1924. Economic – The Republic had survived hyperinflation of 1923. The Rentenmark introduced in November 1923 had curbed the inflationary crisis and the Dawes plan, April 1924 reorganised reparations in Germany's favour. Political – Threats from the Communists and right-wing declined after 1923 and Stresemann's appointment as Chancellor, August 1923 marked a turning point. Radical left-wing governments in Saxony and Thuringia were overthrown, October 1923, Hitler's Munich putsch failed, November 1923, extremist parties improved their positions in elections of May 1924 but moderate parties again in ascendant in December 1924.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief, making simplistic and undeveloped statements about the economic and/or political troubles of Germany, or generalised comments about Stresemann, hyperinflation, or the failure of the Munich putsch. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive. They will describe the problems/recovery of the Weimar Republic, but may be imbalanced, with too much detail on the crisis rather than the position by 1924. They will almost invariably agree with the statement. By Level 3 the answer will be aware of the need to “agree or disagree” and will make some comment on material presented. By Level 4 the comment will be strengthened and broadened to produce a more balanced answer. Level 5 responses will make reasoned but not necessarily extensive judgements based on developed understanding of Germany's position of the end of 1924.

A2 Unit 4: Germany, c1880-c1980**Section A: The Economic Modernisation of Germany, c1880-1980****Question 1****(a) Use Source A and your own knowledge.**

Explain what is meant by a “protectionist wall” in the context of the German economy before the First World War.

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. a system of tariffs or customs barrier to keep out foreign goods/prevent competition from other countries. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn from either the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. by imposing heavy duties on imports, Germany’s producers of staple (primary) goods (machinery and engineering products as well as agricultural producers) were shielded from a market swamped by cheap imports and able to maintain orders and high prices for their goods. This encouraged investment in and the expansion of the protected enterprises. Candidates might refer specifically to Bismarck’s change of course in 1879 and how tariffs, lowered by Caprivi, were raised again after 1902. **2-3**
- L3: As Level 2, with developed references to both source and own knowledge. These answers will show a broader grasp of detail for example: an awareness of the effects of protectionism on the economy or of the political implications of protection, or they may show a greater understanding of the issues. Candidates at this level may draw conclusions and make some overall judgement about the effect or importance of the protectionist wall. **4-5**

(b) Use Sources B and C and your own knowledge.

How fully do Sources B and C explain the success of Nazi economic policies to 1938?

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 source 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 etc in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 answers are likely to note that both sources demonstrate how Nazi policies increased employment opportunities. They are likely to make basic observations e.g. that Source B refers to a shortage of labour by the eve of war and Source C shows how the Nazis increased public expenditure on construction, rearmament, transportation, and in the early years, work creation schemes. Level 2 answers should demonstrate understanding of sufficiency with reference to the sources and own knowledge of Nazi economic policies. These answers will develop the points at L1 above and explain them with own knowledge of, for example, the contribution of Schacht, Goering's drive for autarky or the importance of rearmament. They will probably address the concept of 'sufficiency' in relation to the content of the sources.

Level 3 answers will draw conclusions about sufficiency in relation to the success of Nazi economic policies, with reference to both sources and own knowledge. These answers will use a range of evidence to develop the points made in the source about the reasons for Nazi economic success and will also refer, in part, to the insufficiency of the sources, for example their failure to explain the flaws in the Nazi economic policies – the guns v. butter crisis or the partial failure of the autarky schemes. At this level candidates should make some attempt to comment on the sources as evidence and should show some analysis from which limited conclusions are drawn.

At Level 4 candidates answers should use material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on sufficiency in relation to the success of the pre-war Nazi economic policies. They will acknowledge that both sources present only part of the picture and they will make some links or comparisons between the sources in drawing their conclusions, e.g. both sources show the huge Nazi investment in the economy but answers might point out that total expenditure, in 1936 was only just above that of 1928 and investment in transportation only exceeded 1928 levels in 1937. They might also point out that Source B believed Nazi policies were only "on the whole" successful, and they might stress the limitations – the restrictions on the industrialists (Source B) and the over-riding importance of "armaments-linked industries" as shown in both Source B and C. Finally, candidates at this level may make some observations about the limitations of statistical evidence, and of a general history text which does not attempt to analyse policies in detail.

- (c) **Use Sources A, B, C and D and your own knowledge.**
Consider the extent to which government intervention promoted economic modernisation and change in Germany in the period c1880-c1980.

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **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. 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. **5-8**
- 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. **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 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. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **14-15**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates' responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over the 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 below.

Candidates will need to examine how government policies brought about modernisation and change in the German economy. The pointers in the sources are to the importance of protection and government support for industry (Source A), Nazi policies to counteract unemployment and develop the economy (Sources B and C), government initiatives behind the West German economic miracle (Source D). Candidates should also add further ideas of their own, e.g. the alliance of "steel and rye" in the Kaiserreich, the influence of World War I and the policies of the Weimar Republic in the promotion of the newer industries, the strict government control of the Nazi era and the effect of decentralisation in post-war Western Germany as opposed to Communist control in East Germany. It is also necessary for candidates to balance the effects of government intervention against other factors promoting change and modernisation – internal factors might include, the natural resources and geographical advantages enjoyed by Germany, and the development of banking, education, and management skill, while external factors such as the impact of war or foreign aid (Marshall Plan Source D) might also be mentioned.

At L1 answers might be based on unsupported general assertions, or may be narrow and descriptive, limited to a few source references. L2 answers will focus adequately on a few factors. These are likely to contain limited links and be assertive and unbalanced, drawn either from the sources or from own knowledge – or rather less fully from both. By L3 there should be some clear focus on the role of government policies in the promotion of modernisation and change. There will be some awareness of the 100 year period, but references will not necessarily be fully representative and may be uneven in quality. At L4 answers should cover the whole period, with some balance – weighing the government's contribution against other factors. This approach will be still more evident at L5 where answers will present a clear argument combining sources and strong own knowledge in a direct and effective response. By Level 5 the judgement should be sustained throughout the answer.

Section B: The Third Reich and its Legacy 1933-1965

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

Standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

L1: *Either*

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

Or

Answers 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 almost to 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

Compare the roles, and assess the importance for Hitler's dictatorship, of any two of the following: Herman Goering; Heinrich Himmler; Martin Bormann; Albert Speer.

Target: AO1, AO2

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

The question requires candidates to compare 2 of the Nazi "barons" and the more comparative the answer, the more effective it is likely to be. They will be expected to show an understanding of the importance to the regime of their chosen characters e.g., Goering – influential in achievement and consolidation of power – development of personal "Empire" – the "contact" man with the Catholic Church (concordat), Army, Big Business – influence in Röhm purge – leader of Luftwaffe – 4 year plan and control over economy to 1942 – promotion in, and contribution to war effort.

Himmler – importance of ideas in development and implementation of nazi ideology (including race theory) – influence in publishing – role as leader of SS – the economy – the camps – police – contribution to war effort – final solution – attempt at negotiations with the west (undermining position at the end).

Bormann – administrator – the man with access to Hitler – contributed to the radicalisation of ideology – powerful in wartime (esp. after Hitler's withdrawal during Russian campaign) and others loss of favour – success in struggle against Himmler – considered by Speer, the "most powerful man in Germany" at the end.

Speer – personal friend of Hitler – organisational skills – architect – contribution to wartime economy – the "miracle" of armaments and labour.

Candidates might also consider how the rivalry between leaders was typical of the regime and how far the careers of their chosen characters reflect Hitler's position as a strong or weak dictator.

At L1 answers are likely to provide either a limited amount of descriptive material about 2 of these leaders, some fuller material on the importance of one leader only, or some generalised, but relevant comment backed by a scrap of evidence. At L2 answers will provide some relevant material about two leaders but they are likely to rely on assertions, and may well be unbalanced and not particularly comparative. To reach L3 candidates should make some attempt at comparison and show a reasonable knowledge base, although there may still be imbalance of treatment. By L4 answer there should be more argument, backed by selective examples and greater balance of treatment and ideas. These answers should show an explicit understructure of the question and contain comparison. L5 answers will show some depth of evidence, and/or and awareness of concepts and answers will reach an informed, sustained and comparative judgement.

Question 3

To what extent did the real lives of women and girls in the Third Reich differ from the image of their role in society portrayed in Nazi propaganda?

Target: AO1, AO2

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

The focus of this question is both on the way the Nazi propaganda machine set out to portray the idealised image of German womanhood and the actual policies of the regime and the impact these policies had. Candidates might examine the “myth and reality” idea by looking at women staying in employment, shunning Nazi images of motherhood, remaining loyal to the traditions of the Christian Churches, and educated girls and their mothers despising the BDM, and pursuing female education. At L1 answers may be either unrelated descriptive accounts of one or two areas or generalised assertions about Nazi propaganda or policies. At L2 the information may well be relevant and plentiful but the approach will be fairly descriptive and uncomparative. Candidates may ignore “girls” altogether. L3 answers will attempt to balance the image with the reality. Such comment will be supported by adequate evidence but answers may be rather uneven in treatment. By L4 answer should show confident awareness of the image, the policies and their impact, and the supporting evidence should have greater depth and balance answers at this level should show an awareness in all aspects of the question. At L5, there will be an impressive range of well chosen factual examples and an intelligent contrast between what was promised/attempted and what was actually achieved.

Question 4

For what reasons did the political and economic recovery of West Germany differ from that of East Germany in the period 1949-1965?

Target: AO1, AO2

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 be familiar with key political and economic developments in both East and West Germany and will need to compare developments in both States. The more comparative the answer, the more effective it is likely to be.

Political recovery differed because of the differing ideologies of the 2 regimes, the attitude of the western powers and of 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, his policies and election success, and should reflect on the extent to which West Germany development into a prosperous and democratic state by 1965. 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 of 1960s.

Economic recovery differed because of differences in natural resources and labour, 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 plants, the economy was re-orientated towards 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 better than other Soviet bloc states. The Berlin Wall 1961 led to the launch of the “new Economic System” and candidates might assess its success by 1965.

L1 answers may be very generalised, describe only parts of the period, or concentrate exclusively on one State (probably West Germany). At L2, answers will be better informed and will either provide greater coverage but still of the narrative/descriptive variety, or will be evaluative but narrowly focused, for example, concentrating on economic differences only. At L3 the answer will provide some evidence of both political and economic development in both states and across the period although details may not be equally full and assessment will be limited. At L4 the evidence will be stronger and the answer better balanced with coverage in all aspects of the question. At L5 answers will display some depth of evidence, and answers will reach an informed and comparative judgement.