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General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate’s response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
Generic Level Descriptors: sections A and B

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–4   | • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.  
• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.  
• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.  
• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision. |
| 2     | 5–10  | • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the question.  
• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.  
• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation, and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.  
• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision. |
| 3     | 11–16 | • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.  
• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.  
• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.  
• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision. |
| 4     | 17–20 | • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.  
• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.  
• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.  
• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision. |
**Section C**

**Target:** AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–4  | • Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.  
       |      | • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.  
       |      | • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence |
| 2     | 5–10 | • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.  
       |      | • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.  
       |      | • A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues |
| 3     | 11–16| • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences  
       |      | • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.  
       |      | • A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation. |
| 4     | 17–20| • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised by comparison of them.  
       |      | • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.  
       |      | • Discusses evidence in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation. |
### Section A: indicative content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.  
Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the Nazis’ indoctrination of children was the main reason they were able to control the German people in the years 1933-45.  
Evidence and argument that the indoctrination of children was the main reason the Nazis could control the German people should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- Children were used to spy on adults, e.g. getting children to denounce parents and teachers  
- Schools encouraged children to adopt Nazi values  
- The Hitler Youth was used to enforce Nazi social policies and was difficult to oppose, e.g. demanding support for ‘winter relief’  
- The Hitler Youth acted as a route of progression to other areas of the Nazi state that controlled the population, e.g. the SS and SD  
- The Hitler Youth was encouraged to be fanatical Nazis and provide leadership to the general population in the war years, e.g. their role in defending Berlin in 1945.  
Evidence and argument that other factors were more important in controlling the German people should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- The success of the terror state in rooting out and crushing opposition, e.g. the almost total suppression of the KPD by 1934  
- The persuasion of the population through propaganda, including forms of social policy such as Strength Through Joy  
- The removal of any significant means of opposing the Nazis by the general population, e.g. the banning of all political parties other than the Nazis  
- After 1939 the conditions of war demanded absolute compliance and sanctions used against dissenters became more severe, e.g. the execution of the White Rose group. |
<p>|          | Other relevant material must be credited. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether increased freedom for women was the main consequence of the Weimar Constitution in the years 1919-33. Evidence and argument that increased freedom for women was the main consequence of the Weimar Constitution should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- Women gained civil equality before the law, which removed a significant barrier to discrimination  
- Women gained political equality to men enabling some women to become Reichstag deputies  
- Discrimination against women in the civil service was removed leading to more women professionals  
- Women used their formal equality to expand their cultural freedom and helped to create a more permissive attitude to lifestyle. Other consequences of the Weimar Constitution should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- Attempts to reform the education system inherited from the Kaiser Reich towards a more egalitarian model  
- Increased political instability resulted from proportional representation  
- The rights of the individual enshrined in the constitution allowed for cultural experimentation and free expression  
- Ethnic minorities were much more accepted in urban centres and Jews enjoyed more acceptance in the professions  
- The opposition to Weimar culture on the völkisch wing of German politics. Other relevant material must be credited. |
### Section B: indicative content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3        | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.  
Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how significant support for democracy was in maintaining the political stability of the FRG in the years 1949-89.  
Evidence and argument that support for democracy was significant in maintaining the political stability of the FRG in the years 1949-89 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- Support for democracy was an essential precondition for US support of the FRG in overcoming the legacy of Nazism  
- A significant number of Germans supported the Basic Law because it guaranteed rights while avoiding the excessive democracy of the Weimar Republic  
- Challenges to the regime were dealt with by democratic means, and with some success, e.g. the election of 1972 endorsed Brandt’s controversial policy of Ostpolitik  
- The high turnout of voters in elections indicates broad engagement with the democratic process, e.g. a turnout of 84.3 per cent in the 1987 election.  
Other reasons for maintaining the stability of the FRG should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- The support from western governments for reconstruction after the war gave the FRG a secure economic foundation, e.g. Marshall Aid  
- Erhard’s ‘economic miracle’ and the ‘social economy’ saw benefits for workers and limited opposition  
- Integration into the European economy saw German manufacturing flourish as markets opened and ensured economic contentment with the regime  
- The Emergency Law (1968) allowed the government to take authoritarian measures against perceived opponents.  
Other relevant material must be credited. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4        | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.  
Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which the economic challenges faced by the Weimar Republic were different to those faced by the FRG.  
The extent to which the economic challenges faced by the Weimar Republic were different from those faced by the FRG should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- The economic difficulties arising from the Treaty of Versailles were severe, e.g. the reparations and the hyper-inflation of 1923, absent for the FRG  
- Loans from the USA had different outcomes for the Weimar Republic and the FRG, e.g. the recalling of debts by US banks after 1929 contrasts to Marshall Aid  
- The post-Second World War economic boom stimulated German manufacturing whereas reparations and forced demilitarisation after the First World War restricted it  
- Chronic unemployment fed into political extremism in the Weimar years and contrasts with an overall shortage of labour in the FRG.  
The extent to which the economic challenges faced by the Weimar Republic were the same or similar to those faced by the FRG should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
- Both economies had to adjust to post-war conditions as a defeated power, which limited some forms of industrial growth, e.g. the manufacture of armaments  
- Both economies were dependent on foreign loans, e.g. the Dawes Plan and Marshall Aid  
- Both economies could draw on a reserve of highly educated and skilled workers  
- Both states needed to invest heavily in research and technology to maintain Germany’s edge in the manufacture of high-tech goods, e.g. Erhard’s Economic Council’s role in planning economic growth.  
Other relevant material must be credited. |
Section C: indicative content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5**    | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the view that the Second World War broke out because European statesmen were too concerned with appeasing Hitler. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians’ viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their discussion of various views to reach a reasoned conclusion. In considering the given view, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
Extract 1  
- British and French governments’ actions helped Hitler secure a power-base in Europe  
- The Treaty of Versailles destabilised Europe making it easier for Hitler’s tactics to get the result he wanted  
- All attempts to appease Hitler led to him increasing his demands.  
Extract 2  
- Hitler’s foreign policy was based on ideas of race and expansion  
- Hitler’s foreign policy goals went beyond a European settlement and were aimed at world domination  
- Hitler wanted war as a preferred method of achieving his goals.  
Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues to address to what extent the Second World War broke out because European statesmen were too concerned with appeasing Hitler. Relevant points may include:  
- The encouragement Hitler received from his successful military occupation of the Rhineland  
- The Munich settlement and the subsequent annexation of Czechoslovakia  
- Hitler’s attitude to the British guarantee to Poland, e.g. the Nazi-Soviet Pact and the invasion of Poland thereafter.  
Candidates should use their own knowledge of the issues related to the debate to address other factors that explain the outbreak of the Second World War. Relevant points may include:  
- Hitler’s desire for Lebensraum to procure resources and markets for the German economy  
- Hitler’s ideas about ‘Jewish Bolshevism’ in formulating his attitude to a future war with the USSR  
- The hardening of Nazi policies to Jews in the build up to war, e.g. Kristallnacht and the attacks on Jews in Vienna in 1938.  
Other relevant material must be credited. |