



General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

Alternative G Unit 1

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 2008 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:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS 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 AS level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS 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 AS.

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 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: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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 2008

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

AS Unit 1: Imperial and Weimar Germany, 1871–1925

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of ‘the *Freikorps*’ (line 3) in the context of Germany in the years 1919 to 1920. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that the Freikorps were troops used by the government to maintain order; that they were used in January 1919; that they supplemented the civil service and the army in propping up the regime. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. develops the points made above and sets this in context by referring to some of the following ideas: they were paramilitary bands of demobilised soldiers and officers; they were strongly RW nationalist; they were used against the Spartacists, to quell the Berlin street disorders and destroy the soviet government in Bavaria (developing lead in the source); that they were ruthless and were not afraid to take lives in the interest of restoring order; that many were hostile to the Weimar Republic but they shared a hatred for Bolshevism; they tried to seize Berlin in the Kapp Putsch of March 1920. **2-3**

- (b) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how **Source B** challenges the views put forward in **Source A** about the SPD’s attitude to the use of violence and armed force in Germany in the years 1918 to 1919. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

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

- L1: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. **Source A** suggests that the SPD were fiercely against the use of violence and armed force. They want ‘peace through work’ and ‘freedom’. **Source B**, on the other hand, shows how the SPD came to rely on the army and right wing – ‘grew dependent on the civil service and the army’ and accepted the brutal ways of the Freikorps who crushed the left ‘at the cost of several hundred lives’. **1-2**
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. explains that while the SPD was essentially a left-wing party with a
-

desire to help the workers through 'peace' and 'freedom'. Nevertheless, in the unstable circumstances of 1919 they chose to take a right wing stance and use the army in order to retain control. The Ebert-Groener pact had been made in November 1918 in the belief that this was the only way of preserving the regime. This seemed to prove true when the Spartacists rebelled in January 1919. However, the use of the army and ill-disciplined Freikorps – who brought about the deaths of over 100 workers – conflicted with the pure Socialist belief and consequently deepened splits within the movement. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source A, e.g. candidates are likely to point out that both sources refer to a desire to crush the Spartacist movement but only Source B speaks of doing this through violence and armed force – suggesting that the SPD's attitude could vary according to circumstance. A candidate might provide a conclusion which considers whether Ebert was forced to compromise his principles in order to preserve the Republic, or whether he overestimated the threat from the Communists, took an ultra conservative stance and so ultimately contributed to the Republic's failure. Another line might be to consider the effect of Ebert's decision on the Socialist movement – the SPD/USPD split which weakened the left as the right grew stronger. Reward any attempt to take the contrast beyond the literal and look at its broader implications. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of left wing extremism, in relation to other factors, in explaining the weakness of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919 to 1923. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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 *either* on own knowledge *or* 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 descriptions but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from 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 the sources *and* from 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* from own knowledge, 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 and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From the sources – Source A refers to the SPD's fear of Bolshevik extremism. The SPD newspaper warns socialists not to 'follow Spartacus'. It refers to the SPD ideal of 'freedom' and suggests that fighting can only destroy industry and trade. Source B shows how the SPD had to resort to the army and Freikorps to fight the Communists in Berlin and Bavaria. Source C tells of 'the spectacle of army and Freikorps units marching into German cities to suppress working class unrest' in 1919. However, it also provides some balance. 'The Communist organisation was feeble and their numbers insignificant' and 'the left was divided on the extent to which they should carry the battle out into the streets'.

From own knowledge – Candidates should explain the left wing extremism and may develop some details of: the Spartacist outbreak of January 1919; the Bavarian Soviet Republic (March-May 1919); the strikes and demonstrations in the Ruhr and elsewhere 1919+.

The importance of left wing extremism should lead to debate on some of the following issues: the fear it engendered through comparison with Bolshevism in Russia; the challenge it posed to democracy; the economic disruption it caused; the government's reaction and consequent move to the right; the opportunity it gave to the army and Freikorps; the militarization (which Source A

warned of); the constant harassment the government experienced at a time when there were other troubles to address (as below).

Candidates will need to look at 'other factors' which weakened the Republic such as right wing forces and the power of the army (together with the political assassinations/Kapp Putsch/Munich putsch); the weaknesses of the Weimar constitution; the wartime legacy; the Treaty of Versailles; reparations and the economic difficulties of 1923.

Conclusions are likely to suggest that the left wing challenges do not entirely explain the weakness of the Weimar Republic and that the government's reaction to them and its consequent reliance on the army and right wing were perhaps even more important. Furthermore attitudes to left wing extremism split the Socialists (SPD/USPD) and divided the working class movement so that the left was unable to resist them as the increasingly dominant right.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points about the weaknesses of the Weimar Republic. They may be excessively generalised and assertive. Level 2 answers will show a better use of the sources or some relevant own knowledge but answers will be limited in scope perhaps telling the story of the Spartacist rebellion or mentioning one or two of the problems that the government faced 1919–1923. Level 3 responses will have a greater range of material and draw on the sources and own knowledge to make a reasonably explicit response to the question. However there may be an imbalance of treatment, with little concern for the broader framework of 'other factors' or a limited depth to the knowledge and understanding. Typically, answers will describe the Spartacist outbreak and mention one or two 'other factors' with little development. At Level 4 there will be better balance. Candidates will provide some reasoned argument and be aware that other factors were important. Secure detail, including a good understanding of 'left' and other factors will be shown. Level 5 responses will show greater analysis and judgement about the comparative seriousness of the problems posed both by the left and other issues.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Falk's May Laws' (line 2) in the context of Bismarck's *Kulturkampf*. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. that the Laws were anti-Catholic; the source tells us that they were passed in 1873 and 1874 in order to undermine the position of the Catholic Church. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. explaining that the laws were a major plank of Bismarck's *Kulturkampf* – 'struggle for civilisation'. They aimed to bring the Church under state control as part of his plans for the unity of Germany. They weakened the Church's hold over education, introduced state inspection of schools, made the appointment and training of priests the responsibility of the state, expelled the Jesuit order and legalised procedures for civil marriage. In 1875 further laws dissolved the religious orders and stopped subsidies where clergy resisted the changes. **2-3**

(b) Explain why Bismarck attacked the Catholic Church in the years 1873 to 1878. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Bismarck wanted to keep National liberal support by attacking the Church; Bismarck wanted full control in Germany; Bismarck had a personal dislike of Catholics. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the attack can be seen as: part of a general clash of ideas – an internationalist and ‘infallible’ Pope as against a nationalist Bismarck; a political manoeuvre to keep a Liberal alliance to complete the unification of Germany, knowing the Liberals disliked the Catholic Church for its conservatism; an attack on the Catholic centre party for political purposes since it represented the minorities and those opposed to Bismarck’s authoritarian ways. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. develops some of the points made above and shows the interrelationship of these factors or draws some conclusion, e.g. may be aware that the Catholics were in a minority in the new Empire (37% of the population) and were concentrated in the south (and the areas which had sided with Austria in the Austro-Prussian war) consequently the strategy could be seen as a way of reinforcing Bismarck’s position and uniting the Germans against a common enemy (negative cohesion). (This is one view only. Reward any similarly developed concluding explanation.) **6-7**

- (c) 'Bismarck's political twists and turns enabled him to maintain personal control of domestic affairs in the years 1871 to 1890.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- 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. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant 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 and 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 focus on Bismarck's 'political twists and turns', e.g. the move from a pro-Liberal alliance, which brought him into conflict with the Centre party, to a pro-Conservative one marked by the re-introduction of tariffs and a campaign against the Socialists. This also brought about reconciliation with the Centre. The 'twists and turns' might also encompass manoeuvres like the Kartell of 1887 – an alliance of National Liberals and The Prussian Conservatives.

Candidates need to assess the success of these manoeuvres in enabling Bismarck to maintain personal control and those supporting the view will probably point out that his political pragmatism ensured he retained power and kept the upper hand. Those who disagree with the view may well point out that because Bismarck constantly had to adjust tactics and switch allies he was unable to maintain complete control and his *reichsfeinde* (including the Catholics and Socialists) were never destroyed as a political force. Furthermore his own political position was tenuous by 1890.

Candidates may conclude that Bismarck's 'twists and turns' merely hid an underlying conservatism which matched that of the Kaiser and that this was the secret of his underlying political control. They may argue that he was, or was not, a skilful political manipulator. Reward any line of argument that shows balance and some supported judgement.

Answers at Level 1 will either contain a few generalised points or offer a brief and poorly focused account of Bismarck's time as Chancellor of Germany. Level 2 answers will be mostly relevant but over-descriptive accounts although some will try to respond to the question in a

limited and unbalanced way, e.g. concentrating on perhaps one aspect of Bismarck's 'turnaround' in 1878–1879. Level 3 answers will usually attempt to 'agree or disagree' although the analysis may be slim in places and the issue of Bismarck's control may simply be judged according to the results of Bismarck's policies. If they only address the success (or failure) of policies they can be placed in this level provided they provide some convincing arguments. Level 4 answers will contain more range and show a better understanding of issues. Candidates will confront the issue of 'personal political control' and will show analysis and secure support for the argument adopted. Answers at this level may have more reference to Bismarck's political style rather than just his changing policies. Level 5 answers will have a sustained analysis and a good critical appreciation of the way in which Bismarck operated and its effectiveness.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'eager-to-please Chancellors' (line 2) in the context of the *Kaiserreich* between 1890 and 1914. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. they supported the Kaiser and did as he requested. General comments with no specific links to names or actions should be placed in this level. **1**

- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. showing how all of Wilhelm II's chancellors were subject to their master's whims and keen to please. Candidates should develop their answer with reference to one or two examples relevant to the period, e.g. Caprivi (1890–1894) – dismissed for upsetting the Agrarian league and failing to quell Socialist tensions; Hohenlohe (1894–1900) the 'straw doll' Chancellor whose opinions were largely ignored; Bülow (1900–1909) the 'eel' who fell out of favour after the Daily Telegraph affair and Bethmann Hollweg (1909–1917) who was increasingly isolated by the Kaiser's military line. There is no need for candidates to mention names of Chancellors. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Wilhelm II feared the 'forces of the left'. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. that the forces of the left opposed Wilhelm's policies in the Reichstag or a general link between 'forces of the left' and socialism. **1-2**

- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the Socialists had been outlawed by Bismarck but the SPD had continued to grow; their growing election success caused Wilhelm II considerable alarm as it made it more difficult for him to get legislation through the Reichstag; he believed they were intent on overthrowing the state; he identified them with 'immorality' and a threat to the Church; he feared the power of the masses and the forces of democracy; he believed strike activity harmed Germany's economic position. **3-5**

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. candidates may argue that one of Wilhelm's fears was more or less important than others, e.g. the revolutionary nature of Socialism may be questioned. Candidates may point out that the growth in 'forces of the right' was ultimately to cause Germany more problems than the left and that Wilhelm was only fearful because of his personal insecurities and that he overestimated the 'threat' which the left posed. **6-7**

(c) 'The Kaiser was in full control of German domestic policy in the years 1890 to 1914.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant 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 and 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

The focus of this question is on the Kaiser's control of domestic policy in Germany. Candidates might point out that he tried to exert a personal rule – appointing and dismissing Chancellors (under the terms of the constitution) and taking Germany along his preferred Conservative, militarist and nationalistic course. He exerted his own authority in incidents like the Daily Telegraph interview and Zabern affair and he largely ignored the mounting pressure of the Social Democrat party which became the largest in the Reichstag by 1912.

To provide balance, candidates will need to consider ways in which the Kaiser failed to maintain full control. These might include: the existence of the Reichstag and the opposition voiced to events such as those above; the power of the elites; the pressure groups (trade unions leading strike activity as well as the nationalist groups); the influence of Ministers and courtiers.

Good candidates will make an overall judgement as to whether the Kaiser was in full control over the period 1890–1914 or at any point during it. They may argue that he set the terms and his chancellors were never able to exert the power Bismarck had once enjoyed – nor were others groups able to turn him from his own course. (This view might be identified with the historian Röhl.) Alternatively they may put forward Wehler and Berghahn's view that the real power actually lay in the hands of the elites. There should be no expectation of historiography, however, and any well-argued answer should be suitably rewarded.

Level 1 answers will make generalised, simplistic and undeveloped statements about the Kaiser's rule. Level 2 answers will be largely descriptive but they will contain at least some implicit understanding showing some awareness of the Kaiser's place in government or of his views and policies. Level 3 answers will generally be aware of the need to 'agree or disagree' and will make more comment on material presented. These answers will show a reasonable grasp of the period and the Kaiser's control (or lack of it) although the detail may be better in some areas than others and there may be sections of description. Candidates who present only a one-sided view may be placed in this level provided the material is sound. At Level 4 there will be a more secure understanding backed by suitable evidence and the answer will be balanced and argued. Candidates are likely to offer a good range of evidence across the whole period. Level 5 responses will be analytical throughout and make reasoned but not necessarily extensive judgements based on a developed conceptual understanding of the Kaiserreich.