

Examiners' Report
June 2018

GCE History 9HI0 2G

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2018

Publications Code 9HI0_2G_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 2G which deals with the rise and fall of fascism in Italy, c1911-46 (2G.1), and Spain, 1930-78, republicanism, Francoism and the re-establishment of democracy (2G.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It 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 second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners continue to note this year that a number of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources and to evaluate the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge displayed and an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is important, as was stated last summer, that candidates should be clear that weight is not likely to be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the sources. However, comments on all the things that the sources might have contained, but failed to do so is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight. This approach was still evident this summer, although less so than last summer. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question, although weaker candidates continued this summer to often engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Last summer candidates were advised to ensure that there was both an argument and a counter argument in their responses; it is pleasing to note that there was less evidence this summer of a lack of counter arguments. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology, not merely using the start and end dates as bookends with little consideration of the events between. Not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

This question enjoyed the full range of responses with the majority of candidates in level 3 and low level four although there were some extremely good answers which fully utilised the sources establishing valid criteria to reach a judgement based on weighing the evidence. The most effective responses made good use of the source material to explore the inferences that could be drawn from Source 1 regarding the importance of territorial gain as a motivating factor for joining the Triple Entente and the claims made in Source 2 regarding indignation against Austrian aggression and the possibility of using the war to unite the Italian nation. The best answers made good use of contextual knowledge to interrogate the inferences and claims made as part of the evaluation of the sources. However, some candidates wrote at length about events in the war which was not relevant to the question, and some candidates still complain about what is missing from the sources rather than focusing on what is there. There was some good evaluation considering the different nature of the sources and hence the differing messages they propounded.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

Sources 1 and 2 together bring contrasting motivations for Italy's entry into the First World War on the side of the Entente, in 1915. Source 1 suggests that Italy's reasons for entering the war on the side of the Entente were ^{for} financial ^{and} territorial gains. Source 2 gives defense and security as the main motivating factors. Both sources neglect ~~the~~ domestic unrest as a motivation for Italy's entry to the war.

Source 1 gives evidence for the hidden motivations for Italy's entrance to the war on the side of the Entente. The source clearly lays out the gains Italy expected to receive upon joining the Entente against the Triple Alliance. It shows the many territorial gains Italy would receive, such as 'the Venetian and Cisalpine Tyrol', 'as well as Trieste' and the 'province of Dalmatia.' These land gains were very significant for Italy as they were part of the *Irredente* lands which Italy wished to get control over. The source does not mention that the Italian nationalists had been pressuring the government to obtain these lands, ~~or~~ or that the Italian prime minister Salandra believed that ~~the~~ creating closer ties with the nationalists was the best way to ensure a stronger government. This is a weakness of the source because the ANI's push for colonial expansion and intervention was a factor in Italy joining the war.

The source does mention the 'reasonable gain' Italy would receive from German colonial territories in N. Africa. ~~the~~ Italy had long wanted to expand ^{her} colonial territories since suffering humiliating defeat at Adwa in 1896. Many Italians wanted Italy as a great power and saw colonial expansion as a way to achieve this. The fact that the Treaty of London included this shows that colonial expansion was an important motivating factor. Source 2 only briefly mentions territorial claims in 'the objectives of Italian policy', suggesting Italy simply wanted 'a secure military border to replace the one imposed' in 1886, and to secure the situation in the Adriatic. Source 2.5 suggests that Italy, in terms of territory, Italy was motivated to enter the war on the side of the Entente for defense, not for the territorial gains offered. This seems inaccurate.

Source 2.3 gives a speech by Salandra in May 1915 explaining Italy's decision to join the war on the side of the Entente. It suggests that it was for 'the defence of Italianism' and that Austria denied all 3 'essential advantages' to Italy. It focuses on the 'treatment by Austria' as a motivation for allying with the Entente. Italy had a history of enmity with Austria, as it had some of the Irredentist lands Italy wanted back. It appears from the source that the concessions made by Austria were not enough for Italy to join the war on the side of the Triple

Mobilisation. It also suggests that Italian unity or unification might have played an important factor in bringing Italy into the war. It ~~claims~~ alludes to 'a wonderful moral union' which 'will be our greatest source of strength.' Salandra was well aware that in 1915 Italy was suffering from many divides, socially, politically and economically. This fragmentation plagued the country and was threatening the stability of Italy. The liberals were split between interventionists, like Salandra, ~~also saw war~~ and non-interventionists like Giolitti. Salandra believed that a victory in a great war was what Italy needed to unify the nation, ~~in~~ to provide camaraderie. The source does hint at this somewhat when it ~~to~~ mentions 'the accomplishment of the highest ~~reaches~~ desires that a country can achieve.' Obviously due to the nature of the source being a public speech, the tone of the source is hyperbolic. However, this does reveal how Salandra was using the 'indignation' over Austria's treatment of Italy, and the glory of war to unite Italians. Salandra hoped to win over the nationalists by entering the war, as they had emphasised war as the only way to save the nation from collapse.

Source 1 strongly suggests that Italy joined the war on the side of the Entente ~~for~~ simply because the Entente provided the best offer. More than land gains and colonial expansion, the Entente, as the source shows, offered 'any eventual war

reparation' and 'an immediate loan of at least £50 million to Italy'. The fact that the arrangement was to be 'kept secret' suggests that ~~several~~ the reasons for entering the war were not ~~as~~ particularly due to any real moral outrage, as source 2 would suggest, Italy 'severely condemned the aggression of Austria against Serbia.' Source 2 does mention that Italy's avoidance of meeting its Triple Alliance agreement, 'Italy was under no obligation to Austria', but doesn't ~~even~~ show this was really motivated by an unwillingness to fight the more powerful Entente powers. Source 1 is limited as it just shows the gains Italy would have received but ~~doesn't~~ does not discuss the domestic unrest which was a major factor.

Overall, source 1 and source 2 together give a fairly balanced view of why Italy entered the war on the side of the Entente in 1915. Source 1 demonstrates the ~~primary~~ ~~main~~ financial, territorial and colonial motivations for entering the war, suggesting joining the Entente was because it gave the best deal. Source 2 demonstrates that Austria's concessions were sub-par, and that also the need to win Italy in a glorious war was also a motivating factor. Each of the sources are limited as they do not explain the ~~other~~ other reasons, such as Italian /medan, nationalist pressures or the deep divisions that threatened to tear Italy apart.



This is a level 4 response. The sources are used together from the start. Inferences are reasoned and developed using contextual knowledge. The response shows an awareness of the values and concerns of the society from which the sources are drawn. There is an attempt to establish the weight of the sources but it is not sufficiently developed and explained for level 5.



Remember to use the sources to explore the claims being made by the writer and to consider how valid they are.

Question 2

There were some effective answers to this question well answered with some useful source analysis and focused evaluation. Many candidates were able to make reasoned inferences and the general level of contextual knowledge was good. The main difficulty was that some candidates who used their own knowledge to answer the question with limited reference to the sources. Candidates do need to remember that contextual knowledge should be used to interrogate the sources and the inferences that can be drawn from them; there is limited reward for free standing knowledge. Many candidates used the sources together effectively to consider control across the period and the significance of the Catholic Church in the maintenance of control was developed in many answers. It was, however, surprising how many candidates did not pick up on the content of Source 4 which implied a lack of control over various forms of media.

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

When ~~deciding~~ investigating the extent to which control had been implemented onto the Spanish people both source 3 and 4 provide valuable insight. Source 3 provides insight into fundamental laws that Spaniards had to conform to while source 4 provides a Roman Catholic extract from an uncensored magazine. Although both provide valuable information when assessing the amount of control people were subjected to, we as historians must also analyse the validity of the source through both when they had been published to who and why they may have been published.

Source 3, a source that had been drawn from the labour charter, provides a good primary understanding of Franco's expectations of individuals under his regime. ~~There is~~ ~~in the understanding that~~ The source states that women who are married "will be freed from the work and the factory". Driven from his nationalist ideologies, the extract is considerably valuable in displaying the attitudes Franco had about working women and his preference for a traditional family structure, so much so that Franco made it mandatory law. Through this it would be then logical to state that due to the source being produced in 1938, ^{just before} ~~after~~ Franco's initial victory in April 1938, it provides insight to how life

for women would progressively become more traditional, especially for those who were married. Alongside this, the extract provides evidence of Franco's use of control to try and better the economy post war, stating that Spaniards have "an obligation" to "contribute to the wealth of the economy." Through Franco's ability to demand for "every Spaniard" to "increase national production" he is then able to first force labour onto what would be considered able bodied while increasing economic situations. Overall, when deciding whether the source holds a sense of validity, it would be logical to state that it in fact does. This is due to the fact that it is the first official laws that fundamentally shaped the beginning of Franco's dictatorship. As a result providing a huge amount of significance to both the source while also displaying how early life had been shaped for Spanish Civilians. However, the source fails to provide insight to later enforced laws alongside political laws such as the law of political responsibility in 1939. The fact that such laws denied the legality of other political thoughts signify just how oppressive Franco's dictatorship had ~~it~~ really been, something the source fails to highlight.

Source 4, a source that had been extracted from the religious magazine, Ecclesia, also provides insight into the control of individuals of the state. The extract displays the discontent

with media orientated literature, stating that most could be "ungodly" and "immoral." Through this the church then justifies the reasoning of "Prohibit(ing) publications" as a way of reguiding humanity. The extract could be seen as holding valuability due to the idea that it does not deny such censorship laws such as the press laws but instead takes an upperground to justify it. Through this, it is valuable and holds validity in the aspect of showing a historian just how much influence the church had after franco's condtrat with the catholic church, on everyday civilians. The fact that the church had been able to not just control religious aspects in society but also the media and televised news creates an important picture on just how badly there had been on both normal civilians but also media publishers and journalists. The extract's publishing date of 1950 provides historians with the knowledge that the church had an oppressive hand on society as long as ~~20~~¹⁵ years after franco's dictatorship had been established. Although the source provides some sense of validity, ~~the~~ the extract also has its limitations that create an untrustworthy extract. Although the source is the only uncensored extract, the fact that it had been the church who agreed and worked closely with franco means that whether edited or not, it would not involve realistic truth. This is due to the church's overatching influence.

of catholicism and the need to keep "faith or tradition"¹ -
As a result the extract could be considered as its own
version of propaganda.

when putting both source 3 and 4 together there is
an incredible amount of more validity, the idea of both
sources providing ~~influence~~ insight into stationary,
factual law and also religious control over the
media. Both sources recognise the idea of religion playing
a significant role in religious traditions, source 3
stating that "religious holidays" would be
accelerated for. However, when deciding whether
one source holds more weighted validity than the other
it would be logical to state that source 3 does.



This is a level 4 response. It develops reasoned inferences and uses contextual knowledge to explore them. The evaluation does show weaknesses in places. Responses that begin with evaluation tend to be more generic as they have not yet explored the content of the sources. The response also uses absent knowledge as a means of evaluation but as this is the result of events taking place later it lacks validity as an argument.



Remember that you are evaluating the source material, not the writer of the source. A source can be of great value for the opinions that it holds even if they are highly subjective.

Question 3

This was the most popular essay question answered on the paper. It was generally well answered, with most candidates demonstrating useful knowledge of both methods of indoctrination and the continued use of terror. Although there were some descriptive answers that focused on methods of propaganda, most candidates retained focus on the question. Lower achieving answers tended to focus on the period before 1925 and so provide limited relevant knowledge and some merely described any policy implemented by Mussolini without consideration of indoctrination. The best responses went beyond discussing methods of indoctrination and investigated their impact including the participation in the ONB and the numbers that evaded involvement, especially in the south, and discussed the fact that whilst Mussolini was personally popular, there was little evidence of real indoctrination into fascist values. These answers explored the use of terror effectively going beyond policy to look at impact and so were able to reach supported conclusions based upon criteria established throughout the answer. Some candidates were weaker on exploring the use of terror, and there was evidence that some ran out of time because they spent a disproportionate amount of time on indoctrination.

Chosen question number: **Question 3**

Question 4

Question 5

Question 6

^{agree}
cult of il Duce
↳ people had genuine
belief in Mussolini.

↳ 600,000 turnout for
ministry of press JP speech
1927 - had got
differing views

gold rings - Abyssinia
reduction in use of
SQ words - post 1924/5
↳ Parties banned
after assassinations

^{disagree}

OVRA under
Bochini - 10,000
Cossiga + 13000 trials

programmes such as
OND - was ideological
but kept people happy

OND could be seen as not even
indoctrinating

Following the Matteotti crisis in 1924, Mussolini began to create his dictatorship with ~~use~~ the use of repression and terror to ban opposition. Once his position was consolidated the need and use for terror was reduced with the formation of the cult of il Duce. However there is room to argue that the people were not at all indoctrinated into supporting the state and terror in the form of the OVRA was still maintained.

One of Mussolini's key goals was to

indoctrinate and turn his people into a militaristic people that loved and followed him. This is shown by the creation of the cult of il Duce, the idea that Mussolini was the father of the new Italian empire.

Photo shoots took place whereby Mussolini was depicted in 2500 separate photos to be a dynamic and athletic leader. In this Mussolini was largely successful, the Italian people were drawn to the fascist dictator and flocked to his rallies such as the one in 1936 where an estimated 100,000 people crowded in room to hear him announce victory over Abyssinia in 1936.

However, the success of this indoctrination can be argued to not be as largely successful as portrayed to be. Organisations such as the OND, set up in the late 1920's was a non ideological workers group that offered rewards such as holidays and tickets to the cinema. This could be used to argue against the success of the indoctrination of the people as Mussolini had had to be careful and not force the ideals of fascism to the Italian population. This ~~success~~^{failure} of the indoctrination could be seen with the lack of ability to implement fascist ideals in day to day life. Perhaps a difference could be drawn between the success of indoctrinating people into the cult of il Duce and the indoctrination of fascism itself.

In relation to the too lack of need for

repression, ~~due to~~ ^{despite} the 'success' of the indoctrination, it could be seen to be unsuccessful. Mussolini although making a show of reducing the power of the Squads in 1925 when they were disbanded and made to join the militia, still required the use of Secret Police. The Squads weren't fully broken up and remaining Squadristas were recruited by Bocchini for the OVRA. The OVRA had 5,000 informants and held over 13,000 files on potential enemies of the state. During the years 1927 - 1939 ~~13,576~~ there were 13,576 cases involving the suspected enemies of the state and a total of around 10,000 Italians were sentenced 'confinati'. This ~~shows~~ clearly shows that the use of terror was still prominent with the need for a secret police that carried out a large sum of investigation. The success of the indoctrination is clearly flawed with large pockets of Italians not agreeing with fascism.

Furthermore, the creation of the ministry of press in 1927 makes it hard to accurately inquire into the general ~~consensus~~ consensus towards to Mussolini. The press was regulated by the state and anything published had to be cleared by the PNF. This makes it extremely hard to gauge whether people truly did believe in the fascist state as all opinions published had to coincide with that of the fascists. This level of control could also be far more significant in the

reduction of terror as it was harder for opposition to get a view or for any form of propaganda to the masses reducing the effectiveness and scale of the opposition.

Similarly, the

~~Howe The Success of Mussolini~~

To conclude, I feel that the success of Mussolini's indoctrination was not to a great extent and certainly not successful enough to barely need the use of terror. Non ideological organisations such as the OND show that the people followed Mussolini and the extent of cases persuaded by the OVRA could be a direct result of the failure to indoctrinate the Italians into fascism.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 response. It begins by drawing out the key issues and develops them through the answer by a sustained analysis. It makes a clear distinction between the success in support from Mussolini compared to indoctrination into fascist values.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

This question focuses on consequence. To address it, you need to look at impact.

Question 4

This question was much less popular. There were a number of very good answers which compared aspects of the governments of the south and the Salò republic, including the nature of the leadership, the armed forces and the involvement of outside/occupying powers, for similarity and difference thus demonstrating level 5 in at least bullet points 1 and 2. There were also some weaker answers which were not well informed or dealt with the two governments separately and hence did not carry out an effective comparison.

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

Question 5 **Question 6**

There were not more ~~similar~~ similarities than differences between the Republic of Salò and the government in the south in the years 1943-45. They differed greatly in their ideological outlook, economic structure and in the nature of government.

The Republic of Salò's ideological outlook differed greatly from the government in the south. The RSI was a Republic of Salò (RSI) was a ~~re~~ radical fascist state, returning in part to the PNF's original 1919 roots in the Verona Manifesto of 1944, by ~~denouncing~~ denouncing both the Church and the monarchy, rationalising all industry and enforcing compulsory military service, though it continued to ~~condemn~~ condemn Jews and sent 9,000 to ~~the~~ German ~~concentration~~ concentration camps. This differed substantially ~~from~~ from the government in the south, which was ~~more~~ nominally democratic but largely dominated by pro-Allied ~~and~~ conservative ~~generals~~ generals. ~~It~~ It was ~~formed~~ formed by Field ~~and~~ monarchist regime, placing King Victor Emmanuel III as the head of state, ~~and~~ however, both governments continued to claim they were the legitimate governments of Italy, and declared that the other side was currently occupying. Despite this, the ~~ideological~~ ideological makeup of the RSI and the government in the south continued to differ greatly ~~about~~ in the economic, constitutional ~~and~~ spheres as well as on a fundamental level of ~~and~~ values.

The RSI's ~~RSI's~~ RSI's economic structure also differed significantly ~~between~~ with the government in the south. The RSI rationalised all ~~industry~~ industry, and workers were made to work up to 12 hours a day. ~~It~~ Additionally, it had to pay Germany 100 million lire every month ~~in return for~~ as stipulated in its establishment. Taxes were set very

similar in some aspects to the ~~pro~~ government of the south, whose ~~the~~ actions its actions had to comply with the Allied war directives. However, the Allies were less involved in the ~~pro~~ government of the south and broadly allowed it to do as it wished domestically. ~~Other~~ Another main difference was the nature of the executive in which conservative monarchist Field Marshal Benito Badoglio ruled as Prime Minister in tandem with the King Victor Emmanuel III. There was no legislature to speak of (as in the RSI), but the capital was based in Naples and all government ministries relocated there after the capture of Rome, as opposed to being spread out over a wide area. The government in the south also had a poorly organised Royal Italian Army, which played a relatively minor role as the British and American armies played a large role in the liberation of the rest of the country, ~~though~~ though in comparison the RSI's GNR (the Republican National Guard) was more pre-occupied with attempting to suppress a large partisan movement, leading to around 100,000 deaths overall. Whilst the nature of government of the RSI and the government of the south were drastically different, they did share some similarities, especially in relation to ~~their~~ the states that had dominated their internal affairs.

Overall, there were more differences than similarities between the Republic of Salò and the government of the south in the years 1943-45. Both differed ~~or~~ significantly in their ideological outlook, especially over militarism and fascism over conservatism, ~~the~~ as well as ~~in~~ in economic structure and the nature of government itself. Similarities took the form of a few isolated ~~cases~~ ~~where~~ in some cases quite significant, ~~such as in the~~



This is a level 5 response. It considers the nature of government, economic status and the different ideologies in the north and south. It is fully focused on the second order concept of similarity and difference.



In similarity and difference questions, a brief plan helps you to focus on the second order concept.

Question 5

This was the most popular essay question on Option 2G.2. Most answers were well informed on development in Spain during this period and were able to develop relevant knowledge of political and social developments. Weaker responses tended to focus on the narrative with limited links to 'significance', whilst the most effective responses examined political changes and continuities and social developments and established valid criteria for reaching judgements about significance.

significant political change and social progress

1931 - 36 ?

P1: Yes: reform
 → reforms under
 Azana o.g industrial
 modernisation, education,
 agriculture.
 → ~~and~~ during
 Black year

P2: ~~Yes~~ Yes
 → change from
 Republican → CEDA
 →

P3: No
 → reforms
 undermine
 CEDA → social
 progress limited

The years 1931 - 36 were significant to a certain extent with regards to political change and social progress. Reforms under Azana during the first few years of second Republic created much social progress through industrial modernisation, land reform and educational policies. However, this social progress was overturned after 1934 when CEDA were in power, undoing many of reforms put in place under Azana. The significance of this time really lies in the political changes that took place with a greater division between ~~conservative~~ nationalists and republicans.

Significant social progress was made during this time between 1931 - 33. There were

known as 'Years of Reform' under the moderate president, Azana. Azana introduced reforms orientated around industrial modernisation, improving rights of trade unions and establishing improved pay and 8 hour working day for workers. He also introduced land reform including Law of Municipal Boundaries April 1931 to promote use of local land labour and Agrarian Reform Law September 1932 to improve rural poverty. Reform in education ~~was~~ saw development of travelling schools and improved teacher wages. This shows how both industrial workers and farmer were liberalised through increased employment, improved pay and higher living standards leading to significant social progress. This can also be seen in education by improvement in literacy levels as well as quality and quantity of education showing significant social progress. However, this social progress was only short term and much was undone during the conservative 'Two Black Years', which saw power returned back to the conservatives and social progress limited, particularly for rural workers and

trends remain. Overall, the years 1931-36 were significant with regards to social progress as reforms under Azana saw greater liberalisation in many areas of society including welfare and education. Despite the overturning of these reforms after 1934, they would lay the foundation for social progress and freedom in subsequent years. ^{although extent} However, Lagunas

Significant political change was also made during this time between 1931-36.

The first government of the second Republic was liberal and constitutional in nature, striving for economic and social progress. However, the failure of this government to implement reforms successfully caused the regime to become increasingly weak and unpopular. The right became more effective and November 10-coalition forming CEDA to win February 1933 elections. CEDA wanted to return power back to the monarchy and sent to overturn reforms previously implemented. This shows a shift in public mood from the left to the right, as many were dissatisfied by the policies under Azana showing significant political change

However, although the extreme left did not support the first government under Azana, they did not support the forces of conservatism and were in favour of a more radical left wing solution. In this way, the time period lacks significance as support for left continued to remain and undiminished forces of conservatism. Overall, the years 1931-36 ^{were significant because} ~~mark~~ the foundations ^{were} laid for greater social progress and reform as well as great political change made with increasing support for the right rather than the left, therefore I agree to a larger extent.

However, some may argue that political progress during this time was not significant whilst there was a rise in support for the right, left wing support remained throughout this time and continued to undermine the conservatives. Support for left can be seen when Popular Front government won February 1936 elections, showing how political change in the long term was limited. Social progress was also limited in the short term by the fact political ~~was~~ were overturned after 1934 and only social progress made was completely destroyed.

This is seen by reduction in wages for workers, pressure to trade unions withdrawn and curtailment of Law of Municipal Bureaucracy. Moreover, social reform was only started and well significant to a lesser extent. Although it could be argued that social ^{progress during this time} ~~reform~~ would plant the seed for further reform in the years after when the Popular Front came to power. This can also be seen with political change throughout this time which sharpened divisions between the left and right and lay the foundation for conflict in the future seen with the development of Spanish Civil War. Overall, the years 1931-36 were significant in that political change would emphasise and sharpen divisions in long term between nationalists and republicans. These years would also see greater social progress although this was mainly short term and holds less significance.

In conclusion, the period 1931-36 was significant in terms of political change to a larger extent whilst the time period shows an increase in support for the right, there would still be support for

radical left wing movement undermining the power of conservatism. This era would ultimately emphasise and lay the foundations for greater divisions between left and right wing movements. Social progress was made throughout the first part of the second Republic, although this was only in the short term and reversed during the Two Black Years, showing it is of less significance. However, it must not be ignored that it created a desire for improvement in social conditions and reform in the long term.



This is a level 5 response. It is underpinned by depth of contextual knowledge which covers both political change and social developments. It discusses the issues and reaches a supported judgment based on established criteria.



This question focuses on significance. To address it effectively, you need to establish criteria for judgement.

Question 6

There were fewer responses to this question. Although some were well informed and could contrast the importance of the Law of Leadership Succession with other valid reasons such as support for Juan Carlos by reformers, the media campaign led by Adolfo Suarez and American support, other candidates had little to offer and this limited their achievement in this part of the paper.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should go beyond paraphrasing the content of the sources to draw out reasoned and developed inferences
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source by, e.g. looking at and explaining the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Contextual knowledge should not be used to list all the information that is missing from the sources, unless omission was the aim of the author
- Contextual knowledge should be linked to the material provided in the source
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified; candidates need to be aware that not all questions demand a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates must provide 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 rather than merely present a list of factors.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

