

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2014

GCE History (6HI03/D)

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2014

Publications Code UA039101

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## 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.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## **GCE History Marking Guidance**

### **Marking of Questions: Levels of Response**

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

### **Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level**

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

### **Assessing Quality of Written Communication**

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

### Section A

**Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)**

**(30 marks)**

The essay questions in Part (a) will have an analytical focus, requiring candidates to reach a substantiated judgement on a historical issue or problem.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material. There will be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it, with some evaluation of argument. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### **Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

## Section B

### Target: AO1a and AO1b (7% - 16 marks) AO2b (10% - 24 marks) (40 marks)

Candidates will be provided with two or three secondary sources totalling about 350-400 words. The question will require candidates to compare the provided source material in the process of exploring an issue of historical debate and reaching substantiated judgements in the light of their own knowledge and understanding of the issues of interpretation and controversy. Students must attempt the controversy question that is embedded within the period context.

### AO1a and AO1b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified, on the basis of factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. Links with the presented source material will be implicit at best. The factual material will be mostly generalised and there will be few, if any, links between the statements.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1 mark</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	4-6	<p>Candidates will produce statements deriving from their own knowledge and may attempt to link this with the presented source material. Knowledge will have some accuracy and relevance. There may be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 5 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>



3	7-10	<p>Candidates attempt a broadly analytical response from their own knowledge, which offers some support for the presented source material. Knowledge will be generally accurate and relevant. The answer will show some understanding of the focus of the question but may include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Attempts at analysis will be supported by generally accurate factual material which will lack balance in places.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	11-13	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response from their own knowledge which supports analysis of presented source material and which attempts integration with it. Knowledge will be generally well-selected and accurate and will have some range and depth. The selected material will address the focus of the question and show some understanding of the key issues contained in it with some evaluation of argument and – as appropriate - interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 13 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

5	14-16	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the presented source material. Knowledge will be well-selected, accurate and of appropriate range and depth. The selected material directly addresses the focus of the question. Candidates demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 15 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

**AO2b (24 marks)**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<p>Comprehends the surface features of sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the view posed in the question. When reaching a decision in relation to the question the sources will be used singly and in the form of a summary of their information. Own knowledge of the issue under debate will be presented as information but not integrated with the provided material.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>2</b>	<b>5-9</b>	<p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question.</p> <p>When supporting judgements made in relation to the question, relevant source content will be selected and summarised and relevant own knowledge of the issue will be added. The answer may lack balance but one aspect will be developed from the sources. Reaches an overall decision but with limited support.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>10-14</b>	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence, showing the ability to analyse some key points of the arguments offered and to reason from the evidence of the sources. Develops points of challenge and support for the stated claim from the provided source material and deploys material gained from relevant reading and knowledge of the issues under discussion. Shows clear understanding that the issue is one of interpretation.</p> <p>Focuses directly on the question when structuring the response, although, in addressing the specific enquiry, there may be some lack of balance. Reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, supported by information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 12-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	15-19	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 17-19 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	20-24	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 22-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

### **Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

### **Unit 3 Assessment Grid**

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
<b>Section A Q</b>	30	-	30
<b>Section B Q</b>	16	24	40
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>% weighting</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>30%</b>

## Section A

### D1 From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900-45

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>This question invites candidates to consider the Weimar Republic in the period 1919-29 and assess the extent to which this was a success in political terms. In arguing that the Weimar Republic was successful during this period, candidates may focus on the political stability of the period from 1924-9, particularly if seen relative to the preceding years. Whilst still reliant on political coalitions, these oversaw a period of relative political and economic harmony, with the electoral success and extra-parliamentary activity of extreme groups being reduced. Candidates may point to the drop in support for the communist parties, with the KPD down to 9% of the vote in the 1928 elections, or highlight the involvement of DNVP in coalition government during this period. The role of leaders such as Stresemann and Hindenburg may also be examined, through arguments that they brought success and stability through policy achievements and acceptability to a broad selection of the electorate. However, such arguments may be offset by considering the extent to which instability prevented the success of democratic government, with the absence of the SPD from coalition government until 1928, minority coalitions and frequent changes in the Chancellorship. Candidates may also argue that the apparent success of this period did not see democracy being embedded at a deeper level, with little growth of political parties beyond their sectional support bases, and a trend of diminishing voter turnout at elections signifying a growing apathy towards democratic government. In countering the proposition, candidates are likely to highlight the early years of the Weimar period, drawing from a range of attacks on parliamentary government from both left and right, and the fragmented nature of politics within the Reichstag, with shifting coalitions and eight different Chancellors by the end of 1923. Candidates may draw from a range of related issues, such as the position of elites towards democracy, the impact of the constitution or the economic and social context in which democratic government operated, although the focus should be firmly on assessment tied to the question.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 some successes may be examined although the response may be very one-sided with the case probably being made that across the wider period, the Weimar Republic had little by the way of success. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>This question invites candidates to consider the efficiency of the Nazi war economy from 1939-45. Candidates may draw material from a range of issues or perspectives, and many are likely to examine the extent to which the Nazis were able to overcome deficiencies in raw materials such as iron ore, coal and oil as well as more specialist materials such as bauxite (aluminium ore), tungsten, chromium, nickel and manganese ore. Imports from Sweden and resources gained from occupied countries such as France and Poland significantly increased supplies of high-quality iron ore, whilst the steel industries of the Low Countries went some way to making up for this, as did oil supplies from Romania, although the resources of occupied countries were not always successfully exploited and the increasing demands of war from 1942 meant that these essential raw materials were still lacking, and it may be argued that the destructive nature of conquest meant the Nazis did not take full advantage of the resources of occupied nations. Candidates may also examine other issues weighing on the demands of the war economy, such as the shortage of labour, with a shortfall of 4 million workers by 1944, where candidates may examine the limitations of attempts to use foreign labour and the failure to fully mobilise female workers, perhaps arguing that whilst a failure to conscript women demonstrates an inefficiency, the Nazi policy encouraging women to stay at home had been to some extent pragmatically sidelined from before 1939. Candidates may also consider organisational issues and the conflicting demands of the regime. Early decrees undoubtedly increased military production as Hitler sought to expand the war economy from 1939, but the extent to which this was efficiently organised is questionable; military expenditure doubled from 1939-41, with 55% of workers engaged in war-related production, yet output was disappointing. Consumer industries saw growth whilst armament production stagnated during the early stages of the war. Candidates may make comparisons with the military output of Britain or Russia in this period, with the former producing more aircraft and the latter more tanks. The extent to which this was a result of the overlapping structure of the Nazi war economy may also feature, under the differing remits of the SS, Ministry of Armaments, Office of the Four Year Plan and other agencies. The changing demands of the war, from the launch of Operation Barbarossa led to attempts to rationalise the war economy, firstly under Todt and then Speer (as ministers for Weapons and Munitions) from 1942. However, whilst these saw improvements in efficiency, via rationalisation of production lines and models, improved allocation of materials, investment and in military production and wage incentives, these never managed to overcome the inefficiency which was intrinsic to the Nazi regime. Candidates may indeed highlight the contradiction in a regime short of resources and labour allocating such a proportion of these to the Final Solution. Effective answers may relate such issues back to the shortages in both raw materials and labour; the demands of total war did see some success in the organisation of the war economy, which in part made more efficient use of limited raw materials. Whatever issues or material is offered, the focus should firmly be on the issue of inefficiency for the higher levels.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 there should be some analysis of the extent to which the war economy was efficient, although the response may be in part descriptive or very one-sided. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

## D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>This question invites candidates to consider British actions with regards to the Abyssinian Crisis and evaluate the extent to which these can be seen as confused and disastrous. Candidates may focus on the meeting between Samuel Hoare and Pierre Laval in December 1935 and the subsequent pact which agreed to divide Abyssinia - largely in favour of Italy, with the 'corridor of camels' being retained as sovereign territory. This was at odds with the sanctions imposed by the League of Nations, which, whilst slow to take effect and arguably insufficient, were a display of collective security in which Britain played a leading role in declaring Mussolini's Italy to have been the aggressor. In this sense candidates may argue that whilst Britain's handling appeared confused, the Hoare-Laval Pact may be defended to some extent in terms of being disastrous, as an attempt at practical resolution in the face of a sensitive public and an ineffective system of collective security. Such considerations aside, candidates are likely to argue the outcome was disastrous - candidates may point to how the resignations of both Hoare and Laval under public outcry demonstrate the flaws in such an approach, with its abandonment meaning it achieved little by way of settlement and further undermining collective security and revealing division in cabinet, with Hoare's successor as Foreign Secretary, Eden, being less willing to compromise with Mussolini, preferring action through the League. Hoare's own stated intention, to preserve some of Abyssinia as sovereign territory, and use a form of appeasement to prevent a closer relationship between Germany and Italy developing, highlights the pragmatic concerns of the British government in balancing interests, and candidates may explore these issues in the light of subsequent developments in relation to both of the key terms in the question. In this sense, students may broaden arguments to consider the relationship that had developed with Italy through the likes of the Four-Power Pact signed in Rome in 1933 and the Stresa Front of April 1935 and examine the extent to which the handling of the Abyssinian Crisis was disastrous in terms of shifting relations, perhaps considering developments such as the Rome-Berlin Axis of 1936, Italy's leaving the League of Nations in 1937 or Mussolini's role in the Munich Conference, perhaps arguing that a positive relationship with Mussolini was retained up to or even after this point, and thus British policy was not so disastrous. Candidates may indeed argue that whilst the situation did deteriorate after Abyssinia, this was more the result of factors outside of Britain's control, considering the decisions taken by British officials and government, the nature of Mussolini's foreign policy, the ideological allure of a fascist ally or indeed the sheer difficulty of maintaining a pragmatic approach in the context of a weak international context and unrealistic public expectations. Candidates may even question the extent to which Mussolini was a useful ally. However, the focus should be firmly on the British handling of the crisis, and as such extensive detail on other issues such as the growing relationship between the fascist powers is not a requirement.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion, with candidates likely to make critical distinctions over both the disastrous and confused. At level 4 there should be a real debate, although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 there should be some analysis of the impact of the Abyssinian Crisis although the response is likely to be very one-sided, perhaps with limited consideration of the wider context. At level 2 and below a narrative of these events is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>This question invites candidates to consider British performance in the early years of WWII and assess the extent to which this can be seen as a success. Candidates may draw from a range of material to support arguments on either side. Likely areas of success to be considered may be the defeat of Italian forces in East and North Africa and naval victories against the same adversary in the Mediterranean such as at Taranto and Cape Matapan, although these might be offset by consideration of the setbacks faced in the Battle of Crete and difficulties in support for the early stages of the siege of Malta. In terms of the Atlantic War, notable successes such as the Battle of the River Plate (December 1939), resulting in the scuttling of the Graf Spee, or the sinking of the Bismarck, although the latter may be set against the sinking of HMS Hood (both May 1941). Candidates may also see the defence of Britain as a success, particularly the Battle of Britain, although a case may be made for the Blitz having strengthened resolve and having failed to dent wartime production. In countering the successes, candidates may consider a range of theatres of war, from Norway, Belgium and France, Greece and North Africa, following the arrival of Rommel's Afrika Korps against the weakened British forces, although the relief of Tobruk did see Auchinleck's forces push back Rommel by the end of 1941. Candidates may also examine the proposition in relation to the broader conduct of the war, considering relevant issues beyond military performance, although the focus should be firmly on the question.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion, with candidates likely to explore the nature and extent of many of the above examples in the context of the wider war. At level 4 there should be a real debate, although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 there should be some analysis of the success of British efforts, although this may be somewhat imbalanced in terms of either success/failure, or in terms of theatres of war examined. At level 2 and below a narrative of these events is likely to be on offer.</p>	30



## Section B

### D1 From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900-45

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>This question centres on whether or not the responsibility for the outbreak of the First World War lay with the German leadership. Source 1 highlights a longer-term mentality within the German government and army which made war likely and accepted this as a possible outcome, whilst emphasising how events from 1913 worked to remove the constraints of elements of domestic opinion which had previously countered this. Source 2 also highlights the role of Germany's leaders, although it considers this in more reactive terms, and thus apportions responsibility in the context of international developments alongside the pessimistic fears of Germany's leaders. Thus whilst candidates are likely to draw parallels between these two sources, they open up a range of arguments concerning other possible factors, and candidates may argue that source 2 offers a more sympathetic appraisal of the defensive nature of the actions of Bethmann Hollweg, set against the more reckless and aggressive perspective of other leaders argued in Source 1. Candidates may examine such issues with reference to the Schlieffen Plan, the actions of Tirpitz, Moltke, the Kaiser or other German statesmen, and may be likely to draw from the range of Fischer's research. Source 3 points more towards how the July Crisis triggered the alliances that had developed in the context of increasing nationalism and the arms race. Thus Germany is argued to have had a more acute case of such potentially threatening nationalism, which can be related to both Source 1, suggesting such a mentality was dominant amongst German elites, and Source 2, such as exploring the extent to which the fears of encirclement Source 2 suggests genuinely resulted from the alliances, perhaps arguing Source 3 places more emphasis on factors which were largely beyond the control of Germany's leaders. Such issues may be developed with specific knowledge of the arms race and the alliance system, and are likely to focus on the role Germany played in both of these.</p> <p>At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making a case in support of source 1 by detailing the evidence that Fischer made use of in advancing the cases he made for German war guilt, or of Source 2 and why Germany felt threatened and had to fight a defensive war. At level 4 there should be a real debate on whether the policies and decisions of Germany's leaders proved decisive in bringing about war. Candidates in conducting this debate will show a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case supporting the proposition referred to in Source 1. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or even extensive own knowledge displayed, for instance about the July Crisis or the Schlieffen Plan. At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>This question addresses the nature of the Nazi regime and the extent to which this was genuinely popular. In examining the arguments in agreement with the contention, candidates are likely to start with Source 4, which highlights the growth of the cult of the Fuhrer, with Hitler being portrayed as a saviour for ordinary Germans from the suffering and malaise they had experienced. Burleigh highlights how a separation was achieved between the view of Hitler and the wider Nazi movement. In developing these issues, candidates may even examine the extent to which such a faith in their leader did exist amongst ordinary Germans, or was a manufactured construct of Goebbel's and the use of propaganda. Candidates may draw parallels with this and source 5, which develops the view of the Fuhrer as standing above the everyday concerns over the regime, although candidates may examine the extent to which widespread popularity can be seen from the 'material grievances' Kershaw highlights. Source 6 is likely to be used to challenge the given proposition, giving extensive detail of the terror apparatus used, and candidates may relate this back to the view of Source 4 that Germans rationalised over the Nazi repression detailed in Source 6. A more nuanced examination of Source 6 will consider the changing nature and extent of repressive measures used across the period. In applying own knowledge to extend the debate and assess the given views, candidates may draw on a range of detail concerning the use of propaganda, the position of Hitler, perceptions of the wider regime and the police state, and many candidates are likely to comment on how the nature of the regime places limitations on the evidence available for assessing popular support or indeed repression.</p> <p>At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making critical distinctions, such as over the myth and reality of the cult of the Fuhrer. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one-sided case supporting the proposition. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or even extensive own knowledge displayed, possibly on some aspects of propaganda or Hitler. At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge.</p>	40

**D2 Britain and the Challenge of Fascism: Saving Europe at a Cost? c1925-60**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>7</b>	<p>This question targets the controversy surrounding Chamberlain's policy of appeasement. Candidates may begin with source 7, which can be identified with the proposition in the question, highlighting Chamberlain's actions from March to September 1938 as being the apogee of this policy. Candidates may develop the arguments within Source 7 that Hitler's expansionist aims were evident before this, and that appeasement encouraged Hitler in thinking he would not be opposed. Source 9 argues in a similar vein in some respects, in so far as Britain and France failed to recognise that a firmer line against Hitler was possible, highlighting how Hitler achieved much of his aims through brinkmanship. Source 8 offers a different view, highlighting what Chamberlain achieved in the context of public opinion, British and French capabilities and their attempts to reshape territorial claims and treaty revision. Candidates may relate this to Source 9, regarding Hitler's own limited capacity in 1938, or in contrasting the hope of settlement it portrays with the encouragement this gave to Hitler that Source 7 highlights. In drawing on own knowledge to extend the debate and evaluate these views, candidates may examine the extent of Britain's military preparedness in 1938, events from the May Crisis through the three meetings between Chamberlain and Hitler culminating in the annexation of October 1938, weighing issues such as the time this bought or a genuine belief that peace had been won, against the loss of Czechoslovakia as a bulwark and arguably a potential ally in Stalin against German expansion. Whilst candidates may extend the debate beyond 1938, this should be firmly focused back on assessing the policy followed during this period.</p> <p>At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. At level 4 there should be a real debate on whether the policies followed by Chamberlain's were a misjudgement. Candidates in conducting this debate will show a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case supporting the proposition referred to in Source 1. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources and possibly extensive own knowledge displayed, for instance about the events surrounding Munich, although this will not be fully directed at the debate. At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question asks students to consider the issue of Britain's post-war economic reconstruction. Source 10 clearly supports the contention in the question, with Glynn and Booth arguing that there was an undoubted opportunity to address the issues of economic competitiveness, but that this 'chance was lost' , highlighting conflict between the aims of both major parties during wartime government and a failure to tackle vested interests in industry, in the context of post-war needs. Source 11 supports this to some extent, in highlighting the opportunity offered by world markets in the post-war era. Students may highlight the successes in doing so, although a more developed use of this will recognise the poisoned chalice that the lack of real international competition presented, with apparent success tempered over the longer-term by a failure to improve productivity. In Source 12, Gamble highlights the difficult context that British government and industry operated in. Candidates may draw on this to develop arguments suggesting a successful reconstruction, highlighting issues such as the growth of manufacturing output, the growth of exports and efforts to tackle potential inflation. Candidates may develop these issues with a range of own knowledge, such as evidence of Britain's crippling financial problems with the end of Lend-lease, the demands of building the welfare state and a commitment to full employment, the nature of nationalised industries and their management, possibly with reference to the views of historians such as Corelli Barnett, although these should be firmly focused on the given contention.</p> <p>At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making a case relating to post-war reconstruction with a sharp focus on both opportunities and economic improvement, and candidates may explore the different conceptions of the latter. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one-sided case supporting the proposition, reliant on Source 10. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or even extensive own knowledge displayed, possibly about the economic condition of Britain in 1945. At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge.</p>	40

