



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative E Unit 6W

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

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:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's 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 specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at A2 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 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.

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 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 AO 1.1, 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 (AO 1.2), 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 (AO 2, 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 characteristic: 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.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

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

So, is the response:

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

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

June 2007

Alternative E: Rivalry and Conflict in Europe, 1825–1941

A2 Unit 6: Hitler and the Origins of the Second World War, 1933–1941

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

Assess the validity of the views expressed in **Source A** about the annexation of Austria in March 1938. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

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

Indicative content

Level 1 will provide little more than a summary of the source content: the annexation was “a parade, not an invasion”, without a shot being fired. Level 2 will show familiarity with this interpretation which plays down the significance of the annexation, and provide some relevant knowledge in support – e.g. the *Anschluss* was ostentatiously friendly, and German troops were welcomed by cheering crowds. The event made little impact in terms of future conflict – it had been long expected and thought by some to be inevitable, and perhaps right in principle. Answers at this level will usually be undeveloped. They may also suggest implicit agreement and/or disagreement with the interpretation. Level 3 will present a broader and more balanced interpretation with signs of evaluation – appreciating the significant impact of the annexation as an important step on the road to war. Austria was a sovereign state, guaranteed several times over by treaties and declarations – the *Anschluss* was forbidden in the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler’s effective bullying and intimidation enhanced his personal prestige, and behind the bands and flags came the Gestapo. Significantly, Mussolini acquiesced after his opposition in 1934. Answers at this level will be more explicitly evaluative than those at Level 2, but not necessarily full in terms of knowledge and/or comment. Level 4 will provide a developed, balanced and well supported assessment – the *Anschluss* itself was not part of a plan, and Hitler was unexpectedly compelled to improvise, but it marked the start of a six-monthly series of crises and began a process of accumulation; the Treaty of Versailles was virtually destroyed, and the balance of power changed in Central Europe with an immediate impact on the vulnerability of Czechoslovakia.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of Hitler's role in German foreign policy?

(10 marks)

Target: A01.1, AO2

- L1: Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well-supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

Level 1 will summarise the source, or provide only vague or brief comment on Hitler's role ("all depends on me") and the "bombshell" of the non-aggression pact with Stalin. At Level 2, in terms of utility, candidates will comment either on the strengths or limitations of the source, or briefly on both, or may only comment in general terms or in a broad context in relation to utility – e.g. Hitler clearly talking for effect to his military leaders with unbounded self-confidence, providing useful evidence of Hitler's determination at a key moment to drive foreign policy forward. Level 3 will respond to both the strengths and limitations in a more balanced and developed way in terms of the precise context, showing some insight into the utility of the source or at least broader assessment. By the top of this level, candidates should respond both to the personal focus of the first paragraph, and to the diplomatic context of the second. The source provides good insight into Hitler's self-belief and lack of any self-doubt – "my great strength of purpose". There may be debate about his role in domestic affairs, but in foreign policy Hitler is clearly the prime mover, playing a central role, prepared to do anything and capable of any u-turn – the USSR was his main enemy, ruled by Jewish Bolsheviks and inferior Slavs who occupied Germany's *Lebensraum*. The source reveals Hitler's determination to wage war against Poland and his dismissive confident attitude towards the West. However, the source does have limitations – Hitler's crude and assertive enunciation of his own unlimited political talents is unconvincing, and he was notoriously unpredictable and inconsistent. Hitler's ambitions tended to fluctuate with his moods and according to his audience at a particular time. A minority of candidates might be aware that the record of this speech was based on notes taken, with no official minutes. Level 4 will develop the argument and make a balanced judgement on the utility of the source. Despite Hitler's self-opinionated arrogance, the source provides clear and useful evidence of his determination and willpower, and his central role as the driving force of German foreign policy.

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

'In his foreign policy in the years 1933 to 1939, Hitler never wanted to take the initiative; he liked others to do it for him.'

Assess the validity of this view.

(20 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, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Considerable debate remains about Hitler's aims and methods in foreign policy – about the degree of cold-blooded planning, or Hitler's improvised opportunism or compulsive gambler's instinct. Some historians, such as Henig, would prioritise Hitler's aims in foreign policy, emphasising long-term objectives and a master-plan for war based on ideology, incorporating the themes of racial purity and the need to secure living-space in the East. Bell emphasises Hitler's active and adventurous policy, taking the initiative and exploiting it. On the other hand, others, such as Taylor (and Lee in Source C), would prioritise methods rather than aims, and emphasise the relations between the European leaders as the key element. Taylor concentrates on the initiative of others, especially the British and French leaders, who lurched from crisis to crisis in desperation to preserve peace. However, a third group of historians (Bullock *et al*) seem to combine both these standpoints – accepting that Hitler did have clear policy aims, but was prepared to be flexible in his methods, modifying and developing his aims in the light of circumstances. Hitler responded to events and played the diplomatic system with some skill, achieving what he wanted without a war until September 1939.

In order to assess the given quotation, candidates will need to review the most important events in Hitler's foreign policy up to 1939. In 1936, brushing aside the hesitations of his nervous generals, Hitler ordered his troops into the demilitarised Rhineland. The diversion over Abyssinia may have given him the opportunity (Source C), but the move was a spectacular bold gamble which then gave Hitler the initiative. Decisive action against Hitler by Britain and France might well have successfully checked his ambitions.

There is also no doubt that the absorption of both Austria and Czechoslovakia were Hitler's long-term objectives, but, in 1938 and 1939, the circumstances of fulfilling these aims were clearly not of his own making. As Source A confirms, the *Anschluss* was forced on Hitler in March 1938 by Schuschnigg's threat of a plebiscite – Hitler's spur-of-the-moment reaction showed little planning or preparation. The Munich Agreement of September 1938 resulted from the determination of Chamberlain (Source C) and perhaps Mussolini to avoid war, and from Hitler's failure to take the initiative and his decision to pull back from the brink. In the Czech crisis of March 1939, once again the timing took Hitler by surprise. Clearly within the framework of his long-term aims, Hitler's methods showed that he was prepared to improvise and be opportunistic.

However, in the final crisis over Poland in 1939, it was Hitler who seized the initiative (confirmed by Source B) as the true aims of Nazi foreign policy were perhaps revealed for the first time. The initiative for the Nazi-Soviet Pact did not come from Moscow – it was Hitler's deal, and it was now Hitler's timetable. With the strength of his position in 1939, his increasing self-confidence fed by past successes and the perceived weakness of the West, Hitler believed that he could now turn his ideological aims into reality.

Level 1 might concentrate on the sources, especially C, or provide a brief summary of events. Answers at Level 2 might simply accept or reject the proposition with little challenge, and with only limited supporting evidence from the sources, knowledge or reading, tending to present a descriptive narrative of events with little assessment. Some source evidence must be included from Level 3, with some attempt to broaden the debate beyond the proposition, but this may be general and will not be developed, with limited historiography. This should be evident at Level 4 with a balanced and developed assessment and views from a range of historians, with a clear overview and conceptual understanding in relation to 'initiative'. Level 5 will present a full range of evidence and a convincing evaluation.