

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/73

Paper 5I (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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

1 (a) To what extent does Document C corroborate the evidence outlined in Document D about Hitler’s role in the Holocaust? [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. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities: C shows Hitler dismissing concerns for Jewish killings and taking personal responsibility ‘I have to do it because nobody else will’. This seems to indicate both knowledge and an acceptance of responsibility. This seems to corroborate Himmler’s claim in D that ‘the Fuhrer gave me the order to carry out the total solution of the Jewish question’. D is emphatic that there was an order from Hitler that could not be disobeyed. C’s view that objections had to be overruled – Hitler says to the Intelligence officer ‘You’re getting soft’ seems to be corroborated by Himmler saying that any qualms were overridden by the Fuhrer’s order.

Differences – C is referring to a specific situation in Riga in January 1942. D is referring to a much wider policy of extermination in 1944. C may corroborate an attitude by Hitler but cannot corroborate the much more extensive policy and the decision for the deaths of millions.

Provenance: there are problems with both documents. The highest ranking Intelligence officer is not named in the letter and ‘he is reported’ to have told Hitler about the Riga killings and Hitler’s words are not heard directly by the writer of the letter. What ‘it’ refers to is not clear – is it the killings in occupied regions or is it the much wider policy of annihilation? D is testimony given to a historian thirty five years after the event. It is a recollection of what Himmler said and there is no real corroboration. Was Himmler attempting to secure support for a policy which elements of the army might find disturbing and invoking Hitler’s authority? By 1944 it was not at all certain that the German leadership would escape being held responsible for the annihilation. Against this, is there any reason to doubt Hitler’s support and approval for the racial policies?

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the Holocaust emerged as a result of the situation in the East created by the war? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]**

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on 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 and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in 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 and understanding and evaluation of different historical interpretations is to be expected.

There is a debate about how far the war created the isolation and sense of emergency that allowed extreme racial policy to develop and how far that policy had been envisaged from the origins of the movement. Document A seems to offer evidence that an alternative policy of Jewish settlement in Madagascar was a plan of Hitler's by January 1941 and that concentration of Polish Jews in ghettos was not a preconceived policy, but one that was created as a response to wartime conditions 'to protect the German army and population'. There is no indication here that the ghettos would be a prelude to controlling the Jewish population, isolating them and then deporting them to die. Indeed 'completely sealed Jewish ghettos should not be created.' Ghettos in Germany had been created 1938–39 and there had been increasing separation of Jews. The evidence is not from the top of the party and the author is part of the Resettlement Department; orders come not from Berlin but from Cracow, so this source may not be privy to higher level policy. By December 1941 a different sort of 'solution' seemed to be emerging, but not from the civil administration represented by A or the army, a member of which is reporting in C. Here the brutal SS commander is describing executions in Lithuania. The Einsatzcommandos which followed Wehrmacht forces were a feature of the nature of the war in the East which did not follow the accepted norms of warfare that were by and large prevalent in the West. This could be seen as a sort of deadly improvisation by fanatics under cover of 'security measures' or it could be seen as evidence of a previous intention as the phrase 'solving the Jewish problem' is used before the Wannsee Conference offered more systematic solutions. The complete candour about murder in an official report may be revealing. C indicted that there was not widespread acceptance of the atrocities – so if there were a plan it was not necessarily known about by elements of the army and intelligence forces. Hitler's reaction may be seen as showing murderous intentionality or simply an off-the-cuff reaction which seemed to him weak in a wartime situation. That Himmler feels it necessary to justify the massacres to the officers as late as 1944 and to claim that the Führer's orders overcame his view of the 'horrid assignment' may either show the Führer's iron will, or serious concerns that panning might not have approval. E suggests a lack of planning contrary to the expressions of the Führer's will in C and D and the obviously officially sanctioned killings in B. Here the unexpected stalemate of the Russian campaign has blocked settlement; ghettos have led to problems of disease and extermination is the 'simplest solution' and supported not just by the top but by many in the party and government. This may well be challenged, not only by the evidence here, but also by the increasing violence shown before 1939, by the development of racial euthanasia and by the utterances of Hitler. The view that the ghettos were improvised is supported by A but it may be unconvincing that the decision for mass extermination arose because of public health problems in them, or that the type of actions shown in B were spontaneous and purely a result of war. No set answer is expected.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

2 How important was Hitler’s personal leadership to the development of the NSDAP to 1929? [30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The answers should focus on the years before 1929 – the development is the growth from a small racist debating club to a movement; from a purely Bavarian organisation to a national one; from a fringe national party to one that was capable through nationwide organisation and propaganda to have an electoral breakthrough in 1930. Hitler established his authority early in the history of the Party as speaker, organiser and theoretician. After his release from Landsberg, he re-established the party as a Führer Party. It was his policy of working within the system to destroy it that had a major impact on the way that the Party was able to combine radicalism and an appeal to those who respected authority and law. Hitler’s personal activism in 1923 made a considerable impact and the ethos of the party was orientated towards loyalty to a charismatic leader.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Hitler’s particular oratorical style and his ability to mesmerise people in mass meetings; his personal leadership style and the political skills he showed in reuniting the party after the debacle of 1923 and offering a clear strategy of focusing on different discontents and staying within the bounds of legality to avoid being wiped out by the army could indicate that his leadership was the most important factor. However, there were others: Strasser’s build up of the NSBO and the widening appeal of the party towards the workers; Goebbels’ skilful propaganda techniques; Röhm’s build up of a large paramilitary force; the tolerance showed by key members of the elite, for example the Bavarian justice minister Gurtner who ensured that Hitler did not languish in prison for years after 1923 and Gutenberg who allied with Hitler in 1929. Alternative explanations for the party development might be the circumstances which permitted it to grow – the electoral system; the beginnings of downturn and the Young Plan in 1929 and the authoritarian traditions.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

3 Who was more successful in meeting Nazi aims in economic policy before 1939: Schacht or Göring? [30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded.

Schacht rejected protectionism and excessive control and hoped for recovery through exports and bilateral agreements. He did not favour large scale public works, but wanted to see Germany obtain money and raw materials by using her industrial strength to dominate the trade of neighbours. His financial skills were used to disguise the money used for arms – the so called Mefo Bills. The aims early on were economic recovery, ending unemployment, laying the basis for rearmament. Schacht did not play a part in all these aims and by 1936 the aim was faster arms production and more direct encouragement of production. It was no longer necessary to worry about unemployment – indeed there was a labour shortage. The wider economic goals – the creation of a huge German dominated market in central Europe using the resources of conquered territories required an arms build-up and Göring's Five Year Plans were set up alongside existing economic policies.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Some may see the more orthodox and trade-led policies as being more economically responsible than the often wasteful and haphazard measures undertaken by the Five Year Plans; but Nazi economic aims were inseparable from longer-term geopolitical visions. Though there had been considerable progress made in the economy by 1936, the trade agreements had encountered problems and free market forces could not deliver the sort of rapid rearmament that was required. The Four Year plans openly prioritised 'guns before butter'; whether the development of *Ersatz* materials was efficient or not and whether the development of great concerns directly controlled by the state was always efficient may be irrelevant to the creation of a sense that resources should be linked to expansion. In fact a full war economy did not develop until the war; there was 'over heating', pressures such as inflation and duplication of economic policies and institutions, so there is much to criticise in purely economic terms. Schacht had more economic expertise and his policies helped with recovery and maintained elements of orthodox and 'responsible' economic policy. However, there were signs of limitation and strain by 1936. Göring swept aside any restrictions or reliance on orthodoxy, but increased planning did not go as far as in Russia and he still worked with capitalist concerns; planning was often wasteful and ineffective and the costs of some projects outweighed their usefulness. However it was closer to a wartime economic model and to Nazi aims.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	73

4 To what extent did the success of Nazi foreign policy between 1933 and 1940 depend more on Hitler’s diplomatic skills than on the weaknesses of other powers? [30]

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded.

In 1933 Germany had a small army, limited by treaties and there had been little effective revision of unpopular territorial adjustments made in 1919. Germany was not isolated; her statesmen had worked with the other European powers, and made useful agreements with the USSR. It was a member of the League of Nations and the evacuation of Allied forces had restored its independence. Reparations were no longer being paid in practice. By 1940 the losses of territory had been restored; alliances with other revisionist powers – Italy, Japan and Russia – had reoriented German policy. The defeat of 1918 had been overturned by the rapid conquest of France. In addition to restoring the Germany of 1914, fresh territory had been gained in the East and foreign policy successes had made Hitler a highly admired German statesman at home. Britain remained unconquered, but there was every chance of a settlement and Britain could not threaten German domination of Europe. Hitler had shown remarkable skill – he had reassured Europe of his peaceful intentions by the pact with Poland; he had gambled correctly that rearmament and the remilitarisation of the Rhine would not be opposed by force; he had established a friendship with Italy which allowed him to annex Austria in 1938. By offering the prospect of a settlement of European disputes and by very skilful diplomacy, he had gained the Sudetenland over which Germany had no historic claim. The gamble of the Polish campaign had paid off and the war had proved to be a risk worth taking with the defeat of France. The pact with Stalin had cleverly neutralised the USSR and allowed Germany to risk a two front war in 1939.

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 judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

The counter view is that without very serious weaknesses on the part of the other European powers, no amount of diplomatic skill would have led to success. Had Britain and France been able to offer a joint action towards German rearmament and initial expansion, then relatively limited German forces would have been powerless. However neither country’s leadership could overcome public concern about war. Tardy rearmament by Britain and over-reliance on incomplete fortifications in France were major errors. Hitler maintained the initiative, playing on fears of war and guilt about the treatment of Germany, but without weakness and misjudgement in France and Britain could not have been successful. Stalin put short-term gains before long-term security in 1939. Polish leaders played into German hands by reckless policies. Better analyses will see the interaction between the favourable circumstances created and Hitler’s ability to profit from them.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuations 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.