



General Certificate of Education

History 1041

Specification

Unit HIS1K

Report on the Examination

2009 examination – June series

This Report on the Examination uses the [new numbering system](#)

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2009 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.

Unit HIS1K

Unit 1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

General Comments

This paper worked well, producing a wide-range of responses. Candidates were able to display appropriate knowledge and to access the questions across the mark range. Overall candidates showed a grasp of the question demands. Candidates' answers were spread fairly evenly across the questions and answered with little variation in the popularity of the questions, although there were slightly fewer responses to Question 1, and a slightly lower quality of response. There were few infringements of the rubric although a small number of candidates showed some indecision in selecting their responses.

Candidates performed well on the (a) questions (02, 04, 06) when focused on explanation and less well when listing factors. In some cases candidates struggled to find a range of reasons and a small number failed to answer the questions directly. There were very few who were unable to give any relevant response. Candidates at Level 4 for these questions added links between factors to their explanations and in a few cases gave supported prioritisation.

On the (b) questions (02, 04, 06) candidates who performed well provided assessment with appropriate supporting material; at Levels 4 and 5 candidates required some balance, and at Level 5 some judgement. Lower level responses lacked range, depth and assessment, with relevant material but focusing on description and assertion. At lower levels some candidates struggled to focus on the relevant time period.

Question 1

- 01** Candidates generally produced relevant responses to this question, although some struggled to find a range of factors, many focusing on the importance of foreign policy demands as a factor. Better responses were able to explain how the arms build up and the naval race in particular helped create a need for industrial growth. Higher scoring candidates referred to wider government policies, e.g. tariffs and the education system, relating specifically to the time period covered. Many were also able to explain how longer term factors, such as the availability of raw materials, good communication and transport systems and the growth and movement of population, helped promote growth. Candidates at Level 4 made links between these factors and/or a judgement on relative importance. Lower level answers had limited range and no or limited development of explanation. Candidates at these levels also gave very general reasons some of which applied predominantly to the earlier period under Bismarck.
- 02** Candidates were mostly able to answer this question with relevant material, although the range of many answers was quite limited. A significant number of candidates concentrated mostly on the rise of the SPD but made limited links to the social changes that had led to this. Other candidates focused on other issues such as the need for German unity in relation to Catholics, different nationalities, and the needs of the new and old elites, all of which were valid material. Candidates also found it difficult to organise their responses to this question and many of them opted to go through the different chancellors in chronological order. Although many of these answers were successful and contained assessment, in some cases it resulted in descriptive responses. A small

number of candidates dealt with the wrong time period and wrote about Bismarck's Kulturkampf and his campaign against socialism; it was rarely possible to reward these candidates above the bottom of Level 1. Successful responses covered the relevant time period with an attempt to assess both the successes and failures of the German governments in dealing with the impacts of social change.

Question 2

- 03** Responses to this question were reasonably successful with most candidates able to provide relevant responses. However, some candidates focused on the aftermath of the October Manifesto and consequently could only be rewarded at Level 1. Candidates at the lower levels produced general answers giving long-term reasons why the tsarist regime was unpopular without referring to the particular situation in 1905. Some candidates adopted a descriptive and chronological account of the events of 1905, which could only be rewarded at Level 2; however, many candidates adapted this approach to include explanation and were able to build links between the events – this could be rewarded at Level 4. The best answers contained explanation of a range of factors, both long and short-term, with an explanation of importance; sometimes the relative importance of factors which could be rewarded at Level 4.
- 04** This question was mostly answered with relevant material and a focus on the question. However, a small number of candidates found it difficult to cover the time period demanded by the question. Of these, most referred to the work done by Witte in the 1890s while others dealt with events in the earlier part of 1905. This could only be given credit if linked to the time period in the question. At Level 2 answers were predominantly descriptive and assertive but did make reference to some valid material. At Level 3 candidates were able to give some assessment of the extent to which the regime was able to maintain stability but this was limited and often took the form of a chronological account of the Dumas. Level 4 covered a wider range of material across the time period including some assessment of the changing level of stability. There was some balance of material, i.e. political issues, the use of repression, success and failure. Level 5 answers built on this to achieve an overall judgement on success or failure. Some candidates at these levels did adopt a chronological response but were able to include assessment and to use the chronology to assess the changing levels of stability.

Question 3

- 05** Most candidates were able to respond to this question with relevant material, although there was some misunderstanding of the nature of the Dreikaiserbund. Most answers referred to Bismarck's desire to isolate France as the main reason for the agreement, and were able to explain the reason for the need to do this and how the Dreikaiserbund helped to do this. This limited range with some explanation was rewarded at the top of Level 2, as were candidates who listed a larger range of factors without explanation. Level 3 answers had a range of factors and explanation usually including the need to isolate France, Germany's fear of encirclement, and the need to act as a mediator between Russia and Austria. Some candidates (not many) referred to the agreement as a league of conservative forces against the spread of liberalism and socialism, and referred to Russia's motivation for the Dreikaiserbund. At Level 4 candidates explained the links between factors or explained why one factor (usually the need to isolate France) was the main reason, although this needed to be supported to reach the level.

- 06** This was another question that was largely tackled as a chronological account. For some candidates this resulted in a descriptive answer, although usually with relevant material. Some candidates again struggled with the time frame of the question and insisted on including material right up to 1914. Sometimes this could be credited as there was reference to the long-term success of Bismarck's policies, although in some cases this was not possible. Lower level answers contained little relevant material, were largely descriptive and sometimes irrelevant. At Level 2 candidates made a valid attempt to answer the question but almost entirely without assessment, being predominantly descriptive, assertive and lacking in range. Level 3 covered the issue with some assessment and valid support, dealing with the main events and developments such as the Dreikaiserbund, the congress of Berlin and the Reinsurance Treaty, although the coverage lacked depth and balance. At L4 candidates attempted to balance successes and failures with some assessment. Level 5 answers had a good understanding of the issues surrounding the relationship between Russia and Germany and were able to use this and the supporting material to reach an overall judgement.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.