



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel AS Level

In History (8HI0) Paper 2D



Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2017

Publications Code 8HI0_2D_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see many well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on AS Paper 2D: The unification of Italy, c1830-70 (2D.1) and The unification of Germany, c1840-71 (2D.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part focused on a separate source. The question assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five possible second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/difference and significance. Questions may combine second order concepts, for example, consequence and change. Candidates answer one question from a choice of three.

In general, candidates were much more confident in their approach to Section A this series. It is pleasing to note that more candidates understood what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. However, some candidates are still writing about limitations in question (a) and, in some cases, this did impact on the time available for candidates to focus on 'weight' in question (b). Also more in evidence this series was an awareness of the historical knowledge base required in this section to be able to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources. However, a significant minority of candidates continued to use their contextual knowledge in isolation, rather than to illuminate what was in the sources.

In Section B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was the lack of a sharp focus on the precise terms of the question and/or the second order concept that was being targeted.

Centres are to be congratulated for the thoroughness with which they prepare their candidates for the examination, but it remains important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic. Full coverage of the specification is enormously important. Candidates are, in general, clearly aware of both the structure and the timing of the examination paper; there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

Candidate performance on individual questions for Paper 2E is considered in the next section. Please note that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different routes of the paper to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement.

Section A

Section A questions target AO2 skills – analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context. Both questions require candidates to evaluate the source material in relation to an enquiry; (a) questions target utility (why is Source x valuable to the historian...?) while (b) questions target value and reliability (how much weight do you give to the evidence...?). The questions require candidates to explain their answers using the source, the information given about it and the historical context in which it was produced. The application of this evidence is outlined in the three bullet-pointed strands found in the generic mark scheme.

It is clear that candidates approached Section A with much more confidence this series, although most candidates still found it the most challenging aspect of the paper. Most candidates were aware of the need to address the content of the source itself, the provenance of the source and include knowledge of the historical context. Most candidates understand that they are required to evaluate the utility/value/reliability of the source content provided, depending on the question asked, but some are still evaluating the provenance rather than using the provenance to evaluate the content. Also as mentioned last year, it is of particular importance to note that candidates do need to identify inferences as well as select key points from the source content to achieve above Level 1, and to develop and explain those inferences to progress through the Levels. Candidates achieving at the higher Levels are those able to explain and develop what can be drawn from the source content in relation to the enquiry rather than just comprehend or identify what the source says. It is also worth noting that for question (b), higher Level responses often analyse the strengths and limitations of the source material before weighing up the value of the source to the enquiry rather than applying weight to each element of the source considered.

While most candidates were clearly more aware of the need to engage with the source content this series, use of the information given with regard to the attribution of the source was often ignored when it could have been deployed more profitably. Higher Level responses were able to show how the provenance might add value to the source content in the (a) question and help to address 'weight' in the (b) question by consideration of the extent to which it made the source content more or less reliable/secure. A significant number of candidates still assumed that by copying out the attribution of the source they were affirming or even challenging the utility of the source. A small number also still stated that the source was either primary or contemporary to the time period when this is a prerequisite of the AO2 skill being assessed.

The misconceptions that led to many candidates writing about aspects which were either unnecessary or lacking in relevance in the last series have generally been overcome. However, it is important for centres and candidates to continue to note that the (a) question assumes usefulness in the question stem – Why is Source 1 valuable to the historian...? – and that there is no need for candidates to discuss the limitations of the source. The value is assumed and so the response requires a focus on how the source can be used by the historian and why it is, therefore, useful. In the case of Q2(a), for example, the propaganda value of the source, which some candidates suggested made it lacking in any use at all, needed to be developed with regard to how this might be useful to the enquiry.

Also responses focusing on 'missing factual information' continue to be problematic for students in answering both question (a) and (b), but mainly in question (b). While the failure of the source to mention something which is pertinent at the time might affect the reliability of the source, the fact the source is not comprehensive in mentioning everything it possibly could about the topic is generally not a valid criterion for limiting the weight of the source. A direct statement stating that the source lacks weight because it does not mention a particular fact relevant to the enquiry is not an explanation. Relevant references to 'missing' information might be valid if contextual knowledge suggests that the author may have left out information on purpose or has only witnessed a specific element of events. However, these need to be explained in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which the source is drawn. Higher Level responses were often those that focused on the source content and used valid contextual knowledge to illuminate the strengths or discuss the limitations of what was being presented. It is probably worth noting, once again, that direct reference to missing evidence is found in the AO3 mark schemes for Paper 1 rather than the AO2 mark schemes for Paper 2.

Contextual knowledge in the AO2 mark scheme cannot be rewarded if presented as stand alone information and from Level 1 onwards requires some linkage to the sources. A significant number of responses (both (a) and (b)) began with a paragraph of historical context related solely to the enquiry and then making only limited reference to the historical context of the source content later on. These responses often were only able to access Level 1 or Level 2 with regard to deployment of the historical context in the process of evaluating the source material. Other responses used their historical contextual knowledge to answer the enquiry rather than to evaluate the source material. These responses often found it difficult to establish the 'weight' that could be given to the source in the (b) questions. However, there were also many responses which were able to deploy knowledge of the historical context to show a clear understanding of how the time in which the source was produced, or the circumstances in which the author was writing, might affect the source content or the inferences that might be made from it.

Question 1(a)

Most candidates were aware of Cavour's interest in building up the economic infrastructure of Piedmont and were able to use both their contextual knowledge and the provenance to establish why the source was valuable. Many were able to draw inferences with regard to the wider political implications of government investment and to suggest that parliament was not as enthusiastic about such investment as Cavour undoubtedly was.

Q1(b)

Many candidates attempted to establish the strengths and limitations of the source before making an overall judgement on the weight. Some responses misunderstood the nature of the source as a political manifesto and suggested that it was of limited use because it was 'biased' in some way while others suggested it was limited because it had little factual evidence from the Piedmontese government itself. Some higher Level responses were able to demonstrate that it was possible to make inferences about the attitude of the Piedmontese government towards the Italian nationalists from the references to what the National Society hoped the future relationship could be. Some responses also used contextual knowledge to show understanding that this was representative of the views of only some nationalists and not all.

The following is a higher Level Response achieving Level 3 for the (a) part and Level 4 for the (b) part. Note that the (a) response focuses on utility while the (b) response considers both the strengths and limitations of the source material as evidence for the enquiry.

(This is for part (a))

Source 1 is useful into an enquiry into government investment in the economic infrastructure as it suggests how the government has been ardent to improve the state's infrastructure as supported in the source: "you have spent millions upon new railways throughout the Kingdom. For example, they were ardent for investment in infrastructure as public debt rose from 120m lire to 725m lire during the 1850s; $\frac{1}{3}$ of the peninsula's railways were in Piedmont (880km out of 1800 km); the government funded for a train route linking Turin, Genoa, Milan and the French Border. ~~in~~ Therefore the evidence clearly supports the inference and source evidence. Moreover, the cause of the ~~use~~ ^{utility} of the source into an enquiry into government investment in economic infrastructure is rooted at the author: Cavour. He was Prime Minister from 1852 and finance minister prior to that. Therefore, he

(This is for part (a)) would have been the architect behind funding for infrastructure as it was his department responsible and he made decisions on how much, and what infrastructure, the government should invest in.

Moreover, this source is useful into an enquiry into government investment in infrastructure as it suggests how the government is keen to further the advancement; ~~it is stated in the source:~~ despite all the investment until the point as it states in the source: "energy, ~~prudence~~ wisdom and firmness, will for certain lead this courageous nation" meaning that they see infrastructure development as key to strengthening Piedmont. For example, the first steam ship "La Sicilia" was built to improve transport; a new military port was built (as well as improving Genoa Port as mentioned in the source). Therefore, again, the inference and source is heavily supported by the evidence. Furthermore, the utility

(This is for part (a)) of the source is rooted in the purpose of the source. It was a speech to persuade parliament to further investment spending. Under the statute, Parliament had control over government spending along the government and therefore this speech was being directly articulated to those who had control over infrastructure investment.

In conclusion, the fact that this source was from PM Cavour as well as that the purpose to persuade Parliament - the holder of the treasury - means it gave an insight directly into the heart of infrastructure spenders and so has a lot of utility and ~~value~~ into an enquiry into government investment into infrastructure.

(This is for part (b))

On one hand, this source has weight into an enquiry of the relationship between nationalists and the Piedmontese government as it suggests how the nationalists were cautious supporters of the government as it states: "on the one hand we support the Piedmontese government meaning there are two sides to the argument. For example, Maria met Prime Minister Cavour in 1856 and the national society's paper ^{#1} Il Piccolo Corriere d'Italia backed the government. Moreover, the fact that La Farina was a founder of the National Society gives weight. The National Society had 8000 members and was a key pressure group in wanting government to bolster nationalism. Therefore, it's giving an insight into a group with links to the Piedmontese government, offering an insider's view of the relationship.

Furthermore, the source has weight

(This is for part (b))

into an enquiry of the nationalist - Piedmontese Government relation as it implies that the nationalists were aware of the doctrine, prepared by Cavour, of 'Piedmontese expansionism' over nationalism which threatened the relationship. It states "we accept support... so long as they put Italian Independence first" meaning Italy first and not Piedmont. For example, Cavour never travelled further south than Tuscany due to disinterest and wanted a northern federation of: Piedmont, Lombardy, Venetia as demonstrated by the Plombières ^{and} Agreement (same year as the source). Therefore, evidence backs the claim. This point's weight is rooted in the fact that ~~the publisher was La Farina~~ the origin and date was 1858. This was therefore not hindered by hindsight and gives a contemporary view which helps when looking at the relationship between nationalists and government.

(This is for part (b))

On the other hand, the source has limitations in weight as it suggests ~~to~~ nationalists over-estimate the force of Piedmont when it states: " (Piedmont) has a warlike army, money, credit, reputation". For example, government debt rose from 120m to 725m liras over the 1850s; the last two ^{independence} battles the army had fought (Custoza 1848 & Novara 1849) were convincing defeats. Therefore the relationship between nationalists outside of Piedmont ^{and the government} may not be represented as the reach of Piedmont isn't so great. Moreover, this is again exemplified by the origin, a nationalist in Piedmont. Piedmont was a liberal anomaly; it was the only state to keep a constitution (Statute 1848) after the first unification wars of 1848-1849 and other states had little contact with this nationalist beacon due to the oppressive, anti-nationalist leaders in control of other states. Therefore, Piedmont had little relations with nationalist ^{government} outside of Piedmont.

(This is for part (b))

Moreover, this is a moderate's perspective in La Farina. Many nationalists such as the triumvirate: Mazzini, Saffi and Armellini were radical republicans and so this source has limited weight into the relation between nationalists and the Piedmontese government as it isn't representative of all nationalists. Moreover, in ~~1853~~ 1853 Cavour told Austria of a Mazzinian insurrection attempt killing 50 radicals. Therefore, clearly this contradicts the generally positive relationship espoused and portrayed by source 2 where it praises Piedmont: "we support the Piedmontese government". Clearly ~~the~~ 1853 Cavour telling Austrians in 1853 of a nationalist attempted uprising shows the good relation between nationalists & the government isn't mutual.

In conclusion, this source has a lot of weight, it's contemporary and free from hindsight; it's

(This is for part (b))

from a well-respected key figure in the nationalist movement who was an insider and would have had a direct dialogue and relation with the government as a member of the powerful National Society with 8000 members

Q2(a)

There were opportunities to use the source material to draw inferences from the confrontational tone of the speech made by Frederick William IV but many responses merely paraphrased the source content asserting that the King faced many challenges. Some responses were able to use the references to 'a written piece of paper' and 'representatives' to highlight the growing challenge of liberalism. Some good responses were able to put the speech into the context of the political climate of the 1840s and Frederick William's rule in Prussia.

Q2(b)

A few candidates assumed that the German Confederation was the *Zollverein* but most were able to use the source material to comment on the criticisms being made of the federal political structure and the inadequacies of economic tariffs. There was some good use of the provenance to suggest that the author, although accurate in the information given, was clearly presenting that information from the perspective of a nationalist meaning that the more negative aspects of the commentary probably needed to be used with caution.

The following is a higher Level Response achieving Level 3 for the (a) part and Level 4 for the (b) part. Note that the (a) responses focuses on utility while the (b) response considers both the strengths and limitations of the source material as evidence for the enquiry.

(This is for part (a)) Why is source 2 valuable in an enquiry into the political challenge facing FWH in 1846-51?

Source 3, spoken by Frederick William, highlights the public spoken challenges that the rise in liberal and national have presented him. He describes ~~the~~ the relationship between a ruler and it's people as a natural one and is very certain that, "no power" can make him believe that a state where the people are fully represented, is beneficial.

It is a contemporary source spoken by the king of Prussia so the information and tone must be taken into account accordingly.

The source gives an insight into how the Prussian people want a "constitutional" relationship between them and the king.

They want to have a say in parliament and a higher influence in the running of the country. Frederick William strongly believe this is unnatural and destructive, going against,

"Our Lord God in Heaven". It is also seen that the people want, "representative" in government. This is a challenge for Frederick William as he doesn't want to give liberal and national a higher role in parliamentary decisions.

(This is for part (a)) This source holds considerable value as a historical document as it is written and spoken by Frederick William himself, which also makes it a contemporary piece. It is spoken the year before revolution where tensions were high so the challenges facing him would clearly be seen. It is also spoken to a host of diverse classes, from nobility to peasants, therefore he is not attempting to please or appease a certain class. This makes it more honest. However it also dilutes the true reasons of challenge for the king as they are spoken in public and could differ to his private concerns. The king is very conservative and therefore more likely to be concerned that a revolution would conflict with his interests.

As well as the wish for working and middle class to become more representative, Frederick William also faced political challenges from international uprisings in Baden 1846, where liberal reforms were granted. This excitement, along with the seemingly original liberal movement (freedom of press and religious tolerance) grew and spread, increasing liberal and national wishes and thus increasing pressure. Frederick William was under pressure from both the left and the right, liberals and conservatives wanted to maintain the current system. The king had to compromise.

Overall, this source gives a fairly valuable insight into the pressures on Frederick William.

(This is for part (a)) Frederick William was unclear politically, however, his private concerns could differ, and other factors such as conservative strength and other threats also challenged him.

(This is for part (b))

View much weight - enquiring into

political & economic organisation GC in 1840's

Source 2 certainly shows the basic organisation of the German confederation. However, it is only describing the negative and ineffective factors of the confederation, and therefore can not be held under much weight as an argument unless compared with positive factors. It is also written by a national newspaper which would criticise the lack of German unity so must be valued accordingly.

The source describes the divisions of Germany as a whole and how it affects the confederation. It describes how there are, "38 different laws" in the confederation, making it a confused, unorganised and indecisive organisation. The finance and military influence is also criticised, how it was in their interest to be, "saving money" as taxes were difficult to collect. ~~The~~ The lack of military assistance is commented on as not obtaining a single army. It's communication is almost non-existent as there are, "no mail and no postage" across the German states. "No railway line" also criticises the transport within Germany. Overall the source describes the confederation as chaotic and disorganised, with no advanced economic improvements and a, "deplorable" union that lacks political talent.

(This is for part (b)) The weight able to be put on the source is questionable. It is an only negative and therefore possibly non-factual, non-fair interpretation of its organisation. The tone is very anti-separation of states. The reason is made clear as it is written by a nationalist newspaper, promoting the necessity of economic unification. It was also written near the Rhineland which, three years previously, had been threatened by French occupation in 1840, sparking German nationalism in the form of songs, poems and speeches.

The source can be treated as factual as there was a lack of funding from the states to the confederation. The army also had to come from where Prussia could give in assistance. The 38 states in Germany were economically, socially and politically divided, with only 4 non-dynastic. Democracy was rare and the Princes ruled with individual interests. The reasons for the lack of economic and political development was the aristocratic opposition to reform from nationalists.

Overall, the source can be given a considerable amount of weight as it is based upon factual evidence. However, it must be taken into consideration that the author is a nationalist and the tone is criticising the divided German position, with a hope for promoting unity. It gives information about the organisation in a negative

(This is for part (b)) ... light but can be relied upon as the however,
it would be wise to compare to other sources ~~rather~~ displaying
it in a different light as successful to understand the
significance

Section B

Candidates were generally more familiar with the essay section of Paper 2 and most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. As with last year, there was little evidence to suggest that the range and depth of essays were affected by the time taken to consider the two sources in Section A. Many candidates were able to access Levels 3 and 4, with weaker responses either not providing enough factual support for a depth study essay or not dealing well with the conceptual focus of the question. Centres are reminded that any of the second order concepts listed in the introduction can be addressed in the essay section and candidates need to be aware that not all questions will refer to causation and that not all responses require a main factor/other factors response. Indeed, a persistent number of candidates attempt to respond to all questions by addressing the relative significance of generic causal factors whether appropriate or not.

The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note their progression. At Level 4 there is a requirement for the exploration of key issues by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period and many responses with good knowledge remained in Level 3 because these relationships were stated rather than explained or because key features were addressed separately e.g. stating that each key feature in turn was the main reason rather than developing a logical argument. It is also important to note that the reference to valid criteria in the third bullet point is not a reference to the different factors/key issues/key features being discussed but to the measurement criteria being used to reach an overall judgement. The criteria being used to judge the extent of change (Q4), to justify whether a given causal factor is the main reason (Q6), to determine causal responsibility (Q8) or to determine the most significant individual (Q5).

Once again, there were some interesting and thoughtful answers and examiners commented on the quality of many of the responses. However, this year there were too many responses that did not consider the wording of the questions carefully enough. Failure to answer the question asked can often lead to a well-prepared student achieving at Level 3, or even Level 2, rather than at Level 4.

Q3

Candidates for the Italy option were generally very well prepared with a good knowledge of the key topic areas of the specification. At the lower Levels, responses wrote a brief narrative of the events leading to revolution in the Italian states or provided limited explanations of some of the key causes of the revolutions. Most were able to consider the given factor – economic and social discontent – and some other factors. At the higher Levels, some responses suggested that the cause of the revolutions was a series of inter-linked factors. At lower Level 4 some responses, although establishing criteria for judgement, produced limited discussion with regard to the overall judgement made.

The following is a Level 4 response which considers a variety of causes in relation to the given factor:

Plan

- P.1 - Brief Intro ✓
- P.2 - Yes 330K malaria, 69K cholera, ✓
241K & Palermo, 191K Naples, 1846-47
Europe-wide famines → HUNGER POLITICS
- P.3 - Papacy - Jan doesn't let troops pass
to Sicily) → uprising allowed to spread
✓ 2000 prisoners released
- P.4 - Nationalist culture - Primato (5000) → guideline
Not as important - as Papacy (the other leader)
↳ template, instruction book of how to spread.
- P.5 - Conclusion - long term Yes, short term Papacy
(Pius IX in in only 1846).

The 1848-49 revolutions had many factors involved as to its cause. Socio-economic factors were prevalent as well as relationships between the factors to allow the 1848-49 revolutions to spread. I will attempt to analyse and evaluate relevant importance of these factors.

On one hand, socio-economic factors are said by some to be reason for the cause of the 1848 insurrections. For example, 300 000 died on average across the peninsula per annum due to malaria; 69 000 died in Sicily over 1836-37 due to cholera with 24000 in Palermo alone $\frac{1}{10}$ citizens and a further 16 000 in Naples. This created the panic and anger of the citizens however it needed a target. This was to be the Naples government of Ferdinand II as the citizens blamed him for the famines of the 1846-47 Europe-wide famines. This was particularly important as it induced hunger politics to cause mass-protests. The Lazzaroni, the gov. of Naples' poor, were politically apathetic and didn't care of nationalism. However, when their livelihoods and jobs were at risk they responded to hunger politics. This was of paramount importance as previous uprisings such as the 1830-31 insurrections in Modena, Papal States and Parma failed due to a lack of popular support. However, seeing that the socio-economic problems jeopardised the lower-classes lives, they were mobilised as shown in Sicily January 1848.

On the other hand, other factors are said to be arguably more important. One of these was Pius IX and the papacy, Pius being elected in 1846. He for example set free 2000 political prisoners, appointed liberal Gizzi as secretary of state in 1847 but crucially didn't allow Austrian troops to cross into Sicily in January 1848 in retaliation for occupation of Ferrara. This was more important than socio-economic factors as ~~it~~ Pius IX blocking the Austria troops to access Sicily allowed the badly-organised riots to succeed. Without Pius IX stopping the powerful Austrians who had single-handedly destroyed the 1831 uprisings (e.g. Modena and Viceri's republic in Bologna) the riots would have otherwise failed. ~~The~~ socio-economic He allowed the discontent of socio-economic ~~issues~~ problems to 'germinate' and 'evolve' into a peninsula-wide war.

A second potentially more important factor was the nationalist culture. For example, the neo-Ginolph Gioberti wrote *Primato Morale e Civile degli Italiani* in 1843 selling 5000 copies and Balbo wrote *Le Speranze d'Italia* in 1844. These

pieces of nationalist literature were important as they were the manuals, the instruction books to the nationalists and so gave them a cause and tells the troops how to spread the insurrections. This therefore allowed the uprisings to be more precise, efficient and allow them to survive and grow. ~~It's~~ It's not as important though as socio-economic problems though as the readership was very ~~to~~ niche - middle classes and academics. Without socio-economic failings including hunger-politics the masses would have had no medium to want to revolt. This nationalist culture and literature only had a niche audience and would have insufficient numbers to start a large scale insurrection, after all, *Primato Morale e Civile degli Italiani* only had 5000 readers. Moreover, it's not as important as Pius IX as the neo-Guelphs' ~~the~~ leader was: Pius IX. His actions were the cause of the neo-Guelph movement of Gioberti and others. Without Pius' actions, the neo-Guelphs would never have started as a movement and so Pius IX was the cause of

this factor.

In conclusion, socio-economic factors weren't the main reasons for the 1848 revolution to start in the short-term.

Pius IX was; he was elected in 1846 and his actions in two-years created this whole 'neo-guelph' nationalist movement who spread and started the uprisings with success due to the help from nationalist literature. However, socio-economic issues played a more long-term role as a cause to the 1848 revolutions.

Annual deaths of 300 000 across the peninsula ~~per a~~ caused bubbling discontent amongst the lower-classes but it needed a trigger and an ignition. It's no coincidence that only two-years after Pius IX's election that the revolutions began and so he harnessed the bubbling discontent caused by socio-economic problems and morphed it into a cause of the 1848 revolutions.

Q4

This was the least popular question. Some candidates read this as a multi-factor question with regard to the factors which weakened Austrian domination of the Italian states. Such responses were not penalised but often lacked coherence or logic because the lack of a time period in the question statement made it difficult to select relevant material. Most of those who did answer this question did attempt to determine the extent to which Austrian domination of the Italian states was weakened by the revolutions. Some suggested that the resurgence of Austria in the latter stages of the revolutions indicated that there had been little impact on Austrian power while others argued that, despite the resurgence, Austrian domination had been undermined in the long term.

The following is a Level 4 response:

Chosen question number: Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

The 1848-49 revolutions were spread across the Italian peninsula, each with different aims, although many were united in their individual states due to a desire to rid Italy of foreign - particularly Austrian - influence. The idea of Austrian domination in the Italian states may have been that Austria were largely in control of the states of Lombardy and Venetia, as well as having a strong army that crushed almost every Italian uprising. For this domination to be weakened, the Austrians would have to lose control of the states it held power over or to be defeated by an Italian army and the impact of the 1848-49 revolutions, in weakening Austrian dominance can be assessed in the short term or long term.

~~At~~ Austrian domination was not weakened in the short term at the end of the revolutions of 1848 and 1849 because Austria still had complete control of Lombardy and Venetia. Additionally, the Austrian dominance in the form of its army was not weakened very much because

Austrian forces crushed the revolutions at Lombardy, Venice, Piedmont, Tuscany and assisted the French in dismantling the Roman Republic in June 1849. However, ~~some power~~ was lost to the Austrian army showed signs of losing power after the resignation of Metternich in March 1848 and were forced back to the Quadrilateral in the revolutions in Lombardy while being defeated by united armies from Piedmont, Naples and the Papal States at Peschiera. Though this latter army was crushed later at Custoza and Novara, Austria's inability to immediately crush the revolutions suggested faltering power and that their dominance over Italy may be weakened in future. Therefore, in the short term, Austrian dominance was not weakened by the 1848-49 revolutions.

~~The 184~~ While in the short term, Austrian dominance remained ~~the~~ as strong as before the 1848 and 1849 revolutions afterwards, the revolutions were useful for weakening Austrian dominance in the lessons that were learned from them. Austrian dominance was weakened in later years due to the understanding that foreign support was required by Italy to defeat the Austrian army. Because in ~~later years~~ 1859, Piedmont led the Second War of Independence with French support, despite France making a deal with Austria to end the war, France part of the deal made

by the French Emperor Louis Napoleon III was that he would be given Lombardy which he then ceded to Piedmont, thus ridding Lombardy of Austrian dominance. Furthermore, due to the lesson for the need for foreign support, in 1866, through arrangements Italy made with France and Prussia, Prussia's defeat of Austria meant that Venetia was given to France and France ceded the state to Italy so Austrian dominance was lost in both states Austria ruled. Thus, while the revolutions of 1848-1849 had no short term impact on weakening the dominance of Austria, the lessons learnt from the revolutions' defeat was what significantly weakened Austria's dominance in the long term.

While with the lessons from the 1848 and 1849 revolutions affecting Austria's dominance over Italy in the long term, the revolutions were also a turning point for the cause of ~~Italy~~ Italian unification of which one of the aims was to rid Italy of Austrian influence. The Statuto - issued in Piedmont by Charles Albert during the revolutions in March 1848 - was the only constitution from the revolutions that was kept and was one of the triggers for a chain of events that in the long term affected Austria's dominance in Italy. The Statuto helped weaken Austrian dominance by making Piedmont the most liberal state in Italy which attracted nationalist exiles around 50,000 nationalist exiles ~~who were~~ many of whom

were crucial in promoting Italian unification in Piedmont by forming the National Society in 1857 which promoted the idea of ridding Austrian influence from Italy. The National Society was key in the Second War of Independence for leading uprisings in the Central Duchies and in convincing citizens in Naples and Sicily in 1860 to vote for union with Piedmont, paving the way to the Italian states all being united. This would mean both Lombardy and Venetia being under the control of Italy so Austrian dominance would be lost as a result of this sequence triggered by the issuing of the Statute.

There was certainly no direct challenge to Austria's dominance over the Italian States as a result of the 1848 and 1849 revolutions with Austria's army continuing to crush Italian revolutions and maintaining leadership of Lombardy and Venetia. H.

Q5

This was by far the most popular question. However, although knowledgeable about the various individuals involved, many candidates failed to read the question carefully and did not focus on the years 1858-70. This meant that many candidates spent too much time selecting and writing about irrelevant material from the 1850s. Although contextual knowledge of events in the earlier 1850s may have had some relevance, candidates were invited to consider the impact of Victor Emmanuel II in relation to other individuals on the process of unification from the events of 1858 to the invasion of Rome. Some responses dismissed Victor Emmanuel before moving on to Cavour, Garibaldi and Napoleon III but many were aware of Victor Emmanuel's contribution. A few candidates seemed unaware of the death of Cavour in 1861. There were, however, some very good responses.

This is a Level 4 response:

Chosen question number: Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Victor Emmanuel certainly played a major role in the process of Italian unification through his role as a figurehead for Italian nationalism and his diplomatic dealings. However, it is more accurate to suggest that it was Garibaldi's individual contribution which was most significant as he was able to successfully bring the South of Italy into the equation.

Victor Emmanuel made great significant individual contributions to the process of Italian unification due to his acting in parallelity with Austria and his integral role as a Nationalist figurehead. Many revolutions, such as Garibaldi's expeditions fought in the name of Victor Emmanuel II, which meant many had a common goal and a sense of unity. This was crucial to the process of Italian unification as this had been a major downfall of the earlier revolutions in the 1830s and 40s. Furthermore Victor Emmanuel took the initiative with furthering unification through a second war with Austria in 1859. The pact of Plombières meant that Austria had to be the aggressor, and Victor Emmanuel's "Credo di dedere" speech was incredibly effective at uniting up the Austrians, to ~~the extent they began to prepare for war.~~ contributing heavily towards Austrian mobilisation and then later war.

Without these impressive leadership achievements in terms of providing a focal point for Italian Unification, it is ~~likely~~ likely much less progress may have been made in this time period. However many of the integral diplomatic manoeuvres were as a result of the will of Cavour and Victor Emmanuel only desired to unite Northern Italy, which may have hampered attempts to unify the entire peninsula.

Louis Napoleon III was vital, in and of himself, made very significant individual contributions towards Italian unification. It was due to Napoleon's support of removing Austrian power over the peninsula, that allowed for the pact of Plombières to be signed and triggered when Austria provoked war in 1859. Napoleon committed 200,000 French troops to the war in return for Nice and Savoy. This individual contribution cannot be overvalued. A lack of foreign support was the main reason the previous revolutions failed, and this provision of overwhelming force tipped the balance in the ~~favor~~ favour of the Piedmontese. Without this aid, Piedmont surely would have lost the Second war of independence, completely jeopardizing any progress towards Italian unification in the years 1858-70. However Louis Napoleon did make some negative contributions towards the process of Italian unification by continuing the stationing of French troops within Rome. Rome was the symbolic capital and centre of a future unified Italian state.

and Rose troops were a physical barrier to the annexation of Rome by the Kingdom of Italy. Napoleon's concern for French Catholic opinion certainly hampered the process of Italian unification in these years, however his commitment to *plombiers* cannot be overlooked. Therefore his individual contributions ^{were} ~~can~~ be arguably greater than that of Victor Emmanuel's as without Napoleon's foreign support, Piedmont would have been defeated.

Bismarck of the Prussian empire undoubtedly made significant contributions to the process of Italian unification through the Italian ~~gains~~ acquisitions of Rome and Venice. Due to the treaty of Villafranca in 1860, Austria maintained its grip on Venice, much to the dismay of Cavour. It was Prussia's war with Austria in 1866 which facilitated the gain of Venice through France. Austria made a treaty with France asking for ~~independent~~ neutrality in the upcoming war, in return for Venice. The Prussian aggression in the Southern German States directly led to France gaining Venice, which was then given to Italy. The work of Bismarck goes further when in 1870 he starts the Franco-Prussian war. The overwhelming force of Prussia meant that France had to use all available troops, and so the troops garrisoned in Rome were withdrawn. The eventual crushing defeat at Sedan at the hands of Prussia, facilitated Italy's occupation of Rome, further unifying the peninsula.

Without the individual contributions from Bismarck, ^{it is likely} the Kingdom of Italy ~~may~~ ^{would} never have gained the Rome and Venice in this time period. Hence Bismarck made a significant individual contribution. However, unless Piedmont had been able to defeat the Austrians in the 1859-60 war, these ~~contributions~~ ^{individual} contributions would have been irrelevant as the Kingdom of Italy wouldn't have existed. This means Louis Napoleon III made a ^{more} ~~greater~~ significant contribution towards the process of Italian unification than Victor Emmanuel or Bismarck.

~~Giuseppe~~ Garibaldi arguably did make the most significant individual contribution towards the process of Italian unification in this time period, through his conquest of the South. Many of the figures previously discussed, as well as the Piedmontese prime minister ~~prime~~ Cavour, only desired a unified Western Italian State. When in 1860 Garibaldi set out for Sicily with the "one thousand," he brought the Southern half of the peninsula into the fold of Italian unification. Garibaldi conquered the Kingdom of Naples in the name of Victor Emmanuel II and handed over his conquests at Teano in 1860 to Victor Emmanuel. ~~without~~ ~~the~~ Emperor, it was Garibaldi's conquest of Rome that provoked Cavour's invasion of the papal States, which further unified the peninsula. ~~without~~ ~~the~~ crucial individual contributions of Garibaldi in taking the South, the Kingdom of Italy wouldn't be the unified peninsula it was by 1870.
Therefore Garibaldi's individual contributions were even more

significant than that of Louis Napoleon, Bismarck and Victor Emmanuel. ~~It~~ With or without Louis Napoleon's help, Garibaldi's skill would have conquered the South.

In conclusion ~~Garibaldi~~ it was not Victor Emmanuel II but Garibaldi who made the most significant contribution to the process of Italian unification. This was through his unique interest in unifying the entire peninsula and lack of aid from Prussia and France. Although Napoleon, Bismarck and Victor Emmanuel were important, their lack of concern for the South meant full unification was never on the cards until the individual contributions of Garibaldi.

⑧ Furthermore Napoleon played a significant role in ~~facilitating~~ ^{brokering} an alliance between Prussia and Piedmont at Biarritz in 1865, which ultimately led to the acquisition of Venice from Austria for Italy.

This Level 3 response provides limited development of Victor Emmanuel's role and briefly explains the role of other individuals:

It can be suggested that Victor Emmanuel II was the most important individual responsible for unification in 1858-1870, however there are many other individuals who I would argue are more important.

Victor Emmanuel II could be seen as the most important individual in the unification of Italy, this is because he was key to allowing Piedmont to be a viable nation to support unification. This is shown by his continuity of the Statute ~~matter~~ from its establishment in 1847 without which there would likely have been large scale censorship and suppression of Nationalist views. Furthermore he also was key to remaining independent from the Austria empire who would have otherwise enacted large regulation preventing growth and

development into a viable candidate to lead unification.

On the other hand some would argue that Cavour was the most important individual in Italian unification between 1858 - 1870. One way this can be seen is his development of Piedmont into an industrial powerhouse which gave it a technical edge over Austria in terms of economy, this booming economy meant that Piedmont could hold and sustain a large military presence which was key to the defeat of the Austrians and thus unification. As well as this he was extremely astute in in justifying reason to claim land for unification, he did this through plebiscites which were votes on ~~by~~ the population about whether they wanted to join a larger nation. he used this to peacefully claim the central duchies such as Tuscany and also to justify Piedmont's claim on the entire south. Without

These Piedmontes it is highly unlikely that Italy would be unified as foreign powers such as Austria would argue that their claim on Italy was stronger but you cannot debate the people's decision. In comparison to Victor Emmanuel II I feel that Cavour was more important as he was instrumental in preparing Piedmont for unification and claiming many of the state which otherwise were unlikely to unify.

Another important individual to unification that could be argued is Giuseppe Garibaldi, he could be seen as the most important individual as he was essential to claiming the south of Italy for unification, he with his Red Shirts took over Sicily defeating the Neapolitan army and also claimed Naples all with the support of the people in doing so he handed the land to Piedmont further unifying Italy. Some would argue that this further prevented unification as in order to stop Garibaldi

Cavour and V.E.I.I. marched through the Papal States which divided the Church and unified Italy. It could also be seen as being responsible for the Syllabus of Errors a direct dismissal of the Italian Kingdom by the Pope. In comparison to Victor Emmanuel II I think that Garibaldi was more important as without him the South would have never unified with the North to form Italy. This is because Cavour and V.E.I.I. were under the belief that the poor South wasn't worth their time making it highly unlikely that they would push for claim it.

In conclusion I believe that Victor Emmanuel II was not the most important individual to unification but instead a combination of Cavour and Garibaldi, this is because together they were able to claim both the North and the South which Victor Emmanuel II would never alone been able to do due to

Cavour's innovations in the economy and
Garibaldi's popular support.

Q6

There was some excellent knowledge shown with regard to the Frankfurt Parliament. Most candidates who answered this question were aware of the different possible causes of the failure of the Parliament and were able to discuss the divisions within the Assembly in relation to the lack of an army, the lack of leadership, the resurgence of Prussia and Austria etc. Differentiation within Levels tended to be between those responses that began to explore the reasons for failure compared to those that merely explained or described the failures.

This is a Level 4 response which clearly focuses on the given factor and other factors:

The Frankfurt Parliament, ~~established~~^{elected} in May 1848, had the aim of writing a constitution that would unite Germany as a federal state in which individual states were allowed freedom to write their own laws and have parliaments but there would also be a central government and sovereign. Comprising of many prominent individuals who were mainly liberal and moderate in opinion the parliament had some initial successes such as establishing the Provisional Central Power in June 1848 and declaring the '50' Fifty Articles' in the December however overall progress was lacking because of several fundamental weaknesses within the Frankfurt Parliament such as its divisions and the international situation at the time.

Fundamentally the Frankfurt Parliament was divided from the beginning because ~~there~~ there were disputes over the new united Germany, would adopt a Kleindeutschland or Grossdeutschland form. Kleindeutschland would simply be Germany however Grossdeutschland would also incorporate Austria's German ~~land~~ lands. In October 1848 the parliament voted in favour of the Grossdeutschland scheme however the Austrian Prime Minister Prince Felix of Schwarzenberg was unwilling to have his country split up so a kleindeutschland approach was ultimately decided upon. However there were also other divides within the parliament because there was opposition created by the different

views held by liberals, radicals and conservatives who all wanted to create a different united Germany, in the case of the radicals they hoped to achieve a republic whereas conservatives wished to ~~at~~ change very little about the current system. Additional divisions were between catholics and ~~protestants~~ protestants and there the northern and southern German states. The divisions within the Frankfurt Parliament caused internal fractures so that when outside pressure was applied the parliament crumbled from within.

Without doubt the other weaknesses of the parliament were also significant in its failure. Other nations such as France and Russia would not recognise the parliament but crucially they could not collect taxes which meant they could not have their own army. The Prussian General von Peucker agreed that the Frankfurt Parliament could use the Prussian army however it ~~was~~ would not act contrary to the Prussian King so this offer was no more than a symbol. Not only facing rejection from nations the parliament also had to fight for the support of its people. Initially there had been more than one people's parliament established so that when Frankfurt was attempting to make progress it was battling the Hamburg Parliament for support. After rejecting the Industrial Code presented by workers in order to control working hours, a minimum wage and retain old guild practices, the people began to turn on the parliament because they believed that it no longer reflected their best interests. The individuals within the parliament ~~itself~~ itself must also be taken into consideration, Heinrich von Gagern, who ruled the parliament from May to December 1848,

was a very sincere man however he had no force of character and it became a talking shop that took a very long time to reach decisions. These problems of support ~~without~~ from the people faced the Frankfurt Parliament with many problems because without support from the people, who had established the parliament in the first place, its progress and aims were useless.

It is clear that the Schleswig and Holstein crisis of 1848 also had a great effect on the parliament. The Danish King, ~~as~~ once again, attempted to incorporate the two duchies of Schleswig and Holstein into the kingdom of Denmark. The two duchies had very strong German connections, Holstein was a member of the confederation, so there was immediate uproar at this attempt by Denmark to annex their territory. After small-scale fighting between Prussian and Danish troops on the border the Treaty of Malmö was signed. ~~At~~ Although initially rejected by the Frankfurt Parliament it was eventually accepted and the situation highlighted some of the key weaknesses of the parliament such as they didn't have an army and were heavily reliant on Prussian support. Perhaps one of the most significant challenges faced by the Frankfurt Parliament was on 18th September 1848 when ~~The~~ radicals stormed St Pauli Church ^{in Frankfurt} where the parliament met, and killed 80 people. Archduke John (the temporary regent) immediately imposed martial law and in October 1848 the parliament was pronounced illegitimate. ~~At~~ Although these posed certain difficulties one of the most significant reasons for the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament was that the Prussian King Frederick William IV refused to accept their

crown, calling it a 'crown from the gutter', this rejection ~~and~~ left it devoid of a leader and at this point the parliament came crashing down, all its weaknesses bringing the parliament to a halt and branding it a failure.

It is apparent that the divisions within the Assembly of the Frankfurt Parliament were a significant reason for the ultimate failure of the parliament however ~~as~~ I believe it was not one specific reason that caused it to fail but instead a combination of factors including the parliament's lack of popular support, weaknesses, weak leadership by Heinrich von Gagern, the consequences of the Schleswig and Holstein situation, & the radical challenge of 18th September 1848 and King Frederick William IV's refusal to accept the crown.

Q7

Very few candidates attempted this question and those that did often struggled to do more than assert that the *Zollverein* had some importance connected to free trade. Candidates needed to consider the extent of the impact/the difference made by the *Zollverein* on the Prussian economy. This is part of Key Topic 3 in the specification.

This is Level 2 response with limited development of some key features:

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

The ~~not~~ development of the Zollverein was significant to the growth of the Prussian ~~economy~~ economy in the 1850s.

The Zollverein ~~was~~ ^{was} a development to ~~use~~ unite all German states together, and abolish all state customs between them. Austria's reluctance to be part of the Zollverein resulted in a weakness of economy for Austria, and Prussia became powerful.

The Zollverein was very significant to the growth of the ~~the~~ Prussian economy in the 1850s. The unification of states meant a united Germany with no state customs.

Due to the abolishment of state customs, exporting and importing goods became much cheaper and money was saved. As a result of Austria's reluctance to join the Zollverein they still had to pay for the transporting of goods between states.

A huge benefit to the Prussian economy was the

development of railways and transport lines.

The railways, introduced through the Zollverein, meant faster communication for postage and mail services, also faster transport of goods including food.

Railways also strengthened the military forces of Prussia. With better rail services it meant troops could be transported faster, and officers had accurate and simple maps of the area.

The lifestyle of many Germans improved. Holidays could be taken for those that could afford it via the railway system. This put more income into the Prussian economy, and helped it grow.

A standardisation of single currency was also significant to the growth of the Prussian economy. The Zollverein introduced one currency between all the states, and this meant goods were bought with fair prices.

Arguably, the Zollverein ~~was~~ had little significance to the growth of the Prussian economy in the 1850s. The Zollverein had a natural weakness in a way of having only a diplomatic, political union. ~~It depended on~~

The free movement between states only helped if the

State accepted you in. ~~Proposed~~ Railway services with much of its own ~~length~~ ^{length} ~~not in~~ its state ~~can~~ ^{could} not be proposed.

The economy ~~is~~ was not helped to grow ~~to~~ due ~~to~~ expenditure in all the states, and states had to agree to the delivery of mail and post before it could be ~~delivered~~ delivered.

I conclude the development of the Zollverein was extremely significant to the growth of the Prussian economy in the 1850s.

The free movement between states meant faster communication, the railways meant faster ~~transport~~ transportation and the abolishment of state customs meant a unified Germany.

Austria's disagreement to join the Zollverein also strengthened Prussia's economy. As Prussia gained, Austria lost due to being excluded from the Zollverein, therefore having the disadvantage of less freedom and trade.

The ~~the~~ development of the Zollverein meant 38 German states became one ~~state~~ country, and the Prussian economy ~~grew~~ ^{increased} as unification ~~grew~~ increased.

Q8

This was the most popular of the questions for the German option. Most candidates were able to address the role of military strength in Prussian success but surprisingly few responses made direct reference to the key events of the years 1862-71 that could be used to provide supporting evidence. Higher Level responses often discussed the role of military strength in relation to other factors such as economic factors, the role of Bismarck, the international situation etc. A few were able to show that many of the factors were inter-linked.

This is a Level 4 response which clearly focuses on military strength in relation to other key issues:

Chosen question number: **Question 3**

Question 4

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Military strength in the years 1862 to 1871 was very important as unity was the result of the three short wars against Denmark, Austria and France, which enabled Prussia to dominate Germany due to Roon at Moltke. However, Prussian success also came from Prussian economic successes, due to the Zollverein and their plentiful supply of commodities. Additionally, the growth of liberalism and nationalism was very influential in Bismarck's aims. Moreover, the weakness of Austria and the international situation allowed Prussia to fill the power vacuum in Germany.

It is clear that Prussian success in unifying Germany was mainly due to the army reforms that took place in 1862. Once Roon's military reform bill had been passed by Bismarck in September 1862, the army doubled in size, conscription was increased to three years, the Landwehr no longer took part in military affairs and the troops were re-equipped. Thus, in both the wars against Austria and France, the troops were far better trained and equipped, thus resulting in the wars being very short and decisive so unity was able to be reached quickly. Furthermore, under Moltke's command, the generals became the brains of the army and the use of the railways to move troops was much more efficient than that of France's as Germany had five railway lines to the border whilst France only had one. Also, he recognised the importance of the telegram, thus the control of the troops was far better than any other army. Moreover, the use of the breech-loading gun during the war against Austria proved decisive for the war as it could fire at five times the rate of any other gun. Thus, the military strength of the Prussian army was vital in gaining dominance over Germany and therefore it allowed Bismarck to gain control and unify Germany the way he wanted to.

However, one should argue that the economic success and the Zollverein were also vital for Prussia's success in unifying Germany. By the 1850s, Prussia had a larger production of coal and steel than that of Austria or France due to their plentiful supply of coal, iron and chemicals. Additionally, the railways also encouraged steel and iron production, making Prussia become one of the leading producers in Europe. Moreover, their education system was one of the best in Europe which also helped industry boom. Key industrialists like Alfred Krupp's work in Essen also employed thousands of people and also produced high quality armaments, which helped the military strength. However, the Prussian government did not always follow a clear and consistent plan and some industries may have benefited from a private investment. On top of this, the Zollverein, which abolished its custom barriers and encouraged the movement of trade and people. However, this ^{economic} ~~political~~ unity was not translated into political unity because in 1866, most states allied with Austria against Prussia. Therefore, although the economic success was probably not very important in the short wars, in the long run it helped Prussia dominate Europe economically and produce vital weaponry for the wars.

Fundamentally, the desire for national unity and liberalism was the driving force behind Prussia's success in unifying Germany. After 1848, national consciousness had been stirred across Germany even though the revolutions failed. Many Germans became determined to continue to fight for unity and a German constitution. In 1859 the National German Association was set up to campaign for unity. Although it only had 25,000 members at its peak and the majority were middle-class, it did help to stir up the idea of unity. On top of this, newspapers always got behind national sentiment, thus increasing the growth of liberalism and nationalism. Therefore, the growth in liberalism and nationalism helped to plant the seed of unity in Germany, as it made many people desire and want unity, thus Bismarck had to be led by

German opinion for full unity as it was never one of his aims.

Moreover, Austria's weakness and the international situation also helped Germany to achieve unity. Austria's economy was mainly agrarian with only pockets of industry, thus it could never compete with Prussia. This was also not helped by their mounting financial problems due to Metternich's debt and the strain of having to keep an army mobilised during the Crimean War. The Crimean War also dented their diplomatic position as they sided against ~~Prussia~~ Russia without gaining the friendship of Britain and France, whilst defeat in the North Italian War in 1859 was a massive blow to their prestige. Moreover, Austria's leaders lacked the political and diplomatic skill needed for any strength in Europe. Furthermore, Britain saw a strong Germany as a good bulwark against France and Russia and Russia's sympathies lay with Prussia after the Crimean War. Therefore, the situation at the time was very positive for Bismarck to stir up ~~war~~ nationalism and create situations such as the Ems telegram to provoke war.

In conclusion, ~~Prussia~~ the strength of the army was vital for Prussian success of unifying Germany, there were also many other factors that helped this unity be reached. Without Bismarck's skill in making the enemy seem like the aggressor or the economic successes of or Austria's weakness, it would not have been so easy for the army to win the wars that resulted in Germany's unity.

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

Section A

- A careful reading of the sources is needed so that the issues raised are clearly identified
- Inferences should be drawn out, but they should always be directly linked to the source and not driven by contextual knowledge
- Do not merely re-state what the provenance says – think about how it can be used to address the question. In (a), this requires a consideration of how it adds value and in (b), this requires a consideration of value and limitations
- Contextual knowledge should be used to support the answer and should be made relevant to the enquiry but should not be used to answer the enquiry itself
- Depending on the Option chosen, Question 1(a) or 2(a) do not require consideration of the limitations of sources
- It is unlikely that weight can be appropriately assessed by listing all the things that a source does not deal with.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure that the second order concept is correctly understood and the exact wording of the question clearly identified
- Candidates should deploy more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

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