



**General Certificate in Education**

**AS History 5041**

**Alternative G Unit 1**

**Mark Scheme**

*2007 examination – June series*

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

### **AS EXAMINATION PAPERS**

#### **General Guidance for Examiners**

---

#### **A: INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

**B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS****Level 1:**

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

Answers at this level will

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

**Level 2:*****Either***

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

***Or***

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 3:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 4:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

**Level 5:**

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

---

**C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

June 2007

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

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

**Question 1**

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

Explain briefly the importance of ‘the Zabern affair’ (line 8) in the context of Imperial German policy in 1913. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO2*

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. that the Zabern Affair concerned the harsh treatment of a racial minority within Germany, or simply that it was an example of the Imperial Government’s weakness on the eve of war. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. aware that the Zabern Affair took place in Alsace and concerned the disreputable behaviour of soldiers against the townsfolk. A developed answer would need some link to the outcry this caused, perhaps referring to the mild treatment of the military or to the apparent inability of civilians to influence policy against the will of the Kaiser. 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 Wilhelm II’s rule in Germany between 1890 and 1914. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.2, AO2*

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

- L1: Basic statement identifying the views expressed in the sources based on the content of the sources, e.g. while Source A refers to Wilhelm recording a ‘startling success’, Source B points out that the period ended with a world war. Source A talks of the ‘new circle of bankers and industrialists’ which Wilhelm ‘admitted to his personal councils’ while Source B talks of his reliance on soldiers for advice. Finally, while Source A suggests the expansion of the navy was to support the growing export trade, Source B suggests it was to ‘enhance Germany’s position in the world’. 1-2
- L2: Developed comparison of the views expressed in the sources, based on content and own knowledge, e.g. explains some of the source references as above, and provides appropriate contextual information on Wilhelmine Germany, e.g. the discrepancy between the successful and impressive economic growth of Germany and its retarded

political development hampered by a 'military' Kaiser with ambitions to turn Germany into a world power through imperialism and command of the seas. **3-5**

- L3: Developed evaluation of the sources, with reference to the sources and own knowledge, drawing conclusions about the extent to which Source B challenges Source A, e.g. a candidate might explain how economic change was exacerbating Germany's political problems or they might discuss the theory that Wilhelm immersed himself in military affairs and ultimately went to war to avoid conflict in society. Candidates may also comment on how the sources may be reconciled. Both refer to German dominance, competitiveness and the growth of the fleet. **6-7**

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

Explain the importance of the influence of the armed forces, in relation to other factors, in explaining political problems in Germany in the years 1890 to 1914. *(15 marks)*

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

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based *either* on own knowledge *or* sources. **1-4**

- L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions but will have valid links.

***Or***

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

### Indicative content

From the sources:

Source B points out that 'Wilhelm II failed to address many fundamental political issues within Germany' and refers to his own personality as a possible cause. It also emphasises his interest in the military, his determination to expand the fleet and his reliance on the advice of soldiers. Source C lays some of the blame for the subsequent problems on Bismarck's legacy and

provides examples of progress in some areas, (e.g. schemes for social insurance and the introduction of a more effective secret ballot and payments for Reichstag deputies) balanced by failures in others (e.g. the failure to reform the Prussian electoral system and the treatment of racial minorities). It also refers to the Zabern Incident which provides clear evidence of the power of the armed forces at this time. Source A concentrates on economic success and emphasises Wilhelm's interest in strengthening Germany. It mentions his particular interest in naval growth which provoked 'endless conflicts with the Reichstag' and his hatred of opposition.

From own knowledge:

Candidates should be aware that, apart from the influence of the armed forces which can be explained with reference to the Kaiser's ambitions, background and personality, the political problems may also be attributed to factors already inherent in the Bismarckian constitution which failed to provide for a true democracy; to other aspects of the Kaiser's influence, for example his interference and changes of attitude which led to frequent dismissals of his chancellors; to the weakness of groups such as the Socialists who tried to work through the Reichstag and failed to force change and the attitudes and ineptitude of chancellors and other Ministers.

Candidates may conclude that the influence of the armed forces was of paramount importance or they may argue for an alternative factor. They may also point out that economic expansion (as shown in Source A) provided the people with sufficient material benefits and pride in their country to make them accept their lot and the political problems were therefore less apparent than they might have been.

Answers at Level 1 are likely to focus on a limited range of undeveloped points about developments in Wilhelm II's government, either from own knowledge or the sources alone. They may be excessively generalised and assertive. Level 2 answers will show a better use of the sources or some relevant own knowledge but answers will be unbalanced, paying little if any need to 'other factors', covering only a small section of the period, very descriptive, or limited in relevant comment. Level 3 responses will have a greater range of material and draw on the sources and own knowledge to make a reasonably explicit response to the question. However, there may be an imbalance of treatment or limited depth to the knowledge and understanding of developments in the period. At Level 4 there will be better balance between the influence of the armed forces and other factors. Secure knowledge will be shown and will support an apt argument. Level 5 responses will show greater analysis and judgement and a more sophisticated understanding of Wilhelmine government.

## Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'the national minorities' (line 3) in the context of Bismarck's Germany in the years 1871 to 1879. (3 marks)

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. that National Minorities were the different racial groupings found within Germany's recently unified borders which Bismarck wanted to reconcile to the new state. 1
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. candidates may identify the chief minority groups as the French in Alsace-Lorraine, the Poles and the Danes in Schleswig, and might explain why these minority groups found themselves within the Empire. Alternatively, they could refer to Bismarck's policies – mixed

coercion/conciliation which was largely unsuccessful in Alsace-Lorraine; the Kulturkampf which exacerbated problems with the Poles and a lack of interest in the Danes who were largely ignored. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Bismarck chose to co-operate with the National Liberal Party in the years 1871 to 1879. **(7 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. Bismarck chose to co-operate with the Liberals because they were the largest party in the Reichstag. He thought he could work with the Liberals to achieve full unification. The Liberals shared the same ideas as Bismarck at this time. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. Bismarck found co-operation convenient because of the size of the Party and because both saw the need for economic and administrative reforms, e.g. a national currency, the removal of internal tariff barriers, uniformity of legal procedures, the establishment of the Reichsbank. They also shared commonality of interest over the kulturkampf. **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. points out that Bismarck's co-operation with the Liberals involved working together for similar ends, but with different aims in mind, e.g. Bismarck was never a liberal but his desire for closer political control coincided with the National Liberals' enthusiasm for unity. Furthermore, Bismarck's assault on the Catholic Church was undertaken for political reasons – to eradicate Reichsfeinde, rather than because of the age old liberal concern for human progress and freedom of thought. **6-7**

- (c) 'Bismarck dealt very successfully with the internal problems which Germany faced in the years 1871 to 1890.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **(15 marks)**

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

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### Indicative content

Answers should focus on Bismarck's handling of issues – the problems of national unity and the minorities, the Catholics and the Kulturkampf, the economic problems which led to the introduction of the protection in 1879, the rise of Socialism and the anti-Socialist laws. A balanced answer will provide an assessment of Bismarck's success in each of these areas and/or an overall appraisal of his chancellorship and legacy which might consider issues such as the control of the Reichstag or his relationship with the Kaiser.

A high-level answer might argue that although Bismarck appeared to deal successfully with internal problems, many issues lay dormant and political problems, for example, were ready to surface in the reign of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Answers at Level 1 will either contain a few generalised points or offer a brief and poorly focused account of Bismarck's policies in Germany. Level 2 answers will mostly be relevant but over-descriptive accounts, although some will try to respond to the question but will be very thin or unbalanced, e.g. concentrating only on 1871–1878 or on one problem. Level 3 answers will attempt to 'agree or disagree' although the analysis may be slim in places. They will show a reasonable grasp of at least some of the material and will show some understanding of success and failure. Level 4 answers will contain more range and show a better appreciation of what is meant by success, probably noting that in many areas Bismarck was far from successful. Candidates may argue whichever way they please but answers at this level must show balance and secure support for the argument adopted. Level 5 answers will have a sustained analysis and a good critical appreciation of Bismarck's overall achievements.

### Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Article 48' (line 1) in the context of the Weimar constitution of 1919. **(3 marks)**

*Target: AO1.1*

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. it was a part of the Weimar constitution and gave the President special powers. Ebert used it to crush the Munich Putsch. It was the President's emergency power. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the article gave the President emergency powers to suspend individual rights and take what he considered necessary measures to restore order. In effect this meant that in an emergency the President could make laws regardless of the Reichstag. However, the power was held by an elected president who only held office for seven years and was therefore accountable to the people. It provided a counter-balance to the power of the Reichstag, maintaining some continuity with earlier systems of government, and enabled the Republic to act swiftly in emergencies. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why Ebert had to rely on the army to maintain power in Germany in the years 1918 to 1923. (7 marks)

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2*

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. some general material about the power of the army or the Munich Putsch with a statement that Ebert needed to use the army to put down this (and other) attempt(s) to overthrow the government and constitution. 1-2
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. there was lukewarm support for the Republic particularly after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles and the hyperinflation of 1923. The fragility of the coalitions and the propaganda of opponents made the Weimar Republic vulnerable to coups from both the left and right wings. There was a particular fear of Communism (with its associations with the Russian Civil War) among government circles and so Ebert used the power of the army (granted under the Ebert-Groener Pact) to crush risings. Although the Munich Rising was a right wing rebellion, it was also in Ebert's interests to halt this attempted uprising as quickly as possible at a time when the occupation of the Ruhr and the hyperinflationary crisis was causing panic waves in Germany. 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 links between some of the factors given for L2 above and provides suitable comment. Candidates may conclude that the government had little choice but co-operate with and use the army in order to survive, given the power of the right wing, or may take the line that the government relied on the army because Ebert (falsely) believed the left wing to be a greater threat than they really were. In the case of the Munich Putsch, Ebert had to rely on the army because the tension between central government and local government in Bavaria meant that he was unable to rely on local commanders to arrest the nationalists. 6-7

- (c) 'In the years 1919 to 1925 the Weimar constitution was a source of strength for the new Republic.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

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

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. 1-4
- L2: ***Either***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***  
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. 5-8

- 
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

### **Indicative content**

The focus of this question is on the structure of the Weimar constitution and the part it played in the development of the Republic between 1919 and 1925.

In support of the quotation it may be argued that the constitution was one of the most advanced in Europe at the time and that it permitted a broad range of political opinion to be expressed legitimately through the system of proportional representation and universal suffrage. It provided a strong executive in the form of the President and had an inbuilt system of checks and balances. Furthermore, the Bill of Rights guaranteed individual freedoms.

The opposing view would be that the constitution was only narrowly supported (by the SPD, Zentrum and DDP) in the first place; that proportional representation led to unstable coalition government, none of which lasted longer than 18 months in the period to 1923; that leading political parties failed to work together and the President was left with too much power. There was also a problem with the continuation of local government in the Länder. Although there was marginal improvement 1923–1925, the basic problem of maintaining an effective coalition remained.

Good candidates will make an overall judgement as to whether or not the Weimar constitution was flawed. They are likely to argue that it was not so much the constitution itself as the way it was used (and attacked) by the Republic's opponents that caused the problems.

Level 1 answers will make generalised, simplistic and undeveloped statements about the constitution or will describe events without clear reference to the question. Level 2 answers will be largely descriptive but they will contain at least some implicit links showing some awareness of the problems posed by the constitution. However, these answers are likely to adopt a one-sided approach, for example suggesting that the constitution was a unmitigated source of weakness. Level 3 answers will be aware of the need to 'agree or disagree' and will make more comment on material presented. These answers will show a reasonable grasp of the strengths and weaknesses of the constitution although the detail may be better in some areas than others and there may be sections of description. At Level 4 there will be a more secure understanding backed by suitable evidence and the answer will be balanced and argued responding to the issue of whether the constitution had more strengths than weaknesses. Level 5 responses will argue throughout and make reasoned but not necessarily extensive judgments based on a developed conceptual understanding of the working of Weimar democracy.