



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative J 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 (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 2008

Alternative J: Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, c1848–c1956

A2 Unit 6: The Holocaust, 1938–1945

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

Assess the validity of the view in **Source A** about how Hitler directed Nazi anti-Jewish policy. (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 answers will identify the interpretation, that Hitler had a plan for the Holocaust in mind, which he put into practice in a series of stages. General answers may make little of the source but stress that Dawidowicz is an intentionalist historian and describe the intentionalist case in general terms. Answers may make reference to the documentary evidence and the support of most historians for the interpretation.

Level 2 answers should use own knowledge to demonstrate understanding of the interpretation. The stages may be identified, linking the anti-Semitism of *Mein Kampf* speeches, through Nazi policy in the 1930s, as legislative and economic persecution gave way to marginalisation, exclusion and final solution. The 'rich body of primary documentary source' may be exemplified (Commissar's Order etc), and reference to those historians who share Dawidowicz's view may be made (Bracher, Hillgruber et al).

Answers that swiftly dismiss the validity of the view without developing it using their own knowledge would normally also lie in Level 2.

However, evaluation of these arguments should be made for Level 3 and above, which means challenging Dawidowicz's interpretation. This could mean evidence that Hitler did not have a general plan, perhaps illustrated through different conceptions of the Final Solution (emigration, ghettos, elimination) or through examples of twists in policy, linked to the failure of the war in the USSR. Challenging the evidential base of Dawidowicz's interpretation may be seen, with comments on the lack of any Führer order for the Final Solution. Challenging the notion that 'most historians' subscribe to the view is acceptable, but answers which simply list those who disagree without any reference to details of interpretation or evidence would demonstrate Level 2 understanding.

Judgement at Level 4 may involve considering which parts of Dawidowicz's interpretation are most credible, for example, many historians do not agree with her, but her interpretation is clearly supported by a strong body of historical documentary evidence.

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

How useful is **Source B** as evidence of how the Holocaust began? (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 answers will summarise the content of the source – Heydrich is being asked for a fully developed plan for the Final Solution.

Level 2 answers will show appreciation of the strengths of the source. The provenance makes the source very useful. It is from Goering, a Nazi who was frequently empowered by Hitler directly, to Heydrich the man who developed the Final Solution. It is from July 1941, after the initial success of Operation Barbarossa, which made the Final Solution a possibility. Heydrich would later chair the Wannsee Conference, which confirmed the implementation of the sort of plan Heydrich was being asked for at this time. The content refers explicitly to the 'complete solution' and 'final solution', explicit references to the eliminationist policy of the Nazis. The reference to the 'sphere of influence' ties in with the Nazi policy of evacuating Jews to the East. From August 15 Jewish women and children were recorded as being murdered by *Einsatzgruppen A* in Lithuania. An answer that covers strengths and limits without depth or reasoned understanding would also gain a Level 2 award.

Answers at Level 3 should have clear, developed understanding of weaknesses. The source is from Goering, not Hitler, and no evidence exists of Hitler ordering Goering (or indeed anyone) to begin the Final Solution. The use of euphemistic terms limits the utility of the source, 'Final Solution' had already meant the Madagascar Plan for most of 1940. The murder of Jews had already begun in an ad-hoc manner, with *Einsatzgruppen* executions and the haphazard application of the Commissar Order. The Wannsee Conference followed six months later, a strange time lag.

At Level 4 judgement may involve clear understanding of the limits of documentary evidence relating to the start of the Holocaust, but within that context, this source is a leading piece of evidence.

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

'Hitler was only one of a number of leading Nazis responsible for the Holocaust.'

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

The question requires analysis of one of the strands of debate regarding responsibility for the Holocaust, namely the relative importance of the roles played by Hitler, or other Nazis. Candidates are free to identify other leading Nazis as they see fit, but Himmler and Heydrich are particularly relevant. Reference to Governors of occupied territories, Wehrmacht officers and Einsatzgruppen Commanders could all reasonably be included in an analysis.

At Level 1 answers will be generalised and assert Hitler's importance as dictator who could do what he liked.

Level 2 answers may be unbalanced, offering evidence of the role of Hitler, or other Nazis, but not both. Alternatively they may cover Hitler and other Nazis, but use limited evidence to support their arguments. Answers that use only the sources or only their own knowledge would also be awarded Level 2. A final type of answer lies within Level 2, that is answers that describe different historians' views without any attempt to consider the evidence on which they have based their arguments.

At Level 3 there will be balance. Answers will consider the argument that Hitler was only one of a number of leading Nazis who sought power by providing Hitler with what they thought he wanted (**Source C and Farmer**). This will mean considering the role of at least one Nazi and

the role of Hitler. Himmler ensured Hitler's orders were carried out, and has been described as the 'architect of genocide'. He was in charge of the SS, who ran the extermination centres, as well as being in charge of the Einsatzgruppen who followed the Wehrmacht into the USSR and carried out the first stages of the Holocaust through shootings and the use of mobile gas vans. It was Himmler who transported thousands of SS and police troops to the eastern killing fields in mid-summer 1941, to intensify the rate of executions, Himmler and the SS made the connection with the euthanasia programme and reassigned the gas vans to the east. Heydrich was in receipt of considerable authority, delegated from Himmler (and indeed Goering, **Source B**). He chaired the Wannsee conference, which Roseman has argued turned 'mass murder into genocide', **Goldhagen** would extend responsibility to other Nazis (though he would also point to Hitler's leading role).

The role of Hitler must also be considered. Hitler's role might be supported by tracing a direct line from the anti-Semitism of the 25 Point Programme, *Mein Kampf*, anti-Semitic propaganda in election campaigns, the increasingly discriminatory measures of the years before 1939, the speeches of Hitler in 1939 (warning the Jews of their fate if they caused another war) and 1941 (Garden of Eden). This is the plan in a series of stages that Source A discusses. Reference to the genocide dating from early as July 1941 might be seen. Goering would not have empowered Heydrich without Hitler's direct agreement and when the Wannsee Conference was held it was to simply enable Heydrich and Himmler to reassert control over a process that was already in operation. **Farmer** points out that the order to Heydrich may have been no more than extending his powers beyond Germany's borders and that there was no new frenzied activity following the order.

At Level 4 answers will offer a wide range of evidence, covering at least two other Nazis.

At Level 5 judgement may involve reaching a synthesis between the two views. **Kershaw** would argue for Hitler's centrality in the process, but not the day-to-day decision making.