



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2011**

**A2 History 2041**

**HIS3L**

**Unit 3L**

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

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

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](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

## Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

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

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

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

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

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### ***A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS***

#### **General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

---

June 2011

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

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

**Question 1**

- 01** To what extent was Adenauer's long period in office as Chancellor of West Germany from 1949 to 1963 due to the success of the West German economy? (45 marks)

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

**Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

---

## Indicative content

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

Candidates will need to evaluate the reasons for Adenauer's longevity as Chancellor of West Germany and balance the part played by the success of the West German economy against other factors which enabled him to retain power for so long.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of economic success:

- economic growth was associated with Adenauer's coming to power, e.g. currency reform and Marshall aid from 1950 promoted investment
- economic growth was associated with government policies – subsidies, work creation schemes, the removal of protective tariffs, anti-monopoly laws, banking controls, co-determination curbing trade unions and reducing strikes – as well as sufficient freedom for enterprise in the development of a free (or social) market economy
- growing prosperity brought continually rising standards of living and permitted a period of mass consumption, when most enjoyed comfortable homes, sufficient food and growing numbers of luxuries, e.g. fridges, cars, holidays and TVs. This reinforced commitment to the CDU/CSU government under Adenauer and helped make West Germans ready to accept Adenauer's steady leadership and to suppress the past
- economic success left Adenauer 'in tune' with an electorate which wanted peace, jobs and a reasonable lifestyle (sometimes referred to as 'ohne mich' or the attitude of 'keine Experimente')
- helped reinforce an anti-communist (and even anti-socialist) standpoint and encouraged acceptance of western integration at the expense of reunification – in line with Adenauer's views and policies, e.g. associated West Germany with western Europe through the ECSC and EEC from 1957.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider which aided Adenauer's longevity as Chancellor:

- Adenauer's relationship with the west and particularly the USA which needed his support
- Adenauer's commitment to democracy, skills as a party manager and readiness to address wartime issues such as refugees and compensation for losses
- anti-Communist and anti-fascist sentiment within Germany – in tune with his attitude
- SPD weaknesses and the lack of a viable alternative
- his readiness to use experienced and efficient former Nazis in the administration and turn a blind eye to the past
- his refusal to tolerate dissent – both within government and on the outside, e.g. 1962 Schwabing riots
- his acceptance of status quo rather than pressing for unity
- Adenauer was responsible for leading governments which passed significant welfare reforms and measures to improve Labour relations.

Furthermore, candidates may point out:

- economic policy was really the concern of Erhard; it was not solely the result of government policies nor was growth fully sustained through the period or shared by all levels of society

- Adenauer's policies were moulded by Cold War politics in Europe and his position only sustained because he had the support of the West and the USA.

In conclusion, candidates may argue that a variety of factors enabled Adenauer to retain power for so long and that whilst economic growth was very important, he would not have maintained his position were his moderate-conservative attitude and policies not widely in tune with that of the electorate – and with that of Western Europe and the USA.

**Question 2**

- 02** 'Most East Germans lived contented lives in the GDR in the 1970s.'  
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

**Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

## **Indicative content**

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

Candidates will need to identify and explain the ways in which most East Germans lived contented lives in the 1970s and balance these against the ways in which they did not. They may also analyse what is meant by 'contented', and see certain aspects of life as engendering greater contentment than others.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of contentment:

- there were no uprisings or major disturbances; the country appeared politically stable
- there was virtually no unemployment while all had a home and basic welfare services (education; factory crèches; benefits etc.)
- standards of living rose in the 1970s (highest in the Soviet bloc); families could go on holidays and increasingly acquire cars and telephones
- GDR success in technology and sport helped engender a form of contentment, as seen in the propaganda and reports of the era.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the people were held in check by the Stasi and lived in a state where they were not able to express themselves freely
- there are numerous reports of grumbling over poor quality goods, inability to travel outside the soviet bloc and an inferior lifestyle in comparison with the west
- the number of those seeking to 'escape' the GDR was reduced by the building of the Berlin Wall (1961) but this did not necessarily indicate greater contentment.

Furthermore, candidates may:

- suggest that contentment was artificially manufactured through education and propaganda
- that contentment was superficial and is, in any case, difficult to measure
- examine Fulbrook's argument that a 'niche society' emerged in the GDR.

In conclusion, candidates may argue that the East Germans adapted to the regime and that many enjoyed a happy family life within it, but that it is hard to find evidence to support true depth of Socialist feeling and the very existence of the Stasi would suggest that propaganda had not been successful in inculcating this.

---

**Question 3**

- 03** To what extent were relations between East and West Germany in the years 1948 to 1989 affected by disagreements over Berlin? (45 marks)

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

**Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2**

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

---

## Indicative content

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

Candidates will need to identify and explain the ways in which disagreements over Berlin affected the East/West German relationship and balance these against these against other influences affecting the East/West German relationship.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the ways disagreements over Berlin were important:

- it provided a constant source of irritation – first seen in the Berlin blockade when the Soviets tried to drive the western allies from West Berlin
- the East/West relationship was undermined by the Berlin Crisis of 1958–1961 when Khrushchev threatened to end the four-power agreement and hand Berlin and its access routes to the GDR, placing the West at the mercy of a power they had failed to recognise
- the building of the Berlin Wall emphasised the East/West divide and stopped movement within the city – making division permanent
- Brandt's Ostpolitik evolved from his consciousness (as Mayor of Berlin) of the adverse effects of the Berlin Wall on Berliners
- the desire to remove the Berlin Wall lay behind the tensions of 1989.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other influences to consider:

- East/West division was an ideological division which existed irrespective of what happened in Berlin. West Germany refused to recognise East Germany until 1972
- the ideological division of the USA and USSR was far more important in creating tension between East and West Germany
- Ostpolitik was not solely about Berlin
- the pressure for the removal of the Wall in 1989 was largely symbolic. The real issues concerned broader travel restrictions, standards of living and lack of liberty.

In conclusion, candidates may suggest that, while disagreements over Berlin were doubtless an irritant to those who lived there and that both East and West were prepared to go to extraordinary lengths to retain their control in Berlin, the problems created by that city were only a reflection of the broader troubles afflicting East/West relations. Candidates may suggest that Berlin was a 'pawn' in the Cold War between the two superpowers.

## Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

**UMS conversion calculator:** [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)