



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2004

GCE

History

Alternative G: Units 1 and 4

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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 indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

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

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in 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 the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

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

Level 3:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

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

Level 4:

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

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

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

Level 5:

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

Exemplification/guidance

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

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

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

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

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

Explain, briefly, the significance of Wilhelm II's "attendance at military manoeuvres" in the context of his personal interests as Kaiser of Germany. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that William was a restless personality who enjoyed a "whirl of state occasions and social events" and that attending military manoeuvres was among his many social engagements, which kept him away from government work. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. aware of William's passionate interest in all things military (an interest fostered by his grandfather and perhaps an attempt to defy his own physical deformity). Candidates may refer to the Prussian military tradition and to William's pro-military regime – the strong influence exerted by his military entourage, the appointment of generals to state offices and the link to Weltpolitik, Naval development and ultimately war. Comment on William's determined support for the army in the Zabern incident could also be of relevance here. **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 Kaiser's influence on German government. (7 marks)

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 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.

Target: AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Source A says "there is no stronger force than the Kaiser" or "all policy depends on the will and word of the Kaiser" whereas Source B says the Kaiser was "weak, erratic etc." and "disliked routine work and never commanded the details of government policy." **1-2**
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. develops the points about the Kaiser's "absolutism" made in Source A with reference to the Kaiser's strong constitutional position or with examples of his direct interventions as in his decisive support for the development of

the navy, the Daily Telegraph Affair or the Zabern incident. Source B might be corroborated by reference to his foreign visits or by his manner of government through his Chancellors and his apparent disinterest in domestic policy. Alternatively candidates might make direct, although limited, comment on the nature and context of the sources, or set them within the historiographical debate on the Emperor's position.

3-5

- L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. a candidate might develop the information above and point out that the two sources are at least partly reconcilable, Source A representing the Kaiser's theoretical position (which even the source admits was not entirely tenable; "does not achieve everything he wants") and Source B making a general point on William's character. The source does not say he lacked power but suggests that his personal interests and attitude made him an ineffectual, perhaps incompetent ruler. Another approach might involve consideration of Naumann's obvious prejudice as a pastor, politician and contemporary and show a good understanding of the context in which Naumann's criticism was made, as against Lerman's much later picture. The perceptive might also note Lerman's "it seems" – which hints at Source B offering only one possible view. Reward any comments which show an effective and evaluative overall appraisal of the sources.

6-7

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

Explain the importance of the Kaiser's influence, in comparison with other factors, in creating domestic difficulties for the Chancellors of Germany in the years 1890 to 1914.

(15 marks)

Level descriptors for response *with* use of sources and own knowledge

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 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 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 – The sources all provide material on the Kaiser’s influence, implying problems for his Chancellors, e.g. Source A suggests the Kaiser exhibited a decisive influence on all aspects of policy and would have liked to achieve still more (and incidentally makes it clear that this was the view held by at least one contemporary politician), while Source B refers to his dislike of routine work and his round of activities which took him away from government. Source C to some extent reconciles the two previous views and presents a picture of the Kaiser as a man who constantly interfered in the workings of government providing an “unpredictable factor” that all statesmen had to face.

Candidates should show an awareness of the importance of the Kaiser’s influence on his Chancellors’ problems from own knowledge, e.g. Wilhelm II’s confrontation with Bismarck and differences over social policy set the tone of his reign; Caprivi’s resignation resulted from his attempt to resist Wilhelm’s demand for a new anti-Socialist law (1894); both Hohenlohe and Bülow were sycophants unable to counter the rise of Socialism and domestic change; Bülow was embarrassed by the Kaiser’s Daily Telegraph interview, 1908, and Bethmann Hollweg, although competent, found himself, like Caprivi, unable to pursue an independent line particularly given Wilhelm’s failure to consider the advice of anyone outside the military or his close circle of friends as seen in the Zabern Independent, 1913. Wilhelm was inconsistent in his attitude to social policy (wanted concessions 1890, repression 1905) and to tariffs (wanted reductions 1892, protection 1902).

Candidates should also show an awareness of other factors creating problems. These might include, e.g. the position of the Reichstag, and the Chancellors’ difficulties in obtaining support for legislation; the influence of industrialisation and the problems of agriculture; the growth of Socialism; growing financial problems as revenue failed to meet expenditure from 1900; pressure from elite groups particularly the military and colonialists.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points either from own knowledge or the sources alone. They may be excessively generalised and assertive about Kaiser Wilhelm II or the problems of Germany, or may partially describe policies with scant regard for the question.

Level 2 answers will show a better use of the sources or contain some relevant own knowledge, for example of Chancellors and policies, but answers will be unbalanced (paying little if any heed to “other factors”), very descriptive or limited in relevant comment.

Level 3 responses will have a greater range of material and drawing on both sources and own knowledge to show some understanding of the Kaiser’s position and the problems of the German Chancellors in this period. They will refer to other factors but answers at this level will not be well balanced.

At Level 4 there will be clear attempt to balance the importance of the Kaiser’s influence against other factors and the answer will show good use of both sources and own knowledge in support of its arguments.

Level 5 responses will show greater analysis and judgement and a more sophisticated understanding of the nature of government in the Second Reich.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by “the Junkers” in the context of Bismarckian Germany. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. “the Junkers” were the social group from which Bismarck came. They were Prussian landowners, conservatives and upper class. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, and showing a greater understanding of the influence of the Junkers, e.g. their social position in Prussia and dominance in government, local courts and the army; their opposition to policies seen to favour merchants and factory owners; their commitment to the independence of Prussia and the protestant religion. Reference could also be made to Junker success in forcing the acceptance of tariffs in 1878 and their increased (conservative) influence by the end of Bismarck’s Chancellorship. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Bismarck co-operated with the National Liberals between 1871 and 1878. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue or event through general and unsupported statements, e.g. The Liberals were the largest party in the Reichstag (from source) or the Liberals were supportive of German unification or some (unexplained) mention might be made of Liberal support for the Kulturkampf. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining how Bismarck and the National Liberals had a coincidence of interest in the measures taken to complete unification in the 1870s (uniformity of currency, law courts etc.) and the accompanying policy of Free Trade. Their large majority in the Reichstag was helpful to Bismarck in the passage of legislation and he needed their backing for his Kulturkampf policies (May laws) to challenge the Centre party. **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 the points made in L2 above and explains how, while it suited Bismarck to have Liberal support in the 1870s, he remained the dominant partner, as suggested by the source. He clashed with them over army budget (agreed on a septennial basis 1874) and was ready to abandon them when they no longer served his purpose, (1878). Reward any valid attempt to evaluate the reasons for or “degree” of co-operation. **6-7**

- (c) “Bismarck did all he could, during his years as Chancellor of Germany (1871-1890), to limit the power of the Reichstag”.
Explain why agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Level Descriptors for responses *without* reference to sources.

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving 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

Candidates will need to focus on Bismarck’s relationship with the Reichstag and assess how far, if at all, he tried to limit its powers.

In support of the given view that Bismarck was determined to limit the Reichstag’s powers, candidates are likely to refer to the Bismarckian constitution and the inherent limitations on the Reichstag’s power (e.g. no ministerial responsibility); Bismarck’s attitude over the military budget (1874); his onslaught against the Catholic Centre Party in the earlier 1870s and the Socialists from 1878 (Reichsfeinde) whose popular support might have led to a challenge within the Reichstag; his more authoritarian, conservative stance in the alliance of Steel and Rye in the 1880s and his reaction to the argument over army estimates (which led him to request the dissolution of the Reichstag and fresh elections) in 1887. Candidates might also refer to Bismarck’s own pronouncements that he had never belonged to any party and indeed regarded himself as “above” party politics; or to the view that his chancellorship was in effect a “personal dictatorship” and his efforts to by-pass the Reichstag whenever possible were a deliberate attempt to stunt the development of liberal democracy.

To balance the given view candidates might argue that Bismarck did provide Germany with a parliamentary constitution; that the Reichstag had real power in that it could pass or reject the budget; that Bismarck worked with and through the Reichstag and took considerable pains to engineer coalitions with supportive parties (as in his change of allegiance 1878/9).

Answers at Level 1 will either be generalised and assertive, probably agreeing with the given view but offering little, if any evidence in support, or will attempt to describe Bismarck's policies with minimal reference to the question.

At Level 2, candidates will probably try to describe policies and actions, with some limited links to the given view but some may try to respond more directly to the issue of Bismarck's attitude but have a thin support base.

Level 3 answers will have a more explicit focus on the question and show some grasp of relevant material although answers are likely to be uneven or one-sided, probably agreeing with the given view, displaying limited analysis.

Level 4 answers will display more balance; looking at points which both agree and disagree with the view and providing an effective conclusion.

Level 5 answers will be argued more effectively and systematically, probably showing a greater conceptual grasp of Bismarck's handling of the Reichstag and the nature of German government in this period.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by "the Putsch in 1923", in the context of post-war Germany. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. The Putsch was a Nazi attempt to seize power in 1923 which lacked planning and never had more than a marginal chance of success. 1

L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. in 1923 Hitler attempted a rising in Munich in the wake of the hyperinflation/unemployment crisis caused by the excessive printing of banknotes following the passive resistance to the French occupation of the Ruhr. It failed but gave the Nazi Party good publicity and Hitler's lenient sentence showed right wing support for his nationalist ideas. 2-3

- (b) Explain why the Weimar Republic survived the crises it faced in the years 1919 to 1923. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. comments on the lack of planning (source) or organisation of opposition, or makes brief statements about an issue, for example the Weimar Republic's reliance on the army. 1-2

L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through general and appropriately selected material, e.g. explaining either some of the strengths of the Weimar government – the support of the army (Ebert-Groener pact), the support of the elites, Ebert's use of article 48, reasonably successful

economic policies (i.e. no unemployment problem) until 1923, the appointment of Stresemann in August 1923 and immediate steps to counter hyperinflation; and/or some of the weakness of the challenges – the division of the opposition, (LW/RW and within individual movements) and the limited degree of support for minority challenges (especially the Spartacists and Munich Putsch). **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. shows a developed understanding of the reasons for the survival of the Republic. Answers may balance the Republic's strengths against its opponents' weakness, or challenge its strengths in these years, and make supported observations about its precarious position. **6-7**

(c) “Despite its apparent prosperity and stability from late 1923 to 1925, the Weimar Republic still suffered from major weaknesses.”
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Level Descriptors for responses *without* reference to sources

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving 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 identify the apparent prosperity and stability of Germany between 1923 and 1925 and should also examine the Republic's continuing or growing weaknesses during this period. The assessment should consider how “major” the weaknesses were.

An examination of “apparent prosperity and stability” might include:

Prosperity – The Republic overcame the hyperinflation of 1923 helped by the Rentenmark (November 1923) and Dawes Plan (April 1924) which reorganised reparations in Germany’s favour.

Stability – Stresemann’s appointment as Chancellor (August 1923) marked a turning point. Radical left-wing governments in Saxony and Thuringia were overthrown and in 1923, Hitler’s Munich Putsch failed. Democratic parties were successful in the elections of December 1924 and there were no further coups.

An examination of weaknesses might include:

Economic – reparations were still an issue, with dependence on short-term American loans, low levels of economic growth, continuing unemployment and depression in agriculture. The demands of the welfare state were burdensome.

Political – continued instability because of coalitions and the weak liberal centre, election of Hindenburg (authoritarian, anti-democracy) 1925, the influence of the elites, and weaknesses in the constitution.

Level 1 answers will make simplistic and undeveloped statements about the prosperity and/or stability of Germany in this period, provide generalised comments about Weimar’s strengths and/or weaknesses, or offer a narrative description with minimal regard for the question.

Level 2 answers are likely to be largely descriptive of the problems/recovery of the Weimar Republic, making some links, maybe implicit, to the question. Answers may contain a fair amount of detail e.g. on policies, but fail to assess the position by 1925. Alternatively they may attempt a direct answer but contain very little supporting evidence.

Level 3 answers will be aware of the need to “agree or disagree” and will make some relevant comment on the material presented although the argument will not be fully balanced and the understanding and/or support may not be convincing.

Level 4 answers will show analysis, effective balance, and good use of evidence. Candidates may argue, for example, that the economic developments were more encouraging than the political ones.

Level 5 responses will make reasoned but not necessarily extensive judgements based on a good conceptual grasp of the position of the Weimar Republic by 1925.

Alternative G: Germany From Unification to Re-Unification, 1866-1990**A2 Unit 4: Germany, c1880-c1980****Section A: The Economic Modernisation of Germany, c1880-1980****Question 1**

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

Explain what is meant by “cartel agreements” in the context of the development of the German economy before the First World War. (5 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Basic definition with limited exemplification, e.g. basic use of the source, e.g. that cartels were agreements between large German firms, entered into in order to increase profits. Firms such as Krupp and Thyssen grew very large and dominated entire cities, by developing such agreements. **1**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of the concept with supporting detail drawn either from the source and/or from own knowledge. The response may be thin, but it will show a clear understanding of what a cartel was, e.g. explains, at least in part, that cartels were understandings between firms to share the market between them, to fix prices or to regulate the total volume of production whereby each firm would receive a quota, or profits would be shared. They therefore restricted competition allowing each participating firm to flourish. Candidates should develop the explanation, by referring to the source, or commenting on the context of the expansion of old and new industries in Germany in the early 20th century. **2-3**
- L3: As L2, with developed reference to both the source and own knowledge. Answers at this level will be fuller. They may contain greater detail, for example of firms which entered into cartel agreements – Bayer and the Hoechst Farbenwerke chain in chemicals, the Siemens group and AEG in electricals, the Rhenish-Westphalian Coal Syndicate controlling 95% of Ruhr coal production and the four great German banking chains – Dresdner, Deutsche, Darmstädter and Diskontogellschaft; the types and working of agreements (horizontal and vertical cartels); and examples of the rapid growth of cartels. Alternatively, they may show a greater understanding of the place of cartels in the rapidly developing Wilhelmine economy, referring to Germany’s “scale and concentration of economic enterprise” and explaining the place of cartels in Germany’s high and sustained rate of industrial growth to 1914. Other candidates may gain Level 3 by drawing conclusions from the evidence they provide and demonstrating judgement. They might, for example, question the value of the cartels, querying whether the restriction of competition did indeed have a positive effect on the economy and discussing cartels as a peculiarly German phenomenon, enjoying legal protection and actively encouraged by the state. **4-5**

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

How useful are **Source B** and **C** in explaining the weaknesses in the German economy from 1919 to 1936? (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 sources and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. **9-10**

Indicative content

At Level 1, candidates are likely to relate (fairly briefly) what each source says with reference to the weaknesses of the economy. From Source B they might mention the “misery” of the people, the “starving industrial proletariat”, unemployment and the pauperisation of the middle and artisan class. From Source C they might refer to the dominance of “individual gentlemen”, the lack of economic self sufficiency and the particular need to expand the iron industry. Those providing a relevant concluding sentence (at any point in the answer) can appropriately be placed at the top of this level.

Level 2 answers will refer to own knowledge of the weaknesses of the German economy from 1919 to 1936, but, as at Level 1, will probably be largely dependent on what the sources say, or fail to say. These answers will develop the points at Level 1 above using own knowledge, e.g. may explain how the “misery” and unemployment of the past 14 years had been the result of the Weimar policies taken to deal with the after effects of war (particularly reparations and the 1923 occupation of the Ruhr) and the developing reliance on foreign loans (1924 Dawes Plan) which hit Germany hard in the aftermath of the 1929 crash. They may explain the lack of economic self-sufficiency in the context of Hitler’s drive to rearm and the flaws inherent in Schacht’s economic policies (deficit financing). Answers which attempt some source evaluation (as at Level 5) but are very thin, may also be placed in this level.

Level 3 answers will draw acceptable conclusions about the utility of the sources in relation to the weaknesses of the German economy between 1919 and 1936, with reference to both sources and own knowledge. These answers will attempt some direct evaluation of the sources, probably referring to their provenance, purpose and context and commenting, in particular, on the one-sided Nazi view of the miseries which the German people had suffered. Answers may question the picture given by referring to some of the underlying strengths of the economy (particularly the recovery of industry 1923-1928 and the downswing in unemployment which had begun prior to the Nazi take over) or they may condemn the sources as mere propaganda by illustrating the weaknesses of Hitler’s own economic policies and his flawed attempt to impose a war economy in peacetime.

Level 4 answers will acknowledge that both sources are useful and they will support their conclusions convincingly. They are likely to say that they are both useful as examples of what Hitler and the Nazis perceived to be the economic weaknesses of the economy but that for a full picture, far more specific evidence would be needed. At this level, candidates should be precise about “what is missing” and the limitations of the source as evidence. Candidates might also develop some links or comparisons between the sources and should draw firm conclusions about the place of these sources in any examination of the weaknesses of the German economy in the 1920s and 1930s (perhaps suggesting that statistics would be of greater value than Hitler’s “opinions” as given in Source B, but equally that Hitler knew better than any one else what the Nazis were attempting to do with the economy, as explained in Source C).

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

“The scale of its industrial enterprises and the support of its governments were the key factors which led to the development of a modern and successful German economy between 1880 and 1980.”

Assess the validity of this view.

(15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, some 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 for each particular question. It is not anticipated that coverage of the 100 year period will necessarily be complete but there should be some awareness of the 100 year timescale for the award of Level 3 and clear reference to the whole period, perhaps by citing key incidents and issues, effectively, but not necessarily equally, for Levels 4 and 5.

Candidates will need to examine the key factors which promoted the development of a modern and successful German economy between 1800 and 1980, with a particular focus on the scale of its industrial enterprises and the support of its government. Candidates might use **Sources A** and **D** to illustrate the scale of enterprise, while **Sources B, C** and **D** have specific reference to the support of governments for economic activity.

Candidates will also need to explain the source references from their own knowledge of the growth and diversification of German industry from the 1880s, aided by government policies (e.g. trade agreements, protection, the marriage of iron and rye); the demands of Weltpolitik and World War I; the economic changes resulting from the difficulties of the inter-war period, the effect of the policies of the Nazi era and World War II and the influence of the changed economic structures of both East and West Germany 1945-1980.

To assess the validity of the view, candidates will need to refer to other factors affecting growth such as unification, population growth, Germany's inherited (geographic) advantages, the banking system, education, and the impact of external factors, e.g. the Dawes and Marshall Plans.

At Level 1, answers may be very limited in timescale, or based on unsupported general assertions. Alternatively they may be very descriptive, with no explicit attempt to address the question, or relevant but limited to a few source references.

Level 2 answers may lack any source references, but will otherwise try to address the question, or they may use the sources but produce an answer which only makes limited links to the question. Alternatively the answer may be assertive in type and very unbalanced.

For Level 3 there should be some awareness of the 100 year period although there may be considerable unevenness and lack of balance. These answers will display use of sources and own knowledge and will try to respond to the question, although the understanding may not be entirely convincing.

For an award at Level 4 there should be reasonable coverage of the whole time scale, and a clear analytical approach showing understanding and judgement.

Level 5 answers will balance factors effectively, revealing a high level of understanding and displaying sustained judgement.

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

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

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Answer 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 to almost 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

“To the German people, Hitler was portrayed as a God-like figure, above the Party and beyond the law.”

To what extent was the “Hitler myth” essential to the operation of the Nazi Political system? (20 marks)

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

Answers should focus on the importance of the image and position of Hitler within the Nazi political system. The “Hitler myth” should be examined and its influence debated with particular reference to the ideas given in the quotation that Hitler was a “God-like figure, above the Party and beyond the law”. Candidates should consider whether the Nazi political system was indeed dependent on this view of Hitler, or whether it could have functioned just as easily without this dimension. Candidates might well refer to the historiographical debate on the topic, but it is more important that they are able to provide supported judgements of their own rather than merely reproduce the views of others.

Hitler’s part in the operation of the Nazi political system might include, e.g. the extent to which loyalty to the Führer (the Führerprinzip) dominated the regime. Candidates might consider whether the dual nature of the state (run by both state and party officials), the rivalry of Nazi ministers (e.g. Himmler and Goering), and the competition of rival Nazi Party structures made Hitler’s position indispensable and that without the “Hitler myth”, government would have broken up in chaos. They might also debate whether Hitler’s position was carefully calculated or happened by chance.

Another area for examination is the extent to which the myth engendered the loyalty of the German people as a whole, with references to the adulation received by Hitler at rallies and in walkabouts, the later recollections of those charmed by his spell, and the contemporary interest shown in the German media’s account of Hitler’s personal life.

Hitler’s position “above the law” might also be held to excuse actions such as “the Night of the Long Knives” and explain the weakness of opposition to the regime and to Hitler personally.

For a balanced argument, candidates will need to consider whether the Nazi political regime could have run quite efficiently without Hitler. They might refer to his dislike of day to day policy making and decisions. Also of relevance is the retention of many former Weimar civil servants in the years to 1938, which provided for continuity and efficiency, and the position of his ministers and henchmen whom he allowed to take decisions for him. On the other hand, the near deification of Hitler, which had been developing during the Nazis’ rise to power, but which reached new heights from 1934, meant that no minister dared question policies Hitler was known to favour – a procedure sometimes referred to as “working towards the Führer”. Indeed candidates could argue that, far from producing an effective political

system, the “Hitler myth” (which perhaps even fooled Hitler himself in the end) was the cause of its downfall.

At Level 1, answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, probably agreeing with the quotation and backed by very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced or largely descriptive with a few links.

At Level 3, answers should show some understanding of the Hitler myth and will offer some limited analysis of its place in the workings of the political system.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis, examining the connections and links between Hitler’s perceived role and the actual workings of government. Such answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate “explicit understanding of the demands of the question”.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and clear conceptual awareness.

Question 3

To what extent was the survival of the Nazi regime, both in peacetime and war, until 1945, dependent on repression and fear within Germany? (20 marks)

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

Answers should consider the extent to which Nazi Germany was a police state, dependent on repression and fear as opposed to a regime which rested on popular support – perhaps won through propaganda. Some recent historiography (e.g. Gellately) emphasises the latter opinion, but the view adopted is less important than the attempt to argue a coherent case.

Candidates will need to consider the extent of repression. This is likely to include: the position and activities of the Gestapo (whose threat may have been greater than its actual, rather limited, organisation); the SS, (with which the Gestapo were merged, under Himmler, and which acted independently of the Ministry of the Interior. The organisation had powers of arbitrary arrest and special courts. It could over-ride rulings by the regular courts); the harshness of penalties (effectively curbing basic human rights such as freedom of speech); the intolerance afforded to political and social non-conformists; the attitude to Jews and the place of the concentration camps.

Candidates might also consider the fear engendered by the encouragement of denunciations. Change over time might lead candidates to examine the relatively limited use of “fear” before the war compared with its more widespread application in wartime, particularly after 1942 and the troubles in the USSR. For example, from 1939 listening to a foreign radio station became a punishable offence, and from 1942 transgressors could receive the death sentence.

To provide a balanced argument candidates will need to consider the degree of support for, or at least acceptance of, the regime. They may refer to the resurgence of national pride and the pre-war economic recovery which won Hitler support throughout Germany. The adulation of

Hitler as a leader and the support for movements like “Strength through Joy” and the Nazi Youth movements might also be taken as indications of satisfaction with the Third Reich. Candidates are likely to conclude that while there was fear and repression, for the most part, at least until the closing stages of war, the majority did not have to be coerced into submission.

At Level 1, answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, probably agreeing that the regime was dependent on repression and fear and offering very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but the answer will either be thin or very unbalanced or largely descriptive with a few links.

At Level 3, answers should show some understanding of the extent of repression and fear within the Nazi system and should refer to the years of both peace and war.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis, examining the relationship between fear and repression on the one hand, and popularity, support and acceptance on the other, and providing a balanced assessment. Such answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate “explicit understanding of the demands of the question”.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and clear conceptual awareness.

Question 4

To what extent were Konrad Adenauer and Ludwig Erhard personally responsible for the rapid recovery of Western Germany, both politically and economically, after the Second World War?
(20 marks)

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

Answers should focus on the part played by both Konrad Adenauer and Ludwig Erhard in the West German recovery after the war. Their personal contributions should be balanced against other influences and some overall assessment made of the reasons for West German recovery. Candidates should refer to both political and economic recovery, and at the higher levels are likely to emphasise the connection between the two.

Candidates should refer to Adenauer’s work for political recovery, e.g. his political approach which led him, as Chancellor, 1949-1966, to build up the CDU, weakening the left wing of his party to create a broad based appeal. He adopted a successful anti-Socialist stance in 1949 and won the support of the Bavarian Christian Social Union to form a CDU/CSU coalition which appealed to protestants, Catholics, young people and traditionalists alike.

His work to improve the political position of Germany might include, e.g. he overcame the distrust of his neighbours and the control exerted by the allies; he rehabilitated an independent Western Germany within Europe which included recognition as an independent state (1955), membership of the Council of Europe, the European Coal and Steel Community, NATO and the Western European Union, permitting re-militarisation subject to

parliamentary control; becoming a founding member of the EEC in 1957 and a signatory of the Franco-German treaty with de Gaulle in 1963.

Candidates will also need to look at Adenauer and Erhard's work for social/economic recovery; e.g. their response to the economic/social problems post 1945 – with still over 2 million unemployed and rising prices in 1949; their part in the West German “economic miracle” and the promotion of the Social Market Economy, the “brain child” of Erhard and university economists, which encouraged American industrial techniques and helped maintain good labour relations; the spread of “codetermination” in the coal and steel industries, which increased the unions' sense of responsibility and the 1952 workers' consultative councils.

Socially, Adenauer integrated the refugees and victims of bombing successfully (1952 Compensation Act) and provided houses and flats (generous government grants through the Construction Law 1950) and raised living standards.

Candidates may allude to criticisms of Adenauer and Erhard and their methods/success, e.g. Adenauer abandoned denazification and had ex-Nazis in his cabinet, restored the former privileges of the civil service (1951), refused to recognise the GDR, played down the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and is sometimes considered too “authoritarian”.

Erhard's economic success may be questioned as agriculture continued to be heavily subsidised, by 1958 the economic growth rate was slowing and by 1966 inflation was back.

The main thrust of answers, however, should be less on what these two individuals did, or how they did it, than on the extent to which the overall recovery was their *personal* achievement.

For balance, other influences on West German recovery should therefore be considered, e.g. the attitude of America (and to a lesser extent Britain and France) and in particular the provision of Marshall Aid and the currency reform of June 1948 which provided the context in which Adenauer and Erhard were to work, even though Erhard played an important role in the formulation and overall direction of economic policy. Other factors encouraging economic growth, such as the survival of the economic infrastructure, the availability of cheap raw materials (particularly in the Ruhr) and, thanks to an undervalued mark, from elsewhere, the stimulus of the Korean War (1950), the availability of plentiful cheap labour with the influx of refugees, and German skills and strong scientific/technical tradition, also played their part in the economic recovery. Other factors might include the careful monetary policies of the Bundesbank which avoided inflation; the opening up of trading communities, e.g. EEC. Politically, Adenauer's government benefited from the support of the Liberals (to 1961) permitting an effective coalition with the CDU and was favoured by the weakness of the SPD which disastrously opposed Adenauer and Erhard's foreign and economic policies until the 1960s.

At Level 1, answers are likely to rely on sweeping general assertions, probably agreeing that Adenauer and Erhard brought about the recovery and offering very limited evidence. Alternatively they may be entirely descriptive accounts showing little appreciation of the question asked.

Level 2 answers will show some understanding of the question but answers will either be thin or very unbalanced, perhaps addressing economic issues only or largely descriptive of recovery with only a few links to the influence of Erhard and Adenauer.

At Level 3, answers should show some understanding not only of the position and achievements of Erhard and Adenauer, but also of other factors, and provide some assessment of the reasons for both political and economic recovery, although these answers may not be fully balanced or convincingly argued throughout.

Level 4 answers should show a greater degree of analysis examining the relationship between the contribution of Erhard and Adenauer and the other factors encouraging recovery and providing a balanced assessment. Such answers will be wide ranging and demonstrate explicit understanding of all aspects of the question.

Level 5 answers will show sustained judgement and clear conceptual awareness of the contribution of the key individuals and the broader framework in which they operated.