



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative E Unit 6W

Mark Scheme

2008 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 © 2008 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 (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 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 2008

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 in **Source A** about the Nazi-Soviet pact. (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 tend to summarise the source content, describing briefly how Stalin and the USSR benefited from the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Level 2 will show familiarity with these views and provide some supporting knowledge – evidence of the diplomatic game between Hitler, Stalin and the West which reached its climax in August 1939, and the apparent cynical reversal of ideological allegiances which undermined Hitler's talk of a crusade against Bolshevism. Short-term pragmatism seemed to benefit both states, removing the threat of an immediate German attack for Stalin, and avoiding prospects of a two-front war for Hitler. Answers at this level will be undeveloped, and may include some general comment. Responses may also suggest implicit agreement and/or disagreement with the views. Level 3 will provide a broader interpretation with some signs of evaluation and insight, with some explicit challenge to 'validity'. Some Soviet historians (Khrushchev had been promoted to the Politburo in 1939) see collective security as the bait to attract Hitler, and see Stalin manoeuvring the capitalist states into a mutually destructive war, leaving the Soviet Union unscathed. However, the Pact, though logical and sensible, was Stalin's only option, and could be nothing more than temporary. For Hitler, the Pact was a masterstroke – it was his initiative, his timetable, his deal. 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. This will be more evident at Level 4 which will be as Level 3, but more balanced and/or developed, considering a full range of views providing a well-supported assessment.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of Hitler's aims and methods in foreign policy?

(10 marks)

Target: A01.1, A02

- 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 brief or vague comments about Hitler's broad aims and methods. At Level 2, in terms of utility, candidates will comment either on the strengths or limitations of the source, with little or limited distinction between aims and methods. Responses may only comment in general rather than in specific terms, or in a broad context in relation to utility, largely accepting the source at face value in terms of its content. For example, candidates might argue at this level that these rather desperate assurances, in relation to rightful sovereignty and peaceful intentions, with no territorial claims and offers of new agreements, provide only limited insight into Hitler's aims and methods in foreign policy. Answers at Level 3 will focus on both the strengths and limitations of the source in a more balanced and developed way, showing some insight into the specific context of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. Candidates could achieve some balance by concentrating on the utility of the source in providing insight into Hitler's methods, but also, perhaps, commenting on the source's limitations as evidence of Hitler's aims in foreign policy. It had been the aim of all German governments since the war to do away with the demilitarised zone whenever possible, and Hitler's move was aimed only at the Treaty of Versailles, not at territory outside Germany. However, remilitarisation transformed the whole diplomatic and military situation, providing a shield behind which Hitler could start to fulfil his aims in Eastern Europe. In terms of methods, diplomats had expected Hitler to negotiate; but instead he took swift decisive action, and offered negotiations immediately afterwards – a method soon to become familiar. Level 4 will broaden and develop the argument further, showing reasoned understanding, and make a judgement on the utility of the source. The source shows that Hitler's combination of military *fait accompli* and diplomatic smokescreen was masterly, opening the way for his future ambitions, especially in relation to Czechoslovakia and Poland.

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

'War became inevitable by 1939 and, when it came, it was a surprise to hardly anyone.'
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

This question asks candidates to assess two different but clearly related issues – whether war was inevitable by (though not necessarily 'in') 1939, and whether the actual outbreak of war came as a surprise to any of the major powers.

On the first issue, Source C could be used to help structure the debate, as it considers 3 possible ways of avoiding war. Firstly, Germany might have been satisfied with gains made in 1938 in Austria and Czechoslovakia as further Treaty revision. Consideration of this would enable candidates to provide an assessment of Hitler's aims and methods in foreign policy: revisionism or *Lebensraum*, deliberate provocation or effective opportunism (evidence from Source B should be harnessed to this part of the debate.) Hitler achieved what he wanted without a war until 1939. But for the accumulation of crises, Overy accepts that German aims might well have been accommodated without war, pointing out that, in the end, the western powers actually declared war on Germany. Others, including Bell (beyond Source C) accept that both Nazi aims and methods were instrumental in making war inevitable at some stage. Source C secondly suggests that a formidable Grand Alliance of the USSR, Britain, France and Poland might well have deterred Germany from any further expansion. Source A should be used to provide the context for this aspect of the debate – this source sees the Nazi-Soviet Pact as inevitable, but not war in 1939. Lastly, Source C suggests that war might have been avoided

by acquiescence and appeasement, and candidates should consider why Britain, France and Poland failed to strike a bargain with Germany in 1939, but the Soviet Union did. If Hitler's foreign policy pointed ultimately towards Russia, then why was war inevitable by 1939?

On the second proposition, perhaps the outbreak of war in 1939 came as something of a surprise to Hitler and, to a lesser extent, Stalin – in later years, Soviet propaganda would give Stalin credit for manipulating the capitalist powers into war. Source A suggests that both powers expected to avoid a European war, at least in 1939, although, as Source B confirms, Hitler would do or say anything to defuse dangerous situations and then discard agreements as circumstances dictated. It seems clear that Hitler failed to recognise the shift in British policy after the invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 – he did not believe that Britain would defend Poland or declare war. Alternatively, Hitler seemed determined to go to war, and perhaps he simply discounted British influence. For Britain, the Nazis could no longer be trusted and had to be stopped.

Level 1 might concentrate only the sources, especially Source C, or provide a brief summary. Answers at Level 2 might simply accept the proposition with little challenge, perhaps concentrating on only one aspect 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 signs of some attempt to broaden the debate, but this may largely accept the proposition (perhaps both issues) and may be general and will not be developed, with limited historiography. The views of historians may be presented at this level as merely a prepared formulaic summary, rather than being linked to this specific debate. Candidates may tend to concentrate on Nazi aims and methods without developing any clear synoptic links between the 'inevitable' and 'surprise' issues. This should be more 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 the specific issues raised. Level 5 will present a full range of evidence and a convincing evaluation.