

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report
June 2011

GCE History 6HI01 F

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.

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 Advisor directly by sending an email to MARK BATTYE on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.

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



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028133

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

Introduction

General comments

This is the third year of GCE 2008 and the sixth examination session for Unit 1. Candidates are now aware of how to approach the examination. They understand the need to produce a balanced answer, and they know that the most effective way to structure this answer is to make a number of relevant points, support these with examples, and establish clear links to the question set. However, many of these well-focused and organised answers remain at mid-level 4 rather than progressing to the top of level 4 and into level 5. This is due to a variety of reasons including a need to inter-relate or evaluate the points being made more directly, a failure to cover the whole date range of the question, a lack of chronological awareness and a lack of the convincing support required to gain the higher level marks. Fewer answers than previously were awarded levels 1 and 2. Most candidates appear to have gained something from their course, and thus are likely to be awarded at least level 3. Almost all answers include some kind of plan, though some were very long and detailed, to the detriment of their answer overall.

Many candidates still struggle to maintain a focus on the question set. Some are quick to assume that the questions set are similar to those they have met while revising. They must remember that past questions are exactly that, and cannot appear again in the same form. They need to read the questions carefully and respond to what is asked, rather than what they hope to see or have practised during revision. Knowledge needs to be adapted and employed effectively, rather than taking the form of a prepared answer that may not focus on the question set.

Equally, candidates must ensure that their entire answer focuses on the question. Question D7 required an analysis of the consequences of collectivisation. However, a number of candidates began with a lengthy explanation of the reasons for the introduction of this policy. Similarly, question D10 required a focus on the civil rights movement, yet many discussed Black Power in their answers. Question C6 was often focused on why the slave trade rather than slavery was abolished in 1807 rather than why it took so long for slavery to be abolished. These issues could be of some relevance, but were rarely made so.

Past reports have highlighted the importance of focusing on the timescale set in the question. Many otherwise strong answers were weakened, sometimes substantially, by failing to cover the period set. Question A11 targeted 1455-61, but many ignored this and wrote only on the causes of civil conflict. Question B1's timescale was 1517-25. Some ignored this completely, focusing instead on the long-term causes of the German Reformation. Question D11 set the parameters of 1954-63, yet many candidates discussed the roles of Truman and Johnson in their answers. Question E/F 5 required a discussion of the period from 1896-1922 but many responses focused entirely on the period from 1915 whilst question E/F 6 covered the years 1925-1943 in Italy not the rise to power of the Fascist Party. An understanding of chronology, and the accurate use of dates, was often a factor which discriminated between level 3 and level 4 answers.

It seemed that many candidates did not have the specific knowledge which is essential for accessing the higher levels, but provided generalised examples which showed little depth. Dates, numerical evidence, reference to key individuals and events are all important if candidates are to produce a convincing analysis. If we assume that each topic is studied for at least six weeks, the majority of candidates should have this depth of knowledge.

Many candidates appear to have been armed with a writing template for their answers. The formula appeared to be taking note of the factor raised in the question and then mentioning that other factors (usually three) were also significant. Key marker phrases, such as 'however' and 'on the other hand' were then deployed before reaching some sort of conclusion. The use of these connecting phrases often seem impressive and do lead to a more organised answer but too many candidates increasingly employ them without a real understanding of how they should be used. In many responses the use of 'however', 'consequently' and 'therefore' just led to the introduction of another factor rather than creating a discussion of the points being made. This approach can work as long as effective links to the question are established. Several answers looked at other relevant factors but failed to establish their significance beyond asserting that they were important.

Those candidates who were well prepared in terms of knowledge and understanding of their topics produced answers within levels 4 and 5, and some of these have been included in this report. For students who completed GCSE just one year earlier, the best answers are remarkable examples of young minds at work.

Question 1-14

Option F

General comments

As in previous examination series, the option E/F candidates were generally very well prepared for the topics studied. Most candidates had at least sound knowledge of the content and were able to show understanding of key issues. Responses were found at all levels with many excellent level 5 responses seen, particularly for topic 1 and topic 2. However, it was noticeable this June that many good responses seemed to reach mid-level 4 but not progress further up the mark scheme. Most of these responses were able to provide a range of factors or yes/no points but did not go on to address the evaluative concepts of 'how far...', 'to what extent...', 'how significant...' etc. Alternatively there were many responses with well-developed conclusions reaching sound judgements that had not been convincingly or securely justified in the main body of the response. In particular, many of these responses were hampered by a lack of chronological awareness within the time-frame of the question. There were many examples of candidates with sound knowledge of events or individuals but responding with little regard to the context or chronological order in which developments happened. For example, responses to Q3 on Bismarck's diplomacy including paragraphs within which there were references to the war with Denmark followed by the Franco-Prussian war and then moving back to discuss war with Austria with little acknowledgement of chronology or dates.

NB – please note that the comments on individual questions are applicable to Q1-Q12 for Option E as well. It is suggested that centres refer to the Option E report as well where more exemplification scripts will be found.

Topic E/F1 – The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-1870.

This is a very popular topic for option E centres and candidates are invariably very well prepared. Q2 was more popular than Q1 but there was a healthy balance between the two. Most candidates for this topic have a good understanding of the chronology of events but many responses lack coverage of the whole time period within the question set. There are some factual errors beginning to creep into answers and there are an increasing number of candidates who do not seem to be aware that Cavour died in 1861 and so giving him a leading role in the acquisition of Venetia in 1866.

Q1. Most candidates were secure in their knowledge of the provisions of the Vienna Settlement with regard to Italy and were, thus, able to create a discussion of the changes that occurred in the following years. Answers were differentiated by those who were able to directly compare the extent to which the settlement had been overthrown by 1849 and those who narrated the events of the revolutions in between with varying degrees of secure knowledge. Most candidates were able to refer to the extent to which Austrian power was challenged and there were some perceptive comments about the extent to which the events of 1848-9 may have appeared to have achieved little but prepared the ground for future events. At level 5 candidates were able to compare directly the situation in 1815 and 1849 and select relevant and appropriate supporting material from the intervening years to make points about Austrian influence, revolutionary weaknesses and the development of nationalist ideology.

Q2. Most candidates who attempted this question were secure in their knowledge of the events of the period but many were unwilling to venture into time period before 1859 or after 1866, apart from brief references to either the *Statuto* or the Franco-Prussian War; those who did were often able to develop and explain the role of Victor Emmanuel more fully. The question did not ask whether Victor Emmanuel was the most significant individual but asked 'how significant?' he was in promoting Italian unification. Most candidates chose to develop significance by comparing Victor Emmanuel with other individuals/factors but many more successful answers evaluated his contribution or lack of contribution directly through a process of a yes/no response. Many of the responses which used the comparative method tended to dismiss Victor Emmanuel's role quite quickly moving on to a prepared response about other individuals which gained mid-level 4 at the most. There were a few responses that dismissed his role almost out-of-hand and so could not move out of level 3; Victor Emmanuel is one of the few specified individuals in the 'bullet points' and his role should, therefore, be studied explicitly. Most candidates identified him as a figurehead rather than a driver of unification. At level 5 candidates were able to show the role of Victor Emmanuel across the whole period and to discuss the role that he played at different times and the influence which he had, both directly and indirectly, on other individuals. Many of the better responses were able to identify 'promote' as a key word and discuss his contribution in terms of active support.

Topic E/F2 – The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Once again this is a very popular topic and most of the candidates are very well prepared for the first three bullet points of the specification. Q3 was universally more popular and there were very few candidates who attempted Q4. It would appear, however, that some centres are neglecting to cover the whole of the content. Questions can cover single bullet points or multiple bullet points across the specification and may address any part of the time period from 1848-90. Centres who do not cover all of the content are in danger of limiting an already limited choice of questions for their candidates. As with topic 1, there are some factual errors beginning to creep into answers. Many candidates seem to believe that Bismarck was appointed in 1852 rather than 1862 and attribute him with the foundation of the *Zollverein*.

Q3. Most candidates were secure in their knowledge of the events leading to and the factors responsible for the unification process. There is also a clear understanding of the term 'diplomacy' in connection to Bismarck's foreign policy. Some candidates do refer to his 'diplomacy' on the domestic front but the earlier tendency to refer to this to the exclusion of foreign policy altogether is now very rare. However, as with Q2 the question did not ask whether his diplomacy was the 'most' significant factor but 'how significant' his diplomacy was. As a result there were many answers which seemed to consist of prepared answers which referred to all the factors in turn with a statement at the end as to which was most important. These answers were often list-like rather than discursive and, although often secure knowledge, lacking in an evaluation of the significance of Bismarck's diplomacy. There was also a tendency, as suggested in the general comments, to discuss events out of chronological order and with few dates to create a secure context. Most candidates suggested that Bismarck's diplomacy was very significant but that underlying factors allowed him to manipulate events. At level 5 this approach was addressed directly with reference to longer term economic and military developments, the favourable international situation and 'chance'.

Q4. There were very few responses to this question. Responses tended to be either very strong or very weak. Many of the weaker responses tended to narrate events from 1871-90 or to evaluate the successes and failure of *Kulturkampf*. However, examiners did see some very confident answers which were able to evaluate change over time clearly. The timeframe allowed candidates to chart the move from the political alliance of the 'liberal era' through the more conservative/protectionist 1880s to the more complicated relationship surrounding Bismarck's fall.

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

Both questions were popular and it has been a pleasure to see the improvement in candidates' understanding and knowledge of the Liberal State since the first examination. However, there are still issues of chronological awareness with this topic with many candidates treating the years 1896 to 1915 as a homogenous whole and many responses unable to differentiate between the years 1925-43 and Mussolini's rise to power.

Q5. Most candidates were aware of the key issues relating to the political instability of the Liberal State in the years 1896-1922 but many responses seemed to be essentially prepared answers listing each of the underlying factors involved with little real discussion of the given factor. The concept of Italy's search for 'great power' status is outlined in the specification and, although the majority of the responses did highlight Italy's foreign policy, a significant minority of candidates assumed the term 'great power' referred almost exclusively to Italian domestic policy combined with the effects of World War I; this minimal approach to the given factor resulted in many lower band level 4 responses. The timeframe of the question allowed candidates to discuss a variety of foreign policy events including the defeat at Adowa, the war over Libya and World War I in relation to political instability and those responses that discussed these in comparison to other factors were able to access the higher levels. Some of the most successful answers were also able to show the changing nature of the threats to the Liberal State over time.

Q6. The majority of responses were able to explain and develop the role of propaganda in establishing Fascist control over Italy during the years 1925-43 but with differing degrees of detail. Fewer responses considered the extent to which 'effective propaganda' was the basis of Fascist control. Many candidates suggested that the cult of the personality combined with the positive propaganda surrounding Fascist policies were more effective than the use of intimidation and violence. Other responses discussed Fascist attempts to control or co-opt the elites of Italian society. However, a significant number of responses referred exclusively to the activities of Mussolini and/or were unsure of the timeframe of the question with emphasis on the rise of Fascism in the years 1919-25.

Topic E/F4 – Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75.

This topic is growing in popularity and candidates are increasingly well prepared. However, examiners commented on the lack of secure knowledge of the chronology of events covered by both questions. Q7 was by far the most popular question with very few answers attempted for Q8.

Q7. The majority of candidates who answered this question were able to develop the given factor with some confidence. However many responses tended to describe foreign support in the Civil Wars in general rather than in specific relation to its importance in securing Nationalist success or at a slightly higher level wrote a list-like response of developed paragraphs about different factors with little attempt at evaluation. There were also weaknesses in chronological awareness. For example, the airlift of the Army of Africa was often mentioned after examples of German aid given later in the war with little regard for its role in saving the Nationalists from an early defeat. The best responses were those which were able to show that foreign intervention not only aided success but had different consequences at different time of the war, as well as evaluating the importance of foreign intervention in relation to other factors. Despite good knowledge of the factors contributing to Republican failure and Nationalist success, candidates would benefit from a better overview of the progress of the war during its different stages.

Q8. This was only attempted by a minority of candidates. Examiners noted that the better responses were able to show change over time confidently and clearly and were able to come reasoned judgements which suggested that despite some amelioration of control there was still a great deal of underlying repression and highlighted the growing tension in the early 1970s. Weaker responses often found it difficult to define repression and there were a few answers which answered the question exclusively with reference to the late 1930s and 1940s.

This is a script with a level 5 and a level 4 answer - both are either directly or well-focused creating a discussion and coming to an overall 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"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan:

Yes: More Support. Better Support Nazi: Germany, Italy, Portugal.
~~And~~ Air Superiority due to Gordon Legion Support

No: Had equal forces at start.

Down to conjunction

Army of Africa more experienced

5th column tactics.

(This page is for your first answer.)

The Spanish Civil War was a conflict during the period of 1936-1939. The group of Nationalists emerged victorious from this conflict. The other group, the Republicans were left destroyed and dejected. Both groups received foreign support, to an extent, throughout the conflict. However, the support given to the Nationalists was much larger and better organised.

Nationalist groups, such as the Falange or the Carlists, were given extensive support throughout the war. Their ideology went along with figures such as Mussolini and Hitler who decided to support them. They wanted a right-wing victory in Spain. The Republicans, however, received little support and only saw some arms from Mexico and the USSR. This foreign support was vital in Nationalist success, as without it the Army of Africa couldn't have been able to reach mainland Spain.

Another situation that shows foreign intervention helping the Nationalists win was the air superiority provided by the Condor Legion. This air force was used by Germany to support the Nationalists during the conflict. There are many examples, Madrid and Guernica, of this new air superiority tactic being used. This legion allowed the Nationalists to reach an already destroyed defence and take land easily. If the legion had not been there it is almost certain the Nationalist forces would have encountered

(This page is for your first answer.) much larger resistance in some towns and cities. This shows how much the foreign support had helped the Nationalists.

It can be argued, however, that it was not mainly foreign support that created the right conditions for a Nationalist victory and that other factors were at work, helping the Nationalists to defeat the republicans.

One argument could be about the unification of the groups. Nationalists were made up of different groups such as fascists, monarchists, conservatives and Catholics. However they were united by the cause of returning to a traditional Spain. There was little they could argue about and if there was, differences could be put aside for the sake of Spain. An example being the merge of the Falange and Carlists in 1937 by Franco. This strength and unity was opposite on the republican side, with communists, anarchists, republicans and even more groups plotting against each other to take overall control. This disunity and Nationalist unity was one of the main factors in seeing that the Nationalists emerged victorious.

Another area in which the Nationalists were superior was in terms of experience. This did not come from foreign support, however, and came down to the control of the army of Africa. This army had seen recent fighting in the Rif wars and many soldiers were experienced, especially compared to the workers and

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~person's~~ fighting for the Republicans. This experience, coupled with the use of Franco's tactics, created a force the Republicans were simply outmatched by. This army was able to invade mainland Spain in 1936 to begin the civil war. They can be seen as a major factor in the victory of the Nationalists.

Another area that may show that victory wasn't all down to foreign support was Nationalist tactics. The Nationalists knew of the division and paranoia among the Republicans and used this to their advantage when planning. The Nationalists employed '5th column' tactics. A tactic in which an army attacks from all sides and a small '5th column' rises up from within. The use of this failed multiple times or mixed but it planted seeds that were used to commit sabotage and espionage. It also had a major ~~the~~ psychological effect on the enemy which could have been another reason the Nationalists won. This tactic helped secure territory for the Nationalists and also caused paranoia amongst the Republican forces. ~~Both~~ Both victories for the Nationalists that didn't come from foreign intervention. One thing that proves that foreign support was ~~not~~ not the key factor also, is early Nationalist victories. Early in the war both sides were pretty evenly matched. They both held similar numbers of men

(This page is for your first answer.) and equipment. The Nationalists held agricultural territory for food and the Republicans had industrial for weaponry. Both sides were, overall, evenly matched in terms of resources and fire power. However, the Nationalists managed to secure over a third of mainland Spain in the early period of the war. This shows them being victorious regardless of foreign support.

The Nationalists received extensive support from foreign governments and it helped them massively. However I believe that it was unity and the use of a more experienced army that helped achieve victory, the most. German bombing helped and often was the motivating factor in single battles, but overall foreign intervention only sped up the process of victory, not change the outcome.

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"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

Plan:

Yes: Pressure from US to not limit immigration

Sending of supplies to help them win in 1948.

No: Support from Germany, since the larger in terms of weapons.

Arabs were working against whatever security. No entry.

Jews were entered and fighting for survival.

British withdrawal without solution left land here for Arabs.

(This page is for your second answer.) Israel declared its independence in the 40's just ~~not~~^{as} Britain had left its Palestine mandate. After the ~~or~~ second world war ended in 1945 much sorrow and guilt was felt by the allies towards Jewish people. Many states chose to ~~not~~ support the Jews as a sorry. One of the main supporters was the USA. The US has always supported and, even to this day, still supports Israel.

One example of ~~the~~ US support to Israel was when the British wanted to cap immigration to the area. The US president, Truman, put pressure on the British to allow larger numbers of Jews to immigrate to Israel. This US ~~support~~^{pressure} made it clear that there was American backing to a friendly state ~~is~~, or a more interested one, in the middle east.

Another example of US support for Israel was during the war of independence. The war escalated into ~~an~~ ~~at~~ ~~an~~ a conflict amongst, newly independent, Israel and its Arab neighbors. The US sent arms and ~~and~~ pledged their support to the Israelis. The use of these weapons, specifically, the bombers, sent by the US no doubt had an effect on the war's outcome.

However, it must be noted that during the Israeli war of independence other states sent arms to the Israelis. These included Germany and France. This shows that US intervention was not the only

(This page is for your second answer.) intervention that helped to create the state of Israel.

Another argument that can be made to show how it was not US backing that caused an independent Israeli state is through the ideas of the injured Jews. The Jews, especially during the war of independence, were united fighting for one thing. Their survival. They were together and had a strong desire to create an independent Israel to protect Jews from things just witnessed in the Holocaust. It can be seen that it was this mental state of the Israelis that gave them the desire and need for an independent state. It was not down to US backing.

Another reason for Jews being able to create an independent Israel was British withdrawal. UN ^{partition} plans had failed and the British were financially in a bad position. They simply withdrew without a solution to recent trouble and violence in the area. This meant that this piece of land in the fertile crescent was essentially there for the taking. This is what made a civil war, the unofficial war ¹⁹⁴⁷ happen and what eventually led to an Israeli victory and independence in the 1948 official war.

Another factor that proves the US were not the main reason for Jewish ~~independence~~ independence is

(This page is for your second answer.) -the factor of the people there, the Arabs, were unable to prevent an Israeli Independent state. Arab neighbours attacked in 1948 but their own agendas and distrust of each other left them unable to mount a suitable ~~large~~ offensive on the new state of Israel. Countries such as Egypt, Syria and Transjordan were more worried with their own gains and mistrust against each other. This shows how the inability of the Arab states was a major factor and not US intervention or backing.

Overall, US backing had very little to do with Israeli Independence or the creation of the state. The bigger parts were played by Britain, leaving before a solution was found and leaving an opening for war, the Arabs, ~~who's~~ whose inability to mount a suitable offensive allowed the creation of Israel, and the Jews themselves, for believing in the need and having a desire to create their own state. US backing during the years 1945-48 was in reality very small and didn't increase until the Cold war really got under way and allies were needed more.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Question 7 is a low level 5 response. The question is directly focused on the question asked and is clearly discussin the reasons for the success of the Nationalists rather than the defeat of the Republicans. Foreign intervention is discussed from several aspects and its importance is weighed up within context of the overall pattern of the war.

Question 11 is well focused and organised with an understanding of the key issues but some paragraphs are less convincing.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Conclusions - always try to sum up the argment being made in the main body of the essay and come to a judgement. Both of these conclusions attempt to weigh up importance and to place the given factor in the wider context of the time period of the question.

Topic E/F5 – Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Centres which cover this topic invariably prepare their candidates well but once again it is clear that many candidates have a weak understanding of the chronological order of events and are unaware of the key dates with regard to turning points in the development of Germany post-war. There are a worrying number of candidates who confuse the Berlin Airlift, the building of the Berlin Wall and the fall of the Berlin Wall. However, most candidates deal well with the different events in West and East Germany and are aware of the separate patterns of development. Q9 was overwhelmingly more popular with very few candidates addressing the question of why events in Berlin were so important to the relationship between the two parts of Germany during the post-war period.

Q.9 Most candidates were secure in their knowledge of the role of Adenauer in the economic development of post-war Germany. They were able to refer both to specific examples of his influence over economic policy and his symbolic role as the head of the newly established Federal Republic. Many responses were also aware of other possible factors affecting economic growth and prosperity citing the role of Erhard, support from Western powers, the underlying strength of the German economy and the impetus gained from the supplying of resources for the Korean War. However, many answers remained at low-to-mid Level 4 as they developed but did not convincingly evaluate the importance of Adenauer in comparison to the other possible factors. The best answers were able to show Adenauer's underlying importance interlinked to the other factors. Some of the best answers also address the different concepts of 'economic growth' and 'prosperity'.

Topic E6/F6 – The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism

This is a relatively popular topic but candidates often seem confused as the chronology of events and the dates of the key turning points. Answers on the pre-1979 period are often a narrative-driven commentary on the Arab-Israeli wars and candidates often feel the need to mention the wars even in a question which is firmly based in the period 1945-48 or post-1979. Candidates often also seem very hesitant to answer questions which do not refer directly to the events surrounding the creation of Israel or the Arab-Israeli conflict. Centres should note that these are only directly covered in two out of the four bullet points in the specification and that all bullet points need to be covered to ensure that candidates have even a choice of questions to answer. Questions can be set on individual bullet points or any combination of bullet points joined together. Q11 was by far the most popular question with few candidates attempting Q12. Those who did were often confused over the chronology of events and found it difficult to define the concept of self-interest. There were some good responses, however, which were able to focus on Arab disunity rather than Arab-Israeli conflicts. These answers discussed the role of Egypt in pan-Arab attempts to create unity, the difficulties created for individual states by Palestinian refugees, the significance of individuals such as Nasser and Sadat and the geo-political tensions of the region in general.

Q11. Most candidates were aware of the different factors influencing the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. Some candidates dismissed almost out-of-hand the role of American influences discussing only other factors and these responses could only reach high level 3 at best. There were also a significant minority of answers that could only develop points generally with little specific reference to the events of the years 1945-48; discussing

the impact of the Holocaust and the growth of Zionism in general terms. The majority of candidates, however, were able to develop their knowledge of American support but with varying degrees of detail. 'American support' was given a wide definition with responses referring to the role of American Jews, American business, politicians and President Truman. Many responses were made up of a series of paragraphs about the different factors leading to the creation of Israel but only those which attempted some evaluation or judgement were able to progress into the higher levels. Some excellent responses suggested that, while the more direct influences of British mandatory rule, terrorism and the UN played a major part, the underlying influence of American support was vitally important in giving Jewish leaders the confidence to declare the state of Israel.

Topic F7 – From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany, 1918-45

With the regulations of the specification in relation to the study of topic F7 it is not surprising that the majority of centres following option F study this topic. It is a pleasure to see a continuing improvement in both the knowledge and understanding of candidates entered for this topic. The progression from GCSE to AS level thinking and organisation of material is becoming much more obvious than in previous examination sessions; almost all examiners noted this in their feedback reports. Although there are still a number of obvious factual errors and some chronological confusion apparent in responses to this topic these have reduced considerably. In particular, there are fewer candidates confusing the patterns of economic and political development in the 1920s.

Q13. This question was the most popular of the two. Candidates were required to discuss the extent to which the political stability of the Weimar Republic was influenced by economic factors. This gave candidates the opportunity to discuss the broad pattern of political stability across the time period from the chaos of 1919-23 through the 'golden years' of the mid-1920s to the initial consequences of the events of 1929. Most candidates were able to show a correlation between economic and political events during some of the time period involved but few covered the whole range of the time period directly. Many candidates assumed that the term political stability referred to the years 1924-29 but there were very few candidates who did not realise that the question referred to a wider timespan and so at least considered some aspect of the period before 1924, usually in the form of a contextual introduction. The question did lead to much more discussion of events than in past series with more obvious concluding judgements; this meant that although a lack of date coverage did weaken some answers within levels there were more discursive level 4 responses produced. The best answers often suggested that despite the clear correlation between economic factors and ability of the Weimar Republic to function there were other factors which determined stability as well such as the popular reaction to the new democracy and the strength of anti-democratic parties. Some very good responses were able to show how differing factors inter-linked and changed over time with several pointing out that, even though there was apparent economic and political stability in the mid-years, Germany was, as Stresemann observed, 'dancing on a volcano'.

Q14. The majority of candidates who attempted this question had good knowledge of the social and racial policies of the Nazis and their ramifications for the German people. There were differing definitions and interpretations of *Volksgemeinschaft* but most responses discussed a variety of issues and were able to create some balance. At level 3 many answers merely described and explained the success of different social policies in relation to women, youth and minorities without really establishing how successful they were.

These answers also tend to be made up of paragraphs making assertions rather than creating a discussion. Although it is commendable that opposition and resistance to Nazi policies amongst the German people are now studied as regular practice, at AS level some discussion of how widespread opposition was should be encouraged; many candidates are convinced that the urban youth gangs were a considerable force in resisting the Nazis. There were also some weaker answers that focused exclusively on Nazi racial policies. However, there were many good level 4 responses that were able to begin to evaluate success. The better responses clearly established a definition of *Volksgemeinschaft*, often with reference to the concept of classlessness, determined the nature of success and covered the whole time frame to 1941. Those candidates who can establish some sense of change over time often produce the nuanced, balanced answers which reach level 5.

This is a level 4 response.

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: 1919-29

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3	Socialism - Economic
<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	Nazism - Political military
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 14		

(This page is for your second answer.)

The Weimar republic is most vividly remembered as a period of economic and political hardship, however the marked ~~political~~ economic stability of the Republic under the influence of Stresemann 1924-29 would mark relative ~~st~~ political stability too, however the extent to which this economic stability influenced political stability demands examination.

The political turmoil of the early Weimar Republic, witnessing,

insurrections from both the left and the right (the Kapp Putsch (1920) and the Spartacist uprising (1919)) is matched by the economic

(This page is for your second answer.) issues marriing German progress. The - payment of reparations under the War Guilt Clause of the Treaty of Versailles impared the German economy to the point where Franco-Belgian troops occupied the Ruhr Valley in 1923 demanding payment. ~~and~~ The result was hyper-inflation as governments printed more paper currency to pay for passive resistance. This economic disaster certainly fueled anger and dissatisfaction in Germany, however the anger was directed largely at the foreign occupiers in the Ruhr and the 'unfair' terms of the Treaty rather than democracy, as it would be later. Elections from the period maintain that the SPD were the largest party, whilst extremists on both sides, the KDP and NSDAP recieved little political support. Further, the failure of the Munich Putsch in 1923, and Hitler's subsequent arrest highlights how economic turmoil does not neccasarily correlate with political revolution.

(This page is for your second answer.) issues warring German progress. The - payment of reparations under the War Guilt Clause of the Treaty of Versailles impaired the German economy to the point where Franco-Belgian troops occupied the Ruhr Valley in 1923 - demanding payment. ~~and~~ The result was hyper-inflation as governments printed more paper currency to pay for passive resistance. This economic disaster certainly fueled anger and dissatisfaction in Germany, however the anger was directed largely at the foreign occupiers in the Ruhr and the 'unfair' terms of the Treaty rather than democracy, as it would be later. Elections from the period maintain that the SPD were the largest party, whilst extremists on both sides, the KDP and NSDAP received little political support. Further, the failure of the Munich Putsch in 1923, and Hitler's subsequent arrest highlights how economic turmoil does not necessarily correlate with political revolution.

(This page is for your second answer.) To suggest that Weimar Germany ^{Politically} was stable during hyper-inflation of 1923 is a gross over-statement though. Government ran general strikes and ~~an~~ military opposition to attempted coups like the Munich putsch are not endemic of political stability. However the lack of success of both the extreme right and the extreme left indicates that it is not solely economic matters which lead to successful extremist parties.

The relevance of the left wing during the early Weimar republic is far more significant ~~than~~ ^{than} the right, through the use of passive resistance and the prominence of moderate socialists like Ebert, however in the period of relative economic stability under Strasseman would see the right rise above the left in prominence. As economic stability was achieved through the Dawes Plan (1924) and the Young Plan (1929)

(This page is for your second answer.) The political aspects of these plans gained more prominence. The payment of reparations, despite Strasseman's stabilising of its ^{economic} ~~political~~ implications gave rise to movements like the Anti-Yang plan vote which viewed any payment as an insult to German pride. ~~The~~

In conclusion, although economic instability would be a major factor in the rise of the extreme left in Weimar Germany, it would be the political implications (war guilt itself, not the resulting reparations) that would be the major factor in the rise of a successful extremist party in Germany, the far right Nazis.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The answer is well focused and shows a clear understanding of the key issues. It is beginning to evaluate the role of economic factors in establishing political stability/instability. However, there is a lack of range in the coverage of the whole period under discussion which creates an imbalance.

This is a level 5 script with both answers achieving mid-Level 5.

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:

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"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your first answer)

Plan
Propaganda - ^{man of people} + duty.
Terror? ^{church?} not widely used. Domestic policy

QUESTION 6.

Between the years 1925 and 1943, Mussolini maintained an effective grasp of power in Italy. The source of this power is debatable, however, and some would argue that the answer lies squarely in the extensive use of propaganda utilised by Mussolini in this time. However, other factors do become apparent when placed under observation.

It can be ~~possible~~ argued that propaganda was the most important and significant factor in maintaining Fascist control. Mussolini was undoubtedly the master of ~~re-self~~ creating a stylised image of himself, and throughout his reign Italians were bombarded with films, posters, speeches and even architecture on buildings that painted Mussolini as some kind of demi-god.

(This page is for your first answer.) Photos circulated of Mussolini in almost laughably contrived and manufactured situations, events that would propagate the image of him as a virile paragon of Italian masculinity, something that all Italians would aspire to. ~~Moreover, propaganda was more~~ ~~the~~ Photo opportunities such as Mussolini portrayed helping drain the marshes in the Battle for Land showed Italians that this Mussolini was not afraid to get his hands dirty. Italians were consistently bombarded with the concept of Mussolini as a strong and noble Italian, and so a cult of personality built up around this facade of 'Il Duce'. Propaganda was undoubtedly a vital factor in maintaining control.

However, it is also valid to argue that the extent of Fascist control in the years 1925-1943 was heavily increased by the relationship between Mussolini and the Catholic Church. Initially, the relationship between church and state had been strained; the Church did not take kindly to the demands of Risorgimento in the 19th century, when they lost much land and attention was diverted from them to the government. Although initially a staunch atheist, Mussolini was astute enough to realise that he could not make a heavily Catholic country choose between him and their God. This was a battle he could not win. Therefore, in the Lateran Treaties of 1929, Mussolini chose to work with the Church. Mussolini offered them

(This page is for your first answer.) £50 million compensation for their loss of land in Risorgimento, and recognised the Pope's authority in the Vatican. He also reintroduced Catholic education to schools, banned contraception and made divorce much more difficult to obtain - all strong Catholic beliefs. The Church in exchange withdrew support from the Catholic popolari party, and forbade priests from joining political parties. The co-operation meant that Church and state became more united and Mussolini did not have to fight for the hearts and minds of the people.

Another important aspect of Mussolini's control centred around his domestic policy. Here, he encouraged women to have as many children as possible (with financial benefits for fertile couples who complied; for example, a marriage loan taken out was gradually cancelled with each additional child). This would mean that, much like Hitler's idea of using children to perpetuate his ideology, Mussolini too could use the blank slates of the children's minds to extend Fascism, as well as building breeding new troops for the Fascist army. Mussolini also exerted power by forcing children into traditional gender roles. At schools, Fascism was incorporated into the curriculum and teachers made to make an oath of loyalty to Il Duce. This helped to perpetuate his control because it allowed him to teach Fascism from an early age, as children were more malleable

(This page is for your first answer.) to the idea.

Moreover, the use of the corporative state and the OND helped extend control. The corporative state, an economic policy, meant that trade unions were replaced with Fascist representatives, about which the workers had no choice. These representatives essentially caused longer working hours and outlawed strikes, meaning that Mussolini basically had control over the employment world. To counterbalance this, the OND was introduced. This was an organisation that provided leisure activities such as music, theatre, films and summer camps for workers and their families. ~~This~~ ^{Both} Both of these concepts helped Fascist control because the corporative state limited workers' rights and boosted Fascist influence, whilst the OND meant that Fascism pervaded most aspects of Italian life, both employment and social.

Finally, the use of terror can be argued to have strengthened Mussolini's power in Italy, although its true influence is questionable. Although Mussolini did have a secret police and the Squadristi, their full use was not that terrifying. According to figures, it is apparent that Mussolini favoured imprisoning people over execution or torture. Although his early reign was rather violent, with Squadristi brutality towards political opponents, intimidation of votes for Acerbo law and the Matteotti incident, these were all either used to gain power or maintain the Fascist

QUESTION 13

(This page is for your first answer.)
Not due to economy?

Plan

political stability economic factors

1919 - 1929

Kapp Putsch

Hyperinflation 1923

wallstreet crash 1929.

Between the years 1919-1929, the fledgling Weimar republic experienced erratic political (and economic) stability. The question remains, was this stability (or lack thereof) decided by economic factors or alternative reasons?

~~The~~ In the first few years of the Weimar government, political instability was rife in Germany. The first few years were characterized by numerous uprisings from both the extreme left (the Spartacists) and the Right. However, it is unclear as to whether this instability was caused solely by the economic factors of the time. Certainly many revolutionary groups were appalled by the economic strains placed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles and its demands for reparations, but arguably most groups, such as the Spartacists, were not motivated by the economic factors of the day, but by their desire to implement their own ideology and take advantage of the fact that the government itself was already weak.

In the same vein, the weakness of the government itself can account for the political instability of early Weimar. Weimar operated under a system of proportional representation. Although arguably this was good because it allowed the choices of the people to be represented, it unfortunately meant that there was

(This page is for your first answer.) An excessive multitude of political parties in the Reichstag. Coalition governments had to be made, which were easily torn apart by trivial squabbles such as the use of the national flag or religion in schools. This can show that the political stability of Weimar was decided not primarily by economic factors, but by the inefficiency of the voting system and the governments it produced.

However, the faltering economy ~~was~~ inarguably played a significant role in deciding the stability of Weimar's political system. The hyperinflation crisis of 1923 looked set to destroy Weimar completely. However, it was in response to this crisis that Gustav Stresemann was temporarily appointed Chancellor for three months. In his hundred or so days in charge, Stresemann's response to the crisis, such as calling off passive resistance, monitoring a new currency and drumming up international sympathy for Germany's plight, directly used the economy as a way to stabilize Weimar and restore faith in the government.

The economy came into play more and more over the next few years in affecting Germany's political stability. The fact that Germany's economy so obviously lacked the ability to meet reparation demands meant that Stresemann was able to use the economy and its deteriorating strength to improve political relations with America through the use of The Dawes Plan in 1924, which amended the reparations in accordance with Germany's ability to pay, as well as

(This page is for your first answer.) encouraging foreign investment from the US. This economic factor stabilised Germany politically because, in its weakened state, it forced Germany to reach out diplomatically to other countries and allowed for the steep reparation demands to be somewhat placated.

The wall street crash of 1929 was also a hugely significant economic factor that affected the stability of the government of Weimar. It was particularly disastrous for Germany and the US, because so much foreign investment was supplied by the US under the Dawes Plan, and now the US in her catastrophic financial situation required Germany to start repaying her loans forthwith. This undermined political stability because up until this point Weimar had been enjoying relative ~~stability~~ balance in its economy, with the ~~in~~ its so-called 'Golden Age.' However, this latest fiscal crisis added further fuel to the fires of those who opposed Weimar, and worsened the already-shaky economic situation.

In conclusion, although the economy provided Weimar with a veritable political obstacle course, it seems that the political stability of Weimar hinged more on its rocky foundations rather than the economic challenges of the time. Weimar was established under an ineffective constitution that allowed lengthy terms of 7 years for presidents but only 4 for the Reichstag. Moreover, its system of election meant that coalitions (and therefore factions and in-fighting) were inevitable. Although the economy did nothing to help Weimar's political stability, the

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"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.)

foundation of Weimar and its ineffectiveness was more to blame for the instability than the economic factors.

PLEASE SEE FIRST SECTION FOR BOTH ANSWERS. I misread the instructions and wrote both of the answers in the first section, for which I am very sorry. I hope this hasn't ruined my entire exam. Sorry for the inconvenience and error.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Both of these scripts are directly focused on the question asked and show explicit understanding of the key issues. Each paragraph follows on from the other to create a discussion and the conclusions sum up the main argument providing an evaluative judgement.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Introductions - with only 40 minutes to choose, plan and execute a response in Unit 1 effective introductions are vital. The introduction to question 6 could have been improved further with a more direct and focused introduction. However, the introduction to Q13, although brief, does put the years 1919-29 into perspective and make it clear that the question has been explicitly understood. Try to ensure that the introduction shows that you understand the main focus, the key issues and the importance of the time frame of the question.

This is a mid-level 4 answer:

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"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

(This page is for your second answer.) VGS Plan

the <u>Agenda</u>	<u>Agenda</u>	For
Blut und Boden	-	- Blut und Boden
Food production		Blut und Boden
...		

After Hitler became chancellor in 1933, he wanted to set up a Volksgemeinschaft, the peoples community. This means that everyone worked together and he wanted an end to class divisions. On the whole the Volksgemeinschaft was largely ~~unsuccessful~~ because of the 'Blut und Boden' propaganda and the increase in births from couples. However, there were a few flaws in the Volksgemeinschaft as there were still some class divisions.

The propaganda slogan 'Blut und Boden' was started by the Nazis, depicting the ideal German man to be a well-built farmer who worked on the land. In the period 1933-41 this was largely successful as the production of grain increased. ~~...~~ This was largely

(This page is for your second answer.) successful until the beginning of the war where many farmers and labourers were conscripted into the war effort but until 1941, Germany was winning the war so the grain production was not significantly affected.

Another key part of the Volksgemeinschaft was the role of women and the 'Kinder, Kirche, Küche' slogan. Women were expected to take up the traditional role of being housewives and giving birth to a lot of children. Women were set a target of five children and there were many effective policies that were brought in, in order to make the Volksgemeinschaft work. These included the crosses for women, either bronze, silver or gold, depending on how many kids they gave birth to. The policy to increase the birth rate was effective as seen with Adolf Hitler meeting up with around 100 women, who had given birth to an average of 13 children each.

Finally, Hitler wanted ~~children~~ ^{young boys} to grow up as strong Nazi men so he could carry out a 1,000 year Reich. This was key for the Volksgemeinschaft to work so it could carry on long after Hitler died. In order to do this, youth clubs were set up such as the Hitler youth which became compulsory for young boys to join. In these clubs, they learnt Nazi ideas and they were mainly based on sport and military. To start with, these clubs were very effective like the policy on women and men ~~because~~ because children enjoyed the sports and the military aspects of it but as time went on, attendance levels dropped and it started to become less effective.

(This page is for your second answer.) However, there also flaws that the Volksgemeinschaft did not deal with. Volksgemeinschaft meant a break of class divisions, but these were still prominent. Hitler knew that he had to keep the support of big businesses in order to stay in power so he could not completely eradicate class divisions as the two objectives are contradictory. Although, employment did increase, the rich were still getting richer and there was still a large class gap between the upper and lower classes.

As seen with all the policies, the Volksgemeinschaft became less effective with the start of the war. As seen before, the farmers were conscripted, but also women were employed in order to ~~work~~ help in the war effort. This meant that they had less time to get married and produce kids. This went against what was aimed for in the Volksgemeinschaft, meaning that the Nazis were successful to start off with, but it slowly started to become unsuccessful.

Overall, the Nazis successfully created a Volksgemeinschaft as the men, women and children all played their part in their community and they all worked together to create a better community, when men are the farmers, and the women staying at home and giving birth to many babies. However, there were still class divisions in the Volksgemeinschaft and as time went on, it started to become less successful. This meant that the ~~Germany~~ Nazis were on the whole successful in creating the Volksgemeinschaft.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a well focused answer which shows an understanding of the key issues of the question and provides adequate supporting material. It discusses the differing social policies of the Nazis and their successes and failures. It lacks balance in that the early paragraphs are developed explanation but the answer becomes more analytical towards the end.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Introduction - this is quite an effective introduction because it clearly shows an understanding of the question, discusses some of the issues and shows the line of argument it will probably take. Always try to make sure that the main body of the essay follows the line of discussion outlined in the introduction and justified through the conclusion.

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 publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028133 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

