



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative G Unit 6W

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – June series

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

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

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

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.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

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

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

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

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

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

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:***Either***

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

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
 - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2007

Alternative G: Germany From Unification to Re-Unification, 1871–1990

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

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

Assess the validity of the view in **Source C** about the policy of Ostpolitik. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will be based almost entirely on the extract, e.g. explains that the architects of Ostpolitik had sought to promote political change in the GDR. They had intended to bring about reform 'from above', by helping to stabilise the regime, but instead, they had helped 'destabilise' it so leading to 'rebellion from below'. Ostpolitik had encouraged Honecker to continue without reforms and so the GDR went 'down the road to ruin'. Candidates will show a basic understanding of Garton Ash's memorable phrase that the West 'got it right because they got it wrong!'. At Level 2 candidates will introduce elements of own knowledge including some detail of what is meant by Ostpolitik and how it worked, as well as showing some understanding of the given interpretation. Level 3 answers will contain more extensive own knowledge and will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2. They are likely to balance the conflicting views of Ostpolitik, with reference to alternative interpretations. While they will probably acknowledge the validity of Garton Ash's views as one interpretation of the consequences of Ostpolitik, they are also likely to suggest that an alternative view would point to its positive repercussions in enabling the GDR to survive until 1989. At Level 4 answers will offer sustained argument and convincing judgement. At this level candidates are more likely to question the given interpretation.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence about the attitude of East Germans to the GDR in October 1989? (10 marks)

Target: A01.1, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. | 1-2 |
|-----|---|------------|

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

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will make simple statements related to the content of the extract, e.g. will refer to the young man's attitude – his fear and his expectation of further trouble, and/or that of the crowds in Dresden who tried to storm the station. The utility of the content is likely to be conveyed implicitly.

Level 2 answers will explore utility at a general level, demonstrating appreciation either of some of the strengths and/or some of the limitations of the content of the source. The strength of the content of the source lies in its description of attitudes in October 1989. The bubbling up of mass protest and desire for escape, the fear of the young recruits called upon to keep order and something of their sympathy with the rioters. The source conveys the breakdown of order well, but also suggest that authorities are 'just' maintaining control. The limitations of the source would include the fact that it represents only one incident, in one town and is given through the eyes of a clearly frightened young man who may not be considered representative.

At Level 3 answers will give more careful consideration to both strengths and limitations, (as given in Level 2 above) demonstrating a reasoned understanding of the source in context. At this level candidates are likely to consider the provenance more fully. The source is useful because of its immediacy to the events it describes and the apparent honesty of the author. It can also be corroborated from own knowledge of what was happening in the GDR in the autumn of 1989. Its limitations will be assessed more fully, with some indication of the alternative view, that the authorities still retained ample control.

Level 4 answers will provide a clear evaluation of the source as a piece of evidence and offer sustained judgement. At this level candidates will certainly question the utility of the source and will refer to other useful material which might corroborate or question it, so broadening the picture to provide a better understanding of the situation at this time. References to the views of Kettenacker in support of Garton Ash as well as references to Jaraus and Fullbrook for alternative interpretations might be particularly useful here.

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

'The collapse of the GDR in 1989 was more the consequence of external developments than of internal factors.'

Assess the validity of this view, with reference to the years 1969 to 1989. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
-

-
- L2: **Either**
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or**
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Some explicit reference to the sources provided on the question paper must be evident for the award of Level 3 and above. **All relevant** sources should be used for Level 4 and 5.

The focus of the answer should be on the reasons for the collapse of the GDR in 1989, but candidates are asked to look at developments from 1969 and the launching of Ostpolitik in order to explain this. They will need to balance external against internal factors to reach a balanced and supported conclusion.

Source A explains the importance of the opening of the Austro-Hungarian border in May 1989 and points to the position of ‘utter helplessness’ which this left Honecker in.

Source B shows the extent of discontent in Dresden in October 1989 when 2,000 people ‘high on fear and anger’ stormed the Dresden station in their desire to flee to the West. It also gives some indication of the weakness of the forces on which the GDR relied ‘I was seized by fear for my life; we were completely untrained; many of us fainted’. It also warns about ‘the uses to which our army, and security forces may be put in the coming months’ suggesting wider unease.

Source C confirms the fall of the state through ‘rebellion from below’, although it also provides evidence that an outside force – The Federal Republic with its Ostpolitik policy, should take some of the responsibility. ‘Perhaps the architects of policy towards the GDR got it right because they got it wrong!’

Candidates will have to develop and explain these ideas with reference to their own knowledge. They should display a thorough understanding of the impact of external developments, particularly perestroika and the changes in Russian attitudes (glasnost). The position and attitude of Kohl is also relevant here. Candidates should balance these external changes against internal developments – particularly the Reform pressure groups in the GDR, which developed in the summer/autumn of 1989, and the marches they organised. The collapse of

authority may be considered as a separate factor reflecting the inherent weakness of the leadership, its lack of ideas and commitment, its failure to take decisive action and its ill thought through measures (e.g. the botched decision to allow travel to West Berlin). Whatever argument is adopted, the long and short term reasons for the fall of the GDR should be explained and for an award of Level 3 or higher there should be explicit reference to historiography.

The question does not ask candidates to go beyond 1989 and although some reference to the subsequent reunification in 1990 might be made relevant, this is not a requirement. Detailed reference to America's involvement at this stage is not expected.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to restrict themselves to describing and defining what the sources say with limited explanation in response to the question. Level 2 answers will either provide some comment on the statement but have only limited information in support, or they will be primarily narrative/descriptive of the downfall of the GDR with limited comment. Level 3 answers will make a genuine attempt to debate the validity of the given opinion, with some range of evidence. Candidates are likely to consider a number of factors, and provide some effective comment on these. They may not, however, address the full time span, or may be unbalanced and patchy in coverage. Level 4 answers will integrate argument and evidence and provide a fuller and more balanced picture with some criticism of the quotation. Answers will show a reasonable understanding of both external and internal factors. Level 5 answers will provide a more sustained argument, with supported evaluation throughout the essay. Answers will combine clear understanding with good factual support and make supported judgement about the reasons for the GDR's demise.