

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History
(6HI01) Paper F

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43882

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: A01a and A01b (13%)

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>

5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which directly addresses the focus of the question and which demonstrates explicit understanding of the key issues contained in it. It will be broadly balanced in its treatment of these key issues. The analysis will be supported by accurate, relevant and appropriately selected factual material which demonstrates some range and depth.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 5: 29-30 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing extended writing will be in place.</p>
----------	--------------	---

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

Unit 1 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Total Marks	60	60
% Weighting	25%	25%

F1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on the impact of the 1848-9 revolutions, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which the outcomes of the revolutions influenced the process of Italian unification.</p> <p>Some candidates may suggest that the lessons learned from the 1848-9 revolutions had a significant long-term influence on the process of Italian unification with reference to examples such as the increased awareness that Italy could not ‘make herself’ without the assistance of foreign intervention in the fight against Austria, the emergence of Piedmont with its Statuto, the failure of the Roman Republic and subsequent French occupation of Rome, and the lack of support from the Papacy. This long-term significance, however, may be balanced with reference to the emergence of more significant, later short-term influences such as the role of Garibaldi’s invasion of the south or by the equally long-term influence of Cavour.</p> <p>At the higher levels candidates will possibly suggest that the long-term influence of the lessons learned were clearly interlinked with short-term events. For example, candidates may suggest that Garibaldi’s experiences with the Roman Republic affected his subsequent actions in the 1860s.</p> <p>Some candidates may attempt to establish extent by weighing up the role of the ‘lessons learned’ against other factors. This approach may produce relevant responses but the focus should be on the influence of the lessons learned from the revolutions.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will clearly address the extent of influence, by considering the significance of the lessons learned of 1848-9 for the unification process, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent or integrate the arguments into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the influence of the lessons learned of 1848-9 by addressing strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly explaining the consequences of the 1848-9 revolutions and/or the influences on the process of Italian unification. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on the unification process in Italy and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which Italy had achieved national unity by the end of 1870. Most candidates will probably refer to a variety of different issues affecting the extent to which national unity was achieved, including territorial extent, government influence, and social, economic and cultural development within the peninsula. However, answers that refer exclusively to territorial, political or geographic extent may access all levels.</p> <p>In considering the unification of Italy candidates may refer to the events leading to territorial and political unity from across the time period of the topic (1815-1870), including the creation of the Kingdom of Italy under Victor Emmanuel, the efforts to gain Venetia and Rome subsequently, and the situation in 1870.</p> <p>In determining the extent of national unity answers may consider the continued lack of territory such as Nice and Savoy, the position of the Papacy, the the nature of the unification process, for example the use of plebiscites or the meeting at Teano, the influence of Piedmont and the political unity of the new kingdom. Most response are likely to mention the economic and social disparity between North and South, with some mentioning the ‘brigand wars’, and the lack of an ‘Italian’ identity and culture. At the higher levels some candidates may suggest that the process led to Piedmontese expansion rather than created an Italian nation.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will clearly address the extent of national unity, by considering the situation by the end of 1870, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent or integrate the arguments into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the extent of national unity, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly explaining the situation in 1870 and/or describing the process of Italian unification. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

F2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>The question is focused on the reasons why Prussia became the dominant state in Germany. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the relative importance of key factors of causation with specific reference to economic and military strength. To reach the higher levels responses should be focused on the relative importance of the two key factors of economic and military strength stated in the question, and as to whether economic strength was the key factor. Economic strength may be exemplified by Prussian industrialisation, the role of Zollverein and government policies to strengthen the economy, while examples of military strength may refer to the reformed army after 1862 and the wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870-71). Many candidates will probably refer to Bismarck's 'blood and iron' speech in order to establish a mutual interdependence of the two factors and at the highest levels might suggest that, although both factors are important, without Bismarck then Prussia would never have taken advantage of both. Another example might be the role of the railways in mobilisation and the contribution of Krupps in equipping the army. However, candidates who produce a multi-factor answer without reference to the specific suggestion in the question wording are unlikely to be able to achieve more than low Level 4.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will give balanced consideration to the importance of economic factors relative to military factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement as to whether economic factors were more important.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus one of the key factors more than the other.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>The question is focused on the development of the German Empire in the years 1871-1890. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which a national identity had been established within the Empire during Bismarck's Chancellorship. To establish extent at the higher levels, candidates will provide a definition or understanding of national identity in an introduction or through the course of the response.</p> <p>In reference to establishing a German national identity candidates may address political issues, such as the constitution of the German empire, the introduction of universal manhood suffrage, Bismarck's alliance with the National Liberals in the 1870s, combined with his policy of Kulturkampf and 'state socialism' in the 1880s. Answers may also refer to economic, financial and administrative policies, including unified currency, banking and tariff reforms, legal codification of civil law, government support for industry, free trade policies in the 1870s and protectionism following the Great Depression of the 1880s. Some candidates may refer to Bismarck's attempts to increase German prestige through diplomacy and alliances in Europe and with particular reference to the beginnings of a German colonial policy, but knowledge of foreign policy is not required.</p> <p>To establish the extent to which his policies achieved a national identity, candidates may refer to the relative success of national policies, the divisions within the newly created German empire and/or the extent to which German people viewed themselves as part of a German nation. Answers may refer to the federal nature of the German constitution, Prussian influence on the armed forces, Prussian and conservative dominance in the aims and objectives of Bismarck's policies, both political and economic, and the divisive effects of Bismarck's policies of Kulturkampf and anti-socialism. There were few symbols of national identity established before Bismarck's fall from power, for example it was not until 1892 that a national anthem was employed and some candidates may suggest that his tendency to identify national 'enemies' such as Catholics and Socialists only added to divisions. Some responses at the higher levels might suggest that a German identity had been established but one which was dominated by Prussian ideals.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which a 'national identity' was established, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent or integrate the arguments into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. However, the response may be imbalanced suggesting that national identity either was or was not achieved or by focusing on one area of policy.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and</p>	30

	<p>there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	--	--

F3 The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the rise of the Fascist Party (PNF) in Italy in the years after 1919 and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which this was due to the impact of the First World War. Answers may focus on the consequences of the war in Italy with reference to the influence of the ‘mutilated’ victory, the economic difficulties created by the end of the war and the political situation in persuading many Italians to join or support the ideas of Mussolini and the fascists. However, in supporting the statement candidates might also mention the impact of the divisive nature of the entry into the war, the social and economic upheavals during the war and the military difficulties Italy encountered despite being on the ‘winning’ side.</p> <p>Candidates may challenge the extent to which the impact of war was responsible for the rise of the Party with reference to longer term pre-1915 economic, social and political difficulties, franchise reform, weaknesses in Giolitti’s government, the desire of peasants and workers for a ‘new way’ in politics, the effectiveness of Fascist propaganda and the leadership and personal popularity of Mussolini. Some higher level responses might suggest an interrelationship between these long-term factors and the impact of the war. For example Fascist anti-socialist policies attracted the support of businessmen and the middle classes whose long-term dislike of socialism was fuelled further by events during the war.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will clearly address ‘how far...responsible’, by considering the impact of the First World War as a factor and/or in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material, in some depth, across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the extent of the impact of First World War and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. Candidates may emphasise the ‘mutilated victory’ over other aspects of the war.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the impact of the First World War on Italy or the growth of Fascist support in general. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on the success of Mussolini's attempts to make Italy a 'great and respected' nation and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which this was achieved in the years 1922-43. It is expected that candidates will focus mainly on foreign policy. However, aspects of domestic policy are relevant and should be rewarded if referred to. It is also very likely that candidates will refer to Mussolini's belief that Italy should also be 'feared'. Emphasis should be based on the key words used in the question but candidates may make relevant judgements based on this aim.</p> <p>The specification suggests that candidates should have knowledge of foreign policy with reference to Fiume, Corfu, Abyssinia, Spain and Germany, as well as the diplomatic and military preparations for war. Reference to other geographical areas should be rewarded but not expected.</p> <p>Candidates may also refer to elements of Mussolini's domestic policy that were clearly linked to foreign policy such as the 'battles' for births and grain. For example, it may be suggested that Mussolini's 'battles' were admired by conservative politicians in Britain, such as Churchill. There may also be reference to Mussolini 'making the trains run on time'.</p> <p>Those candidates who differentiate between great and respected to determine success, either with reference to specific policies or change over time, will probably reach the higher levels. Some candidates might suggest, for example, that although Mussolini, and therefore, Italy was treated with respect in some diplomatic situations of the 1920s and 1930s, even at Munich, Italian actions in Corfu, Abyssinia, Spain and the lead up to the Second World War could not be described as either great or respected. It is also possible that some candidates may discuss the differing attitudes towards Italy within Europe and the way in which this changed over time.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the relative extent to which Mussolini was able to transform Italy into a 'great and respected' nation, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material, in some depth, whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>Level 4 candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider Mussolini's success by addressing strengths and limitations, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. Candidates may focus on the pre or post-Abyssinia, for example.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive, charting the course of Mussolini's foreign policy during these years, and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate</p>	30

	material in places.	
--	---------------------	--

	Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	
--	--	--

F4 Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>This question is focused on the political development of the newly established Second Republic in Spain the years between 1931 and the outbreak of the military coup in June 1936. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the reasons why the early successes of republican government were undermined so quickly. Candidates may offer a range of reasons for political instability but should refer to them in relation to the early years of the Republic and/or in terms of relative importance to achieve at the higher levels.</p> <p>Candidates might suggest that in the early years a new coalition government worked together to introduce reforms that sought to deal with the grievances of many of the Spanish people, including a new Constitution supporting redistribution of property, secular education, civil marriage and divorce and the separation of church and state. Further measures reduced the powers of the army, created a new internal police force for the republic and gave a degree of autonomy to Catalonia. Also land reform began with reform of property, peasant and labourers' rights. The presence of a broad coalition government seemed to suggest that many of the divisions present in Spanish political and social life might be overcome. However, this coalition quickly broke down and with a series of left-right coalitions political stability deteriorated rapidly leading to the attempted coup d'état against the Popular Front in 1936.</p> <p>Candidates might suggest different reasons for this rapid breakdown such as long-term divisions within Spain, a lack of finances to support the reforms, the swift creation of a conservative anti-republican alliance, the disunity amongst republican supporters and within the left-wing and the lack of leadership. Those who suggest that the initial success, the swift success of the revolution followed by the introduction of controversial reforms with little planning, actually caused the subsequent political instability will probably reach the higher levels.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will focus on the reasons for the collapse of political stability considering why, in relation to earlier successes, the political situation in the new Republic deteriorated so rapidly, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. These answers will address a range of factors in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the importance of a range of factors responsible for the deterioration in political stability, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. They may establish reasons for the deterioration without reference to the successes of the early period of the Republic.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps outlining the events of the Second Republic with implicit explanation or focusing on a limited range of</p>	30

	<p>factors; the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>This question is focused on the political development of the newly established Second Republic in Spain the years between 1931 and the outbreak of the military coup in June 1936. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the reasons why the early successes of republican government were undermined so quickly. Candidates may offer a range of reasons for political instability but should refer to them in relation to the early years of the Republic and/or in terms of relative importance to achieve at the higher levels.</p> <p>Candidates might suggest that in the early years a new coalition government worked together to introduce reforms that sought to deal with the grievances of many of the Spanish people, including a new Constitution supporting redistribution of property, secular education, civil marriage and divorce and the separation of church and state. Further measures reduced the powers of the army, created a new internal police force for the republic and gave a degree of autonomy to Catalonia. Also land reform began with reform of property, peasant and labourers' rights. The presence of a broad coalition government seemed to suggest that many of the divisions present in Spanish political and social life might be overcome. However, this coalition quickly broke down and with a series of left-right coalitions political stability deteriorated rapidly leading to the attempted coup d'état against the Popular Front in 1936.</p> <p>Candidates might suggest different reasons for this rapid breakdown such as long-term divisions within Spain, a lack of finances to support the reforms, the swift creation of a conservative anti-republican alliance, the disunity amongst republican supporters and within the left-wing and the lack of leadership. Those who suggest that the initial success, the swift success of the revolution followed by the introduction of controversial reforms with little planning, actually caused the subsequent political instability will probably reach the higher levels.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will focus on the reasons for the collapse of political stability considering why, in relation to earlier successes, the political situation in the new Republic deteriorated so rapidly, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. These answers will address a range of factors in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the importance of a range of factors responsible for the deterioration in political stability, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less</p>	30

	<p>secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. They may establish reasons for the deterioration without reference to the successes of the early period of the Republic.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps outlining the events of the Second Republic with implicit explanation or focusing on a limited range of factors; the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	--	--

F5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the contrasting development of East and West Germany in the years from the end of World War II to the building of the Berlin Wall. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which this contrasting development was wholly due to the emergence of Cold War attitudes. Candidates may discuss development in general or choose to define development as either political and/or economic. Those who show an awareness of the interaction, for example, between diplomatic relations and economic factors, or between international and German politics, should be rewarded high marks within the appropriate level.</p> <p>Candidates may suggest that the emergence of Cold War attitudes had a far-reaching effect on the development of the two ‘Germanies’ referring to the cumulative effect of events from the 1945 conferences to the Berlin crisis in creating a social democracy in West Germany and a communist East Germany. Reference might also be made to the positive impact of Marshall Aid and Allied troop deployment on the economy of the West as the East became increasingly hamstrung by Soviet economic influence.</p> <p>In establishing the extent to which the contrasting development was wholly due to emerging Cold War attitudes other factors may also be examined, such as underlying pre-war German influences, the impact of invasion on East and West Germany, the situation in Germany itself in 1945, and the role of German parties and politicians. Candidates may also refer to the extent to which development was affected by the level of underlying economic resources found in the two areas.</p> <p>Some higher level responses might refer to change over time. For example, some candidates might agree that all development was ultimately the result of the emergence of the Cold War, showing a clear chain of events, while others might suggest that although Cold War attitudes were responsible for initial differences, and remained underlying, much of the contrasting development in the 1950s was due to the situation and politicians in Germany itself.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will clearly address extent by examining the arguments for and against the emergence of Cold War attitudes as being wholly responsible, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. These answers will establish the extent of change in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent in an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the extent to which the emergence of Cold War attitudes contributed to the contrasting development, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the</p>	30

	<p>focus of the question, explaining the contrasting development. However, the supporting material is likely to be lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>This question is focused on the contribution of a key event to the process of the reunification of Germany. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the significance of the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 to this process. Most candidates will focus on short-term events of 1989-1991 but others may discuss the reunification in a wider sense looking at longer-term influences going back to the original separation of the 'two Germanies'. Responses may also establish the significance of the event by reference to the specific actions on the 9-10th November 1989 and/or the wider symbolic significance of the Berlin Wall itself. Candidates might suggest that the fall of the Wall was very significant with reference, for example, to both the symbolic and physical opening up of the borders between the two countries and/or that this one event led to a chain reaction that inevitably led to reunification. The Berlin Wall had signified both the physical and symbolic separation of the two countries since 1961 and its dismantling almost overnight might have seemed to suggest that reunification could happen with speed as well. Other responses might suggest the fall of the Wall itself had very little significance for the reunification process. These responses may refer to the 'accidental' nature of the opening up of the Wall on the night of the 9th and, argue that events prior to the opening and/or subsequent to it, such as the collapse of the SED, Helmut Kohl's reunification drive and the reactions of the 'world' powers were more influential in the process.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will clearly address significance, by considering the contribution of the fall of the Berlin Wall to the reunification process either by establishing both its strengths and limitations as a causal factor or referring to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material, in some depth, across most of the time period. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the importance of the fall of the Wall, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the events leading to the fall and/or the process of reunification. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

F6 The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for Arab-Israeli hostility in the years from the creation of the independent state of Israel to the Yom Kippur War. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which the continued hostility can be explained by the Arab support for the Palestinian cause. Candidates may approach the question by referring to hostility in general with reference to specific examples or by following a chronological analysis of the key conflicts (1948-9, 1956, 1967, 1973). A chronological approach will not necessarily lead to a narrative response and should be rewarded for analysis and evaluation shown.</p> <p>With the declaration of the state of Israel and the collapse of the partition plan in 1948, Arab-Israeli hostility remained constant in the years to 1973. Most Arab states and Arab nationalists supported the creation of an independent Palestine and the rights of Palestinian refugees but have supported, in varying degrees, Palestinian political groups such as the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organisation) founded in 1964.</p> <p>Other explanations for continued Arab-Israeli hostility which may be explored include the pre-1945 Middle East situation, the Cold War, the individual aims of Arab states and the actions and policies of Israel. Some candidates might suggest that, although there may have been other factors explaining Arab-Israeli hostility, the fundamental underlying cause of hostility is that of Palestine. Reference might be made to the events of 1948, the continuous expansion and development of Israel, the effect of the Palestinian refugee situation and increased radicalisation of Palestinian politics. Others might suggest that, despite the underlying support for the Palestinian cause, other factors were just as influential at different times. For example, responses may refer to actions and Arab nationalist policies of Nasser in the 1950s.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will weigh up the extent to which hostility across the time period can be explained by .Arab support for the Palestinian cause, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. The response may focus on the earlier or later part of the time period, for example.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. There may be a generalised description of Arab-Israeli conflict over the time period or detailed but unfocused descriptions of the individual wars.</p> <p>Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>This question is focused on the reasons for the increase in radical Islamist politics in the 1990s and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which this was caused by Western involvement in the Gulf region.</p> <p>In considering Western involvement in the Gulf region, candidates may refer to the long-term resentment of Western influence, the continued US military presence in Saudi Arabia, the consequences of the military intervention in Kuwait and the subsequent decisions made by the West concerning the future of the region, all of which may be seen to have contributed to increased Islamist political activity.</p> <p>Responses should focus on the contribution of Western involvement but may refer to other causal factors to establish extent. Other causal factors that may be considered are reaction to Arab-Israeli diplomacy, the post-Soviet international situation, the influence of Iran, the decline of Arab nationalism and the subsequent growth of independent radical groups, and the breakdown of the Palestinian peace negotiations along with a growing militant tendency within Palestinian politics. Candidates may argue that Western involvement in the Gulf region was merely one of many different factors that interlinked to enable the growth of radical Islamist politics during the 1990s or that, although there were longer-term causes, intervention in the Gulf War, in particular, was the trigger that set off an increase in radical activity, which led both to increased Islamist influence in the governments of the region and the further radicalisation of independent political organisations such as Al-Qaeda.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the significance of the consequences of Western involvement in the Gulf region, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material, in some depth, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Answers may focus on the events surrounding the Gulf War rather than across the time period.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive, for example, describing Islamist activity, and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p>At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

F7 From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany 1918-45

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
13	<p>The question is focused on the key features of Hitler’s rise to power with specific reference to the role of political opponents. It requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the reasons why political opponents of the Nazi Party were unable to counter the growing support for the Nazis and prevent Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor. By 1932 neither the left-wing or centre parties had been able to counter the rise in electoral support for the Nazis. The December elections suggested that support may have peaked but the lack of a majority party allowed Hitler to become involved in the political intrigue that commonly decided Weimar chancellorship. Having been appointed Chancellor Hitler was able effectively to create a dictatorship. The question asks why political opponents were unable to prevent these events from happening.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the strengths of the Nazi party but to achieve the higher levels this should be in relation to how this affected the ability of political opponents to counter Hitler’s rise to power. Most responses will probably refer to political opponents in terms of political parties but this can also refer to individuals who opposed or were rivals for power such as von Papen. Candidates may suggest a range of causal factors such as the effect of proportional representation and the use of Article 48, elite fear of left-wing politics, political and organisational divisions of both left and right, fear of Communism/Bolshevism amongst the electorate, lack of financial support on the left, failure of electioneering in comparison to the Nazis, lack of a clear opposition figurehead and the underestimation of Hitler’s political ability in January 1933. Some candidates may refer to the political manoeuvring & tactics of the Nazis against the communists before the Enabling Act (March 1933). Such responses may be rewarded but the specification makes it clear that candidates cannot be expected to venture beyond Hitler’s appointment as Chancellor. Some candidates may suggest that political opponents were always too weak to counter the rise of Hitler while others might suggest that for every weakness of the opposition the Nazis had a commensurate strength. The effect of the wider political, economic and social context on the strength of the opposition may also be addressed.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the relative importance of reasons, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Reasons will be well developed and relevant but will lack direct focus on failure of political opponents to prevent Hitler’s rise to power.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. Responses are likely to explain the role</p>	30

	<p>of political opponents and/or describe the rise of Hitler to power. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
14	<p>The question is focused on the causes of German defeat in World War II and requires an analysis, and evaluation, of the extent to which this was due to the poor decisions of Hitler. Candidates may refer to decisions made with regard to the domestic government of Germany, the economy and the running of the war. Candidates are not required to have detailed knowledge of military campaigns but they should be aware of key turning points in the war and be able to make reference to decisions made over Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, the invasion of the USSR, D-Day etc.</p> <p>In considering Hitler's actions candidates may refer to decisions such as the resolve to go to war in 1939 despite a weak economic foundation, the radicalisation of Nazi policies, unwillingness to allow a total mobilisation on the domestic front and to continue with forced labour, the failure to take advantage of the British retreat at Dunkirk, the declaration of war against the USA, to ignore army generals over Stalingrad and to withdraw from public view as the war progressed.</p> <p>To consider relative importance candidates might consider other factors such as a lack of economic resources, the effectiveness of the Allies, underestimation of the Allied forces and the effect on morale of wartime bombing. The best answers will probably suggest that German defeat was the result of a series of inter-linked factors while coming to a judgement as to the effect of Hitler's decisions. For example, that Hitler's underestimation of the Allied fighting effectiveness led to poor decisions made both in domestic and military policy which meant that Germany was not economically strong enough to bear the brunt of a two-front war fought by determined opponents.</p> <p>Answers at Level 5 will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the consequences of Hitler's poor decisions across the time period relative to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement.</p> <p>At Level 4 candidates will address the question well, supporting their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. There may be an imbalance in the discussion of factors, perhaps focusing on reasons other than poor decisions for German defeat.</p> <p>Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. Responses might outline the events of the war with implicit understanding of the focus of the question. At Level 2 will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places.</p> <p>Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30