

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/73

Paper 5I (Special Subject: Germany 1919–1945),
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result, not all answers fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Question 1 (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and, possibly, as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

Question 1 (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the band. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected or, especially at the lower end of the band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear, there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated, but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well sustained and well grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear, although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated, whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

- 1 (a) How far does Document C corroborate the evidence offered by Document B about women's place in Nazi Germany? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities: B states that the Nazis were not misogynists and that there are fields in which 'one must rely on women'. C corroborates this by stating that the Nazi state did not see women simply as breeding stock (out of wedlock pregnancies were only encouraged by a few fanatics) and that women were ready to act as medical orderlies and supply personnel. C does not state any political interest and the unwillingness of the BDM leader to allow women to fight in the front line until the very end, corroborates Hitler's view that women should not be in situations that do not suit them.

Differences: The role of women as seen by Hitler includes the arts, the Frauenwerk, film, but not the role suggested by Bormann and Axmann, thus B does not corroborate the view of the role of women in A. Neither does the use of pistols at the end of the War.

Provenance: The view of Hitler in his dinner conversations in 1942 was very different from the views reported in B when the situation in Germany had become more desperate. In early 1942, the Führer's *petit bourgeois* view of women could still be held, though, in practice by this time, women were working more in the war effort. The Table Talk is not a considered policy statement. By the end of the War, it had become unrealistic with the Russian invasion. The recollections of Rüdiger in 1987 are different from the table conversation and cover the later part of the War.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that women gained little from their place in the Nazi Folk Community?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to the documents in this set (A to E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well-constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood, Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of different historical interpretations is to be expected. No set answer is expected.

A, a document from the start of the regime, suggests that the party can offer a spiritual home for women, and that they will be protected and helped in the work place, and taught about culture, home and health care. There is no suggestion that women cannot work, but the document does not refer to the type of work or the decrease in opportunities and the opposition to emancipation by the Nazi regime. B is reflection by Hitler not policy. It sees women as unsuitable for politics and the roles of the women he admires are in cultural and artistic matters, and in the NS *Frauenwerk* which candidates may know stressed domestic skills and virtues. C does actually show that women might benefit from chances to show leadership and authority in the party – Rüdiger is able to stand up to senior Nazis like Bormann and Axmann. Her assumptions that there is a biological difference which prevents women fighting may either be seen as beneficial or discriminatory and restrictive. D shows some benefits in the teaching of skills, but also in the assumption about women's roles and the indoctrination about race, which might be seen to have been damaging rather than gaining much for women. E is more critical and mentions Jewish women as victims and the overall oppression of women, not really supported by C and D. The view might be challenged as the Nazi state did offer opportunities to women, even if some of these were as perpetrators of repression and agents of the racial policy. The limited work available to many women is in contradiction to A.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

2 How strong was the NSDAP on the eve of the Great Depression in 1929? [30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

Answers could consider its electoral successes, its organisation, the potential of its para military force, the ideology and its potential appeal and the leadership role of Hitler who had re-established his authority since 1925.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required.

The debate is whether the prosperous years since 1925 had weakened Nazism or whether the party had had increasing successes by: focusing on local issues; establishing its organisation; having an effective policy of legality, in contrast to the putschism of 1923; having the SA as a means of combating its enemies on the streets; and Hitler’s powerful oratory skills. There could be analyses of the superficial nature of the prosperity and the long standing grievances of the Mittelstand which gave the Party important potential support. Or, answers could argue that: the party was not strong, as it was internally divided; the army did not trust the SA; the establishment looked down on Hitler as a provincial rabble rouser; and, that it took the depression to increase support.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2.

AO4 – write in a coherent structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

3 ‘Gambles which paid off, not a coherent policy.’ Discuss this view of Hitler’s foreign policy in the period 1933 to 1938. [30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

The key elements may be seen as: the withdrawal from the League and the moves to end Versailles; having rearmament accepted and remilitarising the Rhineland; ending the rapport between Italy and France; and, Britain, gaining union with Austria and the Sudetenland.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required.

The issue was whether there was a planned policy of first destroying Versailles, and then using restored armed forces in a war of racial destruction and expansion, and acquisition of *Lebensraum* for a new Teutonic empire. The alternative is that there were certain broad objectives, but Hitler relied on exploiting and gambling on weak enemies to see what advantages he could extract from situations. The German military leaders lacked confidence in German’s ability to use force so Hitler gambled on its threat. It could be argued that policy was improvised, especially during the Czech crisis of 1938 rather than implemented to a plan.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2.

AO4 – write in a coherent structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	73

4 Why was there not more opposition in Germany to the racial policies of the Third Reich?
[30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. Analysis and evaluation are required, not a simple narrative of actions and events.

There was some opposition of a brave and heroic nature but not enough to prevent discrimination, isolation, deportation and mass murder.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and of different historical approaches may well enhance responses but are not required.

Explanations may focus on the sheer repressive power of the regime which increased with the War. They may point out to the gradual effect of propaganda and the staggered measures which did not necessary signpost the Holocaust and offer a decisive point to resist. By 1938 it was much harder to offer opposition, though not impossible, and the argument has been made that belief in the racial measures and compliance with them, even when they included killing, was the key factors. Arguments should be supported by evidence and assertions should not be over-rewarded.

AO3 – Candidates are not required to use and evaluate documents. However, such use and evaluation, where appropriate, could enhance responses. Where these skills occur, they should be rewarded under AO2.

AO4 – write in a coherent structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.