

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2011

### GCE History 6HI01 E

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Subject Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on [HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk](mailto:HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk).

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

## ResultsPlus

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

January 2011

Publications Code US026439

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## Introduction

### General Comments

As in previous examination sessions the candidates for Option E were, in general, very well prepared for each topic studied. Candidates are increasingly aware of the need to answer the question asked rather than write about the question themes in general but there is still some need to focus more on the key words. Supporting evidence is generally secure but candidates often do not select the most relevant or appropriate material, and there is still a disappointing lack of chronological awareness and an apparent lack of confidence in using dates. At the lower Levels, however, there was a tendency towards the description and explanation more appropriate to GCSE than has been seen before.

The scripts reflected the full range of levels. Most students wrote between three and five pages for each answer, though a small number were unable to write more than a few Level 1 sentences or paragraphs. The overwhelming majority of students followed instructions, writing their answers on the appropriate pages and indicating the question number in the appropriate box. Legibility was generally not an issue, and, where it was, this seems to have been about the colour and type of pen used.

Students understood the questions but some key words and phrases were misread, misunderstood or misinterpreted. Some candidates found difficulties with focussing directly on 'economic grievances' in Question 1 and 'political problems' in Question 5 apparently assuming that the question referred to grievances and problems in general. As has been commented on before, many candidates find it difficult to discriminate between political, economic and social factors or themes. Responses to the very popular Question 6, in particular, often failed to focus on the key phrase of 'growing power' assuming that the question referred to growing support.

Most candidates were able to identify and evaluate at least some key points. However, some scripts, especially for questions 7, 9 and 11 were conspicuous by an absence of appropriately selected factual evidence. In such scripts, worthy points were often supported by very thin detail and candidates often resorted to repetition. As suggested above, however, there were more Level 3 scripts this session with a tendency towards adequate narrative supported by brief commentary.

Some responses, although showing obvious evidence of knowledge, could only access Level 3 and in many cases Level 2, particularly Question 7, because of a misreading of the time period referred to in the question. For Question 1 some responses focused on the whole revolutionary period up to 1848-9, some responses to Question 3 assumed an end date of 1871 and many Question 6 responses only focused on events up until 1922. The most significant misreading of dates, however, occurred in Question 7 where a significant number of candidates appeared to ignore the dates 1931-36 completely in favour of a discussion of the event of the Spanish Civil War.

Future candidates might consider whether a generalised 'prepared' opening is an effective way to focus on the question set with only 35 minutes available to plan and write a response. A large number of answers began by repeating the question set, prefacing this with 'To a certain extent I agree that...'. Others declared that 'many historians' agreed with the point made in the question, but were never able to substantiate their claim. Better answers avoided these approaches, producing their own opening statement which usually suggested individual confidence and a personal viewpoint.

It is highly recommended that centres read the reports and exemplification documents produced for the other Options available in 6HI01.

## E1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Once again this was a popular and well-taught topic. Although there were more descriptive style Level 3 answers than have been seen in past sessions, candidates have very good knowledge and are well-prepared to answer questions on all aspects of the unification process.

### Question 1

This was attempted by relatively few candidates. The best answers were able to refer to both the general economic grievances which developed in Italy during the 1840s and more specific references to the situation in Lombardy, Venetia and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies; these were then balanced against other relevant factors usually with some consideration of the different causes in different parts of Italy. Some candidates, however, wrote about the causes of Italian revolutions in general or wrote weak narratives of the events of 1848-9.

### Question 2

This was by far the most popular question and was, in general, answered very well indeed with a secure focus on the extent to which France was an obstacle to the unification process. Even Level 3 narrative responses showed a sound knowledge of events and were able to access the higher bands. Most candidates were able to identify examples of both help and hindrance to create a well-balanced answer. However, many responses chose to concentrate on the middle years of the time-period with only a brief reference to the events in Rome of 1849 and a cursory mention of the withdrawal of troops in 1870. There was no requirement to refer to other significant obstacles to Italian unification but many were able to compare effectively. Too many candidates wrote whole essays referring to the 'obstacles' to Italian unification.

This is an example of a low Level 5 response that directly addresses the question asks, explicitly understands the key issues and reaches a judgement.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **FIRST** question you have chosen to answer .

If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.) .....

Plan

Yes: french garrison in Rome - 1849.

Napoleon did not want a too unified Italy -  
Plombières.

NO: Lombardy received in 1859. - Austrian war.  
Austro-Prussian war - Venetia in 1866.  
1870 - Rome also part of Italy - Franco-Prussian war.

2. France's involvement in the unification of Italy played a major role, and especially during the years 1848-70, France had played a ~~the~~ crucial part in Italy as many of the important wars ~~are~~ or revolutions were carried out during this time period. As for the question, to what extent did France's involvement an obstacle to the unification of Italy, it can be said that France was responsible for causing the Roman Republic in 1849 and therefore proving to be an obstacle and also Napoleon's intentions of not allowing Italy to become too unified, especially geographically ~~which is~~ is also contributing as an obstacle. However, ~~Italy~~ France was also one of

(This page is for your first answer.) The main reasons as to how Lombardy, Venetia and then eventually Rome became part of the new Kingdom of Italy.

Firstly, the French ~~ga~~ were to blame for not allowing unification of Italy to progress ~~in the~~ after the 1848 revolutions. When the revolutionaries had successfully taken over the Papal States and forced the Pope to flee from Rome, they set up a provisional government and a Roman Republic. This was to be a very crucial point in



~~was~~ making progress towards the cause of Italian unity. The people had wanted their and had finally fought successfully for their dreams to come to fruition. However, their dreams were crushed when France with ~~at~~ <sup>many of</sup> its reinforcements marched into Rome and got rid of the Roman Republic. In this case, France were very much ~~because of~~ in charge of ~~bringing back~~ <sup>restoring</sup> the oppressive rule of the Catholic Church. They stationed a garrison in Rome where they didn't leave until 1870 in order to protect the Pope. This was a major obstacle towards the unification of Italy as nationalists were not strong enough to fight their foreign influence in their country, ~~so~~ thus made them struggle harder. This involvement by France had lengthened the unification ~~process~~ process as who knows that perhaps with Pope Pius IX out of the city, they may have had

(This page is for your first answer.) a chance of speeding up unification in more peaceful, less violent manner.

Moreover, another obstacle which France had presented started off when Italian Prime Minister Cavour had met Emperor of France: Napoleon in a secret meeting at Plombières. This meeting formed an alliance between the two countries in 1858. Although for most part of the meeting, France had told Italy that it would help them drive out the Austrian influence in Italy as they

were the traditional enemy of the French, ~~France~~ Napoleon also made sure that Italy not get too unified so that they may pose a threat to France itself. When Cavour and Napoleon drew up a plan on what the new kingdom of Italy should appear geographically, he made sure the states were still divided as one united Italy could become overpowerful and dangerous. This proved an obstacle in the process of Italian unification as nationalists saw one geographically united Italy as a lot stronger and superior than a divided one. However as it was made certain by France that this would not happen, it showed that although France were willing to get rid of Austrian influence in Italy, they were not prepared to make Italy too self-sufficient because perhaps Napoleon had an idea of replacing Austrian influence in Italy with French.

(This page is for your first answer.)

However, there were a number of occasions between 1848-70 where France had not proven themselves as an obstacle to Italian unification but instead had help achieve Italian unification. In 1859, when Piedmont ~~went~~ also went to war with Austria, France had agreed to side with Italy so that they would receive Lombardy <sup>back from Austrian control</sup> as a result. By providing the troops needed for this war, ~~France~~ France essentially led Italy to victory in the war. This incident cannot be labelled as France

hindering Italian unification as it was Napoleon's careful and clever negotiations that made Austria agree to handing Lombardy over in the Armistice of Villafranca. France had obtained Lombardy through this armistice and then ceded it to Italy to save Austria face. France can be seen as the major reason of Italy's victory in the war, as without their help, the Italians would have been so outnumbered, that it may have made Italy even less unified than before. Therefore, France was not an obstacle to the Italian unification as it allowed Austrian-controlled Lombardy to be given back to Italy without Austrian intervention.

Furthermore, in the Austrian-Prussian war, France had very intelligently negotiated with both sides ~~of the~~ so that no matter which country won, France did therefore

(This page is for your first answer.) Italy would make gains. France told Austria that if they remained neutral in the war then, they would have to give up Venetia to the French who would consequently hand it to Italy. He then did the same thing with Prussia and gained Venetia in 1866 when Prussia won the war. Venetia was added to the Kingdom of Italy at which King Victor Emmanuel II was ~~the~~ head of France in this occasion also had shown that they were not ~~an~~ obstacle to Italian unification.



but by careful dealings and negotiations could obtain back parts of Italy which were previously there without even being involved in any kind of bloodbath. Similarly, Italy had recovered Rome in 1870 (without <sup>being</sup> involving in a war) when the Franco-Prussian war <sup>in 1870</sup> meant that French reinforcements were needed so the withdrawal of the French garrison in Rome was important. Rome was finally added to the <sup>rest of the</sup> unified Italy and could be declared as one single country together. Again, the question of how Rome was united with Italy has the answer of France allowing it to happen. The withdrawal of their troops meant that the civilians could now be free from oppressive rule as the Pope backward reactionary Pope Pius IX was no longer the head. France was to be again credited for allowing the one last addition of Italy to be unified with the rest of the kingdom, by helping not hindering unification of Italy.

(This page is for your first answer.) In conclusion, it can be strongly stated that the French involvement in the years 1848-70 in Italy was not an obstacle to Italian unification, as the ~~1859~~ 1859 Austro-Prussian War, Austro-Prussian War of 1866 and French removal of the garrison in Rome <sup>are</sup> ~~can~~ all ~~be~~ major contributors to a unified - at least geographically united Italy. There may have been some instances, such as the crushing of the Roman Republic

in 1849 and limitations to unifying Italy at the Plombières meeting in 1858 with proved as an obstacle to unification of Italy but overall France's involvement as an ally to France was overshadowed by its hindering Italian unification.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

This response directly addresses the extent to which France was an obstacle to Italian unification across the whole period. The candidate clearly addresses the ways in which France was and was not a hindrance to unification through developed, detailed and secure paragraphs. The question does not require a discussion of alternative obstacles and the approach taken here allows for the key issues to be developed more fully across the time period. There are some weaknesses in written communication but the script is a low band response.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

Use the opening sentences of paragraphs to build on from one another creating a discussion which directly addresses the question.

## E2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

As with Italian Unification this is a popular and well-taught topic to which most candidates bring detailed knowledge. There were, again, more descriptive answers than have been seen in the past but the knowledge was usually secure and able to reach Level 3. Candidates show increasing awareness of the inter-relatedness of the key factors involved in the process of German unification.

### Question 3

Very few candidates attempted this question. A few candidates misread the end date of the question leading to poor responses but several candidates produced analytical and well thought out answers which were interesting to read and achieved the higher Levels. There was some good discussion of the concept of 'progress' and the extent to which the revolutionary years created the foundation for future events.

### Question 4

This was overwhelmingly the most popular question for this topic. There were some narrative-led responses and a significant minority which mentioned the three significant wars briefly but failed to discuss their contribution. It is vital in teaching both 'unification' topics that the chronology of events is made clear, as weaker candidates often make valid analytical and explanatory points but confuse the events. Many responses showed a very good understanding of how the different factors influencing the unification were inter-related. The best were able to suggest, with supporting evidence, that the military success of Prussia was only possible through its economic superiority over Austria combined with the diplomatic machinations of Bismarck. However, many responses were unable to move out of Level 4 because of the generalised and, often assertive, nature of the comments about the way in which factors were inter-related. It is not enough to say that there was no 'blood shed without iron' there needs to be supporting evidence focused on the comparative significance of the given factor. The very best answers also referred to the specific territorial and political gains made at each point of the unification process, for example, the creation of the North German Confederation in the wake of Austrian defeat.

This is a high Level 4 answer. It focuses on the question well with a clear understanding of the key issues but some of the points lack development.

**Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer ☒.**  
**If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒**  
**and then put a cross in another box ☒.**

Chosen Question Number:

<del>—</del>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<del>—</del>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<del>—</del>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<del>—</del>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.) *Military force was of course a key factor in unifying Germany and without.*

defeating Austria and France some may argue that Unification would have been impossible due to the interference of the two European powers. However other important factors contributed towards Unification in 1871, such as the diplomatic skills of Otto von Bismarck, vast economic progress due to an Industrial Revolution and a dramatic increase in the rise of Nationalistic feelings and German Identity.

The use of military force during the years 1862-71 cannot be underestimated as War Minister Roon and General Moltke led Prussia to three comprehensive victories during this period enabling Unification. Prussia's superior guns made by their armament industry KRUPP gave them a huge advantage over their enemies and led to the victories, notably in 1866 at

(This page is for your first answer) - the battle of Sadowa where they faced an evenly matched Austria but the superior weapons proved decisive.

~~Prussia~~ All three wars gave Prussia a larger stronghold on the Confederation which eventually allowed for Unification.

The Convention of Gastein following Austria and Prussia's triumph over Denmark came the decision



to split the ruling of Schleswig-Holstein, resulting in Prussia gaining the German speaking Schleswig which was a step towards unifying the German people as one united nation.

The Seven Weeks War with Austria was also a crucial victory for the Prussians as this allowed them to expel Austria from the Confederation and steer Germany towards a kleindeutschland unification.

Unification however could not be achieved ~~while France~~ until France had been defeated due to Emperor Napoleon III's fears of an emerging Central European power dominating France and more importantly ruining his legacy as Napoleon's nephew.

Bismarck, appointed in 1862, ~~was~~ was extremely influential in winning these wars.

(This page is for your first answer.) In my opinion however, these wars would not have been initiated and won with such efficiency and decisiveness had Otto von Bismarck not been appointed chief minister in 1862.

Bismarck's secret meeting of Biarritz in 1865 with Napoleon III was a huge success in ensuring the ~~full support of the French in a war with Austria~~ French neutrality in the event of an Austro-Prussian war.



Bismarck also cunningly intervened in the Hohenzollern crisis of 1868-1870 by changing the Ems telegram sent to him by King Frederick William III and issuing it to the papers to fuel anti-French feelings in Germany and ~~make~~ anger France into declaring war with Prussia.

The Zollverein, created in 1834 to abolish trade barriers in the Confederation was a total success and this eventually led to an industrial revolution in Prussia during the 1850's. ~~The~~ the industrial revolution ~~was~~ resulted in a power shift ~~over~~ over the Confederation from the Austrians to the ~~Prussians~~ Prussians due to their now superior coal and ~~steel~~ iron and industries as well as the railways that had been built through the Confederation with the exclusion of

(This page is for your first answer.) Austria. All these economic successes resulted in Prussia being able to defeat initially Austria and the France in the 1870's.

In conclusion I believe that while unification could not have been achieved ~~without~~ without the ~~military~~ militaristic brilliance of the Prussian leaders in defeating Denmark, Austria and France. This could not have been achieved without the combined efforts and successes of Bismarck's diplomatic

exploits and the ~~Prussian~~ Prussian/German flourishing economy due to the introduction of the Zollverein which ~~gave~~ gave Prussia the resources necessary for waging war with and defeating two great nations.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

This is a well focused answer which has a clear understanding of the contribution of military force and shows the connection between war and the expansion/unification of territory under Prussia. The answer goes on to develop several other factors with some attempt at integration. However, the explanation could be more developed with more detailed supporting evidence.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

Introduction and conclusion are important. In the introduction try to put the question into context and to outline the key issues to be discussed whilst in the conclusion come to a judgement using the argument outlined in the body of the essay.

## E3 The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943

This was a very popular topic which results in responses reflecting the whole range of levels available. It has been a pleasure to see candidates increasingly willing, able and confident enough to tackle questions on the 1896-1914/5 period; it is now only rarely that responses to these questions focus on Mussolini. Many candidates do, however, continue to make insecure statements about the number of Prime Ministers who governed Italy over this period. Many of the textbooks refer to the period from 1870-1914/15 as whole and it may be necessary to identify specifically the situation in 1896 at the beginning of the course rather than refer to general statements about the post-unification Liberal State.

### Question 5

Although not as popular as Question 6, a considerable number of responses were answered on the pressing political problems of Liberal Italy. Most candidates were able to identify the general, if not specifically political, problems facing Italy in the 1890s and to describe and comment on the response of Liberal government or to comment on the situation in 1914. However, fewer were able to combine these together to create an evaluation of the extent to which the problems had been solved. The best answers were able to focus on political problems such as the lack of representation, influence of the elites, challenges of nationalism and the consequent rise in socialism, determine the extent to which governments, particularly those of Giolitti, were able to deal with them and reach a judgement as to the situation in 1914 as Italy decided whether, and on whose side, to go to war.

This is a well focused Level 4 script.

**Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .**  
**If you change your mind, put a line through the box**   
**and then put a cross in another box .**

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.)

By the 1890s, Italy had only been a unified country for thirty years. The Liberal government began to address several of the pressing political problems <sup>and many</sup> that were commonplace before the 1890s; however such attempts to stabilize Italian politics hadn't succeeded by 1914.

~~By the 1890s~~ During the 1890s, the Liberal State and in particular, Giolitti, ~~begin to~~ ~~take~~ had undertaken several successful steps in attempting to modernise and stabilise the Liberal government. Previously, only 2% of the Italian population had been enfranchised. Giovanni Giolitti's decision to introduce universal male suffrage had ~~gone~~ to some extent reduced the image of the Liberal State as being un-democratic, corrupt and a of actively discouraging bottom-up involvement from the sections of Italian peasants and industrialists.

(This page is for your first answer.) However, the Liberal State was still ~~was~~ ~~the~~ subject of claims of corruption and patronage, whilst imposing its own form of governance and high taxation, without fully involving itself with the masses.

~~Another~~ The Liberal State's continued application of *Trasformismo* style politics was to also remain a pressing political issue by 1914. Following the instability of 33 different Liberal cabinets before 1896, the Liberal government attempted to stabilise itself through deploying ~~as~~ its political tactic of *Trasformismo*. This did at times help to keep ~~the~~ ~~lib~~ successive Liberal governments stable.

but Prime Ministers continued to change on a yearly basis, providing less and less stability to what was an already unpopular government. The issue of increasing political support remained ~~the~~ at the turn of the twentieth century and the Liberal State only seemed to be losing support. The growth in <sup>Socialist</sup> opposition had been fuelled by <sup>pre-war</sup> industrialisation in Northern Italian cities and also by Giolitti's extension of the franchise. Migration to developing cities such as Milan and Turin <sup>mobilised</sup> industrial workers into socialism, which was to provide increasing criticism of the Liberal government. Moreover, the abstention of the Catholic Church from

(This page is for your first answer.) Liberal politics continued to be a pressing issue for the government. The Liberal government was deemed anti-Catholic as the Church had incurred losses from the Wars of Unification. Their rejection of involvement in politics took a significant proportion of the population with them and now the Liberal State was being attacked by both sides of the political spectrum. However, as Giolitti appeared more anti-Socialist, Catholic opposition was relaxed, helping to create greater political unity.



In terms of international politics, the <sup>entry into</sup> ~~beginning of~~ the nineteenth century had seen liberal Italy take a turn for the worst. A nationally humiliating defeat at Adowa in 1896 at the hands of the Abyssinian army was to bring shame on the Liberal government. Furthermore, Italy was reliant on the Triple Alliance and unlike its European rivals, hadn't managed to acquire a notable Empire, and therefore international problems hadn't served to alienate <sup>any</sup> of the pressing political issues of the nineteenth century.

In conclusion, the pressing political problems of the 1890s ~~had been~~ continued ~~until~~ despite attempts from

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~Liberalism~~ to alienate them. By 1914, the Liberal state ~~was~~ remained unpopular and was open to greater attack, cabinets remained unstable, Liberal Italy had failed in its foreign affairs and ultimately, the continued political problems ~~to~~ were to be brutally exposed by Italy's entry into World War One.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .  
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.  
If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.) The Second Spanish Republic from 1931-6 had failed as by the summer of 1936 the country had descended into civil war. The opposition of the Army, especially towards the Left Republic, was ~~one~~ <sup>the</sup> a key factor ~~among~~ <sup>that</sup> contributed to the wide-scale polarisation that brought down the republican government.

The opposition of the army, and notably Franco, served as a crucial ~~key~~ factor <sup>in</sup> explaining the failure of the republican government.

The Left Republic (1931-33) regarded the army as top-heavy, wasteful and largely incompetent. The government decided to close military academies and also offered retirement to army officers on full pay, of which half accepted. Such a decision ~~to~~ isolated military generals such as Franco, Sanjurjo and Mola and brought them not only into a ~~opposition~~ <sup>of the</sup> republican government but brought them closer to a rebellion. The army's opposition was illustrated when General Sanjurjo attempted several coups in Andalusia against the government. Yet more importantly,

(This page is for your second answer.) The opposition of the army was shown during the ~~1934~~ Asturias rising in October 1934. The army, under Franco's control, crushed a socialist miners' strike in the northern province of Spain and showed that the Right Republic not only had the army's support, but the method of <sup>military</sup> violence would seem successful in the future. The left, <sup>however</sup> were to be more reliant on legal tools in order to pursue change.

The reforms made under the Left Republic served to mobilise the population against the republican government and cause further unrest, contributing to the eventual failure of the republican government.

The Left Republic's sudden secularisation of Spain saw an explosion of outrage. ~~Working~~ The burning of ~~the~~ convents and the complete end of church involvement in the state mobilised a large proportion of the population away from the republic and instead into parties such as CEDA or the Falange.

Additionally, the Left Republic's Agrarian Land Reform where large estates were taken over by the state and the land was re-distributed to the peasants was not successful in resolving agrarian inefficiencies but also served to lose ~~the~~ support from middle-classes and landowners, causing further polarisation and helping to bring down the republican government. Moreover,

(This page is for your second answer.) The global economic Depression limited the availability of credit to the ~~right~~ left Republic in order to introduce further reform, which was deemed slow by many forms of ~~left~~ the left and too radical by the right.

The Right Republic (1933-6), pursued more reactionary policies and so tensions merely increased as the republican government neared its collapse.

The reversal of many of the left Republic's reforms saw the left call it its time in governance the 'two black years'. The Right repressed socialist and anarchist uprisings, including the events at Asturias, and the left continued to demand greater change and reform. Such ~~the~~ issues saw greater polarisation of Spanish politics and again in early 1936, the government had changed hands.

The Popular Front saw the final part of the Spanish Republic; yet they were no more successful and saw the ~~final~~ end of the republican government.

The Popular Front was responsible for not only a continued absence in change but sending army generals to various parts of Spain. Franco was further isolated when he was sent to the Canary Islands and sending Mola to Pamplona simply gave him the opportunity to negotiate with the Carlists in Navarre. This increased the

(This page is for your second answer.) Likelihood of a military rising and by July, Franco's rising from Morocco saw the outbreak of Civil War and the failure of the Spanish Republic.

In conclusion, the opposition of the army was the most important factor in explaining the failure of the republican government as the left Republic's actions against the army saw key generals oppose the government, as shown in Astoria Asturias, and when ~~dispersed~~ dispersed in 1936 ~~again~~, they had been pushed into a ~~rebellion~~ rising that would mark the end of the republican government and the outbreak of Civil War.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Both of these responses are well focused on the question asked. Each answer is developed with paragraphs that create a discussion and the key issue is considered. The first response focuses on political problems which the second response addresses the opposition of the army before dealing with other factors. Some of the paragraphs could be developed in more detail and with greater explanation.



This is a low Level 5 script.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Always focus on the key phrase and key dates in the question - in this case the answer is focused directly on the growth in power of the PNF during the years 1919-25.

Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~■~~ The powerful and unchallenged leadership of Mussolini was a large factor in the growing influence and power of the Fascist Party in Italy because he was able to, assisted by his excellent public speaking ability, exploit the weakness of the Liberal government in power. However, there were other factors to explain the growth of Fascist power, such as the 'Mutilated Victory' experienced by Italy at the Treaty of London following World War 1, which highlighted the lack of ~~the~~ power Italy was able to exert internationally. ~~The~~ The Mutilated Victory intensified the social discontent, with many people looking to the Fascist Party as a fresh alternative to the faltering Liberal government.

It could argued that between the foundation of the Fascist Party in 1919 and 1922 the Party barely grew in power. Despite the Mutilated Victory and high levels of unemployment that resulted from the fall-out of World War 1, Mussolini's Party was not instantly a success. This is seen by the

(This page is for your first answer.) September 1919 election, when the Party was just four months old. Unable to exert its control, it was defeated resoundingly by the PSI and Popolari coalition. Further still, in the election of 1922 the Fascist Party won just 35 out of 535 seats - a clear indication of its lack of popularity amongst the Italian people. One year later, however, the Party was in power.

It is this huge jump from winning just 7% of the votes to being in power that highlights the weakness of the Liberal state. Through his use of street violence (using his paramilitary wing - the *Blackshirts*) Mussolini struck fear into the Italian people, and the government; who began to fear for their safety and position. Not dealt with by the police or army, Mussolini exploited this in October 1923 when he threatened a 'March on Rome'. Designed to display his leadership qualities through his extremely effective use of propaganda, the March on Rome eventually led to the gaining of power for Mussolini, having been elected Prime Minister by King Emmanuel III. The failure to deal with the threat of military pressure by the state was seen when D'Annunzio occupied Fiume in 1921 for 13 months, and it could be argued that this encouraged Mussolini to carry out his March on Rome - an example of his strong leadership exploiting government weaknesses.

(This page is for your first answer.) Once in power, Mussolini's strong leadership was able to increase the popularity of the Fascist Party. He did this by re-organising the voting system, and eventually, in 1925, establishing a dictatorship. By altering the voting system, Mussolini secured 66% of the vote in a supposedly fair election in 1925, allowing him to establish a one-party state through 'overwhelming popularity'. Between his appointment as Prime Minister in 1922 and 1925, Mussolini systematically obliterated any source of opposition or threat to his power. This can be seen by the murder of Matteotti in 1924 after he spoke out against the Fascist Party.

The murder of Matteotti, however, was extremely unpopular with many Italians. The Fascist Party lost many members and the influential Catholic Church - ~~was~~ a friend of the Fascist Party since the 1923 Lateran Accords - spoke out against the murder. Mussolini's strong leadership can be seen by his ability to distance himself from any involvement, and despite probably being aware of the plot, solving the following crisis by sentencing the involved Fascist Party members to jail sentences - despite being very soft terms. The crisis was then calmed, with Mussolini maintaining his power through bold leadership.

(This page is for your first answer.) Limits to alternative Mon. By 1914, the Liberal state ~~was~~ remained unpopular and was open to greater attack, cabinets remained unstable, Liberal Italy had failed in its foreign affairs and ultimately the continued political problems ~~to~~ were to be brutally exposed by Italy's entry into World War One.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer .  
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.

If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12

(This page is for your second answer.) The immediate transition to monarchy in Spain after the death of Franco in 1975 was successful because of the increasing discontentedness with the Franco-regime that stemmed from the boundaries placed upon the Spanish people by the authoritarian Franco. In addition, the regime had begun to relax, with less fascist-minded ministers ~~and~~ and lower levels of censorship of the press. Franco had planned for the end of his reign, ~~making~~ <sup>making</sup> Juan Carlos ~~the~~ heir to the throne in 1959. ~~Such~~ Such preparation ultimately led to a smooth transition to a monarchy in 1975.



As Franco grew older, it can be seen that the regime became less totalitarian and increasingly moderate. The international suspicions that were inflicted on Spain throughout the 1940s began to relax in the 1950s when Spain was admitted to the UN (1955) and OECD. Furthermore, Spain allied with the USA in the 1950s, with the 1953 Pact of Madrid allowing US arms to be placed in Spain as the Cold War rumbled on.

(This page is for your second answer.) Increasingly, the Franco-state began to relax, ultimately allowing for a successful transition to monarchy in 1975. In 1963 censorship of the press was relaxed and non-political strikes were made acceptable. This in ~~turn~~ <sup>to</sup> led to strikes regarding pay and paid holiday becoming increasingly common, and the Spanish people thus became less content to withstand the rigour of Franco's state. The most volatile members of Spain in the 1960s were arguably the students, who began to protest regularly over education and university fees.

The transition to monarchy in 1975 was also successful because of the economic stability of Spain that resulted from the mass tourism boom of the 1960s. GDP per capita rose by 40% in this period, thus satisfying the Spanish economy and Spanish industry and workers, who were integral in this tourism boom. Increasingly important in the Spanish economy,



tourism offered Spain a key industry on which to focus and improve in the 1960s and 1970s, minimising discontent ~~and~~ for the transition to a monarchy.

The lack of key fascist players in Franco's cabinet led to a modernising of the political spectrum in Spain, with less extreme influences through which to maintain the regime after Franco's death. As a result, Franco appointed Juan Carlos future king in 1969 - allowing time for the

(This page is for your second answer.) transition to monarchy to be planned and received by the people of Spain. Furthermore, as Franco's health began to fail in the late 1960s, he minimised his role in politics, stepping down as Head of Government in 1968, but still remaining Head of State. This allowed for a development of government stability prior to Franco's impending death.

In conclusion, the transition ~~to~~ to monarchy in Spain after Franco's death in 1975 was so successful because of the public discontent ~~with~~ <sup>with</sup> the regime, highlighted by the many strikes from 1963 onwards, and most notably the Basque terrorism that erupted months before Franco's death in 1975 - which prompted National Law to be brought in in the Basque region. Furthermore, the modernisation of Spanish affairs, notably foreign policy (joining the UN) and ~~mass~~ <sup>mass</sup> tourism

allowed for a smooth transition into a well-planned monarchy from an increasingly moderate Franco-regime in 1975.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Both of these answers are focused directly on the question asked showing explicit understanding of the key issues. The first response focuses directly on the growing power of PNF with direct reference to power in the electoral process and government rather than more vague reference to growth in popularity or rise in support. It adheres to the time period of the question and reaches a clear judgement of the role of Mussolini.

The second answer attempts to explain the reasons why the immediate transition to monarchy on the death of Franco was successful with reference to relevant events before his death. The transition to monarchy is established in the context of the later years of Franco's rule and although not always completely secure in its reasoning uses the supporting material available well.

## E4 Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75

This is an increasingly popular topic within centres and candidates are becoming more confident in writing about very complex situations. However, there is still a tendency for many of the weaker responses to assume that every question set on the topic that refers to the period before 1939 is about the Spanish Civil War itself. Many candidates clearly find it, understandably to some extent, difficult to distinguish between Republican government in the years before the outbreak of the war and Republican forces during it. This is a topic for which a strong chronological foundation needs to be created and those candidates who do master it produce some very interesting and often thought provoking answers. Please refer back to the exemplification scripts for Topic E3.

### *Question 7*

This question gave the candidates the opportunity to discuss the long term opposition to republican government by elements of the army and the dissatisfaction with the Popular Front government in 1936 which led to the rebellion in July in relative comparison to other factors. Although the early months of the Civil War have some relevance to the question the time period specified was that of 1931-36 and it was focus on this period which was rewarded within the mark scheme. A significant number of candidates did not recognise the key themes in the question at all except as a simple Republican versus Nationalist battle and focused wholly on the Spanish Civil War itself. Responses in which there was little recognition of the period before 1936 often only achieved Level 1 or Level 2 whilst a few were written in such a way as to achieve low Level 3. Candidates who did focus on the years 1931-36 often wrote generalised answers with much detail about church reforms and political in-fighting but little about the opposition of the army except the dislike of the initial army reforms. There were, however, also a significant number of very good scripts at Level 4 and above that were able to deal admirably with not only the complexity of the chronology but gave detailed information in supporting evidence. Some responses suggested that an underlying distrust of Republican government was evident throughout the period, and that pro-republican politicians did attempt to divide and rule the army hierarchy, but despite spreading them far and wide geographically significant army generals were able to use this to their advantage in the planning to overthrow the Republic in the spring/summer of 1936.

### *Question 8*

This question was designed to allow a discussion of the situation in which Franco left Spain on the occasion of his death and the extent to which the 'nature of Franco's provision for a successor' and the 'role of Juan Carlos to 1975', as stated in the content clarification, was a success. Dealing with the very end of the topic this was focused on a very specific period of time but it was expected that candidates would deal with this by a consideration of Franco's legacy and why a monarchy was acceptable to Spain at the time. This was exactly how the small number of candidates who attempted the question responded to it; the majority of responses clearly met the requirements of the mark scheme. It did not require a detailed description of the events following Franco's death or a need to question the extent to which it was 'so successful'. However, any candidates who were able to use this in their analysis were clearly rewarded. Most candidates were able to give a variety of relevant and, often very interesting reasons, as to why they felt the immediate transition to monarchy was so successful; there was a clear sense of the nature of Franco's legacy, the traditional role of the monarchy in Spain and the popular need for a new style of government. The responses were differentiated mainly through the amount of explanation, development and supporting evidence candidates were able to provide for their analysis.

## E5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

This topic had very few entrants and the responses were either very secure in their knowledge or understanding or very weak descriptive answers.

Please refer to exemplification report for Option F for an example of an E5 response.

### *Question 9*

Very few responses covered the whole of the time period involved. The best answers were able to show how the influence of the USSR both in political and economics changed over time and that East German influences were also very significant in themselves. Most answers were limited to Level 3 as they focused almost wholly on the period from 1949 to 1961 or referred to the period from 1945 through to the 1950s.

### *Question 10*

There were even few responses to this question and those candidates who did respond tended to concentration not on the period of re-unification but on the downfall of the East German government. A few very good answers were able to compare the role of Helmut Kohl with external influences in the international community.

## E6 The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism

A small but significant number of centres enter for this Topic. Candidates invariably attempt questions set which cover the time period before 1979. Those candidates who attempt to address the later period often produce responses with weak analysis and detail and are often confused chronologically. A significant number of candidates appear to mistake Iran and Iraq for each other. Centres should be aware that the nature of the specification is such that questions can be asked across the whole time period and across time periods covered by individual bullet points; a lack of preparation for the period after 1979 could result in candidates being unable to meet the high Level 4 and Level 5 requirements of the mark scheme.

### *Question 11*

This was the most popular of the two questions. Although a chronological analytical approach can result in high level answers, with the number of wars and the time-scale needed to be covered candidates who write such responses often run out of time; a thematic approach using the discussion of different factors is usually more effective. Most candidates were able to discuss the effects and influence of foreign intervention with the very best responses showing a clear understanding of the changing circumstances over time. However, some of the weaker answers became confused between outcome and causation.

### *Question 12*

There were very few responses indeed. Those that did, attempted to show how Iraqi actions were connected to different events in the Gulf between 1979-2001 with references to the Iran-Iraq war, the invasion of Kuwait and the resultant Islamist response to the western presence in the Gulf region.

Finally, this is an example of a Level 3 script. The response are sound in reasoning and understanding but do not development of the given factor adequately and lack secure, detail supporting evidence.

Chosen Question Number:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |

(This page is for your first answer.)

French involvement was an obstacle to an extent, but it was not the strongest factor. This is because the church and Austria always tried to hinder the unification process - whereas France helped and hindered. However, French involvement did to some extent make obstacles for Italy to unify.

Firstly, French involvement was always going to be necessary because of the strong links with Italy and Napoleons Catholic and romantic attachment to the country. Nevertheless, France did hinder the process of unification. France sued Austria for peace and betrayed Italy at Villafranca (Treaty of Zurich) which completely went against the Plombières agreement between Italy and France. The agreement was made to drive out the Austrian forces which would have led to the unification process happening much quicker. In addition, it was evident that



(This page is for your first answer.)

France wasn't completely loyal to Italy. It seemed that France was more interested in their own interests and what they could gain. France was always interested in Nice + Savoy - which wasn't theirs at the time. At the Treaty of Zurich, Austria allowed them to have Savoy and Nice - as long as Austria kept Lombardy. France accepted and stabbed Italy in the back. However, France does also help the unification process. The meeting at Plombières showed their willingness to help and provide support to drive out Austria, which shows that France was an obstacle to an extent, but was not the main obstacle.

Austria was the main and most important obstacle. The dominance of Austria was much more visible and evident than that of France. Austria stopped every opportunity for Italy to be unified. This can be seen from the 1848 revolutions where Austria crushed them with ease due to strong leadership qualities of Metternich and leadership in the army. In addition, at the first war of independence, Austria crushed the Piedmontese army whilst still containing the Quadrilateral.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Austria did not want Italy to be unified as it knew that if it was, they would be driven out and lose their dominance and strong connection with the Pope and the Papal States. The strong army stopped uprisings and revolts which kept Italy in its place and un-united. This shows how France was to an extent a threat, but Austria was a much more dominating obstacle.

Another obstacle was the Church. Pope Pius XI claimed to be liberal, and revolutionary in his ideas but this was not the case. When the subject matter of a war with Austria came up, the Pope was very displeased. He provided Italy with the 'Anno Domini' and could not condone a war with another Catholic country. This was a great obstacle for Italy unifying as it did not have the legitimacy of the Pope and was seen as wrong to want unification. The Syllabus of Errors also showed that the Pope did not recognise any unification process and everything up to that point was 'not right in the eyes of God!' Furthermore the church had such a great influence on lifestyle in Italy that

(This page is for your first answer.)

unification would make them lose dominance. This shows how important the Pope and the Church were, and how they were even more of an obstacle than France.

~~Furthermore, the military did~~

To conclude, it is clear that France were an obstacle due to them betraying Italy at Villafranca.

However, they were only a small extent of the obstacle. The Church and Pope were a dominant force in all matters and tried to legitimise the unification. However the greatest obstacle was Austria as they crushed <sup>1848</sup> revolutions and Piedmontese army, which would have led to the unification happening much faster. Therefore only to a small extent were France an obstacle in the unification of Italy.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer .  
 Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.  
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
 and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12

(This page is for your second answer.)

The opposition of the army was not the main reason for the failure of the Republican Government 1931-36. It was other factors such as no sorting out of long term problems, weaknesses with individual aims and the Black Years. Therefore, to a small extent it was the army.

Firstly, the army were conservative elites who wanted to keep themselves in power. Even though the army were "top-heavy" with too many generals to men, they wanted to keep the traditional values. They did not approve of the Republic as it was to change the system, and it would make them lose power and privileges. When this occurred, they would not fight for the new Republican Government, which weakened the Government tremendously. Without the military's support,



(This page is for your second answer.)

the Republic had no trained defence if anyone tried to attack and take over power. However, this is not the most important factor as the Republic could form army's from the anarchists (CNT) or socialists (POUM) which shows it's not to a great extent that the army was the reason for the fall of the Republic.

The main reason and extent to why the Republic Government failed was the "long term problems" regarding the land and the latifundios, church and it's dominance, secularisation of the Basque + catalonia country and social welfare. These were supposed to be the main problems sorted out by the Republic but they were not. The Republic promised very little and delivered little for the people. This lack of trust between the Government and the lower classes caused the proletariat to raise protests and revolt against the new Republican Government. Even though, this Government did grant catalonia autonomy - and attempt to sort out the problems early on - it didn't last which made the people lose faith on this Government and start to look for a new



(This page is for your second answer.)

one. This shows how the Republican Government failed due to not sorting out long term problems which is more vital than the military.

The two Black Years highlighted how the Republican Government failed as they lost the support of the people and Nationalism was the way forward. The Right were united and ~~now~~ had a consensus aim not individual ones.

Another problem + reason for the failure of the Republic was their individual aims. Even though they claimed to be for "all the people" in their policies this was not the case. They each had hidden agendas and individual aims. The Anarchists wanted to fulfil their dreams of having co-operatives on the land they owned. The Socialists (Caballero) wanted a socialist revolution whilst the Republicans wanted democracy. These individual aims meant they could not work together and make policies for Spain as they all had individual ideas on what should be done - which links back to them not dealing with long-term problems.

This shows how the individual aims meant they were a weak republic and could be said "destined to fail". This factor is more important than the military as this affects decision making and stability of the Government.

To conclude, opposition from the army was a minimal factor in the failures of the Republic. If the left were not constrained to different aims and lack of support after they couldn't sort out long-term problems then the army may have had more of an impact in the failures. However, the fact that the left had different aims for the Republican army, individual aims and the two Black years in between meant they failed in the Republic, and the military was a small extent in this.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

Both responses are similar in that they clearly show some understanding of the question asked and can identify some of the key issues. The paragraphs are developed and make points in relation to the question asked. However, in the first response the given factor is weakly developed with little coverage of the time period and in the second response the given factor is more clearly developed but the other factors are developed with general explanation rather than more specific supporting evidence.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

Always support analysis and explanation with detailed and accurate supporting evidence.

Overall, once again, however, centres should be commended for the preparation and obvious enthusiasm with which they approach the Topics; the knowledge of candidates is more tailored to the themes each year. The best responses are analytical, detailed and reach interesting, well-supported judgements.

## 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>





Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US026439 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

