



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

---

# Mark scheme

## June 2003

GCE

History

Alternative G

Units 1, 4 and 6

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*

**CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:****AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners**

---

**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 undiscriminating 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 undiscriminating 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 AO1.1, 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 (AO1.2), 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 (AO2, 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 characteristics: 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 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

**June 2003****Alternative G: Germany From Unification to Re-Unification, 1866-1990****AS Unit 1: Imperial and Weimar Germany, 1866-1925****Question 1**

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

Explain briefly the significance of the “Social Democratic Party” in the context of German politics in the 1890s. *(3 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. The Social Democratic Party was a political party committed to a change in government which gave greater equality, reducing the power of the rich “upper classes” and giving ordinary (working class) Germans more say in the running of their country. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. in the 1890s the Social Democratic Party was flourishing (after the repeal of Bismarck’s anti-Socialist laws) in response to the growth of Germany industry, urbanisation and the working class. It adopted a radical programme at the Erfurt Congress, 1891, which alarmed the government (particularly the Kaiser) and made the elites more determined to crush them. **2-3**

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

Explain how the view of the Social Democratic Party expressed in Source C challenges that put forward in Source B. *(7 marks)*

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 C states that there was an important group within the Social Democratic Party which was not revolutionary, whereas Source B suggests that the Party was becoming so powerful that it would soon challenge the government in an “inevitable struggle”. It stresses the need for the government to act promptly to prevent a rising. **1-2**

L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to own knowledge, e.g. is aware that the Social Democratic Party programme was potentially revolutionary but that while the Erfurt programme might have been a long-term aim (and was never rescinded), in reality the membership was more realistic and the main interest of the party in the 1890s was to improve the position of the workers within the existing system, working for better wages, working and living conditions and to support the unemployed. They wanted to increase the Party's representation in the Reichstag, rather than to challenge it, and were essentially loyal Germans, for example, supporting the Kaiser's Weltpolitik. **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 points out that those who claimed that the Social Democratic Party was planning imminent revolution were guilty of exaggeration and probably did so to protect their own interests. While some may have genuinely feared concessions, many more pretended to, to avoid loss of power and income. Consequently Germany suffered from an increasing rift between the workers demanding more rights and the elite of landowners/factory owners who were unwilling to jeopardise their positions. The situation was made worse by inconsistent government policy. Candidates may also point out that while Source C has the benefit of hindsight, and is the view of a modern writer, Source B represents the fears of the elites in the 1890s. **6-7**

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

Explain why there were various changes in government policies towards the rise of Socialism in Germany in the period 1890-1914. **(15 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO3*

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating, 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:** e.g. Source A shows that the SDP programme was potentially revolutionary and therefore alarming to the government with its direct challenges to the existing constitution. Source B gives an indication of that alarm, and the sort of advice the Kaiser received. Both these sources partly explain the government attempts to crush Socialism. Source C shows the moderate side of the movement, and explains how the Socialists worked within the constitution and achieved electoral success. This may explain the absence of a head-on clash but growing strength in the Reichstag also provoked government reaction.

**From own knowledge:** e.g. candidates should be able to describe and explain changes in government policies towards Socialism from the relaxation of the anti-Socialist Laws under Caprivi (1890-1894), following the Kaiser's desire for a "new course" post-Bismarck, through the largely unsuccessful anti-Socialist legislation (1894-99), in response to the Kaiser's disillusionment at SDP success in the 1893 elections (35 seats 1890 to 44 seats 1893). The pressure of his more extreme advisers and a weak Chancellor (Hohenlohe) might explain the clashes in the Reichstag after 1894 as the government attempted, unsuccessfully, to introduce more repressive legislation, alienating the workers still further. It should be noted that from 1897, despite the attempt at Sammlungspolitik, gathering the elites together in opposition to the SDP, the Party experienced almost continuous growth (56 seats 1898 to 81 in 1903) although there was a brief dip in SDP popularity in 1907 election (43 seats) following Bülow's successful election campaign which played on patriotism and the "national interest" and led to the establishment of the "Bülow Bloc". Nevertheless, attempts to satisfy the workers with welfare legislation from 1899 onwards backfired and in 1912 the Party won 110 seats, making it the largest party in the Reichstag. By 1914, however, the party had been won over to support the war effort.

Answers at L1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points about government policies, the attitude of the Kaiser and/or the growth of the SDP in these years. There will be greater range and selectivity of points and some supportive descriptive at L2. Although there may not be a full range of material, answers will be reasonably accurate and there will be some valid links to the question. L3 responses will have greater precision, range and depth and will respond directly to the question, although the explanation will not necessarily be sustained and evidence may be unbalanced. By L4 the case will be argued more strongly, with more focus on why policies changed rather than what the policies were. Candidates will also cover the whole timescale of the question. L5 responses will integrate the sources with own knowledge and draw conclusions about the reasons for the inconsistency of government policy.

**Question 2**

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “a federation of self-governing states” in the context of the unification of Germany. *(3 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. some of, a group of separate political areas, each with its own ruler, diet and law courts, brought together in a new political unit known as the German Empire by 1871.

**1**

- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. the old Germany had consisted of a loose Confederation of (mostly monarchical) states with a central diet under an Austrian presidency. In the nine years from 1862 when Bismarck became minister-president of Prussia, there had been three wars in which the old German confederation had been dissolved and Prussia expanded to create a “united Germany”. This comprised a federation of 25 states – each with its own ruler and government, represented according to size in the new Bundesrat. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Germany was unified in the years 1866-1871. *(7 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Bismarck was victorious in wars against Austria and France 1866-1871 which brought the German states together. **1-2**

- L2: Demonstrates understanding of more than one specific factors explaining the development of the issue or event through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining the position of Bismarck, the wars, particularly 1866-1871 and the part played by the Prussian army, economic factors, the part of liberalism and/or external influences. **3-5**

- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue or event and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative significance, e.g. debates whether it was “blood and iron” or “coal and iron” which was more important, or assesses the pressures for unification within Germany and makes pertinent comment on the extent of Bismarck’s personal role. Shows developed understanding and is able to link the events to the underlying motives and assess the degree of planning and of “chance”. **6-7**

- (c) “It was Prussia and the Prussian elites which dominated the newly unified Germany from 1871 to 1879.” Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. *(15 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating 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 explain the dominance of Prussia and the Prussian elites in the new constitution and the evolution of united Germany to 1879. As the largest state, Prussia had the largest representation in the Bundesrat (17 seats) giving it the right of veto over any proposed change. The Emperor (Kaiser) was the King of Prussia, and the Minister – President of Prussia, Bismarck, was the Imperial Chancellor. The Chancellor did not choose his cabinet from the Reichstag deputies and was not responsible to that body, so power was concentrated in the hands of his personal supporters and friends – mainly Prussians. Bismarck favoured the Prussian elites, especially the Junker class of which he was a member, and was socially conservative. Although he “used” the National Liberals to 1878, the consolidation of the new Germany took place in a way that would not disadvantage the traditional elites. When they clamoured for protection in the turnaround of 1878-9, they won. The Prussian elites favoured a system which guaranteed the separate identity of Prussia combined with Prussian control of the Bundesrat and the Prussian civil service provided the model (and most of the personnel) for Reich administration.

Answers may agree with the opinion given, stressing Prussian dominance. However a good answer should at least touch on alternative views – that Prussia and its elite were not entirely dominant and that the new Reich had certain liberal features – state autonomy and an elected Reichstag which carried through reforms and policies such as free trade, under the dominance of the National liberals from 1871 and in direct opposition to the desires of the Prussian elites. Some might even argue that it was Bismarck, rather than Prussia or its elites which dominated the development of the newly unified Germany.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief and may provide some general description of Prussian dominance – perhaps relating only implicitly to the question through a description of Bismarck’s political policies. At Level 2, answers may still be largely descriptive, but they will be fuller and there will be some more explicit links between events and the issue of Prussian dominance. These answers may ignore one aspect of the question – concentrating, for example on the new constitution only, or on a part of the period 1871-1879. By Level 3, answers will show more explicit understanding, offer some analysis and provide a range of

material across the timespan, although treatment may be uneven. By Level 4 there will be balanced and supported comment, showing a secure understanding. Level 5 responses will be largely analytical throughout and will draw conclusions based on the sound and detailed evidence.

### Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “Bolshevism” in the context of political unrest in Germany in 1918. *(3 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term or concept, largely based on the extract, e.g. Bolshevism refers to the activities of Communist groups in Germany who took inspiration from the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 in Russia. They wanted to overthrow the rich, upper and middle classes and give the working class greater power. **1**

- L2: Developed explanation of the term or concept, linked to the context, e.g. Bolshevism refers to the activities of Communists who wanted to seize power and create a soviet style revolution in Germany in the wake of the economic distress and military failure of Germany in the War, the Kaiser's abdication and the establishment of a precarious Socialist republic. They worked through the KPD and Spartacists to develop local and national councils (soviets) to create a communist state. The Socialist government set up under Ebert greatly feared their activities. (Note that details of the Spartacist revolt of 1919 are not strictly relevant here.) **2-3**

- (b) Explain why, in 1918-1919, the SPD leader, Ebert, opposed the communists and co-operated with the traditional elites. *(7 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates implicit understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. describes the communist threat in 1918-19, e.g. the Spartacist uprising or makes a general comment about Ebert's pact with the army. **1-2**

- L2: Demonstrates understanding of more than one specific factor explaining the development of the issue, Ebert's hostility to Communism and his co-operation with the elites, through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. the influence of the Communist revolution in Russia 1917, support for the communists in the post-war conditions in Germany with the creation of Soviets from November 1918 and the Spartacist rebellion of 1919; the continuing left wing threat; Ebert's precarious position and the power of the old elites; the value of the Ebert-Groener Pact with the army (November 1918); the need for/advantages of retaining the support of industrialists, the old civil service, judiciary and officer corps. **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 significance, e.g. develops the points given for L2, and shows some links between these factors. May suggest that Ebert exaggerated the threat from the Communists and made a fatal error in 1918-1919, or may argue that Ebert had no other option and

that reliance on the right wing was necessary in order for the Republic to survive. Reward at this level those that show a real understanding of the dilemma faced by Ebert. **6-7**

- (c) “By 1924 the Weimar Republic was both politically and economically stable.”  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. **(15 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating 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

Candidates should be aware of the economic and political problems of the Weimar Republic stemming from failure in war and the collapse of the old authoritarian political system. They are likely to develop a picture of the Republic’s problems before 1924. The imposition of the Treaty of Versailles, on top of Germany’s economic exhaustion, brought inflation, which grew worse in 1923 following the French occupation of the Ruhr. Politically, the new regime faced continuing political threats to its existence, and answers are likely to refer to how the Republic survived threats from the Communists and right-wing (particularly the Spartacists’ rebellion, Kapp putsch, Munich putsch). They might also examine the weaknesses of the Weimar constitution and the compromises that had to be made in order for it to survive. The apparent strength of the Republic by 1924 rested on the effective crushing of political opposition and the easing of political extremism as the country recovered economically. Mention should be made of the work of Stresemann (Chancellor 1923). This included the reduction of government expenditure and the pruning of the civil service, the Rentenmark (November 1923) which curbed inflation and the Dawes Plan, April 1924, which reorganised reparations in Germany’s favour and provided foreign loans for development. However, there was clearly still some major political and economic weakness present, particularly in

the preservation of the power of the right wing and army and the reliance on foreign loans for economic recovery.

Answers may argue that Germany was relatively stable in 1924 and that without later economic problems the Weimar Republic would have survived, but it is more likely that answers will question whether Germany was really stable in 1924, pointing to the government reliance on the army and right wing, the weaknesses inherent in the growing dependence on foreign loans and the continued existence of right wing and left wing extremists (e.g. Hitler). Whatever view is adopted, reward each answer on its merits, with reference to the level discriminators.

Answers at Level 1 will be brief, making simplistic and undeveloped statements. These may rely on a description of the political and/or economic troubles or some general statements about Stresemann and the situation in 1924. At Level 2, answers will be largely descriptive showing some awareness of the way the Weimar Republic handled its economic and political problems, but there will be limited debate of the given statement. By Level 3 the answer will be more specific and show an accurate knowledge of relevant material with some clear attempt to consider the validity of the statement. By Level 4 the analysis will be strengthened and broadened and there will be some balance in the answer. Level 5 responses will make reasoned but not necessarily extensive judgements based on a developed understanding of the position of the Weimar Republic by 1924.

**June 2003****Alternative G: Germany From Unification to Re-Unification, 1866-1990****A2 Unit 4: Germany, c1880-c1980****Question 1**

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

Explain what is meant by the “marriage of iron and rye” in the context of German economic development in the years 1897-1902. *(5 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. basic use of the source, e.g. Government economic policy was based on the support of the agrarian and heavy industry interests. Candidates may refer to the two areas “working together” or may offer some relevant detail with only an implicit definition of the term. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn from either the source and/or from own knowledge, e.g. explains that the government favoured the junkers and big business because of their innate conservatism and the dual need for food and military strength. Candidates at this level show and refer to tariffs, cartels or other aspects of government policy supporting industry and/or agriculture or show greater own knowledge in explaining the development as industry or agriculture in this period. **2-3**
- L3: As Level 2, with developed references to both the source and own knowledge, showing an awareness of the government’ role in the development of agriculture and industry. The Kaiser was a natural supporter of the large Prussian landowners who provided his circle of friends and were the backbone of the army. His naval building programme of these years also needed the support of heavy industry. There was therefore a parity of interests which the Kaiser and government could use to their advantage. This might include reference to the “limits beyond which the German State was not prepared to coddle heavy industry or large landowners”. Even during the period of “Sammlung” (rallying together) conflicts of interest occurred and the government sometimes had to play down its naval interests to avoid upsetting the junkers. Equally, many agrarian demands – particularly complaints about government spending policies and social reforms such as education that might tempt workers off the land – went unheeded in order to promote a modern industrial economy. Answers may conclude that the “marriage” was little more than a political slogan. There were industries that remained on the borders of the “marriage”, such as the chemical and electrical sectors and when there was a conflict of interest, the need for modern, efficient industry invariably won. **4-5**

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

Comment on the usefulness of Sources B and C in explaining the success with which the Nazi regime organised the economy to meet the needs of war. *(10 marks)*

*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**

L1 answers are likely to point out that both sources explain how the Nazi regime increased labour supplies, Source B showing how women were employed in munitions factories even before the war began, and Source C, how male and female labour was requisitioned from the conquered Soviet territories to maintain supply. At L2 answers will develop the points at L1 using own knowledge, e.g. may explain how labour supplies were maintained through the use of prisoners of war and “slave labour”, or refer to work of Speer in mobilising the German economy for war. L3 answers will use a range of evidence and will partly question the utility of the sources. They may refer to other factors which helped keep the German economy afloat, e.g. the strong base from which Germany started and preparation before 1939, Nazi organisation and the support of business and industry, the abundance of raw materials and their increase through occupied territories, the failure of allied bombing campaigns. Answers at L4 will use appropriately selected material from both sources and own knowledge to reach sustained judgement about the sources in relation to the success of Nazi wartime 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 and other factors in drawing their conclusions. They may, for example, point out that the Nazis were inconsistent and weakened their own economic programme by their reluctance to use German women. Their reliance on foreign labour may be criticised on economic, as well as moral grounds. Their preparedness for war might also be questioned and the “success” of their policies called into doubt. After all, the German economy could not ultimately stand the strain of war.

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

With reference to these four sources, and your own knowledge of German economic development, consider the extent to which it was economic factors, not government policies, which most affected changes in employment in the period c1880-c1980”.

*(15 marks)*

*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 the economic factors which affected changes in employment. Material from the sources might include Source A – the diversification of the economy and the growth of consumer industry bringing an expansion of certain employment areas. Source B – unemployment forcing women out of the workplace and the pressures of rearmament increasing women’s work in munitions factories. Source C – economic pressure in the war years leading to the employment of prisoners of war. Source D – an economic upswing after 1947 creating a shortage of labour and a reliance on Gastarbeiter in West Germany.

Candidates will also need to explain the source references from their own knowledge of the massive growth and diversification of German industry from the 1880s – the demands for labour in World War 1, the economic problems of the inter-war period and their effect on employment, the policies of the Nazi era and World War II and the changing post-war employment patterns which can be linked to the changed economic structures of both East and West Germany.

Government policies will also need to be examined and balanced against the economic factors above. Source A refers to State support for heavy industry and agriculture, tariffs and the marriage of iron and rye. Source B examines Nazi policy, to get women out of the workplace to relieve unemployment and its failure under economic pressure. Source C shows government policy in time of war. Source D refers to the government’s encouragement to

use foreign labour. Again, candidates' own knowledge will need to be used to exemplify these points and reference may be made to changes in employment policies and measures taken to deal with unemployment as well as changing attitudes to industry and agriculture.

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 develop either economic or political factors affecting employment or will provide a limited amount of material from both. By L3 there should be some attempt to compare the effect of economic factors with government policies and answers will be fuller, looking at the whole 100 year period although possibly rather unevenly. At L4 there should be a balanced argument and reasonable coverage of the whole time scale, while L5 answers will balance factors effectively, showing a good understanding of the sources and plentiful and relevant own knowledge.

## Section B

### Question 2 onward

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

“The Hitler State was dependent upon the efficiency of the SS to prevent its political and economic collapse.”

Examine the validity of this statement with reference to German internal development in the years 1934-1944. *(20 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, 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 examine the part played by the SS in Nazi Germany – with particular reference to its political role (destroying enemies through arbitrary arrest, special courts, concentration camps, intelligence reports), and its economic role (responsibility for slave labour, armaments construction, V-weapon production and running vital firms/camps). To support the political role of the SS, candidates may also refer to its military role as an elite military force with the Waffen SS rivalling the Wehrmacht and Death’s Head units running concentration camps and forming Panzer divisions. The information must, however, be used with reference to German internal development. Candidates at the higher levels will also need to consider whether the regime was in danger of collapse without the support of this paramilitary group, or whether inherent support for Hitler and his policies, the influence of propaganda and the underlying administrative, military and industrial structure of Germany meant that the Nazi regime could have survived without the SS.

At L1 answers are likely to rely on generalised comment or limited descriptive material about the SS. The approach may be similar but answers will be slightly fuller and more selective at Level 2. By L3 candidates will assemble good material, examine the various roles of the SS and make some attempt to assess “efficiency”, perhaps showing some knowledge of the weak/strong dictator debate. By L4 the analysis will be stronger, there will be some balance in the answer and a good range of selective examples. L5 answers will make a clear argument, either backed by an impressive range of evidence, or showing conceptual depth in the discussion of the nature and limits of power.

**Question 3**

How successfully did the Nazi regime attempt to control and change the beliefs and values of German society from 1933 to 1945? You should make special reference in your answer to **any two** of the following: art and architecture; the cinema and theatre; music; the radio; newspapers and literature; education. *(20 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, 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 on the aims, methods and results of Nazi propaganda and policies on beliefs and values. Candidates are required to include at least two of the given areas in their answers. They may choose to write a generalist answer, focusing on Nazi aims and success and drawing examples from the given (and other) areas or they may concentrate exclusively on the chosen areas providing a more thorough account of the topics chosen. Either approach is acceptable, but the more precise the examples given in support, the more convincing the answer is likely to be. Themes which are likely to feature include anti-modernism (anti-American and the decadent west), anti-socialism and family values, anti-semitism and the promotion of aryanism, the fuhrenprinzip – adulation of Hitler – volksgemeinschaft – loyalty to the regime - secularisation, nationalism, militarism. Candidates are likely to criticise Nazi success and some may be aware of the historiography on the subject. A likely view is that propaganda and policies were reasonably successful in their aims of reinforcing support for Hitler and the regime, and may well have strengthened a latent anti-semitism and militarism. Nevertheless, their impact was neither extensive nor universal and where the regime opposed traditional loyalties – particularly in the case of the churches, it was less successful.

At L1 answers may be either descriptive accounts of one or two areas or generalised assertions about Nazi propaganda and views of society. At L2 the information may well be relevant and plentiful but the approach will be fairly descriptive and uncritical. There may be an imbalance of treatment between areas or answers may adopt a generalist approach, ignoring the demand for special reference to two specified areas. L3 answers will cover at least two areas adequately and will make some reference to success, although the comment will still be limited. By L4 answers should show confident awareness of the chosen areas. They will examine aims, policies and results and the comment will show understanding and provide some balance. At L5, there will be a good range of well chosen detail and a critical awareness of success and failure in the various areas discussed.

**Question 4**

“While Adenauer spent his 14 years in office tightening the FRG’s western links, Ulbricht spent two decades tightening the GDR’s ties with Moscow.”

To what extent does this statement explain the differing development of the two German regimes in the years 1949-1963? *(20 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, 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 should be aware of actions which support the given statement, e.g. Under Adenauer, the Occupation Statute was revised, West Germany joined the Council of Europe, the European Coal and Steel Community, NATO and the Western European Union. It was a founding member of the EEC in 1957 and Adenauer signed the Franco-German treaty with de Gaulle in 1963. While Ulbricht was General Secretary of the East German Communist Party and the most important of the members of the East German politburo, on the other hand, East Germany joined Comecon, the Warsaw Pact and other communist organisations. When Ulbricht tried to impose higher working norms and prices in June 1953, he was forced to rely on Soviet tanks to crush the protests. Candidates should also consider other factors which affected development to provide a fully convincing argument. These might include the natural resources and labour supplies of the two countries, the attitudes of the political leaders – the strict planning in the east as opposed to the market economy in the west and the role of other factors, such as the Korean war or the building of the Berlin Wall.

L1 answers may be very generalised or describe only parts of the period or concentrate on development in one State only (probably West Germany). At L2 answers will be better informed and will either provide greater coverage but still primarily of the narrative/descriptive variety, or will be evaluative but narrowly focused, e.g. on economic development only. At L3 the answer will provide secure evidence across the period showing some understanding of differing economic and political developments in FDR and GDR, although these may not be treated in equal depth and evidence may be stronger from one State. At L4 the supporting evidence will be more extensive and there will be a clear attempt to assess the statement. At L5 answers will display an impressive depth of evidence, and a broad understanding of the influences affecting the development of the two States. They will arrive at a substantiated conclusion which will clearly assess the part of Moscow and the West in developments within Germany to 1963.

**June 2003****Alternative G: Germany From Unification to Re-Unification, 1866-1990****A2 Unit 6: The Re-Unification of Germany, c1969-1990****Question 1**

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

How valid is the view of the importance of the Basic Treaty of December 1972 suggested by this source? *(10 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

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

**Indicative content**

Answers at Level 1 will be based entirely on the extract, e.g. picks out that the treaty was “profoundly welcome to the Soviet leadership”, “enabled the GDR to continue” or was “a step further than any previous Bonn government had been prepared to go”. To reach Level 2 candidates will need to introduce elements of own knowledge noting, for example, that although the policy of Ostpolitik (which the Basic Treaty formalised) helped prop up the GDR by supplying loans, it also made the GDR more dependent on the West, exposed Eastern Germany to more Western influences (particularly in the field of human rights) and preserved the “all-German” ties, that were eventually to culminate in the re-unification of Germany. Level 3 answers will develop points such as these and will contain more extensive own knowledge. They are likely to question the interpretation of Source A and point out some of the misgivings of the East in accepting West German support. At Level 4, answers will be analytical throughout, combining awareness of the given standpoint with other opinions backed by secure own knowledge.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence for the reasons why, after its recognition in 1972, the GDR survived until 1990? *(10 marks)*

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

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

- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation 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. describe the effect of the Treaty in creating better relations, allowing for the improvement of humanitarian issues and permitting practical co-operation and opportunities for western business. Candidates will extract relevant material from the extracts but present it without analysis or assessment. Level 2 answers will explore utility at a general level. This will mainly be concerned with the content of the source, but will comment on it, e.g. bring in some corroborative own knowledge to show that, by establishing a degree of co-operation and greater stability as well as increasing trade, fostering business agreements, and highlighting human rights issues, the Basic Treaty of 1972 heralded a period of improved living and working conditions for East Germans, which in turn made them more prepared to accept the East German regime. At Level 3 answers will give more careful consideration to both utility and its limitations, e.g. candidates may comment that “it initially stabilised the regime” is just opinion and answers may question whether a contemporary historian writing so close to the events described could really have known the optimist/realist view at the time. Candidates might also question the utility of the source in that recognition and increased business opportunities do not on their own provide for the survival of an unpopular regime. There must also have been other factors at work. Responses at Level 4 will be distinguished by their ability to form judgements developing from the source, e.g. they will integrate successfully analysis of the utility of the source – in particular commenting on the authorship – with selective own knowledge of the factors which led to the survival of the GDR. From this they will assess whether the source provides useful evidence and whether that evidence is most, or only a small part of the picture.

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

“Brandt’s policy of Ostpolitik benefited the GDR far more than the FRG.”

Assess the validity of this claim.

*(20 marks)*

*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. **1-6**
- 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 a 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**

**Indicative content**

Answers should assess the impact of Ostpolitik on both East and West Germany. In West Germany there was some controversy. Ostpolitik was seen by Conservatives as against Germany's national interests and, it was claimed, stabilised an immoral regime which would otherwise have collapsed far sooner (Source A). However, it won widespread public support and others argued that it was essential for the successful outcome of movements for reform in the GDR. Adenauer spoke of the "magnet theory", that exposing the East to the success of the West would bring eventual reconciliation. This can, however, be questioned. Ostpolitik did maintain the GDR, reducing discontent in the East and leaving dissenters isolated, and enabling the State to weather the recession of the 1980s more effectively than other Eastern European countries (Source B). It was the end of the cold war rather than any West German policy that eventually brought reunification. Ultimately, Western policies were probably less important than those of the Soviet Union and the rest of Eastern Europe, although the lowering of tensions was important in permitting negotiations with USSR. Furthermore, the human rights concessions, (e.g. public tolerance to the churches, easing of visa restrictions for travel to the west in the 1980s), did contribute to the broad based "grass roots" dissent of 1980s and may have affected the way the revolution evolved (Source C).

Answers at Level 1 are likely to restrict themselves to describing and defining what the sources say or will offer narrative accounts of Ostpolitik and/or the reunification process. At Level 2 answers will show awareness of the debate on the significance of Ostpolitik, but will have only limited information or argument. By Level 3 there will be some attempt to argue, probably bringing in a range of evidence, or citing the views of different historians. Answers at this level and above will refer to sources and own knowledge. Responses at Level 4 and Level 5 will integrate argument and evidence and show an understanding of different views on the impact of Ostpolitik. At Level 4 judgement may be confined to the conclusion, whereas answers at Level 5 will provide more sustained argument and evaluation.