

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE in 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 or 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.

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

Summer 2015

Publications Code US041792

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

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. 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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks 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>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks 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</p> |

| | | |
|----------|--------------|---|
| | | <p>organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks 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>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks 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>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 29-30 marks 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>Low Level 1: 1 mark The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3 marks 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>Low Level 2: 4 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 5 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 2: 6 marks 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>Low Level 3: 7 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 10 marks 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>Low Level 4: 11 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 12 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 13 marks 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</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 14 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 15 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 16 marks 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.

AO2b (24 marks)

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|--------------|--------------|---|
| 1 | 1-4 | <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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 2 | 5-9 | <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>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-9 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 3 | 10-14 | <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>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 12-14 marks 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>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 17-19 marks 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>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 5: 22-24 marks 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.

Unit 3 Assessment Grid

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

Section A

D1 From Kaiser to Führer: Germany, 1900-45

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 1 | <p>This question invites candidates to examine the consequences of the economic development that took place during the Second Reich, and assess the extent to which the impact was positive in the years 1900-14. Candidates are likely to offer extensive knowledge of the developments in a range of industries, from coal, steel, chemical, through to electrical industrials, with overall increases in industrial production that are likely to be argued as impressive. However, the rapid urbanisation offered consequent problems, and candidates may examine issues of pollution, disease, overcrowding and other problems associated with housing, and cyclical unemployment. Candidates may also explore the demographic changes with regards to the movement from rural to urban populations and indeed the growth of the middle class. Set against these issues, candidates may examine how Germany rose to meet the challenges these developments presented, considering issues such as sanitation, vaccination, wages increases and the development of transport facilitating suburban living. With regards to agriculture beyond demographic upheaval, candidates may examine increased domestic demand for produce, the impact of innovations in fertiliser alongside the chemical industry and mechanisation, as well as the impact of increasing competition from foreign produce and labour. Whilst the question focuses primarily on economic development, the implications of this with regards to the political system may also be explored, such as the development of the socialist movement beyond 1900, the growing influence of pressure groups and the government response to these pressures. Candidates may even relate these to foreign policy considerations, although the analysis should be clearly targeted towards the demands of the question.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the impact of Germany's economic development, culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate on the extent to which the impact was positive, although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 both positives and negatives are likely to be examined, although the response may be very one-sided. 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 targets the rise of Hitler and the NSDAP, and candidates are expected to examine the role played by the actions of politicians, weighed against other factors. With regards the given factor, candidates are likely to examine the role of Hindenburg and other members of the political elite, where it may be argued that they sought to restore authoritarian government. Candidates may even argue that such actions were wilful, although the result of Hitler taking the office of Chancellor may be considered an unintended error on the part of those involved. Consideration may also be given to the role of the DNVP under Alfred Hugenberg, in rejecting parliamentary democracy and working with the Nazis against the Young Plan. Responses may link such issues to systematic difficulties displayed by the Weimar Republic that came to prominence particularly during the period of economic crisis, such as the consequences of a reliance of rule by emergency decree or the evident limitations of coalition government in dealing with the depression. Higher level responses are likely to be more convincing in offering evidence to analyse the role of such issues beyond generalised assertions over the flaws in the Weimar system. Such arguments may again link to alternative explanations, such as an exploration of the extent to which Hitler and the NSDAP exploited these failings, or the crucial role played by the economic crisis. Extensive material on the role of the NSDAP and Hitler himself may be offered, although this should be focused on the specific demands of the question in a convincing manner for the higher levels. Candidates may also explore the extent to which broader electoral support was crucial, and through this may examine the nature of Nazi appeal with regards to specific groups and the social and economic issues they faced in the period.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the factors behind Hitler's appointment culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate on the importance of the misjudgements of Weimar politicians, although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 a range of factors may be offered, although this may be one-sided and elements may not be fully convincing. 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 targets British foreign policy towards Germany in the years 1933-37, and candidates are expected to assess the judgement that this was sensible in the circumstances. Candidates may draw from a range of events and issues where British involvement can be discerned, from the Disarmament Conference of 1933, involvement in the Stresa Front, the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935 through to the re-militarisation of the Rhineland and beyond, and may even consider less directly obvious events such as Guernica. The context of the world threat is also likely to feature, with reference to issues such as British imperial concerns and the actions of Japan. British concerns over communism are also likely to be considered. Candidates may also challenge assumptions that British policy was passive, perhaps highlighting Churchill's warnings of the growing aerial threat in a Commons speech of March 1934, seeing that Baldwin's response led to an increase in spending on the RAF from 1934. A range of approaches are valid, although analysis should be squarely targeted towards an assessment of policy towards Germany. Candidates are likely to underpin their analysis of such issues with consideration of the motivations and influences at work, and are particularly likely to examine attitudes towards the Versailles settlement, public opinion and attitudes to peace and even economic considerations, and may evidence these with references to the East-Fulham by-election of 1933, the Oxford Union debate of the same year or the LNU Peace Ballot of 1934-5. Candidates may also consider the lack of trust that existed between Britain and France over French intentions as a factor limiting the options available with regards to policy towards Germany. The extent to which particular opinions held sway may also be examined, possibly considering the prevailing influence of liberal Conservatives such as Lord Halifax, or the wider impact of denunciations of Versailles through texts such as Keynes' <i>The Economic Consequences of the Peace</i>. Candidates may set such notions against the minority dissenting voices of the likes of Sir Robert Vansittart's warnings to politicians of the threat of Hitler from 1933 onwards, although such responses are not expected, and successful analysis should be firmly targeted towards the question.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the extent to which British foreign policy was sensible in the circumstances, culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate over British foreign policy towards Germany, although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 some arguments should be found, although the response may be imbalanced, offer aspects of narrative or stray beyond the questions parameters to some degree. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p> | 30 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 4 | <p>This question targets the latter period of WWII, and candidates are expected to assess the contribution of Allied air superiority in the liberation of Europe from 1944, set alongside and against other factors. Candidates may argue that the 'round the clock' bombing raids the RAF and US Air force inflicted in tandem on German cities from 1943 onwards severely weakened Germany, in terms of damage inflicted on German industrial production, refineries and cities, as well as the impact this had upon the Luftwaffe being pressed into defence of the skies. Whilst the success of the bombing campaigns may be hotly debated, candidates should recognise that by 1944 allied forces had established control of the skies. Astute candidates may also recognise the impact such activities had on the Eastern Front, in forcing Germany to relocate aerial resources to defend Germany, when weighing the relative significance of the different issues, although the focus should remain firmly on the contribution these made to liberation. With regards to the Normandy landings themselves, an Allied force of over 12,000 planes was able to muster 102 squadrons to patrol over the invasion fleet, against a German force of around 500. Eisenhower was able to assure troops "If you see fighting aircraft over you, they will be ours". Expect significant material on the Normandy landings and subsequent advance through France and the lowland countries in the summer and autumn of 1944 onwards, from consideration of the role played by deception planning and technological innovations such as the Mulberry harbours, through to the failure of the German counter-offensive in January 1945. Candidates may also consider issues from a broad range of factors, from the economic superiority of the combined Allied effort against the failings of German production and indeed Hitler's leadership of the war and the contribution made by other theatres of war, although again, successful candidates need to focus such material on the specific demands of the question.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the contribution made by the bombing offensive, culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate on the factors behind the liberation of Europe, although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 a range of arguments may be examined although the response may be one-sided, or tend to elements of description of Operation Overlord. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p> | 30 |

Section B

D1 From Kaiser to Fürher: Germany, 1900-45

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 5 | <p>Candidates are asked to argue explore the contention that German aggression was not the main cause of war in 1914. It is likely candidates will make use of Source 1 as evidence in favour of this contention, drawing on issues raised regards relations both within and between the two alliances, and may explore related issues such as the actions of other members of these, such as Austria, the failing efforts to maintain the concert of Europe in the face of the growing alliance system and the alliances themselves. These issues can be considered against Source 2, where candidates may draw upon the references to Fischer to explore the responsibility of German aggression in terms of policy after the Second Moroccan Crisis of 1911. Source 3 may also be used to present a case for the German responsibility, although the emphasis here is less likely to be placed on aggression than misjudgement, with reference to a range of aspects of this debate, and may touch on viewpoints concerning Weltpolitik, Primat der Innerpolitik, and calculated risk.</p> <p>In extending the debate with own knowledge, candidates may draw on a range of issues, such as considering the July Crisis in the light of the alliances and the extent to which these committed nations to their actions, the evidence concerning the actions and plans of the German leadership, considering issues, individuals and events such as the Schlieffen Plan, the actions of Tirpitz, Moltke, the Kaiser or other German statesmen and the so-called 'War Council' of 1912.</p> <p>Responses at level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on the relative strengths of the different viewpoints and /or to resolve the conflicts. Candidates may offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the extent to which a 'desire for war' can be ascertained amongst Germany's rulers and held responsible for WWI. At level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess differing viewpoints even if many points are not addressed or developed. At level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At level 1 candidates may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be assembled into a narrative. Candidates who are drawing out the implications of the arguments and attempt to support and/or challenge them by both cross referencing the sources and/or applying contextual knowledge are likely to score above level 2.</p> | 40 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 6 | <p>The question addresses the authority of Hitler in the government of Nazi Germany. Source 4 clearly provides the quotation, and thus goes some way in supporting the proposition. Candidates are likely to examine how Source 4 portrays such issues, examining the extent to which Hitler was indeed a 'weak dictator' as a result of the system the Nazis established, considering the polycracy of overlapping institutions. Some candidates may highlight Source 4's reference to the views of 'Some experts' and 'some commentators' in the light of their historiographical knowledge, although this is not expected even at the highest levels, and any consideration of this should be firmly focused on the debate in the question. It may be noted that Source 4 offers some moderation of these, although broadly favours such arguments. The concept of 'institutional anarchy' (Source 4) may be linked to Source 5's reference to 'rival empires', offering candidates the opportunity to debate the extent to which such systematic features were indeed a constraint or even desirable from Hitler's perspective. Candidates may examine this in the light of the final statement from Source 6 concerning the nature of the government and party institutions, and may well relate the perspective taken by Source 4 to the lack of legal and political constraints on the Fuhrer that Source 6 emphasises. Candidates will thus be able to develop the parallels and contrasts that exist. Candidates are likely to focus on issues such as the 'will of the Fuhrer' (Source 6), the issue of the 'rival empires' that were established by Hitler's deputies (Source 5) and access to the Fuhrer (Source 6), and the more astute responses may debate the extent to which Source 5 considers this to be a strength, or at least sees this as being an intentional aspect of Hitler's rule. Candidates should recognise the significance of phrases such as 'in theory at least' (Source 6) in examining the extent to which Hitler's authority was constrained. Source 5 may also be used to explore the impact Hitler's own personal qualities played as a leader, with regards to both his preferred policy areas and the allusion to his somewhat distant methods of governance.</p> <p>Candidates may explore these issues drawing on range of own knowledge, considering policy areas such as foreign and military relations, the extent to which individuals as diverse as Schacht, Darré, Himmler and Bormann were able to gain access, limit the access of others or indeed establish individual fiefdoms.</p> <p>Responses at level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on the relative strengths of the different viewpoints and /or to resolve the conflicts. Candidates may offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the nature of authority in Nazi Germany. At level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which Hitler's powers were constrained, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At level 2 the analytical focus will probably be</p> | 40 |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At level 1 may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be assembled into a narrative. Candidates who are drawing out the implications of the arguments and attempt to support and/or challenge them by both cross referencing the sources and/or applying contextual knowledge are likely to score above level 2.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

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

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 7 | <p>This question targets British foreign policy in the years 1937-39, and candidates should be able to draw on the given evidence to examine a range of arguments. Candidates are likely to start with Source 7, seeing this as the source offering the strongest support of Chamberlain, perhaps with reference to how 'it cannot just be written off as cowardly'. Source 7 offers some degree of defence, and candidates may use this as a starting point for exploring the appraisals of British readiness in period, the view on Chamberlain's policy being a pragmatic response to this in both gaining through negotiation and time bought, whilst also highlighting the continuity in seeing Eastern Europe as peripheral to British interests. More astute responses may also develop the reference to the changing historiography concerning Chamberlain, and may consider this in the light of Taylor (Source 8). Source 8 offers a way into a range of arguments relating to the failings of appeasement, from the perceived cowardly nature of Munich, the extent to which the policy was ill-judged in terms of dealing with the likes of Hitler and the extent to which it can be seen as a turning point in both Hitler's aggression and the domestic response towards the policy. It is likely candidates will draw on Source 7 to counter some of these arguments, Source 9 may be considered as evidence both for and against the given proposition. Whilst clearly critical of both appeasement as a policy, and Chamberlain's perceived dogmatic commitment to this, it does place this in a longer-term context, referring to 'Chamberlain's predecessors' and the failings of such a policy since 1936. In this sense, candidates may explore the extent to which the 'disaster' of appeasement was mitigated – at least personally as far as Chamberlain was concerned – by the situation he inherited.</p> <p>Candidates may draw from a broad range of contextual knowledge, such as the actions of previous leaders such as Baldwin or even MacDonald, the development of British policy in the context of events from the Anschluss through to the guarantee given to Poland and the subsequent declaration of war, and may also explore the given view in the light of material relating to issues such as the relative strength of military preparedness and rearmament or the shifting public opinion in reaction to events such as the Munich Conference and the invasion of the Czechoslovakian rump state.</p> <p>Responses at level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on the relative strengths of the different viewpoints and /or to resolve the conflicts. Candidates may offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the failings of appeasement and Chamberlain's commitment to such a policy. At level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which Chamberlain's defended the national interest as best he could, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At level 1 candidates may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be assembled</p> | 40 |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | into a narrative. Candidates who are drawing out the implications of the arguments and attempt to support and/or challenge them by both cross referencing the sources and/or applying contextual knowledge are likely to score above level 2. | |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 8 | <p>This question addresses the expectations that arose as a result of the Second World War. Source 10, emphasises the common experience of wartime privation, and candidates are likely to recognise and develop this as the source from which the quotation is taken. Thompson (Source 10) outlines a range of ways in which these experiences were felt, through evacuation and controls, seeing these as fostering attitudes towards a more egalitarian society. Candidates may examine the reference to the 'pre-war years' with regards to shifting attitudes, perhaps examining the extent to which such changes originated in the experience of the 1930s, and many are likely to consider the issue of the economic necessity of government planning and control with regards the war effort and post-war reconstruction. Candidates are likely to use Source 11 to develop opposing viewpoints; McKibbin does not deny the existence of some of these outcomes, but suggests that with regards the post-war years, little was altered outside of the spheres of 'social welfare and nationalization', highlighting inconsistencies that existed within Labour's programme that may be used to question the extent of any utopian programme based upon wartime experience. Candidates may also examine the reference to how the 'Conservative party had been overthrown quite unexpectedly' (Source 11) in the light of the issue of the 'new resolve' (Source 10). Source 12 may be related to both perspectives, and may be used as the basis for examining an alternative view. Hattersley outlines the acceptance of the 'social revolution of 1945' by the Conservatives upon returning to power in 1951, suggesting that wartime experience played a part, and indicating that such a programme was 'widely accepted'. However, he also suggests that some aspects of this were not achieved. Additionally, Source 12 may be used to suggest that the post-war reforms were as much a product of the vision of the Labour Party, empowered to carry this out by an electorate by a combination of wartime experience and the appeal of what Labour offered.</p> <p>In order to assess the given views, candidates may offer contextual relating to a range of issues raised, considering issues such as the reaction to the Beveridge proposals, which may even be explored in the light of the 1945 election, the extent to which the wartime experience of issues ranging from evacuation through to munitions production can be seen to shape public expectations, and may examine issues in the light of the relative military and domestic concerns of wartime governments.</p> <p>Responses at level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on the relative strengths of the different viewpoints and /or to resolve the conflicts. Candidates may offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the variation in public attitudes and the overall extent to which attitudes were shaped by wartime experiences. At level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which a desire for a 'better society' arose, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At level 1 candidates may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be</p> | 40 |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | assembled into a narrative. Candidates who are drawing out the implications of the arguments and attempt to support and/or challenge them by both cross referencing the sources and/or applying contextual knowledge are likely to score above level 2. | |
|--|---|--|

