

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/73 Paper 5I (Special Subject – Germany, 1919–1945),
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 51 |

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 5I |

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 5I |

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 51 |

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 51 |

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 5I |

- 1 (a) How far are the problems of worker opposition in Document A corroborated by the views expressed in Document C? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions as well as the text of the documents. A is clearly written earlier in the regime than C as it refers to 'new masters' while C is written in 1939 after the regime has established itself. A refers to the labour exchanges – with joblessness high and Nazi promises to help the unemployed ('slogans and grand words'), opposition might have been difficult as many might have wanted to give Hitler a chance. By 1939 there was plenty of work, but opposition was difficult for a different reason – the strengthening of discipline within factories by the Reich Labour Law and the Trustees of Labour and the willingness of the Gestapo to become involved in disputes – especially by 1939 when rearmament was such a priority. Both refer to Gestapo activity making life difficult – in A for political protest and in C for those resisting lower wages. The repression of political activity seems much harsher in A with reference to concentration camps and torture, but there is still relatively harsh treatment for criticism in C with the arrests, threats and drafting to work on fortifications. In C there is little of the positive encouragement referred to in A, but work has been provided; there is less repression in C than in A, but there is a very speedy response by the authorities which implies a close eye is being kept on labour. Both documents are from opposition sources – one recalling the situation and one much closer to the time. It is possible that both are seeking to explain the problems of worker opposition and neither mentions the divisions in the left. However, C does not paint an unrealistic picture of the workers – they are not politically motivated and there are informers and neither does A with its picture of the masses being influenced by slogans and accepting an obnoxious regime for the hope of material gain.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 5I |

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that repression was the main reason that opposition to the Third Reich was not more effective?

In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as all the documents in this set (A–E) . [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. A suggests a mixture of repression and positive appeal by the Nazis; E corroborates a strong degree of repression but again does not present a complete case for this being the key factor as apart from targeted groups, many were not touched by it. E agrees with A on the positive appeal and B has evidence for Nazi appeal to particular groups, but stresses divisions more than the others (though C does talk about informers). A is certainly typical – with unemployment very high in 1933 and a great deal of Nazi propaganda centred on the need for work and the selfish policies of the elites in government (Bruning as the 'Hunger Chancellor'), then workers might well be expecting help – and there were some well-publicised schemes early in the regime, though the recovery of the economy would probably have brought more work without the Nazis. The repression was intense as E says too. The source is looking back and may be making rather too much of the resistance and not enough of the splits in the left, with some communists seeing Nazism as the death throes of capitalism and trade unions drawing back from the general strike. However the Reichstag Fire Decree and the sudden onslaught on the left was effective. B may reflect the frustrations of the SPD but whether it is fair to blame the great masses rather than the ineffective leadership offered by the SPD is debatable. Failing to take responsibility after 1928 and offering little resistance to the steady erosion of democracy – especially the suppression of the SPD government by Papen in Prussia – indicates that repression did not have to be very extensive. However the Nazis did indeed target the *Mittelstand* with propaganda and the fear of Communism may well reflect the success of this campaign. This was also an influence on church leaders, fearful of a repeat of scenes of destroyed churches in the USSR in Germany. By 1936 propaganda was less focused on anti-communism than the positive benefits of the Folk Community. In D the Nazi eagle is a protecting and comforting symbol. With full employment, a rising population, help for the farmers and international recognition in the Berlin Olympics, repression and fear had given way to positive reinforcements of the regime's successes. It is unlikely that without real economic achievements this sort of propaganda would have had much effect but E confirms that most of the population did not protest and were not much affected by brute force. E reflects much modern historiography in playing down the role of repression for 'ordinary' Germans. There may be some knowledge of the quite limited numbers of Gestapo agents in comparison, say with the KGB or the Stasi, and their reliance on denunciations by members of the public. However, this is only from one area and depends on the memories of the respondents. The documents as a whole do not all take into account the quite steep increase in repression after September 1939.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 5I |

2 Assess the view that Hitler's personal leadership was the most important reason for the rise to power of the Nazi movement in the period 1929–33. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Discussions of Hitler's personal leadership might stress his oratory and ability to move crowds by playing on simple, unifying factors. The skill with which he asserted his personal authority after 1925 and his adoption, against internal resistance, of the policy of legality together with his handling of opposition in the party, shows a remarkable degree of political insight. The energetic campaigning he pursued after 1929 and his ability to charm members of the elite who despised him socially might be discussed. The Nazis were a Fuhrer party and he kept them together; his acuity in rejecting the SA's call for a putsch and his nerve in rejecting an inferior position in a coalition in 1932 must be acknowledged as key issues. However it was not just his personal qualities; the changing economic context after 1929; the miscalculations of his enemies to right and left; the position of the army; the fears of the *Mittelstand*; the disunity of the left and even, as some historians claim, the *Sonderweg* taken by Germany since the weakening of liberalism by Bismarck and the trauma of war and defeat should be set against Hitlercentric explanations.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Here the judgement is whether, as revisionists think, Hitler's role can be overstated. By November 1932 despite all his efforts, the Nazis were not going to be chosen by Hindenburg and a coup would have led to army action against them. The party was beginning to split and Hitler's hysterical oratory was paying fewer dividends. Had not the elite fatally split and had not Von Papen underestimated Hitler, then whatever personal qualities he had might not have been enough. However, this has to be set against the massive support that Hitler had created, without which Von Papen would not have wanted to deal with him. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 5I |

3 Did the social changes brought about by the Third Reich amount to a social revolution in Germany? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Much will depend on the definition of 'social revolution'. The Nazis aimed to weaken traditional class divisions by the creation of a new Racial Community. Bonds between family members would be replaced by stronger bonds between members of the community; youth would be given a new vision; the place of women would be defined by the needs of the community; there would be more cooperation between the classes as all strove for the future of the race; there would be new attitudes towards key elements such as the role of the individual in the community; religion would be changed to take into account the needs of the race. These ambitious aims were tackled in different ways and with varying degrees of success. Candidates could look at whether youth policy really did produce a new, tough, ideologically motivated generation. There is evidence of both success and failure. The educational and youth policies lacked resources and often the necessary imagination; but youth gained a status never seen before and many did fight passionately for the Fuehrer and his vision. Women's policy was inconsistent, but some argue that the Nazis' stress on the importance of women offered new status and opportunities as well as exploitation. The policy towards workers varied in its success, but much of the welfare capitalism generated did last after the war and some seems remarkably modern. The wholesale commitment of workers to the regime may have eluded the Nazis but there was limited outright resistance and some blurring of the class barriers, especially as the radicalism of war eroded the power of the traditional elites. There is plenty of evidence of limited success of the new ideas, but also evidence of its remarkable appeal and effectiveness.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Balanced answers will not treat the period as one but look at different aspects. The impact of war is important here and candidates should attempt to take a balanced view of the period as a whole – better answers will establish a framework for discussion of the social impact. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

| | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 11 | Mark Scheme: Teachers' version | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Pre-U – May/June 2011 | 9769 | 5I |

4 Assess the view that the Holocaust was a result of war after 1939.

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. This is a well-established debate, but candidates are expected to consider the actual evidence and events, not to write a historiographical account. The issue really is whether the anti-Semitic acts since 1933 amount to a preparation for the Holocaust and show intentions for mass murder, or whether these acts were typical of the random brutality of the regime and do not necessarily point inevitably to mass murder which arose with the sharp rise in radicalisation brought by war. The early boycott of Jewish shops, the economic discriminations and the random acts of violence and discrimination which characterised the early years of Nazi Jewish policy did not pursue the wholesale violence and expulsion demanded by the SA. There is evidence of pragmatism in the Nuremberg Laws, apparently improvised and possibly driven by local radicalism. The accelerated tempo of anti-Jewish measures after the Holocaust began seems to show the impact of territorial expansion on policy. The events of *Kristallnacht* have been seen as emerging from internecine strife among the Nazi leaders rather than a pre-determined plan. The increase in discrimination prior to the war has indications of future policy, for example ghettoization, but may well have been motivated by previous success in getting Jews out of Germany. By January 1939 Hitler was openly speaking of '*Vernichtung*' but whether this was merely rhetoric is debatable. Plans for forced emigration to Madagascar were official policy well into 1940. Did the rapid successes of 1940 trigger larger ambitions, perhaps always present, but dormant? Or did they simply allow pre-existing plans to go into operation? Did Hitler really only react to the sudden acquisition of millions of Polish, then Russian Jews or was the whole preparation for war a preparation for a war against those Jews and the Bolshevik menace the Nazis associated with them? The random killings, the ghettoization, the construction and use of death camps may seem to show a progression, but evidence suggests some lack of a firm strategy – whether economic needs to use the Jews came before the ideological need to murder them was not always clear and varied in different phases of the war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well-considered set of judgements. Some may argue strongly one way or another, but there must be supporting evidence and better answers will show a balance, even if agreeing with one interpretation. There will be a treatment of the whole period, though not necessarily in a balanced way for higher marks. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.