



Pearson

Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
In History (WHI04) Paper 1B
International Study with Historical Interpretations
The World in Crisis, 1879-1945

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2018

Publications Code WHI04_1B_pef_20180815

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

Please note: that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different options within WHI04 1A-1D and previous series to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement. It is also highly recommended that centres read the general Introduction and Section A and B introductions in the Principal Examiner Reports for June 2017. These generic introductions outline the assessment requirements for WHI04 and give an indication of the skills required.

Centres may wish to refer to the *Getting Started* guide that is to be found on the IAL History Pearson Edexcel website. It is also useful to take note of the indicative content in the mark schemes.

2018 is the second June series of the WHI04 paper. There has been an increase in entries over this time period and it is clear that the majority of centres have taken note of the feedback provided in previous Principal Examiner reports. Candidates were usually well prepared in relation to knowledge of the specification and centres are to be commended for this. Candidates have good knowledge and they often include material which is interesting and thought provoking. Many responses were well-informed and well-written. There was a definite improvement in the understanding and appreciation of the skills required for the Section A Historical Interpretation question which assesses AO3/AO1. Section B responses were also generally stronger with many more responses clearly showing the qualities of Level 4, and indeed Level 5. However, lower Level responses continue to exhibit the weaknesses highlighted last year in regard to a lack of focus on the wording of the question and/or the second-order concept being targeted and a tendency for candidates to write about everything they know rather than to select material relevant to the question.

It is worth noting that the responses are marked using a 'best-fit' process. Each bullet point strand within the generic mark scheme is considered to create an overall sense of Level and a mark applied within the Level. If a response has qualities which exemplify a variety of Levels or a strand is missing then this will be reflected by applying a 'best-fit' Level and mark. For responses which do not address one particular strand, for example a lack of contextual knowledge for Section A Strand 2, it is not possible to reward the strand and so this will be reflected in the mark rewarded.

There is also a tendency for a significant minority of candidates to write responses which seem to thread their knowledge into the language of the mark schemes. The descriptors reflect the qualities examiners would expect to see in an essay answering the question set rather than a scaffold on which responses should be built. It is the examiner who determines whether criteria are valid or if the analysis is sustained rather than the candidate by asserting 'so it can be seen by the valid criteria I have used...' or ' In conclusion, this sustained

analysis...'. This does not necessarily add value to the response and can be detrimental if this assertion is clearly not substantiated. This is also the case in responses that assert 'It is a compelling argument...' when that argument is not well organised or even contradicts itself.

Once again, candidates were, in general, clearly aware of both the structure and the timing of the examination paper; there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

General candidate performance on each Section and specific performance on individual questions for Paper 1B are considered below.

Section A

It was genuinely pleasing to see the improvement in the application and understanding of the skills required to answer the Interpretation question successfully. There were clearly more responses being rewarded Level 4 and some excellent responses in Level 5. There is sufficient time to read the extracts carefully and plan an answer (see below) but some high Level responses reflected an outstanding ability to address the viewpoint through superb analysis of the interpretations presented while integrating detailed historical knowledge in the time provided. The best responses are invariably those that are built around the views expressed in the extracts throughout the response. These responses were often thoughtful discussions of the viewpoint in the question and resulted in interesting answers that were very enjoyable to read.

The question requires candidates to make a judgement on a stated viewpoint, through the analysis of two extracts from historical works which address the historical issue and their own knowledge of the historical debate. It is worth reminding centres that the generic mark scheme clearly indicates the three bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks:

- interpretation and analysis of extracts
- deployment of knowledge of issues related to the debate
- evaluation of and judgement about the interpretations

The best responses reflected the qualities of each strand outlined in the Level 4 and Level 5 descriptors. However, it is worth noting that, although some candidates now clearly better understand what is required and write answers that can achieve Level 4, there are many candidates failing to reach high Level 4 or Level 5 because they are writing very long responses that include everything they know and develop a confused or contradictory argument/overall judgement as a result. There is sufficient time to plan a response of sufficient length which interprets the extracts with 'confidence and discrimination' and in which the

knowledge is 'sufficient' and 'precisely selected and deployed' to explore the view under debate.

There are also some candidates who are able to access Level 4/Level 5 for interpretation and analysis of the extracts but who either do not deploy knowledge of the issues related to the debate or do not come to a judgement in relation to the view in the question. Many responses reflected a structure that analysed Extract 1 and Extract 2 with some skill but then wrote a conclusion which just restated an understanding of the view in Extract 1 and the view in Extract 2 without coming to a judgment at all – so making it difficult to reward strand 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates exhibited great knowledge of the debate central to the overall focus of the question but ignored the extracts altogether perhaps referring to them briefly to exemplify a point being made.

There are still a significant number of candidates whose responses reflect the qualities outlined in the lower Levels of the mark scheme. These responses often showed the following characteristics:

- answering the question without reference to the extracts at all or only using the views implicitly
- paraphrasing the extracts or just stringing together quotations from the extracts using connecting words or terms
- do not include any relevant historical knowledge to support the analysis
- use AO2 skills of source analysis to evaluate the extracts with regard to aspects of provenance.

Candidates at all Levels tend towards using the term 'source' rather than 'extract' when referring to the material under discussion. If candidates are to see the material as interpretations, rather than sources of evidence, centres should encourage candidates to refer to Extract 1 or Extract 2 or the names of the authors. Candidates should be encouraged to see the sources evaluated in WHI02 and WHI03 as the building blocks which create the interpretations and views being discussed in WHI04. One extract will mainly reflect the view given in the question statement while the other will mainly reflect a counter argument to be discussed in the course of coming to an overall judgement.

As in the previous Reports please note the guidance given in the *Getting Started* document. *Students are not expected to be familiar with the writing of the selected historians but they should be familiar with the issues that make the question controversial. Reference to the works of name historians, other than the material in the extracts provided is not expected but students may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their arguments.*

Once again, many candidates appeared to create their discussion by reference to only the first few lines of each extract and so lost an opportunity to develop key points made later in the extracts. Candidates have sufficient time to

consider the extracts carefully and to draw out a variety of different key points in order to compare and contrast the interpretations presented.

Finally, centres should note that the response is set up for candidates to discuss the view put forward in the question in relation to the views being expressed in the extracts rather than using the extracts to exemplify the debate.

Q1

There were some good responses to this question which were pleasing to read. Candidates were generally well-prepared in relation to both their knowledge and understanding of the debate surrounding the origins of the First World War. Candidates were clearly aware of different views and the best responses were able to deploy this in discussing the extracts and using their understanding to reach a judgement on the view stated in the question. Fewer candidates ignored the view stated in the question and went on to develop a discussion of the stated view reflected in the extracts provided. However, it was noticeable that a number of candidates analysed the extracts without developing a discussion of the view and failed to reach an overall judgement because in the conclusion they merely summarised the views of the extracts. A small number of candidates also wrote long responses which could have been more effective with some judicious planning.

Most responses were able to contrast the view in Extract 1 that alliance system nor the diplomatic disputes pre-1914 but key decisions made in June and July 1914 led to the outbreak of war with the view in Extract 2 that the cause was as a result of the conversion of the alliance system into militarised rivalry. Some candidates, however, did not appear to read both Extracts in their entirety or thoroughly with some responses suggesting that Extract 1 stated that the war was caused by the alliance system and that Extract 2 was only referencing the Anglo-German naval rivalry. There is sufficient time for candidates to read through the Extracts and to plan their answers.

Many candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to explain and evaluate the views presented. Candidates used their knowledge of the events of the June-July crisis to exemplify and discuss the references to 'mistakes, failures and miscalculations' in Extract 1 and to challenge the extent of the Anglo-German naval rivalry by 1914 identified in Extract 2.

Plan:

Extract 1 agrees → July Crisis

Extract 2 disagrees → Arms & Naval race

Extract 1 argues to a large extent that the decisions made by Germany and Austria-Hungary were the main reason for outbreak of war in 1914. This is true to an extent as Germany actively pushed and coerced Austria to declare war on Serbia. However, it also mentions other key events such as the Balkan wars and argues that they didn't cause war because they were "settled by → through diplomacy". Extract 2 on the other hand argues that it was the "naval" race and arms race that lead to rising tensions in Europe and eventually to war. This is also true to an extent as the Britain relied on its hegemony, especially in the Mediterranean to protect its dominions and colonies.

The Historian can argue that it was a combination of different factors.

Extract 1 argues because the the assassination was not "resolved by ~~diplomacy~~ diplomatic means" this lead to war. This is true to an extent both Austria and Germany ~~to~~ wanted war, however for different reasons Austria-Hungary was threatened by a growing Serbia and growing sentiment for Pan-Slavism. Austria wanted a localised war that would destroy Serbia and therefore the only Russian ally in the Balkans and give her an opportunity to expand. ~~In this case it is true that~~ Here already one can argue that it wasn't just the decisions made in the July Crisis but also the tension that existed due to previous events such as the ~~Russian~~ ~~and~~ Balkan wars that strengthened Serbia. Germany ~~on the other hand~~ wanted war ~~to~~ be Germany's decision during the

July Crisis were influenced also by other ~~area~~ factors, such as the great military programme planned by Russia, and the slow encirclement. Germany's only true ally was Austria-Hungary so it had no

choice but to support Austria ~~and~~ in the July Crisis, ~~the~~ with the blank check on the 6th. Otherwise it would have stood alone against the triple entente. Also at the time Germany would have been able to defeat the Russian army, because the great military program hadn't begun yet. ~~By~~ In addition British-German relations were improving as Germany abandoned their naval race and re-focused on the Army in 1914. Therefore it was militarily and politically a favourable time for war. So the historian

can argue that, yes if the July crisis would have been resolved by ~~both~~ diplomatic means a war could have been avoided. However the crisis was not handled diplomatically because of the combined factors of the arms and naval race, the short term events such as the Balkan wars and the alliance system.

The second extract argues that it was to the most part the arms and especially the naval race that led to the outbreak of war. The naval race officially started in 1906 when both Germany and Britain

started to build "Dreadnaughts" this is also argued in Extract 2. The arms and naval race did indeed lead to heightened tension in Europe as none of the countries

tension in Europe as none of the countries could avoid rearmament, this went hand in hand with the 2nd industrial revolution which led to fast advancement in weaponry such as the machine gun first adopted by the French in 1903 and semi-recoilless artillery. In addition both Russia and France increased their military. As ~~the~~ Extract 2 argues two great "rival alliances" emerged out of the ~~for~~ naval and arms race, the triple Alliance with Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy ~~and~~ and the triple Entente with Britain, France and Russia. Although the triple Entente was only a loose agreement, ~~there~~ the historian can argue that the naval race led to heightened tensions which led to the outbreak of war. However, British public ~~opinion~~ opinion was strongly against war until Germany attacked Belgium. And German and Anglo relations were ~~in~~ improving in 1914, they even reached an agreement on the Bagdad railway.

to which France agreed. So it can be argued that the arms and naval race were only to a small extent responsible for the outbreak of war in 1914

In effect it was a combination of different events that occurred before the war, this includes the July Crisis and the naval and arms race however doesn't exclude the alliance system built by Bismarck ⁽¹⁸⁷¹⁻¹⁸⁹⁰⁾ and the ⁽¹⁹¹²⁻¹⁹¹³⁾ Balkan wars, the Moroccan Crises ^(1905/16 and 1911) and the ^(1908/09) Bosnian Crisis.

The alliance system although not set in stone did raise tension especially between Russia and Germany. It also made Germany believe it was being encircled which technically it was as at the beginning of the war Italy opted for neutrality and Britain officially joined the triple Entente making it a military alliance so the alliance system

was definitely an important factor for the outbreak of war. The short term events as extract one argues did cause "problems" however they had a smaller part to play.

Overall, the decisions ~~did~~ made in the July Crisis such as the blank check, the ~~unreasonable~~ unreasonable ultimatum given to Serbia, the decision by the German ~~ambassador~~ High Command to ignore Kaiser Wilhelm's by Austria-Hungary to declare war on the 28th July, even though Britain would not stay neutral and it would result in general war, were a major ~~part~~ reason for the outbreak of war in 1914. Still, it wasn't the only reason, the rearmament, the events leading up to 1914 and the alliance system also had an important role so they raised tension.

This is a Level 4 response. It demonstrates understanding of the extracts and uses its knowledge to explore relevant aspects of the debate on the given view while coming to an overall judgement. However, the judgement is based more on historical knowledge than a discussion of the views given in the extracts and as such is a combination of the qualities required for an interpretation AO3/AO1 response and responses expected in Section B.

There are various explanations regarding the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. ~~Some~~ Extracts 1 ~~and 2~~ argue that ~~the~~ the most important of these were the key decisions made during the June-July crisis, in the form of miscalculations made by the diplomats following the Sarajevo events and the decision to militarise. I disagree with this view, as I believe that the outbreak of the war was inevitable due to the imperialist ~~efforts~~ ambitions of the superpowers and the popular feeling in favour of the ~~the~~ military action, as suggested by source 2.

Firstly, Extract 1 argues that since the mid-1890s, 'economic and imperial rivalries around the globe were settled by negotiations'. Whilst this is true, it does not prove that the war was not caused by the long-term imperialist ambitions rather than key decisions made during the ~~crisis~~ June-July crisis. Namely, all the crises of the 1880-1914 period ~~the~~ stemmed from the imperialist efforts of the ~~superpowers~~ superpowers. For example, the Balkan tensions were caused solely by the

expansionist policies of Russia and Austria-Hungary which wished to fill in the vacuum of power. It is true that until the June-July crisis, as suggested by Extract 1, these were solved diplomatically, yet the settlements, despite being agreed on, often motivated international hostility, ~~which~~ which erupted in the June-July crisis. For example, the Moroccan crisis, despite having been solved at the Algeiras Conference, inevitably led to the deterioration of ~~the~~ ~~relations~~ relations ~~between~~ ^{of} England ~~and~~ ^{and} France with Germany. Whilst the ~~apparent~~ ~~peace~~ deceptive appearance suggests that the conflict was resolved diplomatically, it fails to uncover that actually the ~~the~~ solutions to imperialist disputes were ~~not~~ agreed upon only in order to preserve peace, not because they satisfied the involved powers. Yet, ~~as soon as~~ ~~it~~ Germany ~~lost its temper in dealing with~~ ~~France~~, despite the official ~~the~~ ~~peace~~ ~~loss~~ ~~of~~ ~~war~~, the ~~central~~ ~~powers~~ became increasingly divided after each crisis. Whilst initially, they attempted to reconcile ^{diplomatically} ~~even~~ ~~if~~ it meant the disadvantage, as occurred in the case of Germany in Algeiras, ~~soon~~ ~~the~~ ~~nations~~ ~~lost~~ ~~their~~ with each crisis, the nations were closer to losing their temper, as occurred ~~in~~ in June-July crisis, which marked the eruption of the international hostility stemming from the imperialist disputes, which until then was ~~concealed~~ ~~concealed~~ concealed under the facade of

hostility rather than peace. Hence, the argument of Extract 1, that the imperialist disputes would not have led to the outbreak of the war as they were settled by negotiations is false, as despite the attempts to preserve peace, each crisis caused by imperialist disputes, brought superpowers close to erupting, which occurred in the June-July crisis, when the powers ~~then~~ gave up on diplomatic reconciliations that actually satisfied nobody. Therefore, the ~~3rd~~ ~~claim~~ claim of Extract 1 that ~~Secondly~~ the war broke out because the assassination at Sarajevo was not resolved by diplomatic means is weak, as the ~~previous~~ previous negotiations did little to prevent the war from occurring, instead they only gave time for the powers to militarise before they lost their patience in another crisis, which was the June-July one.

Secondly, ~~the extract~~ extract 2 claims that the main reason for the outbreak of the war in 1914 ~~was the~~ naval rivalry and the alliance system, as it emphasises were the ~~then~~ was caused by the long-term naval rivalry, fuelled by the militaristic values of the popular opinion, ~~resulting in the~~ I agree that this undoubtedly triggered more hostility and eventually war, as for example when France decided to mobilise, Germany became belligerent towards it, yet the ~~the~~ naval race did not ~~start from the~~ begin in its own right but was

This is a Level 5 response. It combines the elements required in the mark scheme to address the view in the question in relation to the interpretations presented in the extracts before coming to an overall judgement based on these views.

Section B

There was a significant improvement in the quality of the answers produced by candidate this series. In particular, well-informed candidates were more able to respond to the focus of the question directly and to use the wording of the questions to create discussion and debate. There were some knowledgeable and well-organised responses. Once again, there was little evidence to suggest that the range and depth of essays were affected by the time taken to consider the two extracts in Section A.

It is important to note that questions can cover content which stretches across the key topics as well as within the key topics. In order to ensure that candidates are prepared to answer any question set centres should cover all the content outlined in the specification.

The question requires candidates to explore and discuss the given question while coming to an overall judgement. It is worth reminding centres that the generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks:

- analysis and exploration of key features and characteristics of the period in relation to the second-order conceptual demands of the question
- selection and deployment of knowledge
- substantiated evaluation and judgement
- organisation and communication of argument

Most candidates are clearly well-prepared and have good knowledge of the content of the specification with Strand 1 and Strand 2 often the strongest elements of the responses seen. However, knowledgeable candidates are often writing detailed responses which include too much unfocussed supporting material and which often results in confused or contradictory arguments being developed. Level 5 Strand 2 refers to 'sufficient knowledge precisely selected and deployed'. Good responses are also often undermined by a lack of precision in the use of vocabulary when formulating an argument or establishing valid criteria. Some responses begin every paragraph by saying 'x is significant to some extent...' or 'x is the main reason...' or begin a conclusion by stating that 'I agree with the statement...' and then give an overall judgement that contradicts this. Many responses begin with 'It is a compelling argument...' and then argue the opposite. It is important that judgements are substantiated and arguments

developed with logic, coherence and precision and so candidates should use discursive language relevant to the argument being proposed with thought.

Weaker responses were often those that did not address the question carefully, described the key features rather than explained or explored, wrote a response set within the wrong time period or included major inaccuracies. Many candidates seemed to be prepared for specific potential set questions and edited these to 'fit' the focus of the question asked resulting in Level 3 responses that showed some relevance but were not really suited to the focus of the question.

Q2

This was the more popular of the two questions. Candidates are to be commended on their knowledge of Mussolini's foreign policy and a significant number of candidates were able to analyse events in relation to whether Mussolini was able to achieve his aim of making Italy a great international power. Mussolini's role in diplomacy, the intervention in the Spanish Civil War and events in Abyssinia were often judged in relation to apparent versus real success. Some weaker responses failed to address the specific time-frame of the question and spent too much time discussing events pre-1933 and post-1939. As pointed out in Section B above it is important to answer the question asked and select supporting evidence with some precision.

Mussolini achieved his foreign policy aim of making Italy a great international power in the years 1933-39, through Abyssinia, 1935-6, the Spanish Civil War 1936, the anti-comintern pact 1937, and the Pact of Steel, 1939, however, only to an extent.

During Mussolini's time as leader, his aim throughout was to make Italy a great, respected and feared international power. The Abyssinian crisis of 1935 played a significant role in achieving Mussolini's aim, however, only to an extent. The embryonic stages of this crisis started when the Italians built a front at the Walwal oasis in 1930, well beyond the border limit. 1000 ~~Abyssinian~~ Abyssinian soldiers were demanded to be withdrawn, however, this was futile. Skirmishes between the Somalis and Abyssinians

ensued. Emperor Selassie immediately referred this problem to the League of Nations in 1935. However, during this crisis the weakness of the League's weakness became clear when Foreign Minister Laval decided to meet with Mussolini in Rome. During this time, the League feared Hitler and his potential threat, and therefore Laval was willing to sign the Franco-Soviet agreement which gave the Italians some French Somaliland and a free hand in Abyssinia. Therefore Mussolini felt like nothing was standing in his way, which is why soon after the meeting with Laval, Mussolini invaded Abyssinia. The only way for the League to appear strong, while at the same time having the support of Italy, was to impose sanctions, however, they had no effect, as they did not include oil or coal, but also because not all countries restricted their exports to Italy. In fact, America increased their exports to Italy. Hoare and Laval ascertained that the only way to stop the fighting was by signing the Hoare-Laval pact, which simply gave

Abyssinia to Italy. However, as the plan leaked, the two men resigned and Italy ~~then~~ got full control over ~~Angstam~~ Abyssinia, and hence was one step closer to achieving his foreign policy.

Furthermore, the Spanish Civil War, 1936, also helped Mussolini achieve his foreign policy, however, only to an extent. Before the Spanish Civil War even began, Mussolini promised Spanish officials and generals in 1934 that he would supply them with rifles, hand grenades and various military vehicles if there were to be a civil war. However, as soon as the civil war started, Italy's ~~power~~ lack of ~~power~~ ^{resources} became conspicuous when Italy sent only 12 bombers in the first week. Additionally, despite a ~~an~~ non-intervention agreement being signed by 27 countries, including Italy and Germany, Italy still decided to send a total of 30,000 black shirts, along with 20,000 soldiers. Italy played a significant role in the Spanish Civil War, often having fierce

fights and helping Franco win the war. However, they suffered detrimental casualties as soon as the war had finished. These losses are very similar to ~~Italy~~ their role in the Second World War, during which they suffered many defeats. Thus, we can see despite having a large impact on the Spanish civil war, Italy still lost many men, which illustrates their true power and strength.

Moreover, the Anti-Comintern Pact also helped Mussolini achieve his foreign policy aim of making Italy a great international power, however, this is only true to an extent. Initially the pact was aimed directly at the third international and was a pact with Germany. First in 1937 did Italy and Spain join one year after the initial pact. ~~As~~ Additionally, despite being disguised as anti-communist, the pact was in reality a military alliance. ~~at~~ The pact also said that if ~~any of the~~ Italy,

This is a Level 4 response. It explains key issues relevant to the question with some degree of exploration in looking to establish the extent of success. However, the use of language to establish extent is repetitive ('only to an

extent') so limiting the organisation of the argument. Also the judgement is based on stating the relative significance of the key features identified rather than using established criteria, such as international standing and ability to enforce policy, to measure the extent of success.

Q3

Candidates who answered this question generally had a good knowledge of the role of the different arenas of war in the Allied victory 1941-45. The specification identifies the war in the Mediterranean as encompassing the Italian defeats in 1940, events in North Africa and the invasion of Italy. Most candidates were able to discuss these events in relation to their significance for the Allied victory. Differentiation between Levels depended on the extent to which the key features were described, explained and explored. Some responses structured the argument around the extent to which the Mediterranean arena was significant or was not significant, e.g. North Africa important in 'turning the tide' but the invasion of Italy holding up Allied advances, while others compared its significance to other arenas of war such as the war in Eastern Europe, D-Day or the war in the Pacific. A small number of responses clearly did not know what the war in the Mediterranean encompassed and dismissed its significance out of had to concentrate on either D-Day or the Russian front.

The war in the Mediterranean, in the years 1941-45 was significant to the Allied victory in the Second World War to a certain extent. It was significant as it ~~drained~~ essentially drained ^{and machinery} ~~the~~ out the resources of the Axis powers and outstretched them further as the Mediterranean provided ~~to~~ a fluid third front, which the Russians had so long requested as it relieved them of some of the Axis troops in the Eastern Front. The war in the Mediterranean ~~which~~ ^{officially} started in ~~1941~~ ¹⁹⁴² as that was when the British ^{officially} gained physical support of the USA in the Mediterranean in the North Africa campaign and the Italian campaign which proved ~~very~~ significantly efficient in the following 3 years of the war as they gradually ~~more~~ tightened the noose around the Axis powers. Although the battle in the Mediterranean was significant to a certain extent, there were other battles; in the Atlantic, in Moscow, in ~~Kursk~~ ^{and} Stalingrad which were significant to the Allied victory in the Second World War as well. In addition to the Bombing campaign in Germany and D-day.

The ~~Great~~ Battle in the Mediterranean which mainly consisted of the British navy and air force ~~protecting its water~~ fighting against the Italian navy and air force with its main aims being to protect its arteries of trade in the Suez canal and blocking the trade of resources going to the Axis powers. ~~The~~ The Battle in the Mediterranean, just like in the Atlantic and on the Eastern front resulted in a war of attrition between both powers, with the problem of the Axis powers being that they would not ~~obtain~~ ^{have an infinite} supply of resources like the Allied powers essentially had due to the lend-lease programme of USA to Britain and the USSR ~~before~~ before they entered the war but also after they entered the war starting from the 8th of December 1941 after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour. USA did not only bring a significant increase in resources from its geographically isolated country (concerning the world war) but they also brought a boost in morale and fresh soldiers, this was significant to the Allied victory in ^{the war} the Mediterranean in the Mediterranean and the Atlantic because by late 1942, morale of the axis powers was declining as they were becoming overstretched and overexhausted throughout all the fronts. By 1942, they were also

notable to replace desperately needed equipment

14

Such as, in the Mediterranean and in the Atlantic, their Submarines, which ^{German} Admiral Dönitz thought was one of the most important ~~we~~ ^{an} ~~of~~ ^{of} vicious weapons to win the war as it had so well proved in the embryonic stages of the war by destroying millions of tons of Allied ships and resources ^{with their U-boat}. However, due to the race in technology which the Allies and Axis powers faced, the Axis powers were running out of ^{resources and} ~~ideas and~~ ^{time} to build new and more effective weapons ~~to~~ ^{to} defeat the Allies at sea. Despite ~~forming~~ ^{the} creating the efficient Metox receiver which had ~~effectively~~ ^{effectively} ~~was~~ allowed U-boats to circumvent the weight limit of the Allied planes by night to a certain extent they were also faced with struggles at sea by day, especially by 1942 and 1943 with the Allied invention of the Hedgehog which was upgraded to the Squid which had effectively destroyed many U-boats on both seas. These technologies were most effective in the Mediterranean ^{and} ~~Italy~~.

U-boats and ships did not have efficient radars or even any radars at all. The battle of the Mediterranean definitely contributed to the Allied victory of World War 2 to a certain extent as it further depleted ^{the} resources of the Axis powers.

Furthermore, the battle in the East was also significant in the years 1941-45 to the Allied victory in the second world war to a certain extent. In the East was where 4 million Axis troops were headed in Operation Barbarossa and also where most Axis troops as well as significant numbers of Russian troops died. However it was not only due to the effectiveness of fighting of the Russians as the Germans proved ^{to be} significantly better ~~at~~ trained and held air superiority with the Luftwaffe in the early stages of the war in the eastern front. Not only did the Russians have a numerical advantage, especially after they could safely retrieve troops ~~at the~~ from the East as Japan focussed on the U.S. but they also had were also used to the extreme weather changes in Russia and had the right equipment and clothing at hand while in the muddy summer of July 1941 and 1942 and the frosty ice cold winter killed off many Axis troops and destroyed much of their ~~war~~ machinery which was too heavy and inadequate for Russia's bad infrastructure ^{where Blitzkrieg tactics proved inefficient} across its massive country. However, tactically Russia's success in pushing the Axis powers back in Moscow ^{was} created a watershed moment as it made Stalin

believe that he should listen to the advice of his Generals which in turn contributed to the success in the battle of the bulge in Kursk and the battle in Stalingrad while ^{Huber's} Hitler began to turn away from the advice of ^{his} Generals which produced a positive feedback of strategic blunders, one after the other which was also a significant reason to the victory of the Allies in the years 1941-45 to a significant extent.

~~Moreover~~ In addition, The bombing campaign ~~was~~ ^{was} also significant to the Allies victory to some extent. The bombing campaign which was all about the RAF bombing industrial and civilian cities in Germany by night and the USAF bombing by day was significant as it dissipated the morale of the civilian Germans as their homes ~~were~~ and the German economic resources were gradually deteriorating through incendiaries and other bombs. It created fear among the Germans and negated ~~the~~ Goebbels attempts to brighten up their morale through propaganda. The bombing campaign was also useful as it relieved the Russians of some German troops and ~~the~~ also was part of the result of Germany's policy of 'Totaler Krieg'

where Gestapo, with their lack of troops and resources resulted to the fighting of the Volksturm and the Hitler Jugend which must have been eye-opening for the German civilians as each one of them were not only starving and poor but losing ~~to~~ their family, regardless what age they were. ~~And~~ This ~~is~~ During the end of the war the morale and economy was so destroyed for all the Germans to see which they had not seen in the beginning years of the war that they begrudgingly accepted defeat within the German country (^{some} Wehrmacht soldiers still fought on until their death) to a large extent als being the reason for Allied victory in the years 1941-1945

This is an example of a high Level 4 response. This response provides a lot of relevant information with regard to the war in the Mediterranean and other arenas of war which contributed to the Allied victory. However, the knowledge deployed is not selected precisely to evaluate the relative significance of the Mediterranean war so undermining the organisation of a discursive argument and a reaching a judgement which suggests that the factors are combined rather than using criteria established in the main body of the response to create a reasoned conclusion. There is time available for planning in the IAL examinations and time taken to plan could have led to an organised argument being developed using more precisely selected supporting knowledge.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should use the time available to read and consider both extracts carefully before planning their answer
- Candidates should read the question carefully and make sure that they address the view specifically stated in the question preferably beginning with the introduction
- Candidates should aim to interpret both extracts by analysing the issues raised and showing an understanding of the arguments presented by both authors
- Candidates should come to an overall judgement with regard to the view stated in the question; it is not sufficient just to summarise the views presented in the extracts
- Interpretations should be referred to as Extracts or by the author's name; the material presented are interpretations and not a sources of evidence.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the argument being presented is well organise
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Some Level 4 responses included too much information which led to contradiction and confusion in the overall argument being presented
- Candidates should think carefully about the language they use to evaluate the second-order concepts being assessed; do not use 'to an extent' to mean both 'a little' and 'a to a large degree' rather state the extent explicitly
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.