

Examiners' Report
June 2016

GCE History 8HI0 1G

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2016

Publications Code 8HI0_1G_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

It was pleasing to see responses of a decent standard from candidates attempting the new AS Paper 1G which covers *Germany and West Germany, 1918–89*. The paper is divided into three sections. Section A and Section B contain a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in breadth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts – cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/difference and significance. Section C contains one compulsory question that assesses the ability to analyse and evaluate historical interpretations (AO3) concerning how far Hitler's foreign policy was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1939. Candidates have to answer three questions – one from each Section.

Generally speaking, candidates found Section C more challenging mainly because some of them were not entirely clear about how to analyse and evaluate the extracts they were presented with. Moreover, the detailed knowledge base required in Section C to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the extracts was also often absent. Having said this, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A, B or C.

The ability range was wide, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Sections A and B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section A and B essays was a lack of knowledge. It is important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any of the four Themes, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the lack of effective opposition to the Nazi regime in the years 1933–45 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (popular support for Hitler) and a range of other factors (e.g. the role of the terror state, the use of effective propaganda and the problems for groups and individuals in resisting the regime). Judgements made about the relative importance of popular support for Hitler were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for the lack of effective opposition to the Nazi regime in the years 1933–45. Low scoring answers were also often off focus or essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. discussing one aspect of Hitler's personal qualities as a leader). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

This was the more popular question in section A. Candidates were well prepared for this question and there proved to be a number of ways of going about it. Stronger candidates set out clear criteria by which the answer could be tackled, while the weaker candidates tended simply to assume Hitler's popularity and assert this as a given. The example response offered here shows a structure which worked well.

I disagree that popular support for Hitler was the main reason for lack of opposition to the Nazis. One of the reasons for this is because the repression of opponents was key to preventing any opposition movement from gaining strength, and although Hitler's strong economic policies did gain him popularity, which helped the Nazi cause, it had not taken him long to consolidate his dictatorship and his stranglehold on the ruling of Germany.

Repression was key to the survival of the regime. Two groups that were especially important were the Gestapo and the SS, led by Heinrich Himmler. The Gestapo did not wear uniform and were the Nazi's secret police force. They would attempt to seek out

opponents of the state who were quieter in their opinions, and this was possible because ordinary members of the public could be Gestapo officers, because no-one knew who they were, because of a lack of uniform. The public knew about this, and the vast majority of them did not speak against Hitler, perhaps a fear of their ~~neighbour~~

(Section A continued) neighbour potentially being an officer. The Nazis therefore caused a sense of distrust ~~in~~ within the public for one another, making alliances ^{against them} difficult.

If ~~members of the public were~~ people were caught, the likelihood is that they were sent to one of the numerous concentration camps run by the SS. 500000 political prisoners were sent to these camps throughout the length of the regime, where many would then die. This brutal punishment was a strong deterrent to speaking against the Nazis; again, it created a sense of fear within the population.

Hitler, did, however, have some popular support in his time as Führer. The slogan 'One People, One Nation, One Leader' was spread as propaganda, by one of his most loyal ~~colleg~~ colleagues, Joseph Goebbels, minister of propaganda. This office did a huge amount to ~~spread~~ spread good news about the Nazis to the public, and took inspiration from Italy and Mussolini's 'cult of Il Duce' to

promote Hitler as a truly great leader, and the 'saviour of Germany'. However, the Nazis' main selling point to the population in the 1933 election, where they gained a majority, was the promise to fix the economy after ^{the} disaster of the 1929 Wall Street crash. From a peak of over 2.5 million unemployed in 1932, the Nazis halved this during the first 4 years of their power. Other policies such as

(Section A continued) agriculture helped too. The minister of this office, Richard Darré, forced German farmers into regulations over which crops to produce, to fuel the German economy, because less imports were needed. They were fined 10000 RM for failing to comply, so many did, and it made 80% of all produce being German by 1937. The drive towards war and the Four-Year Plan helped give the economy a real drive behind it, due to the production of new materials like Buna and synthetic oil. All helped the economy recover very well, and this led to popular support from the public towards Hitler.

Despite this, there were clear obstacles if people did want to oppose Hitler. In February 1933, Hitler persuaded the then-President Hindenburg to pass the Decree for the Protection of the People and the State, which gave Hitler emergency powers to rule by decree for a short time, and crucially, to arrest opponents of the state. After the Reichstag Fire, he blamed KPD # was banned, and then

In March, the Enabling Act was passed, ~~was~~ which meant that all political parties were banned. It was then tricky to restart movements due to the Gestapo seeking out opponents. Certainly, these rules ruled out diplomacy as a method of gaining power, and alliances were now ~~near~~ impossible to have. A small group of people voicing their opinions did not match up well to the

(Section A continued) permitted SS's 1 million soldiers, so force was now almost impossible as a means of gaining power. Many therefore saw opposition as pointless and dangerous.

In conclusion, the main reason was not Hitler's popularity, but rather the repression constitution and repression, ^{particularly} that led to the retention of power. The Gestapo and the SS were a lethal partnership that were ruthless in picking opponents out, and punishing them, which deterred others from following.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response offers evidence on a range of key issues centred around the popular support Hitler enjoyed set against the terror and coercion used to enforce submission. Popular support is shown to be underpinned by economic improvement and the cultivation of the Hitler Myth, while coercion is explored by looking at the terror state and the legality of state terror. There is a good focus on the demands of the question throughout. There is a logical organisation and a clear argument. There could be a little more discussion and evaluation, but there is nevertheless a well developed explanation. This is a secure level 4 response.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always plan your answer to make sure you meet the full demands of the question. This response is organised around the criteria that meet the needs of the question.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted whether improved living standards were the main consequence of German economic policies in the years 1933–45 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (improved living standards) and a range of other factors (e.g. the creation of a war economy, the exclusion of groups from economic life such as Jews and women, and the attempt to build a peoples' community). Judgements made about the relative importance of improved living standards (and their limitations) were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the consequences of German economic policies in the years 1933–45. Low scoring answers were also often off focus or essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one aspect of changing living standards such as improved employment rates). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Question 2 requires candidates to have knowledge and understanding of some economic data. Fewer candidates felt confident with this question. As a result the weaker candidates tended to describe economic features of the Third Reich and then assert the effects on living standards. Stronger candidates were able to evaluate living standards as a consequence of economic policy, and compare living standards to other economic outcomes. The example offered here offers one way of dealing with the question.

Living standards certainly did improve during the Nazi period although, naturally, they decreased during the war years. It is also important to note that living standards for ethnic minorities & Germans who were not racially 'pure' did not improve - in fact quite the opposite, for example Jews having to face the atrocious living condition in ghettos from 1938 onwards or concentration camps, 1939 onwards.

The German economy inherited by the Nazis was already improving from the terrible state it had been in following the Great Depression (1929) and, because of the Depression, Chancellor Brüning had arranged in 1932 for reparation payments to the Allies to stop, as paying them now would be virtually impossible for Germany. ^{so the Nazis did not have to worry about reparations} The point of this is that the Nazis inherited a Germany where living standards

employment levels were already improving and so this improvement was not all down to Nazi economic policies.

In 1933, ~~the~~ the Nazis came up with the first Four Year Plan, which focused the economy towards autarky; Hitler himself even stated in a speech in 1934 that achieving autarky came before the needs of the individual. This drive towards autarky also led to less foreign imports, such ~~to~~ as food and even oil to be used as fuel

(Section A continued) in the home, ^{which} could actually be said to have in a way decreased living standards ~~to~~ ^{compared} to ~~the~~ pre-1929 levels.

Aside from getting very close to achieving autarky (Germany only had to rely on exports for 17% of its needs by 1939), another consequence of Nazi economic policy is an increased ^{especially under Speer,} move towards rearmament, which commenced with conscription in 1935. The consequence of this was the beginnings of a war economy (later to become a command economy) and making Germany appear increasingly aggressive to other nations due to their rearmament going actively against Versailles.

Another economic policy from the time, ~~in~~ in order to help along autarky, was to try and replace necessary things which needed to be made in factories with synthetic versions of these things, for example rubber being replaced by buna. This meant that products, such as ^{buna} rubber, were

not as high quality as they could be as a consequence
of Germany not wishing to trade very much, thus ^{not} increasing ^{living standards}.

Germany did however trade with some countries to get items they could not produce themselves or needed to aid rearmament, such as oil from Bulgaria. This they paid for by trading German-made goods for the oil rather than money, and ^{this} helped improve living standards in Germany as German craftsmen, etc. had to produce, and were paid for, the goods that were traded with countries such as Bulgaria.

(Section A continued) A Nazi economic policy which did help improve the standard of living was their welfare system; workers had supported the Nazis in their early years and, in ~~abroad~~ reward for this, the National Socialist Welfare Estate (NSV) was set up. This provided aid to Germany's poorest, as long as they were 'deserving' of the help, and of pure blood. The consequence of this was that living standards among Germany's poorest did improve, as did Nazi popularity, ^{but not from people's wages to pay for NSV} although 'voluntary donations' were ^{made}.

In order to further help the workers, the Nazis fixed wages, making competition for jobs (wherein the person who is willing to work for the least amount of money gets the job) decrease. However, this did not ~~absolutely~~ necessarily aid in improving living standards, but in creating a stable economy; wages were fixed at such

an amount that workers had very little disposable income, and could only earn more by working over-time.

As war began in September 1939, and the economy took a turn toward 'total war' - that is to say, ~~all~~ shops which did not contribute to the war effort, such as Sweet Shops, for example, were shut down. This meant that consumer goods were few and far between and, although antiseptic meant no one starved, items such as sugar became black market goods; these economic policies led to decreased living standards.

In conclusion, Nazi economic policies looked towards war

(Section A continued) before they ~~was~~ aided the people (the 'guns vs. butter' debate is a consequence of this) and so, although rearmament did create many new jobs and some workers (between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{3}$ of Germany's workers worked in the agricultural sector) received extra benefits, such as the wiping out of debts and inability of banks to ~~repossess~~ repossess farms from those in debt (Hugenburg) it also meant that people tended to have less consumer goods, plus fixed wages meant much less disposable income. Thus, it is fair to say that the main result of Nazi economic policy was speedy rearmament, especially under Speer, and increased levels of production & employment; they had not ~~recessed~~ necessarily meant to raise living standards.

but it was merely a consequence of the strong economy they built & high levels of employment via schemes such as the R.A.D.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The strength of this response is that it offers a decent range of criteria upon which a judgement can be made. The response covers reconstruction in the early years, autarky, the war economy, the welfare state and the war years. Therefore the time frame of the question is covered. The broad range has affected the amount of detail, but the candidate has taken opportunities to link these economic criteria to living standards in quite a thoughtful way. This has produced some discussion and evaluation. Not all the detail is accurate but it is organised and relevant and this allows the candidate to make a judgement. The conclusion is quite sophisticated and has level four quality. This is a secure level three answer.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When revising a question on the economy think of a simple way to remember some economic detail. You need good knowledge to make a secure judgement.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted how accurate is to say that the role of German women continued to be that of wife and mother in the years 1933–89. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change and continuity) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. the importance of women in creating a 'racially pure' 1,000 year Reich under the Nazis, the retreat of the Nazi regime during the war which allowed women back into employment, and the continued expectations of women to be in the home during the early stages of the FRG giving way to better opportunities and increased equality by the end of the period). Judgements made about the role of women were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the changing role of women in the years 1933–89. Low scoring answers were also often off focus (didn't properly engage with change and continuity) or were essentially a description of women's role during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. looking mainly at Nazi policies on women as home-makers). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The focus of this question is on change and continuity over time. This question was answered well on the whole and candidates were clearly well prepared. Quite a few candidates were prevented from reaching level 4 by making some elementary mistakes. Weaker candidates tended to spend too much time on the Third Reich. Descriptions of Nazi policy affecting women were then contrasted with women's status under the FRG. This does not meet the demands of the question. Many candidates were able to show change, but ignored the continuity side of the question. Stronger candidates were able to cover the time frame and deliver an analysis of change and continuity by paying attention to turning points. The example response offered here contains strong and weak elements.

The Role and Status of Women changed dramatically throughout the years 1933-89. During Stresemann's 'Golden years', women experienced civil liberties that were not available to them under the rule of the Kaiser. However, between the years 1933-45, the Nazis relinquished this freedom and reinstated a more traditional approach. Weimar ushered modernity for women. Styles changed, women could smoke freely in the streets just as men could, and Berlin was considered the nightlife capital of Europe. The Nazis despised this and set

to work on changing the roles and expectations immediately. For example, married women were not expected to work in a professional environment. By law, a woman could not work without the expressed permission of her husband. The Nazis adopted the phrase 'Kinder, Küche, Kirche' meaning 'children, kitchen, church' and with the use of propaganda, the German people divided by this as the three responsibilities of a Nazi woman.

(Section B continued) Hitler intended on expanding Germany, and so ~~too~~ in order to do that he needed ~~more~~ to increase the size of Germany's population (mostly for military purposes). In order to do this, Hitler granted loans of 2000 reichmarks to families and then gave the option of remaining 500 from the debt per child the mother had. Therefore, he created a financial incentive to have more children. There was also a medal system for mothers who bore multiple children. For instance, a bronze medal was awarded to someone with four children & silver for 6, and a gold medal for someone with 8 children. Many mothers at the time said that it was actually a very good time to be a mother, and that it was nice to be recognised for work that had previously gone unnoticed.

In terms of Women's rights however, things were far from being better. Female politicians from the Weimar era lost their jobs and politically, a woman had no power whatsoever.

¶ After the fall of the Nazis in 1945, things changed again for German women. The countries major cities and towns lay in ruin from the allied bombing campaign. And there was a vast shortage of able-bodied men due to the war, and so it

(Section B continued) was the women responsible for the 'clean-up' and rebuilding operations. The debris and masonry that lay in the streets was moved through enormous amounts of labour and the women involved in this became known as the 'women of the rubble'. This sudden responsibility was actually greeted with content from many women who had so recently been ~~be~~ denied of all responsibility. Following the denazification of Germany, the female politicians from the Weimar period became involved with politics again and there was a huge rise in female employment rates. Women were granted the power to vote again and upon the first election that women

were to be involved with, a staggering
turn out of 92% all voting women occurred.
As the years progressed through
the FRG, things continued to get
better for women, particularly post 70's, as
a ~~series~~ series of women's rights student
protests helped to solidify an equal footing
for women at the time. Therefore we
can see that there was not a huge
difference in the way that women were
expected to act as a wife or mother,

(Section B continued) and that the only significant difference
in the roles of women came to pass due
to the Nazis. Before the regimes interruption in
German history, Germany appeared to be modernising
well and ^{was} ~~there~~ one of the best places to be
as a woman. This ~~was~~ progression slowly resumed
after the fall of the Nazis.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate clearly does focus on change over time. The information supplied is mostly accurate and the essay is able to compare the role and status of women in the Third Reich with that of women in the FRG successfully. The response is organised and well written. There is less focus on continuity however, and this makes the overall argument less convincing. It means that key issues relevant to the question are not explored, which in turn points to insufficient knowledge being deployed and limited criteria by which to judge the question being used. This response is therefore judged to be in level 3.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

To exemplify change and continuity over time, structure the essay around important turning points. Explain what changed and what was unchanged about the topic at each turning point. In your conclusion look at the whole time frame.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted how far the stability of the Federal Republic of Germany was mainly achieved by avoiding the constitutional problems of the Weimar Republic. These included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (similarity and difference) in the question. In addition, sufficient knowledge was used to assess how far the stability of the FRG was achieved by avoiding the constitutional problems of the Weimar Republic (e.g. the proscriptions against extreme parties under the FRG, the constitutional differences with Weimar enshrined in the Basic Law, and the stronger government of the FRG made possible by avoiding the need for coalitions). Judgements made about the similarity and differences between Weimar and the FRG were reasoned and based on clear criteria, which often included a further comparison of economic factors and differences in the attitudes of other powers. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the similarities and differences of Weimar and the FRG. Low scoring answers often lacked focus (didn't engage with similarity and difference) or were essentially a description of some features of the two constitutions. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. a description of proportional representation or article 48 of the Weimar constitution). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

This focus of this question is on a comparative analysis (similarity and difference) of the stability of the Weimar Republic and the FRG and how their constitutional differences account for this. Stronger candidates were able to successfully compare the constitutions of the Weimar Republic and the FRG, and then consider other issues such as differences in the attitude of foreign powers to the two states, and differences in economic fortunes. Weaker candidates tended to treat the constitutional issues briefly and then went on to look at other factors. Stronger candidates offered good analysis of constitutional differences/similarities and then went on consider other factors.

Chosen question number:

Question 3

Question 4

On the 1st September 1948 the new ~~Fed~~ Federal Republic of Germany began to write up the new constitution known as "basic law". ~~The law was passed in 1949 and~~ The new constitution was written to try and avoid mistakes made by the Weimar Republic and ultimately led to its collapse by 1933. The changes can be seen in particular areas, the role of the chancellor, how elections work and how the Bundestag is elected, the powers of the president and finally the rights of German people.

The role of the Chancellor changed ~~is~~ significantly as the chancellor was now the most powerful person in the Bundestag. This changed from the previous Weimar Constitution as the president was the most powerful, however, this was one of the instabilities that the new FRG wished to avoid. The president could reject new laws passed by the Reichstag and with the powers of Article 48 they could pass their own laws. This was used by Hindenburg after 1928 and the collapse of the 'Grand Coalition'. Hindenburg appointed

(Section B continued) new chancellors who did not have significant support from members of the Reichstag. For example, Von Papen was appointed yet he did not have the support of the members. This was changed in basic law to allow the chancellor to have the majority of seats. This is shown by Adenauer who had 163 seats in the 1949 elections and therefore made him, as leader of the CDU, chancellor. This is significantly different from the Weimar constitution and the problems it faced from the lack of support from the Reichstag. Wilhelm Marx in the 1924 elections was made chancellor yet only having 44 seats.

Another way in which the FRG tried to avoid problems caused by the ~~Weimar~~ constitutional problems of the Weimar Republic was to change the way the Bundestag was ~~to~~ elected.

The ~~Weimar Constitution~~ was Reichstag members were voted in ~~so~~ using proportional representation. ~~to elect~~ This meant that many small parties who gained 1% ~~or~~ of the vote would gain a seat, this caused problems for the Weimar Republic as it led to every government becoming a coalition, the Grand Coalition in 1928 had 5 parties. There was also as many as 40

(Section B continued) parties ~~in the~~ represented in the Reichstag at one time. To prevent this from happening the Basic Law had "the 5% rule". This rule meant that a party needed at least 5% of the vote to gain a seat. This proved to provide some stability for the new Bundestag as for 20 years there was only 3 parties ~~in~~ represented in the Bundestag, CDU, SPD and FDP.

Furthermore, the governments had similar rights in theory, however, the FRG did allow for political parties to be banned. This prevented extremist oppositions to gain a place in the Bundestag.

For example, the Weimar Republic had members of the Communist parties and Nazi parties into the Reichstag, even though, they had ~~presented~~ ~~ideology~~ ~~to suggest~~ been involved in uprisings and putsches against the government. The Munich putsch in 1923 had members of the Nazi party, including Hitler, involved however these ~~was~~ Hitler and other members of the Nazi party were still represented in the Reichstag. The FRG banned the communist KPD from running in elections to prevent there being extremist opposition in the Reichstag.

Finally, the power of the president had been reduced

(Section B continued) significantly. Instead of being publically elected every 7 years the presidents were now elected by a secret ballot by members of the Bundestag and Bundesrat. The powers were also reduced, Article 48 was removed as well as their power to appoint new chancellors.

The stability of the new Federal Republic of Germany can be conceived to have been by ~~avoided~~ ^{avoiding} the constitutional problems of the Weimar Republic due to the significant changes from the role of the chancellor having the majority of members of the Bundestag. Also, the new system of

proportional representation allowed the three largest parties to have more stability in government compared to the Weimar Republic. Therefore, it can be shown that the stability of the new FRG is significantly helped by the changes from the Weimar Republic.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is an excellent analysis of the constitutions of the Weimar Republic and the FRG and the consequences for stable government. Analysis and support are both to level 4 standard. The knowledge is very good and the candidate successfully uses criteria - the role of the Chancellor and coalition government - to secure their judgement. A criticism would be that the broader reasons for stability, the economy and attitudes of foreign powers are left untouched. This response is at the top of level 3.

Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were clearly focused on the extracts, and possessed the confidence and understanding to develop an extract-based analysis of how far war broke out in 1939 because of the miscalculations of European statesmen, other than Hitler. Higher scoring answers offered some comparative analysis of the two extracts, and used own knowledge effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views presented. Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (whether war broke out in 1939 because of the miscalculations of other European statesmen), rather than the general issue of the outbreak of war in 1939, and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts. Weaker answers tended to show some understanding of the extracts and attempted to focus on how far war broke out in 1939 because of the miscalculations of other European statesmen. Such responses, however, demonstrated limited development by relying on a basic 'Hitler versus other European statesmen' approach. At the lower levels, basic points were selected from the extracts for illustration and comparisons made between the two extracts were fairly rudimentary. Weaker candidates sometimes also relied almost exclusively on the extracts as sources of information, especially using extract 1 to elicit the failures of British and French governments in dealing with Hitler. Others made limited use of the two extracts and attempted to answer the question relying largely on their own knowledge. Moreover, in lower scoring responses, the candidate's own knowledge tended to be illustrative (e.g. just tacked on to points from the extracts) or drifted from the main focus of the question. Furthermore, these answers were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The majority of section C responses were in levels 3 and 4. Candidates were able to call on knowledge about the historiographical debate and accurately use terms like 'structuralist' and 'intentionalist'. Weaker candidates tended to pick out the surface features of the sources and not see them as interpretations, or used the sources to support their own points. Stronger candidates focussed on the clear differences in interpretation and were able to develop these using their own knowledge.

The outbreak of war in 1939 is one of the most debated topics in History as Hitler's foreign policy can be interpreted differently; either as optimism from circumstance or an overall masterplan leading to the outbreak of war. Extract 1 gives an overall interpretation that the outbreak of war was a mixture of Hitler's optimism and miscalculations of other statesmen, whereas extract 2 gives an overall interpretation that Hitler was the driving force behind the outbreak of war. I agree to a further extent with the view that war broke out in 1939 because of the miscalculations of other European statesmen due to the strength of the view with ~~another~~ clear evidence shown in Extract 1 arguing this ~~view~~ as well as own knowledge.

Extract 1 gives evidence of European miscalculation such as, "Hitler was given ~~the~~ his opportunity to remilitarise the Rhineland by diversion of Britain and France". We know this was key to the outbreak of war as the capturing of the Rhineland boosted domestic belief in Hitler and drove his levels of optimism up significantly with regards to the threat he could pose to his foreign policy. The League of Nations was also a ~~key~~ key

(Section C continued) part of the lack of realism as they strove for world peace and didn't promote fighting war in any form. Therefore by Britain and France choosing not to oppose the occupation of the Rhineland this set a trend of lack of opposition through violence across the League of Nations. This fed through into the 1933-39 period with "Chamberlain's strong determination to avoid a European conflict" allowing for more expansionary foreign policy by Hitler with the "Sudetenland", however the ~~text~~ extract conflicts the idea that war broke out solely because of "other European statesmen" but also that Hitler himself "misreading of the Anglo-French guarantee" which triggered the outbreak of war instead of more land gained by Germany. However this argument has less weight as the 'Four-Year Plan' set out in 1936 clearly was preparing Germany for war not expansionary foreign policy. Yet the extract still has weight due to its use of evidence such as the "Italian aggression in Abyssinia" and "the lessons of the Spanish Civil War" although it does partly conflict the view that war broke out because of the miscalculations of other European statesmen ~~and~~ excluding Hitler.

Extract 2 gives views that Hitler's "abnormal psychological make-up" was a factor for the outbreak of war in 1939. This can be backed up by the fact that Hitler was so unique in comparison to other world leaders. Hitler had clear anti-Semitic and racial purity views and had no issue with killing millions of Jewish his. He also had issues with decision-making and trust as he trusted only a handful of advisors and often left them to undertake lots of domestic and sometimes often

(Section C continued) foreign policy issues. This point is exacerbated further in Extract 2 with "not just external circumstances, but also his personal psyche pushed him forward, and made him risk everything." The invasion of Poland was a risk that very few world leaders would have taken, and potentially could be explained by his psychological uniqueness. However the invasion of Poland did ultimately trigger the outbreak of war in 1939 in which there was "no going back". The extract gives less weight in suggesting that Hitler's psychological condition was the main reason for the outbreak of war however lacks any evidence that he was in a unique psychological position. Whereas extract 1 gives direct evidence of European miscalculations, hence giving extract 2 less weight in its view.

The evidence shown of foreign policy by other European statesmen feeding Hitler's opportunistic personality is given with weight and clarity in extract 1 as well as external evidence from the extracts confirming the views given. Whereas extract 2 relies heavily on the assumption that Hitler has

some form of psychological condition yet gives no clear evidence of it so giving the extract less weight in this view on the outbreak of war in 1939. Although there is external evidence such as racial purity that Hitler did have psychological issues the view is not as strong with a weak interpretation from Keshav. However Extract 1 conflicts the view that the outbreak of war was due to other European statesmen by suggesting that Hitler also miscalculated the Anglo-French response. However

(Section C continued) This view has less weight as it is known that Hitler's Second 'Four Year Plan' in 1936 conflicts this view and suggests Hitler was expecting war in 1939. Hence the extracts alongside the majority of the views that the outbreak of war in 1939 was due to miscalculations of other European statesmen in ~~the~~ extract 1, has and given weight with clear evidence as well as confirming external evidence, that I agree to a great extent with the view that war broke out in 1939 because of the miscalculations of other European statesmen. This is accompanied with the weak view of Hitler's psychological state shown in Extract 2 giving little weight on evidence to the opposing view.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response focuses on interpretations from start to finish. The extracts are analysed and are appropriately cited. The candidate uses their own knowledge to develop the sources and to discuss and criticise them, with the controversy in mind. The integration of the candidate's own knowledge with the extracts is commendable. The conclusion is thoughtful and based on a discussion of the contending views. This is a secure level 4 response.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Although it is important to use terms like structuralist and intentionalist to assess the extracts, don't make the mistake of criticising the historian for what others in these camps might argue. Always look at what is in the extract. Highlight the interpretations and structure your answer around these so that a discussion is possible.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their thinking in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.