

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report June 2010

GCE History 6HI01 F

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034

ResultsPlus

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code US024072

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

6HI01 F

General comments - 6HI01 Option A/B/C/D/E/F

Once again the current cohort of candidates were generally well prepared, answered two questions without apparently experiencing difficulties with timing, and made a genuine attempt to engage with the question. However, it was noticeable that even well prepared candidates underachieved due to an increase in formulaic answers which did not directly address the specific question asked or show explicit understanding of the key issues. The comments below are intended to encourage both centres and future candidates to improve on past performance.

An important issue which was raised by many examiners this year concerns candidate interpretation of the questions set. Many candidates appear to believe that all the questions on the paper require them to consider the importance of a given factor in relation to a number of other factors. It is important that centres impress on future candidates that this is not the case; if it were, it would reduce the examination to a simple formula. The mark scheme requires an essay to 'present historical explanations and reach a judgement' and this is achieved through a variety of different question stems such as 'to what extent', 'how accurate', 'how far', 'how significant' and 'why'. Although the majority of questions require an analysis of relative importance not all of the questions do. Questions requiring the candidate to analyse relative importance are indicated through the use of trigger words such as 'main reason', 'key factor', 'primary reason', 'due to', 'responsible for' and 'explain'. Questions which do not refer to relative importance require a balanced answer with a counter-argument giving reasons for and against the given statement/factor. Questions which refer to 'significance' or 'importance' can often be addressed using either approach whilst 'why' questions do not require a counter-argument (although this is often present in higher Level answers) but an overall judgement of the different reasons put forward.

The following examples indicate how some students underperformed by misinterpreting the question set:

Question A13: 'How accurate is it to say that Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck were both serious threats to Henry VII's security?' Some saw this as an invitation to deal briefly with the two pretenders before considering other threats to the king's security, including the nobility, the Yorkist rump and the taxation rebellions.

Question A14 : 'How far did Henry VII's financial policies strengthen the power of the monarchy?'. Many candidates wrote about other ways in which the monarchy was strengthened.

Question D7: 'How successful were the Five-Year Plans in transforming Russian industry in the years 1928-41?' Many dismissed the plans briefly before investigating the role of terror and the purges in transforming industry.

Most candidates produced a readable answer with, at the least, some historical knowledge and, at best, a sophisticated analysis. The analytical and evaluative answers at high Level 4 and Level 5 were impressive for their breadth and depth of knowledge, and by their sharp focus on the question. However, a significant number of answers were less directly targeted on the question; these seemed to be answering practice questions, or were a prepared response. As always, there is evidence that candidates were not answering questions on the current paper, but those on the previous one. This often leads to responses which 'relate well to the focus' (Level 4) but not 'direct focus' (Level 5) e.g. in Option E/F Question 5 candidates often referred to Mussolini's rise to power rather than growing support for the Italian Fascist Party. Now that there are ten sample

questions for each option (the four examination papers plus the sample questions) centres might consider it appropriate not to use the most recently asked questions in trial examinations.

A lack of both general and detailed chronological awareness is a growing concern. The importance of covering the timescale in the question is still a discriminating factor between candidates, and is dealt with in the reports on various questions. Candidates do need to be aware of the importance of key dates in the topics studied and, quite simply, the order in which events took place. A failure to understand why the dates in the question have been used led to a significant number of candidates failing to cover the whole period set, and thus to miss out some key events or developments, or referring to the wrong time period altogether.

Perhaps the most significant discriminator between different answers was the range and quality of supporting information. It is impossible for a candidate to frame an analytical response if the evidence offered in that answer is lacking in depth of development or is not directly relevant to the question. The generic mark scheme makes clear that progression through levels depends on the answer displaying two linked qualities; the strength of the explanation or analysis offered, and the range and depth of accurate and relevant material.

Examiners are required to reach a judgement on the quality of communication before awarding their final mark; it is an integral part of the mark scheme. Future candidates should be reminded that slang and argot have no place in an AS History answer; that spelling, punctuation and grammar may influence the quality of their argument; that it is worth learning how to spell the historical terms used in the topics studied; and that abbreviations, and the absence of capital letters, should remain in the realm of text messaging. It is also important to use correct terms when referring to people of different races and cultures.

Questions 1-14

Option F

Virtually all of the candidates who enter for Option F answer questions on Topic F7. Alongside F7 the most popular Topics are F2, F3 and F5. Many of the candidates produce well-reasoned analytical responses with appropriate accurate and relevant supporting evidence. However, it has become increasingly noticeable that, although some candidates approach each question with a similar analytical style of response, the mark for Topic F7 is often lower than that of the other Topic studied; this appears to be mainly due to a lack of secure chronological and factual knowledge deployed as supporting evidence. A significant number of candidates appear confused with the chronological order of events; as pointed out in previous reports the hyper-inflation and unemployment of the 1920s are often confused but it is clear from both questions this June that a significant number of candidates are insecure in their knowledge of the key events and dates. As many of the alternative Topics are not taught at GCSE, it is possible that candidates who have already studied Weimar and Nazi Germany are either not revising F7 as thoroughly as the 'new' Topic and/or are not supplementing their previous knowledge with the 'different' requirements at AS Level. There were also a noticeable number of candidates who answered questions on Topics F2 and F5 with reference to the 1919-1945 time period. Centres may wish to consider this when devising schemes of work and exercises to test chronological and factual knowledge.

IMPORTANT NOTE: EXEMPLIFICATION SCRIPTS FOR QUESTIONS 1-8 CAN BE FOUND IN THE REPORT FOR OPTION E

Topic F1 - The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

This is a popular topic and the responses were evenly balanced between Q.1 and Q.2. Candidates are very well prepared with both detailed factual knowledge and a good understanding of the 'big questions' involved in the process of unification.

Q.1. Most candidates were aware of the need to select relevant material appropriately considering the lengthy time period and number of revolutionary outbreaks involved but were not always able to deploy the material effectively. Some candidates followed a narrative commentary whilst others chose to analyse the failures using a variety of different factors. Good time management was vital in both cases with some narrative commentaries failing to reach the 1848-9 period and more analytical responses failing to provide appropriate accurate supporting evidence. A significant number of responses were able to generalise about the strength of Austria but were surprisingly lacking in support with little specific reference to Metternich, Laibach, Troppau or the events of 1848-9. There was also much evidence of candidates writing responses which, although adequately dealt with the failures of the revolutionaries, seemed pre-prepared about obstacles to unification rather than directly focused on the responsibility of Austria. The best responses were able to identify the strength of Austrian power throughout the period and to compare this to other external factors and internal weaknesses using specific, relevant factual supporting evidence. Some candidates suggested in the conclusion that Austrian interference during the period ultimately created the seeds for the eventual unification of Italy in the decades after 1849.

Q.2 produced some very interesting and well-reasoned responses with examiners commenting on the many thoughtful responses which engaged well with the question asked. Once again candidates tended to approach the question either through a narrative commentary or through a more analytical thematic approach addressing the territorial, political, economic, social and cultural unity of Italy during the period. Those who provided a narrative commentary were

often very effective but many were unable to manage their time to reach 1861 or produced pure narrative. Some candidates' chronological knowledge proved to be very insecure with the period between Garibaldi's success in Naples and the meeting at Teano particularly weak. There also appears to be some confusion as to where and when the different plebiscites were held. There were, however, some excellent answers which clearly showed the territorial consolidation within the Italian peninsula during the period but questioning the 'nationalism' behind it and the extent of political, economic and cultural unity.

Topic F2 - The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

This is a popular topic with majority of candidates being well-prepared. However, the overwhelming popularity of Q.3 and the quality of the responses to Q.4 would suggest that the candidates are less secure in their knowledge of the period 1871-90 which is covered in the fourth bullet point of the specification. Candidates should be encouraged to revise adequately for questions covering the whole time period.

Q.3 was by far the most popular question. Many candidates were well-prepared in terms of factual knowledge, chronological security and understanding of the process by which Prussia became the dominant state. However, this question, in particular, seemed to suffer from a failure to focus directly on the question asked and many responses achieved high Level 3 or low-secure Level 4 as a result. Many responses took economic factors to mean exclusively the role of the Zollverein (too many candidates believe that it was created by Bismarck), the focus of a previous question, or interpreted the question as being about the process of unification rather than reasons for Prussian dominance. Some candidates took a narrative commentary approach which, although at its best allowed candidates to analyse the emergence of Prussia from the 'false start' of 1848-52 to dominance over the German Empire in 1871, resulted in many being unable to cover the time period involved. The best answers were able to discuss the role of economic factors in comparison to the political, military and international advancement of Prussia and the growing weakness of Austria with some candidates able to manipulate the various historical debates surrounding the Bismarckian concept of 'blood and iron' to considerable effect.

Q.4 was answered by relatively few candidates. Those candidates who were secure in their knowledge of the period were able to produce succinct responses clearly showing the methods used against the socialists, the counter-policy of social welfare and an awareness of the role of anti-socialist legislation in Bismarck's downfall. However, there were a significant number of responses which were only able to access low Level 3 due to a generalised understanding of Bismarck's anti-socialist legislation and social welfare reforms or Level 2 due to a lack of accurate knowledge (candidates confused the attack on socialists with Kulturkampf and some even suggested that 'attempts to undermine the socialists' was a factor in the process of unification concluding the response in 1871).

Topic F3 - The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943

This is a popular topic and, although Q.5 was generally more popular, a significant number of candidates answered Q.6. Candidates are generally well-prepared for this topic but there is much variability in the quality of responses with many candidates being able to analyse effectively but lacking the ability to select relevant supporting material, particularly in questions concerning foreign policy.

Q.5. Most candidates were able to address the issues surrounding the consequences of First World War on Italy well with knowledge of the indecision, events of the war, the 'mutilated victory' and post-war economic problems. They were able to contrast/integrate these with the

long-term problems of the Liberal State, the rise of socialism and the methods of Mussolini and the Fascist Party itself in the increasing popularity of the PNF. Some excellent answers were able to focus explicitly on how the ‘disappointment’ with outcome of the war, particularly the ‘mutilated victory’ and the economic hardship, linked directly to the ideas and methods used by the Fascist Party whilst making it clear that this support was growing slowly rather than creating overwhelming support. Other responses focused on support from different groups in Italian society.

However, many answers, although able to access high Level 3 and low-secure Level 4 did not achieve the higher Levels because there was a lack of focus on the question asked. Some spent too much time describing the Italian war effort rather than focusing on the ‘disappointment’ with the outcome whilst others responded to this question in terms of Mussolini’s rise to power or the failure of the Liberal State. Many answers merely stated that the territorial ‘disappointments’ of the war led to an increase in support without explaining why. There were a significant number of candidates who did not address the end date and mentioned events which happened after 1922, particularly the Acerbo Law, death of Matteotti and the Lateran agreements. There also seems to be a growing tendency to assert that the north-south divide explains most of Italy’s problems during this period with little evidence of reasoning.

Q.6 produced some very interesting answers. The focus of the question was the success with which Mussolini increased the international prestige of Italy. It was expected that most answers would concentrate on the success with which this was achieved through his foreign policy. However, there proved to be a variety of different responses with some candidates balancing a discussion of foreign policy with comments on the role of Mussolini’s domestic policies in enhancing Italy’s international prestige. Many candidates produced engaging responses with well-reasoned discussion of the fluctuations in international approval of Mussolini’s actions. There was sound discussion of early attempts to increase prestige in the Mediterranean and at the international conferences of the late 1920s, the domestic ‘battles’, forays into Abyssinia and Spain, relations with Britain, France and Germany in the 1930s and the final disastrous period of the war to 1943. Some candidates followed the change over time through a succinct chronological narrative analysis but many found it difficult to cover the whole period or showed some chronological insecurity. In general, most answers were discursive and success depended on the ability to provide appropriate and relevant supporting material. Some weaker candidates focused solely on domestic policy and/or prestige in general.

F4 - Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75.

Candidates studying F4 are becoming more confident with the factual and chronological material involved and it was pleasing to see more candidates attempt questions covering the Franco period this session.

Q.7 was the most popular of the two questions and candidates used the material at their disposal to produce some very interesting answers. In general, candidates were able to bring together supporting material to discuss the political, military and territorial strengths of each side at the beginning of the war alongside discussions of the nature of support both internally and externally. The best responses were able to focus on the situation at the outbreak of the war itself providing some detail on the support of the different sections of the military, support from foreign powers and territorial strongholds. However, fewer candidates than might have been expected referred to the German aid given to airlift the Army of Africa. Also there was a general assumption that the Nationalists were potential stronger and more united at the outbreak because Franco was already the clear leader when his position was initially less obvious. Weaker candidates tended

to explain the reasons why the Nationalists won the Civil War but were able to include enough relevant material to achieve solid Level 3 answers.

Q.8 was less popular but the responses generally showed a good understanding of the pattern of change over time in Franco's Spain. Almost all candidates were able to give some definition of totalitarianism to establish extent and were able to refer to initial repression in the 1940s and 1950s followed by some liberalisation through technocrats, economic policies and foreign relations. Better candidates were able to discuss the nuances of totalitarianism as opposed to an authoritarian regime and were also more aware of subtle changes over time with the continuous control of information and the return to greater repressive measures in the early 1970s.

F5 - Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

The quality of responses concerning this Topic on post-war Germany is very variable ranging from extremely well-prepared candidates with excellent detailed knowledge to candidates with a very insecure understanding of the chronology of events. The textbooks available for this Topic often cover material which is useful for both AS and A2 units across a variety of boards and so it is important that centres select supporting material for the 6HI01 specification carefully. In general the Topic produces interesting responses which are often very engaging.

Q.9 was by far the most popular choice and many candidates were clearly aware of the need to determine the success of the West German economy during this period and whether it really constituted an 'economic miracle'. There were many well-reasoned answers with strong supporting material however, most struggled to discuss the whole period to 1969. There was clearly an understanding of the arguments for and against 1945 as being 'Year Zero', the role of external and chance factors and the extent to which the West German economy was built by Adenauer and Erhard. Weaker responses often narrated the story of the recovery in the 1950s with little judgement or seemed to be prepared only to answer a question required a comparison with East Germany rendering much of the answer irrelevant.

Q.10 was both less popular and less well answered. There were generally two approaches with candidates addressing the long-term reasons for the collapse of communism or focusing on the events of 1989. Both approaches led to some interesting answers integrating the external pressures from both the Soviets and the West with internal developments in East Germany. Most candidates were aware of external factors but a few candidates stated that Gorbachev's role was a completely separate factor. There was a general weakness with knowledge of both the chronology of events over the long-term, with some candidates confusing the Berlin Airlift, the building of the Berlin Wall and the opening of the Wall, and the lead up to and events of 1989.

This is a high level 3 answer

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Question 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Question 13 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

(This page is for your first answer.) How far was the collapse of communism in East Germany in 1989 due to the influence of external pressure?

was because of external pressure	was not because of external pressure
----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1989 was Gorbachev elected, perestroika and glasnost - Red Army no longer supported Honecker - debts to the BRD made DDR under its influence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Honecker long time pressure on East German's such as Berlin ^{Uprising '53} - Honecker created <u>Berlin Wall '61</u> - internal disagreements for reform |
|---|---|

people were upset but external situations allowed them to free themselves

(This page is for your first answer.) By 1989, the East German people had gone through much repression and from the hands of Communism, ^{Since the} ~~such as~~ SED was established in 1946 and was ~~the 1953 Berlin Uprising which was caused~~ governed by Walter Ulbricht until the early 70s ~~by Walter Ulbricht, leader of the SED~~ ^{East} the German people had put up with social and economical agitation from the government, an example being the 1953 Berlin Uprising which was due to a cut in wages and an increase in working hours for the East Germans. The East German's suffered from a low standard of living, especially compared to the standards of living of their neighbors West Germany which between 1951 and 1966 were experiencing huge economic growth known as the 'economic miracle'. Besides ^{economic} repression from the lack of consumer goods and high working hours, the East Germans also had to put up with tough social climates due to the East German special police, the Stasi, and had to live in constant fear due to a program created by the Stasi known as the IM which consisted of plain-clothed and civilian informants, creating an environment of repression and suspicion which was bound to create enmity towards the Communist regime and would have a large role to play in the collapse

(This page is for your first answer.) of communism in East Germany in 1989. Another important point to consider was Honecker, East German leader after Walter Ulbricht from the early 70s until ^{about} ~~the~~ ^{he} collapse of communism in East Germany, decision to construct the Berlin Wall in 1961. The Berlin Wall was very significant to the people of East Germany as although a period of economic stability pursued its construction due to the decrease in fleeing ~~to~~ the West by the East German people, it still created a added to the isolation of the East German people, especially those in Berlin, and created resentment towards the regime that cut them off from their family, friends, and neighbors in the West which would ~~create~~ be significant in the downfall of communism. All this resentment lead to its explosion in 1989 when Gorbachev was elected president of USSR and called for reform, as the East German people saw this as a time to ease their living situations and increase their standards of living and gain their freedom of speech which lead to large protests in the months following Gorbachev's words of reform. Another ~~one~~ reason that the fall of communism in East Germany was internal is because of how ~~Honecker~~ Honecker reacted to the protests, as he ^{suppressed them with batons} wanted to ^{and he} even gun them down, and then lead to an internal

(This page is for your first answer.) divide in the government of the East as many opposed Honecker's reluctance to allow ~~ref~~ Gorbachev's reform policies to flow. However, considering external factors, it must be understood that since the creation of the SED in 1956, it was always just a puppet for the Soviet country USSR and would abide by what Stalin and the USSR told it. So, the 1953 Berlin Uprising that caused so much resentment, for example, was put down by the Red Army, Russia's military, to prove its influence over East Germany. The seven year plan which ~~was~~ was introduced in 1957* and caused a decrease in wages and an even larger increase in working hours than before plus the ~~Berlin Ultimatum~~ Khrushchev's, the USSR president at the time, Berlin Ultimatum and the U-2 crisis created the instability which led to the construction of the Berlin wall in '61 which would create resentment in the East German people and later lead to the fall of communism in 1989 in East Germany. ~~As~~, we must consider that it was when Gorbachev announced that there would be reforms in the Eastern Bloc countries which led to the East Germans' rush for freedom and later the collapse of the communism. Another significant matter to consider with external influence is the role Willie Brandt's, leader of West Germany

(This page is for your first answer.) 1969-74, Ostpolitik and policies which lead to the west giving 1.2 bn dollars in loans to the East. This created a form of influence over the East which, added to Gorbachev's unwillingness to provide the Red Army as armed resistance, led to the resignation of Honecker and the fall of communism in East Germany. In conclusion, it was although the external influences of Russia and the BRD lead to Honecker's inability to withstand the East German populace's protests, it must be considered that the more significant reason for the fall of communism ^{in EGM} were the internal factors which lead to the people's dissatisfaction and wanting to throw communism out. So, for example, although Gorbachev announced reforms in the Eastern Bloc countries in 1989, it should be taken into consideration that Gorbachev was still a communist and the only reason he announced the reforms of perestroika and glasnost was to make communism more appealing to the Eastern Bloc states population. So, it can be argued in this essay that the collapse of communism in East Germany in 1989 was more so in response to the internal policies and dissatisfaction in the country than the external influences of the country.

F6 - The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism

As with Topic E5 the textbooks which cover this period are generally written to cover a variety of AS and A2 units across different boards it is, therefore, important to identify the relevant supporting material which corresponds with the specification.

Q.11 was overwhelmingly the most popular questions. Most candidates were able to explain why Israel was so successful in surviving suggesting a variety of reasons such as national unity, external military and diplomatic support, disunity amongst Arabs and military tactics and to suggest which was the most important and/or the inter-relationship between the different factors. The best answers were able to focus on and, in some cases, question the phrases 'so successful' and 'threats to survival'. Some candidates concentrated on explaining Israeli success through a narrative commentary of the Arab-Israeli wars whilst others produced a multi-factored answer. Most candidates are very well versed in discussing each of the Arab-Israeli conflicts succinctly and as such are able to cover the time period well. However, the multi-factored answers tended to struggle to produce the most relevant and appropriate supporting evidence connected to a particular theme.

Q.12 appears to have been answered by very few candidates and, in general, seem to have been very weak. A few responses showed an awareness of the role of Iran in Middle East relations during the period 1979-2001 and/or were able to discuss differing reasons for instability such as the Palestinian question, Iraqi policies, non-Iranian Islamist politics and external factors. However, several answers also showed virtually no knowledge of events with Iran being mistaken for Israel and the time period discussed finishing in 1979.

Topic F7 - From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany, 1918-45.

Overall the answers to questions on Topic F7 were disappointing mainly due to the lack of secure chronological and factual knowledge. There were a significant number of responses which had some general understanding but were awarded Level 2 marks due to a lack of awareness of the time period being discussed and due to major factual inaccuracies.

Q.13 was by far the most popular question with a wide variety of responses. Candidates used two approaches to the question with either a focus on the events of Hitler's appointment in January 1933 or a broader response addressing the longer-term reasons as to why he became Chancellor. Many candidates had a detailed understanding of the intrigue surrounding the appointment in January and the electoral progress of the Nazi Party. The best responses often argued that it was the political intrigue which led to his appointment but without the electoral success essentially created by the consequences of the Great Depression Hitler would not have been in the position to be appointed in the first place. There were many competent responses which although well-related to the focus did not address the question directly with seemingly pre-prepared answers on the Nazi rise to power. Some higher Level 3 responses clearly had some understanding of the factors leading to Hitler becoming Chancellor but could not see the links between them; the ability of Nazi propaganda to manipulate voters was often stated as being entirely divorced from electoral success, for example. Disappointingly there were many answers with major factual inaccuracies and confused chronology. Some candidates answered with references to the period 1919-23, many candidates believed that Ebert was President at the time, hyper-inflation was regularly cited as having been caused by the Great Depression and, despite January 1933 being explicitly stated in the question, many answers focused on the period January 1933 to August 1943; a number of candidates believed that Hitler was elected Chancellor through elections held in January 1933.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14	

(This page is for your second answer.)

Plan - Electoral Success.
- Troubled times -
- Failure of Brüning, Schleicher
~~Adolf Hitler~~ - Model for Hitler

In 1928 the Nazi party only had ~~about~~ 2.6% of the votes and the political power was negligible. However in only just 5 years their leader had become Chancellor. He was appointed ~~as~~ by Hindenburg, the President, who had previously disliked Hitler. There are several factors involved in Hitler's appointment as Chancellor.

Firstly Hitler's appointment was due to the Nazi electoral success. By September 1930 the Nazis had gained 18.6% of the votes and by July 1932 they secured 37.3%. This was a remarkable rise in support for the Nazis. This meant that the Nazis had ~~as~~ the most votes of any party but not an

(This page is for your second answer.) overall majority. There ~~was~~ was a sudden increase in support for the Nazis but mainly from the protestant middle classes and not the crucial cities. However ~~to~~ ~~is~~ 37.3% of the votes was still a substantial achieved due to the political set-up of proportional representation. This large percentage of the votes made Hitler seem ~~to~~ the most suitable candidate ~~to~~ but as the other had the Chancellor was appointed by Hindenburg and didn't necessarily have to be the leader of the largest party.

~~Another~~ ^{Another} significant reason for Hitler's appointment as Chancellor was the failures of Schleier, Papen and Brüning, the previous Chancellors. The Chancellor had been frequently changed in the years before 1933 and the post was unstable. Schleier and Papen both failed in bringing some stability to the position. ~~Brüning~~ ^{Brüning} also suffered failures. In ~~1932~~ July 1932 he dissolved the Reichstag in the hope to gain more support for the SPD but instead the Nazis gained votes. Hindenburg saw the failures of the previous Chancellors and decided that a strong leader such as Hitler was needed to bring stability to the Reichstag and Weimar system. Additionally Hindenburg had previously disliked Hitler ~~but~~ and may have only appointed him as he knew it would cause some attention and slight controversy. This was to take ~~Hitler~~ the spotlight away from ~~the~~

(This page is for your second answer.) Hindenburg ^{as} there was ^{an} ~~an~~ investigation into possible corruption by Hindenburg ~~of~~ over his estate. These were factors which meant ~~that~~ even though Hitler was not the favored choice his was still appointed Chancellor.

A further reason for Hitler's appointment was the weakness of the political ~~system~~ system and the economy. Germany was suffering under ~~the~~ difficult times. Unemployment was on the rise, reaching 6.1 million in 1932. The economy was ~~in~~ a dire state with 50,000 businesses ~~closed~~ and 5 major banks ~~collapsing~~ after the Wall Street crash. This meant there was growing contempt for the ~~the~~ government and ~~an~~ intense pressure ~~of~~ on Hindenburg to appoint a strong Chancellor. The weakness of the political system also allowed Hitler in the ~~the~~ first place and continued to allow him to gain support. He however did not manage to gain the support of ~~many~~ the elites but they underestimated Hitler and thought they could control him if they let him into power.

Overall the remarkable rise in electoral results did play a significant role in the appointment of Hitler as Chancellor. However it wasn't the crucial factor. The troubled time firstly led to the rise in support and secondly exaggerated the failures of the other Chancellors. This was the most vital reason because

(This page is for your second answer.) it ultimately persuaded Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as chancellor. Nazi support even went down in November 1932 when they only got 33.1% of the votes, but Hitler was still appointed.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer relates well to the focus of the question by discussing the given factor and other factors and coming to a judgment in the conclusion. There are a reasonable range of factors with adequate although not always detailed supporting material. However, there is some lack of development and although there is judgement in the conclusion this is not integral to the essay as a whole.

Q.14 was answered by significantly fewer candidates many of whom, as with Q.4 (F2), had an insecure understanding of the chronological and factual detail required. This question covered elements of both bullet point 3 and bullet point 4 of the specification. Bullet point 4 of the specification perhaps deviates most from the 'traditional' coverage of Weimar and Nazi Germany as it requires a specific understanding of the events in and impact of the Second World War in Germany. There are several episodes of the documentary series 'The World at War' which specifically deal in some detail with the situation inside Germany during the war years showing clear changes over time. A significant minority of candidates were unable to recognise the dates 1939-45 as corresponding to the war years and did not refer to Germany being at war at all whilst a larger number of candidates saw this as being incidental rather than pivotal to the question. Many of these candidates read the question as covering the period 1929-45 (with Nazis coming to power in 1929) or even 1919-25 whilst others wrote out the title accurately but used material almost exclusively from 1933-39 with a brief reference to the outbreak of war making things worse. As many of the social policies being described did carry on into the war years candidates were often able to achieve high Level 2 and low Level 3 but did not show enough understanding to access the higher marks. The question was also framed with reference to German citizens in order to broaden the responses in terms of German society and to allow for a greater discussion than just that of minorities (with some presumed awareness of the loss of citizenship rights of German Jews). However, many candidates wrote almost exclusively about either German Jews and/or minorities; a significant number of candidates beginning their answers with a list of minorities followed by a generalised description of social policy towards 'asocials' from 1933 onwards.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14 | |

(This page is for your second answer.) To what extent did the lives of the ~~East~~ German citizens worsen during the years 1939-45?

<p>→ mitl x</p> <p>→ Industri x</p> <p>did</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inflation - ration decree - - no food 	<p>→ landown ✓</p> <p>→ big industri ✓</p> <p>farmers ✓</p> <p>did not</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - landowners gained more land - autarky - industrialization - foundation of nation - big industries
---	---

(This page is for your second answer.) In 1939 Hitler, the leader of the Nazi party and fuhrer of Germany, attacked Poland to begin his conquest of Europe. We consider how the citizens of Germany's lives were affected firstly ~~it~~ pre-war policies must be considered. By 1939, Germany was enjoying a period of economic growth and industrialization, and 3 years before the attack on Poland had established a four-year plan which was meant to increase armament production and attain autarky so that the country can survive without imports. So by 1939 ~~the~~ most German's had good living standards and there was good employment rates. The German's benefitted from the emergence of World War II which lasted from 1939 ('41 was the beginning of Total War) and ended in 1945, as the increase in occupied lands meant there was cheap land to be purchased which created a huge benefit, especially for landowners as landowners enjoyed Nazi years. Also, as war was waged on, large industries had more and more to sell which meant more jobs for the German people and richer Germans. This made the living standards of the German people quite

(This page is for your second answer.) high. Plus, as Germany occupied countries such as Poland and later most of Russia, they began to gain more and more political prisoners, Jews, sub-humans, and others to enslave which were then used, under Albert Speer's, minister of economics during World War II for Germany, radicalization decree as to cheap labor which further increased the capacity of industries in Germany. The Germany, by the start of the war in 1939, had almost achieved full autarky as only rubber and some other goods needed importing, which helped the German people during the war. However, as the years into the passed the German economy began to fall due to poor economical decisions made by Hermann Goering, minister of economics before the start of the war, as his four-year plan did not do as good as was expected plus because of the onset of an early war which began ^{a year} before the four-year plan would finish. In the years of 1943, the war on, the German population would begin to fill the gulf of the economic downturn, which would worsen the living standards of the German people. For one thing, as the four-

(This page is for your second answer.) The four year plan focused mainly on rearmament, the production of food began to slump ~~to~~ which proved to be a huge problem when austerity did not set in fully by the beginning of the war. The consequences of these were so drastic that by the end of the war in 1945 millions of Germans were starving. Throughout the years of war, as Germany created more and more enemies (the entering of the US in '45) more guns and ammunition were needed. So there was more focus on armament production than even basic goods so that by the end of the war toilet paper was as scarce as gold, thus showing the decline in living standards. In order ~~to~~ increase the production of weapons ~~and~~ ~~to~~ which were falling due to the death of men at war which would mean less laborers, women had to be recruited to work in the factories and at ~~a~~ ^{that} point there was ~~almost~~ plus the introduction of rationing due to large inflation. By the end of the war ^{Hitler's} ~~it~~ ^{degree of} ~~became~~ ^{rationaliz-} ~~a~~ ^{ation} a very significant factor of the decrease of the standards of living of the German people was the allies' use of blanket bombing which led to the destruction of large populated industrial

(This page is for your second answer.) area, such as Cologne, which made many German's homeless. Thus ~~was~~, in conclusion, although some people in Germany benefitted from the increase of land due to Hitler's conquest, and for a short period of time the four-year plan's ^{policy} use of re-armament lead to an increase in employment, due to Hitler's hasty decision to invade Poland and the lack of preparation time for the German economy to sustain a war, the German people saw large and significant detrimental ~~at~~ and deteriorating living standards throughout the war until finally in 1945, millions of German's were homeless and ~~poor~~ poor.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer shows some understanding of the focus of the question and attempts analysis. However, the essay is weak in organisation and the supporting material although often relevant is insecure.

Having brought attention to the disappointing nature of many of the responses, there were, however, some very good answers. Many candidates were able to organise the knowledge available to them to write good Level 3 and low Level 4 answers which attempted to show change over time during this period with references to German 'prosperity' combined with high morale at the beginning of the war and the changes which inevitably occurred as tide of the war turned with rationing, bombing and invasion. Others were able to access the higher levels with a clear analysis of the situation in 1939, acknowledging that certain elements in German society were prospering but that the 'guns versus butter' debate was already going on, that minorities were under threat and that some German citizens were already questioning the Nazi propaganda machine, compared to the changes over time as the war effort increased. These answers often referred to rationing in more specific detail, the requirements to provide for the war effort, the debate over women in work, decreases in working conditions, specific bombing raids and the experiences in different parts of Germany.

In conclusion, as one of the examiners commented in their final report, "Able candidates wrote articulately and coherently and demonstrated a logical mind as well as good linguistic skills. Weaker answers were characterised by poor sentence construction, spelling and poor writing skills, which was a limiting factor in some answers where candidates clearly knew their history but struggled or failed to produce a coherent readable response."

Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	37	32	27	22
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US024072 June 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

