

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History
(6HI03) Paper D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 2016

Publications Code 46671

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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.

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

Section A

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>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 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 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.

A02b (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 targets period of 1900-14, and asks candidates to examine the significance of political developments in Germany in reaching a judgement on the extent to which it moved towards a democracy. Candidates are likely to explore the following issues. Whilst candidates are not expected to detail the formation of constitutional government from 1871, they may indeed argue that some of the facets of this were in place well before 1900, with the Constitution of 1871 having established elections to the Reichstag, with a franchise extending to men aged 25 and over, with a range of parties representing different interest groups at the national level. However, candidates may argue over the limitations of this system, such as government ministers not being accountable to the Reichstag. Candidates may also explore the role of the Federal Council, which represented all individual states, although many may argue that Prussia's holding of 17/58 seats gave them a veto which was used in a manner which limited genuine democracy. The dominance of Prussia is likely to be explored in relation to the Kaiser and the Imperial Chancellor, the latter of whom was the Prussian Minister-President, appointed and accountable only to the Kaiser himself. Chancellor's largely served the Kaiser's interests, although the likes of Bethmann's (failed) attempt to reform the three-tier system may be seen as intent to broaden democracy. The powers and role of the Kaiser may be considered at length, with control over much of policy, and some candidates may debate the extent to which this was personal rule or even served to represent elite interests, neither of which are likely to be seen as genuinely democratic. In countering, candidates may argue that the Reichstag did have important powers regarding approval of military and imperial budgets. Additionally, the Reichstag and Federal Council both had a say in approving legislation. Thus, whilst they were not the initiators of policy, the size of the Centre and later SPD parties meant significant concessions were made, such as those by Bulow extending social welfare across the period 1900-1908. Alternatively it may be argued that the policy of <i>Sammlungspolitik</i> was used to block the rise of social democratic parties, although the fallout from the budget of 1909 and the success of the SPD in the 1912 elections highlight the limits of this. Some candidates may examine politics at the level of the Lander, and indeed may argue there was a genuine federal democracy in terms of the freedom over policy which individual states operated, with a variety of electoral systems and arrangements in place. However, few were truly democratic, and it is likely many candidates will examine the role of the Prussian three-tier system maintained Junker power in Germany's most powerful state. Particular events may be used to examine the extent of democracy, such as the Zabern affair, which may be used to highlight the limited power of the Reichstag and Chancellor, although candidates may point to how this demonstrated to elites and the right that a military coup undermining what democracy did exist could not take place. Foreign policy is likely to feature as an issue in some, possibly in relation to the Kaiser's role, the Reichstag's control over budgets and the relationship between policies such as <i>Weltpolitik</i> and <i>Sammlungspolitik</i>. Candidates are also likely to explore the developments that took place around the war. <i>Burgfrieden</i> may be argued to have been a suspension of tensions, with promise of further democratic reform.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of Germany's political development in the period, culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate 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 lack balance across the period. 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>Candidates are asked to examine the opposition that existed within Germany during the period of the Second World War, and assess the significance of this. Candidates are likely to draw from a range of material. There is likely to be extensive coverage of the opposition from the left, most successfully showing itself in the spy network known as the Red Orchestra, from the Churches, from youth groups like the Edelweiss Pirates and the White Rose Group and - arguably most dangerously - within the army and the Abwehr. On the one hand, it may be argued that wartime presented both motivations and opportunities for protest of some form to manifest itself, and each of these groups may be considered significant in some sense. On the other hand it can be argued that the opposition in all its forms was never serious enough to threaten the regime, although the likes of Himmler took it seriously and the consequent repression was one of the reasons why it remained largely ineffective. Points raised on this side of the argument might be the handicap raised for the Communists by the Nazi-Soviet Pact from 1939 to 1941, the oath of loyalty taken seriously by many serving officers and the widespread consensual support that the regime appeared to enjoy from broad swathes of the public. Candidates may also examine the strength of the Nazi state in evaluating the extent to which opposition was significant in posing a threat, although the focus should remain on assessing opposition rather than lengthy digressions on the terror state. Whilst detailed coverage of particular of events and issues, such as the July Plot, are likely to feature, the focus should be firmly on assessing the significance of this for the higher levels. Candidates may even explore the nature of opposition, e.g. consideration of distinctions between passive resistance and opposition may feature, although again, this needs to be framed in manner which answers the question. Higher level responses may seek to establish criteria in which to judge significance, e.g. the size, proximity to Hitler and the leadership, the extent to which they were potentially able to damage the war effort, etc, or even make distinctions over the period.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of opposition to the Nazi regime over the period 1939-45, culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate 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 lack balance across the period. 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 the entire period of the Second World War, and candidates are asked to give a judgement on the extent to which the Battle of Britain was the most significant contribution of those made by Britain. Candidates are likely to draw from a range of arguments and issues. With regards the battle of Britain itself, candidates are likely to examine Britain's willingness, and ultimate success in, fighting on rather than accepting the terms offered by the Nazis. It is likely candidates may argue Britain was close to defeat, and the crucial nature of the Battle of Britain in terms of the survival of the RAF specifically and Britain's survival more generally as a fighting force is likely to be linked to later developments, such as examining the Luftwaffe's failure to gain aerial superiority or the extent to which this contributed to US sympathy and support at a time when Britain stood alone. Germany's indefinite postponement of Operation Sealion is also likely to feature; candidates may explore German error in this, such as arguing that Hitler's decision to focus on bombing cities as being the defining issue in preventing defeat and subsequent invasion, although for the higher levels the focus should firmly remain on Britain's contribution to the war effort. Candidates may also examine the significance of the battle of Britain as the first reversal in combat for Nazi Germany, and the impact events had on public morale. In exploring other contributions, candidates may draw from a range. Early events such as the Norwegian Campaign or Britain's role in prior to the fall of France and the Dunkirk evacuation may feature, although candidates would be likely to argue the contribution made with these was limited, although damage to the <i>Kriegsmarine</i> in the Battles of Narvik may be noted. Candidates may also examine the successes in North Africa, against Italy in 1940, although it is likely the later efforts such as the First and Second Battles of El Alamein (in July and October/November 1942) would feature more, stalling the Axis and then beginning their military reversal, also being significant in terms of access to oil and other supplies through the Suez Canal. Candidates may argue the significance of the Battle of the Atlantic, not least because of its duration, arguing that by May 1943 the greatest threat from the German navy had been overcome, although it should be remembered that this contribution was alongside (in particular) American and Canadian allies. Similarly candidates may examine Britain's role alongside U.S. Army Air Forces in the aerial war over Germany, and this is an area where it is likely more able candidates will explore the relationship between this and the Battle of Britain. Other theatres that may feature heavily include the war in the Mediterranean and the slow advance through Italy of 1943-44, Operation Overlord and the liberation of France, or even the contribution of mobilisation in order to keep going throughout the war. Candidates are not expected to address the full range from such an exhaustive list, although at the higher levels there should be relative evaluation of these issues.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the contribution made by the Battle of Britain, culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate 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 lack balance across the period. 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>Candidates are expected to offer an assessment of the home front during the Second World War, examining the contention that maintaining high morale was crucial to maintaining the war effort. Candidates may explore a range of issues across the home front, such as social change or wartime production, and even related issues such as evacuation, although for the higher levels sufficient focus should be given to the stated issue of maintaining morale. In arguing for the proposition, candidates may emphasise how fears over the loss of morale never materialised, pointing to the general response to coping with the Blitz, drawing on evidence from Mass Observation and Home Intelligence reports. Candidates may point to the efforts of individuals such as Brendan Bracken as Minister for Information from 1941, or the leadership of Churchill, and may even examine attempts to balance the needs of total war with attempts to lighten the mood, with provision of various entertainments, and even point to a lack of rationing on alcohol and cigarettes. In countering this, candidates may suggest that the 'Dunkirk Spirit' was somewhat exaggerated, or even point to the work of Angus Calder in showing how the Myth of the Blitz was to some extent a construct of wartime propaganda, possibly examining how morale in heavily-hit areas such as Coventry. At the higher levels, candidates are also likely to weigh the significance of wartime spirits against other issues such as wartime production, arguing the latter played a more crucial role. It may also be argued that exaggerated government fears over morale meant energies were expended on this with marginal returns, and that spirits in the main were maintained by the very nature of the threat that was faced, although this could be balanced against fears of public complacency. In examining other areas, candidates may range across a issues such as rationing, disruption to the family unit as a result of evacuation, the mobilisation of women and conscription, and may link such issues to morale, as well as arguments over the success of mobilisation for total war whilst avoiding social breakdown. The issue of social change is also likely to feature in many, and in some cases may focus heavily on the impact the war had on women. Thus, a range of responses may be expected, although for the higher levels, candidates should deal with the issue of morale thoroughly alongside any other issues developed, and in doing the latter should remain firmly on the analytical demands of the question.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation of the significance of maintaining morale, culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate 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 lack consistent focus. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

Section B

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>This question centres on whether or not the responsibility for the outbreak of the First World War lay with the Germany. Source 1 is likely to be identified by many as that which relates to the contention in the question, emphasising long-term preparations towards war and the role of the Kaiser in this. Candidates may indeed see this more as an unfortunate by-product of the 'imperialist paranoia' that Clark (Source 3) refers to, or relate the description of Willhelm II to Martel's reference to 'management of that power' (Source 2), perhaps even seeing the Kaiser as an unfortunate figurehead at such a crucial juncture in Germany's development. Paxman's reference to 'waiting for an opportunity' (Source 1) may also be seized upon in reference to the July Crisis, although any knowledge of this should be firmly focused on the debate. Source 2 offers some evidence which may be used to support the contention in the question, highlighting Germany's encirclement, and it is likely many good responses will develop this to explore the extent to which this was genuine, exaggerated by paranoia or indeed, as Source 2 suggests, even wilfully exaggerated by some who saw war as a means to solve internal problems. A discriminating factor in analysis here is likely to be how carefully candidates qualify points. 'Diplomatic crises' (Source 2) such as the Moroccan Crises or relations with Britain over naval expansion are likely to be offered, amongst others. Stronger responses will explore responsibility through these, and the best are likely to offer reasoning as to not just the extent to which Germany was responsible for escalating tension, but as to whether this was the result of outright aggression or a blundering response to pressures both internal and external. As such, candidates may use Source 2 to argue for and against the contention, although it is expected more will conclude that the mishandling of the, dynamic growth of German power' in the period did amount to some degree of aggression. Source 3 is most likely to be used to counter the contention in the question, with Clark emphasising how it is erroneous to place blame on Germany and her leaders, suggesting that culpability was shared, and even then more through mistaken blundering than any 'coherent intention'. Candidates are likely to focus on how Source 3 suggests issues such as 'belligerence' and 'imperialist paranoia' were not unique to Germany, and higher-level responses are likely to use points relating to the 'shared political culture' and 'multipolar and genuinely interactive' to explore the differing explanations, highlighting developments in the relationship between the eventual belligerents. Many candidates are also likely to pick up on the reference to Fischer, with the more astute recognising the qualified acknowledgement Clark offers.</p> <p>Such issues may be developed with specific knowledge of the arms race and the alliance system, and are likely to focus on the role Germany played in both of these. References to views and theories such as <i>Primat der Innenpolitik</i> (likely referencing Wehler) may feature heavily, although will be those candidates who apply and explore these in the context of the question that perform the best. Knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan is likely to feature in many responses, although more successful answers will explore the extent to which this plan can be seen as aggressive, being as it were defensive in conception but ultimately serving to be offensive.</p> <p>At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter should be deployed in exploring the validity of the arguments in the given sources. At level 4 there should be a real debate on whether or not German aggression was decisive in bringing about war. Candidates in conducting this debate will show a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case supporting the proposition referred to in Source 1. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or even extensive own knowledge displayed, although this will not be integrated in any real analysis. At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>This question addresses the nature of the Nazi regime and the degree of support it enjoyed. Clearly the proposition arises from Source 4, where the case is made that the Nazi regime did not essentially rely on terror but sought a consensus of support. Source 4 emphasises Hitler's concern with building a regime with the active consent of the masses, and whilst it does not deny the existence of the apparatus of terror, this is seen as both secondary in creating support, and with encouraging ordinary Germans in 'actively cooperating with the police and the Party'. This line is clearly contradicted by Source 5, which stresses the legal basis for establishing a police state. Emphasis is placed on the SS and Gestapo. The implications of this are clearly a regime relying not on consensus but fear, and good responses will explore the apparent contradictions between these first two sources. Source 6 might be cross referenced with Source 4 which it can be argued that it basically supports insofar as Germans participated in incentive schemes such as the KdF, although there is less to suggest that Germans were truly won over by this, and Baranowski (Source 6) makes clear distinctions over this being only open to the 'racial community', a point which may be cross-referenced back to Source 4 in relation to gaining consent of the (majority) of the 'community' for any actions against outcast (Source 6), or Source 5's references to the camp system of the 'safeguards' ensuring equality for all were 'shredded'. All three sources can be enlarged upon by reference to own knowledge, notably the role of the security forces in Source 5 and the Gellately thesis that the Germans policed themselves or the popularity of Nazis policies mentioned in Source 6.</p> <p>In applying own knowledge to extend the debate and assess the given views, candidates may draw on a range of detail concerning the use of propaganda, the position of Hitler, perceptions of the wider regime and the police state, and many candidates are likely to comment on how the nature of the regime places limitations on the evidence available for assessing popular support or indeed repression. Candidates should also be rewarded where knowledge of the historiographical debate is appropriately applied. For example, they might recognise Robert Gellately, his studies of the Gestapo and the emphasis he placed on popular collaboration with them.</p> <p>At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making critical distinctions, such as over the degree of genuine support, or the extent to which this applied across the population or the period in question. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one-sided case supporting the proposition. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or even extensive own knowledge displayed, possibly on some aspects of propaganda or Hitler. At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge.</p>	40

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>This question targets the controversy surrounding Chamberlain's policy of appeasement. The proposition offered is that this was a disaster for Britain, and candidates are most likely to begin with examining the arguments of Source 7, which clearly offers some support for this view, including how weakened any possibility of a united stance against Hitler's aggression, effectively sacrificed a useful ally in Czechoslovakia and undermined the diplomatic position of Britain, with the misguided trust being revealed as a fallacy so soon after the Munich agreement. Candidates may also pick up on the point regarding Munich being appeasement being without any real mutual concession', and may also pick up on the implications that this strengthened the hand of Hitler. Higher level responses will be able to explore these issues in the light of the other sources and their own knowledge, possibly exploring this in the light of earlier evidence to Hitler's expansionist aims. Stronger responses should also make clear distinctions over which of the criticisms are valid in terms of appeasement being a disaster for Britain. Source 8 in the main offers evidence which candidates may use to refute the contention, highlighting the weak position in terms of both Britain's ability to fight, and in rallying international support to stand against Hitler. However, Kershaw (Source 8) does also suggest that Chamberlain's own handling of this made things worse, and as such this offers opportunities to explore the debate. Source 9 also offers insight into Chamberlain's own decision making, although it is likely candidates will see this as the most sympathetic of the sources. As with Source 8, Source 9 details arguments relating to Britain's military preparedness, in particular focusing on the timing of the Czechoslovakian Crisis. Candidates may even examine the extent to which this portrayal sees Chamberlain's policy as being pragmatic, with his own decision making being level-headed when set against a public and international community which needed to be steeled for the realities of another war, a point which may be cross-referenced to the references to Kristallnacht and March 1939 in Source 7.</p> <p>In drawing on own knowledge, candidates may extend the analysis of appeasement to other events and issues in the period 1937-39, with the Anschluss, the wider timeframe of the Czechoslovakian Crisis and events up to the outbreak of war. Many candidates are also likely to examine the relative preparedness of Britain and Germany in late 1938 and 1939, and the contentious nature of evidence over this and Hitler's satisfaction or disappoint at Munich mean a variety of approaches may be taken, although the material should be firmly focused on the debate and integrated with the sources for the higher levels.</p> <p>At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. At level 4 there should be a real debate on whether the policies followed by Chamberlain's were a misjudgement. Candidates in conducting this debate will show a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one sided case supporting the proposition referred to in Source 1. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources and possibly extensive own knowledge displayed, for instance about the events surrounding Munich, although this will not be fully directed at the debate. At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question clearly targets the controversy surrounding the expectations in Britain in regarding post-war reform and reconstruction. The proposition for debate clearly comes from Source 10 and support is provided by reference to the ‘spate of social legislation’ that emanated from the period, with Marwick et al detailing a range of measures enacted, linking this to the wartime experience and the subsequent government under Attlee, and in particular tracing this back to the Beveridge Report (1942). Thus Source 10 clearly argues that social reform was stimulated by the wartime experience, suggesting that the subsequent government and legislation was to some extent a product of this. Source 11 accepts this insofar as Wilson acknowledges the electorate’s choice of the Attlee government and their ‘very clearly explained programme’, which was based in the experience of war, and was evidently socialist. However, candidates are more likely to use Source 11 to challenge the given proposition; Wilson clearly suggests that, from the perspective of the electorate, this commitment was transitory, particularly as the costs and effectiveness of these policies became evident. Source 12 is likely to be used alongside both these perspectives, offering a qualified view, which overall is likely to be used to support the contention. Pope highlights how government organisation of resources strengthened the case of those arguing for social reform. Whilst Source 12 acknowledges that there were limitations to what could be realistically be expected, particularly considering the financial implications of total war, it argues that overall, governments remained broadly committed to an agenda of social welfare, a point which many may explore in the light of the measures listed in Source 10. The extent to which expectations were realistic, shared and maintained across different section of society and government may also be examined in relation to Source 11.</p> <p>Candidates may apply contextual knowledge to explore the extent to which a rejection of the Attlee government at the ballot box amounted to a turn against a commitment to social reform. Candidates may even examine the extent to which the wartime experience was a genuinely collective experience which nursed ideas of social reform, or was the significance of the war more in the experience and influence gained by Labour politicians, trade unionists and reformers such as Beveridge, and thus the war acted as a platform to further this agenda.</p> <p>At level 5 there will be a sustained and evaluative argument precisely supported from both the sources and considerable own knowledge. The latter may be deployed in making a case relating to expectations for the post-war, with a sharp focus on both reconstruction and reform, and candidates may explore the different conceptions of the latter. At level 4 there should be a real debate, showing a real awareness of the different perspectives of the three sources, which will be expanded upon. At level 3, candidates should begin to integrate the sources and own knowledge, probably producing a rather one-sided case supporting the proposition, reliant on Source 10. At level 2 there may be some cross referencing of the sources or even extensive own knowledge displayed, possibly about the economic condition of Britain in 1945, although this will not be used to develop relevant analysis. At level 1 candidates will offer some simple statements drawn from either the sources or own knowledge.</p>	40