

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

GCE History 6HI01 E

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2014

Publications Code US039069

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## Introduction

This year most candidates were able to provide some explanatory framework as a basic scaffolding for their answer, had a general understanding of the demands of the question and were able to sustain a focus on the question set. The ability to call on some relevant information, and to develop it to some extent, means that fewer answers were placed in Level 2. Level 1 answers were, as always, characterised by their brevity, often just one or two paragraphs of generalised material with no development. At the other end of the scale of attainment, many answers accessed Level 5. These answers were directly focused and analytical, considered a number of relevant points, and exemplified these with a range of detailed information. Moreover, most Level 5 answers came from candidates with good communication skills and the ability to use historical words and phrases confidently.

There was a variety of approaches towards questions which had a multi-factored focus, usually signalled by the phrase 'the most important reason'. Some of the most confident answers included an introduction which either agreed with the role of the stated factor or proposed an alternative. Many candidates, however, were more reluctant to commit themselves. Their introduction usually agreed with the stated factor 'to some extent' but did not propose an alternative. Weighing up different factors before reaching a clear conclusion often differentiated between Level 4 and Level 5 answers.

There have been some improvements overall in the quality of written communication, with far fewer abbreviations and colloquialisms scattered through candidates' answers. However the quality of handwriting on a small number of scripts meant that some words and phrases were impossible to decipher, and this factor weakened communication overall.

Over 2500 candidates sat the Option E paper in the June 2014 session. As in previous years centres and candidates are to be congratulated on their preparation for the examination. The majority of candidates were able to attempt an analysis of the focus of the questions set and were able to produce paragraphed responses with at least a sound knowledge of the content covered. However, there appeared to be more candidates this year relying on a type of 'model' answer which addressed the question sufficiently enough to be well-focused (Level 4) but not directly focused (Level 5) enough to create a well-rounded evaluative response.

It was noticeable yet again this summer that a large number of responses referred to the whole time period of the question in sweeping general statements with little regard to change over time. This was particularly so in Question 5 – topic 3 – where most candidates referred to Mussolini's control of Italy in the years 1925-43 as if it were an unchangeable reality.

There is much good practice amongst centres to promote the use of 'connecting' terms and phrases at the beginning of paragraphs to create more discursive answers e.g. on the other hand, nevertheless, further etc. However, there are also an increasing number of responses where the use of these terms seems to have become either arbitrary or formulaic. Both of these approaches often create the opposite effect to that which was intended i.e. poorly reasoned and incoherent responses. Of most concern is the wide use of 'on the contrary' or 'on the other hand' when candidates are in reality discussing an extension of the previous point or developing a factor related to the previous point.

Many candidates this year produced sound Level 4 responses with good supporting material but were unable to fashion a response which moved securely into Level 5. This led to many responses following the pattern of a series of discrete paragraphs about the contribution of various factors to the process of unification with the focus of the question only really being addressed in the conclusion. Many excellent concluding statements were not supported by the material discussed in the main body of the essay.

These responses could be improved with regard to the following:

- introductory sentences which clearly show an understanding of the stated factor and the focus of the question along with the relevance of the beginning and end dates of the time period – this may prevent discussion of irrelevant material particularly with regard to events after the end date of the question
- chronological awareness – this may facilitate a greater awareness of change over time
- more focused analysis and explanation – many good responses produce well developed paragraphs which outline and expand on the contribution of various factors but this often leads to either inference or assertion rather than explanation and analysis
- linking related factors to create an overall impression of causation, consequence, significance or change over time – responses are often made up of a series of paragraphs about different factors with the assumption that they are completely independent of each other even where the links are obvious or fundamental.
- The best response are those which create a discussion of the hypothesis or statement in the question by developing a balanced argument using accurate, well-selected supporting evidence and coming to a reasoned conclusion.

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

### ***Question 1***

The unification topics were amongst the most popular in Option E. Candidates were well prepared, had a sound knowledge of the content and were able to reach a judgement. However, in this session examiners commented on the continued increase in somewhat formulaic answers which although relevant and generally focused failed to engage explicitly with the question asked. One examiner commented:

'I often felt that some candidates had learned about the process and complexities of Italian unification, but in many cases did not apply their knowledge to the question demands – they had learned the topic, but seemed at times to have rehearsed answers to unification instead of adapting to the question demands'.

Many of the responses in both questions created imbalanced answers due to a lack of coverage of the whole time period of the question. Thankfully, there were far fewer responses than in previous sessions that included references to Mussolini.

Q1. This question focused on the role of Victor Emmanuel in the process of Italian unification. Candidates mostly discussed Victor Emmanuel in the context of Cavour and Garibaldi. Some introduced Napoleon as an individual. The more able candidates recognised and defined figurehead – although very few did this as part of an introduction, this meant they often lacked precise focus (see Option E general comments). The more able candidates often discussed Victor Emmanuel as being 'king in name' but also recognised his political contribution. However, there was a tendency by some candidates to engage with Victor Emmanuel's role and then introduce other figures (as a list) without offering links or a comparison or to dismiss Victor Emmanuel completely with little development. Many did not take into account evidence from across the whole date-range. Some candidates confused that the term 'figurehead' with that of leader or most important figure.

## Question 2

Q2. This question focused on the role of France in shaping the process of Italian unification in the years 1858-70. This was generally well answered with candidates commenting on the French contribution at the various stages of Italian unification during these years. However, many candidates would have profited from briefly outlining the key elements of the 'shaping' process at the beginning of the response and so would have been more likely to cover the whole time period. In particular, many candidates did not refer to the plebiscites in the Central Duchies or the acquisition of Venetia; although some candidates suggested that France played no part in the events of 1866 at all. Some more able candidates suggested that while France was most important in the expulsion of Austria from Italy in the north it was the work of Cavour and Garibaldi which unified the rest of the peninsula. There were also some effective responses which focused on both the positive and negative impact of France on the shaping of the process. Less able candidates did not clearly establish links between various influences often leading to inference rather than analysis.

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"/>

(This page is for your first answer.)

How far was France responsible for shaping the process of Italian unification in the years 1858-70?

① 1859 war with Austria Magenta  
- couldn't have been Solferino done without

② No - This was Cavour - his plan  
- his diplomacy

③ Handing over Venetia, Rome leaving  
also took Nice + Savoy

④ No - Garibaldi; - didn't shape it, went along. Garibaldi did.

(This page is for your first answer.)

With Austrian influence dramatically reduced after the joint forces of France and Piedmont forced the Habsburg Empire back from Lombardy, Unification had almost been completed. Yet, it took a further conquest on behalf of Garibaldi and the eventual defeat of Austria (and later France) to bring together the whole peninsula. ~~The~~ ~~the~~ word 'shaped' indicates a changing to a current idea, making unification into something different - perhaps France could be <sup>considered</sup> more of a driving force than ~~the~~ <sup>an element</sup> that influenced what was included in the final country of Italy.

Certainly, the French impact in the war of unification in 1859 shows how foreign influence was discarded - a shaping of the state of Italy announced in 1861. The joint forces of Piedmont and France with an army numbering almost 300,000 men defeated the Austrians, pushing the country that had controlled the Italian peninsula since the Congress of

(This page is for your first answer.)

Venice back to the quadrilateral (a strong military stronghold). On one hand, the French forces had made what had been impossible in 1848-9 (as Charles Albert failed in Piedmont's conflict against Austria) possible: the influence that had held much of Europe to the status quo, ~~the way~~ not changing from the reactionary circumstance imposed by 1815, had been removed. Yet, the conflict had been ended early by Napoleon, with Venetia ~~was~~ still under Austrian rule. In addition to this, ~~the~~ France had no influence in the various plebiscites held in Emilia and across the Northern Papal states that asked for union with Piedmont. So, ~~perhaps~~ the French armies could be regarded as the force needed to unify, but did not specifically shape the process.

Instead, the figure that did shape much of the union of northern states was Cavour. The Prime Minister of ~~France~~ Piedmont, he had not only allied with Napoleon at Plombières in 1858 but also organised the votes ~~that~~ that resulted

(This page is for your first answer.) in the majority of the northern states' union with Piedmont. This makes him the force that began and continued the progress of unification, as he carried out what he may have believed to be an expansion of Piedmont. His diplomacy and forward planning had shaped the process, uniting not just those states agreed at Plombières but also principalities that lay outside of the agreement made with France - such as Tuscany, Modena and Parma. Cavour had ~~been~~ taken control of the future of Piedmont, and could also be considered to be responsible for French assistance in 1859 as it was he that convinced Napoleon III to further the cause of unification.

However, it was France and Napoleon III that continued the movement ~~to~~ through the 1860s. Not only adding Venetia to the new state of Italy after diplomatic manoeuvring in the ~~French-Prussian~~ Austro-Prussian war, but also indirectly passing over the city of

(This page is for your first answer.)

Rome. This was due to the conflict between France and Prussia, and the occupying troops (in the Papal States) were needed to further the war effort. Although perhaps not the largest territories, ~~these~~ ~~additions~~ these additions to the Italian state almost concluded the long struggle for unity. They were the last states ~~to~~ under anti-nationalistic rule, Austria and the Papacy, which meant that the whole of the peninsula could be joined under a single leadership. Yet, the states of Nice and Savoy had not been included in the new Italy, as they had been incentives for France in the 1859 war. However, this could again show France shaping unification between 1858 and 1870 as the country had influenced the makeup of King Victor Emmanuel II's ~~country~~ newly formed country.

On the other hand, without Garibaldi's influence and action unification would not have included Naples <sup>the south</sup> and Sicily. His expedition in 1860 led Sicily and

(This page is for your first answer.)

Naples to be joined with the north, a manoeuvre that many (including Cavour) had very little hope in. The consequence of Garibaldi's handing over these states the Piedmontese role was that the total peninsula was now (or would be post 1870 when Rome was added) under Victor Emmanuel's rule. ~~The~~ Garibaldi had shaped the process significantly, changing the entire layout of the Kingdom of Italy and influencing its inhabitants. ~~Both~~ Both Cavour and Napoleon III had little time for what was known as the backward, illiterate and agricultural south - yet one man had influenced the entire unification movement: a significant shaping.

In conclusion, although the French did much for the discarding of Austrian influence in Italy, this cannot be specifically attributed to 'shaping'. They had achieved what Charles Albert had failed to do in the years 1848-9, yet this had been along Cavour's instruction. The most significant shaping was on

(This page is for your first answer.) the part of Garibaldi, putting the smaller states France gained for Italy into perspective. Napoleon, although providing strength, ~~and~~ numbers and eventually completing the process of unification had, ~~not~~ to an extent, shaped the process - yet this was through Cavour's planning and forethought, not that of the French.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a low Level 5 response. It is directly focused on the 'shaping' of unification and discusses French responsibility for bringing 'shape' to Italian unification.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Always try to begin paragraphs with sentences which create a discussion, following on from the previous paragraph or making a new point. Try not to begin new paragraphs with factual information.

## E2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

### Question 3

Candidates were generally well prepared and had good understanding of the content of the Topic. There was much more evidence this year of secure chronological awareness leading to more coherent responses but many candidates still confused the dates of Bismarck's appointment as envoy to the German Confederation (1851) and the appointment of Cavour in Italy (1852) with the appointment of Bismarck as Minister President in 1862. Many candidates were able to deploy supporting evidence succinctly but some responses lacked clear exemplification and/or explanation of points made. Please note that the general comments made under the Unification of Italy also apply to this topic.

Q3. This was the less popular of the two questions but those who chose to answer this question often produced interesting answers which attempted to show the links between the events in 1848-49 and the process of unification in the years after. These answers often referred to the failure to unite Germany from below, the emergence of Prussia as a potential leader of a *Kleindeutschland* and the early signs of Austrian weakness despite the apparent 'victory' at Olmutz. Some candidates were able to show the link between the consequences of the 1848-9 revolutions for liberal-nationalism and their relationship with Bismarck in the 1860s. Less able candidates tended to dismiss the contribution of 1848-49 revolutions and launched into a prepared answer with reference to other factors. Some responses at Level 2 described the course of the 1848-49 revolutions.

## **Question 4**

Q4. Candidates overwhelmingly chose to answer this question. Most were able to address the role of Bismarck in the process of unification but many candidates were still unaware of the concept of diplomacy in this context; a significant minority saw the meaning of diplomacy as Bismarck's ability to be 'diplomatic' in carrying out both his foreign and domestic policy. There were also a significant number who took the response beyond 1871 with particular reference to *Kulturkampf*. More able candidates had detailed knowledge of Bismarck's diplomacy and were able to distinguish between the way in which he handled different situations – luck, opportunism etc. This was argued against a range of 'other' factors such as economic, military, Austrian weakness and Napoleon's miscalculations. Examples of individual situations were often skilfully explained, e.g. the Schleswig-Holstein question and its links with the lead-up to the Austro-Prussian war. However, many responses showed a lack of balance with too much focus on the early stages at the expense of the events leading to the Franco-Prussian war. Candidates could have prevented this by briefly outlining the key elements of the process of unification earlier in their response (see Option E general comments).

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

### Question 5

Topic 3 was by far the most popular topic of Option E and, as such, responses varied widely in their quality. As with last year, most candidates were well prepared with good knowledge of the content covered in the specification but there were a significant number who found it difficult to select supporting evidence which was wholly relevant to the questions asked or who made assertions without justifying or explaining the points made. A significant number of candidates also produced responses with a very confused chronology. In this session the chronology of both time periods covered were often confused and many responses included material irrelevant to the years being discussed.

This question produced a wide variety of responses but most candidates had sound knowledge of the underlying influences on events in the years 1919-22. However, a worrying number of candidates included material from the post-1922 period and seemed to assume that Mussolini's promises were actually policies being actively implemented during the period. The responses were generally differentiated by the ability of the candidates to focus on the key elements of the question; growing support for Fascism as opposed to the rise to power of Mussolini, and fear of socialism as opposed to the growth of socialism. Many candidates were aware of the nature of, and responses to, the socialist threat but tended to assume that a description of socialist activities and the Fascist response was enough to explain the growth in support for Fascism. There was also an overwhelming assumption that Fascist policies and aims were attractive without outlining or explaining what those policies and aims were. The more able candidates often showed that the fear of socialism explained the growth in support from certain groups e.g. the middle-classes, but that a combination of other factors led to other groups supporting Fascism.

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"/>

(This page is for your first answer.) As Fascism in Italy began to grow, along with its support, it is fair to say that many elements contributed to this growth. To pick one, such as the fear of socialism, is a difficult task. In fact, it is fair to say that the support for socialism actually outweighed the fear; by 1929, ~~the party~~ <sup>it</sup> had over 200,000 members and even as late as the April 1921 election, Socialists <sup>had</sup> <sup>over</sup> received 2.5 million votes, despite

a growth in pressure from the Fascists. To further <sup>idea of</sup> ~~the~~ component this question, it can be argued that the "growth in support for Fascism", whilst theoretically accurate, never physically manifested itself; in the November 1919 election they ~~so~~ gained no seats in the Chamber of Deputies and even by 1921, they only had 72, making 35 seats Fascist.

However, in numerous other ways, it's clear that their support was increasing. Perhaps a key reason for this was the fear of Socialism. Landowners, factory owners and big business owners, all who had given up

(This page is for your first answer.) hope on receiving any Liberal help, turned to the Fascist Squad; organised groups of Fascist supporters who attacked Socialists. The first example of this was in ~~1920~~ November 1920, in Bologna, when the induction of a new Socialist council turned into a riot.

Soon, middle-class townsfolk were offering Fascist squads large amounts of money to rid them of Socialists in their area; some of their techniques for doing so were to beat up trade unions, burn down Socialist buildings, like <sup>that of</sup> "Avanti!", and force their enemies, even, to drink litres of castor oil which would make them violently sick. It was named "biennio rosso" <sup>meaning the</sup> "two 'red weeks'".

Perhaps, however, the Socialists' ~~own~~ ~~not~~ ~~the~~ ~~only~~ ~~political~~ ~~groups~~ mistakes were also key to a growth in support for Fascism; particularly, for instance, their first ever attempt at a fully-fledged general strike in August 1922. Whilst it was a technical success for them as the majority of public sector workers did abstain from attending their jobs, the Fascists

Completely manipulated and exploited the situation by taking over all of the public services, for example, public transport; this ensured that when people looked back on the situation they saw the Fascists as heroes, Socialists as troublemakers, and the Liberals as weak as ever. So, somehow, in all of this, through a fear of Socialism and Socialist errors, the Fascists emerge

(This page is for your first answer.) They turned a blind eye to the Socialist threat, for example, when it became apparent that some factories were being used to make weapons for Socialist strikers, they did absolutely nothing about it.

Their weaknesses were blatant; Liberal governments were always fragmented, corrupt and in coalition; old traditionalists and conservatives turned to Fascism as an alternative; they were strong, strictly right-wing and anti-Socialist, something that the Liberals never managed to present themselves as. Support also grew from the youth; Fascism was still new, fresh and exciting to them, especially in contrast to the old-fashioned, out-dated Liberal Deputies.

A further mistake made by the Liberals were their pathetic attempts at diplomacy after the First World War. During peace talks, Italy was ceded South Tyrol and Trentino, as agreed, ~~as~~ but the Western-European powers refused to hand over Fiume or give Italy a share in Germany's African colonies. Nationalists were outraged, turning to Fascism, as they believed that the Liberals had cheated Italy.

out of the recognition and foreign respect that they deserved, having sacrificed so much; they named this "the mutilated victory". Support also came from returning soldiers and ex-officers who

(This page is for your first answer.) felt humiliated by the outcome of the First World War's peace settlement, and as though all they had done, and all those whom they had led, was, ultimately, for nothing.

Finally, perhaps ~~was~~ one of the most significant reasons for a growth in support for Fascism was the King's appointment of Mussolini as Prime Minister in 1922. He was becoming a recognised figure who was respected, admired and feared simultaneously and who was running the country. And so, the support for his party grew.

To conclude, to say that a fear of socialism was key to the growth of fascist support is completely accurate, whether or not it was the most<sup>key</sup>, especially considering socialism continued to grow and perhaps led more parliamentary support than Fascism (votes/seats-wise), is open to personal interpretation.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response. It engages with the question from the beginning by directly focussing on the 'fear of socialism' as the main factor. It not only analyses the reasons for the growth in support but indicates the appeal of Fascism to different groups and outlines the various aspects of Fascism which were appealing to supporters.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Although this is a Level 5 response the response could be improved by a more explanatory and explicit introduction and conclusion.

## Question 6

Q6. This question was the less popular of the two. The question gave candidates a chance to discuss the nature of Mussolini's control over Italy across the period 1925-43. It was, therefore, disappointing that very few candidates acknowledged the clear changes over time which took place. Indeed, most candidates referred to the period 1925-43 as if it were a whole and made virtually no reference to his fall from power. Also, while contextual reference to the period 1922-25 was clearly relevant, many candidates referred almost entirely to events in the period before 1925 or made general statements with limited reference to chronology of any kind. Many candidates also found it difficult to determine what was meant by personal popularity and, although linked to popularity, produced predetermined responses on the role of propaganda. Also in many responses popularity was seen entirely in relation to his popularity amongst the elites and individuals such as the king and the Pope. The more able candidates were able to discuss the extent to which Mussolini was popular with the Italian people at various times across the period and in relation to other factors with which Mussolini attempted to control 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:

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.)

It can be claimed that Mussolini's personal popularity was ~~was~~ very significant in maintaining his control of Italy in the years 1925-1943. I ~~disagree~~ <sup>agree with this</sup> ~~disagree~~. Many other reasons were also very important such as the OURA, political prisoners and repressive laws.

Aggressive foreign policy is used by leaders to get support. Mussolini pursued a very aggressive foreign policy in the years 1925-1943. The conquest of Abyssinia in 1936 was when ~~was~~ Mussolini's popularity had reached

its peak. The success is Abyssinia won the hearts and minds of the people, not to mention distracted them from the Great Depression

(This page is for your second answer.) depression.

Mussolini's popularity was further increased due to successful use of propaganda. For example, his ~~picture~~<sup>image</sup> was propagated all over the country and children in schools were indoctrinated with propaganda information, so that they would grow to become the ideal fascists. This skillful use of propaganda not only made Mussolini more popular, but helped him win the hearts and minds of the people, thus maintaining his control.

Other than personal popularity, Mussolini had a far more sinister side. The OVRA, Mussolini's secret police, kept a close eye on information going around. Anti-fascist propaganda was viewed as high treason. Although it is said that Mussolini killed far fewer people than Hitler or Stalin, his rule certainly was repressive. The regime kept an estimated 5,000 political prisoners,

(This page is for your second answer.)

not to mention the fact that 10,000 people had been exiled to live on islands. This tells me that oppression and fear was also used by the regime to tighten their grip on Italy.

- Nevertheless, Mussolini's popularity further peaked due to his economic policies in Italy. For instance, electricity production increased from 3 billion kWh to 15 billion kWh. Also, in 1925 only 14% of railways were electrified, by 1939 this had reached 31%. This also, the battle of the marshes, lira and grain all played their role in winning Mussolini support and ~~tighten~~ increasing his control of Italy.

The *Dopolavoro* was an organisation that was responsible for providing leisure activities to Italians. This helped gather support for Mussolini as these activities ~~gained~~ allowed

(This page is for your second answer.)

him to reach to the people, become more popular and have greater control.

Mussolini's popularity also increased as he managed to end the state church quarrel, the Lateran Pact 1929. This can be seen as his greatest achievement as with the church on his side, he gained a better grip on Italy. The Church always proved as a counterweight ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> fascism, but with the church on his side, he faced little opposition.

Mussolini also set up the EOA (agency for welfare activities). This allowed him to reach out to areas, especially in the north, ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> were untouched by fascism. This gained him more support and popularity as he ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> helping the poor, especially in the north, something which the liberals before him largely ignored.

(This page is for your second answer.) Mussolini also used the 'mutilated victory', a term coined by d'Annunzio, to rally Italian's behind him and support his expansionist foreign policy. His popularity increased due to events such as his takeover of Rome

in 1924. The ~~to~~ leaders before him failed to gain Fiume at the Versailles settlement, even though it had a majority Italian population. Despite some accusations of the Mussolini's regime being savage and brutal, they were estimated to have killed no more than 400 people, unlike other dictators at the time. Thus, the main reason

Mussolini stayed in power was due to his huge personal popularity. Given that <sup>most</sup> ~~many~~ Italians did not endorse the Fascist ideology, the reason ~~to~~ Mussolini maintained control was because they supported him, and he gained this support due to successful domestic and

(This page is for your second answer.)

foreign policies, whether they were social, economic, military or simply increased Mussolini's prestige, they all contributed to ~~and~~ an increase in popularity and tighter control of the country.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is low Level 4 response. It is well focused and explain the contribution of the stated factor and other factors to Mussolini's control of Italy in the years 1925-43. However, it lacks detailed supporting evidence, includes some material from before the period and has little sense of change over time.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Use the time period of the question effectively to show change over time. Mussolini's control of Italy changed over time and the methods he used to control Italy changed with them.

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

### ***Question 7***

Once again it was a pleasure to note that the candidature studying this topic continued to rise. Centres should be congratulated for preparing candidates to deal with a complex and often confusing content and chronology so well. It was very rare to find a candidate who confused the Nationalists and Republicans during the Civil War period but some candidates did still have difficulty with the complexities of the period 1931-36. Without overemphasising the need for detail there was much more well-selected and relevant exemplification than in past sessions.

Q7. This was the less popular of the two questions. Most candidates were able to identify and explain the weaknesses of the reforms and how that provoked opposition. However, many struggled to understand the nature of 'conservative opposition' and then link it to the weaknesses of the government of the Second Republic. There was a tendency to narrative and often a failure to distinguish between left and right wing governments in the period. As a result many candidates would have profited from a clearer definition of the key terminology and time period as mentioned in the general comments to Option E above. The more able candidates were able to explain how the strength of the military, Catholic Church and landowners/industrialists were able to undermine the initial reforms of the Republic and evaluated this in relation to other factors such as divisions amongst the left.

## Question 8

Q8. This was the most popular question and most candidates were able to produce effective answers to the question. However, the focus was on the significance of Franco and many candidates produced imbalanced responses where Franco's role was dealt with briefly before launching into other factors. This was also a question where responses often dealt with the various factors, including the different contributions of Franco himself, as completely separate from one another with little acknowledgement of the links between them. However, there was some excellent exemplification of Franco's role and the nature of his approach to warfare. Some more able candidates were able to show the links between Franco's contribution and other factors such as external support or compared the effectiveness of Franco's contribution in comparison to the failures of the Republicans.

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"/>

So what? PEE.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan

<u>Yes</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>No</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• favored only one to achieve foreign aid</li> </ul>		Divisions within left - united on
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• leader of elite army of Africa</li> </ul>		one thing - hate to nationalists
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• opposed Molotov-Sporkle of conflict</li> </ul>		• many divisions:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• His tactics suited the war, started tactics</li> </ul>		- anarchists - immediate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>republican headhunting.</li> </ul>		- Spanish Socialist party / Communist faction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heroism, lost a testicle fighting in the war.</li> </ul>		- Trotskyite POUM. 1 cabellero
		- Communists 'lost his job
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• United the Nationalists, initially as divided as</li> </ul>		- middle class libs Demote - Bayon
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blocked supplies to north Spain, R with navy.</li> </ul>	- tactics	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cut off direct link to north republicans</li> </ul>	- tactics	Foreign Support - Italy + Germany. lifted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skewed politician - didn't give much away - who he supported.</li> </ul>		

It's debatable as to ~~the~~ main what was the main factor in the nationalists victory in the civil war from 1936-39 which produced ~~two~~ 500,000 deaths. Franco undoubtedly played a huge role <sup>in</sup> with his leadership qualities while other factors such as divisions within the left, foreign support ~~and~~ all contributed to a nationalist victory. Franco though was the main force behind this nationalist victory and showed exactly what the republicans were missing:

Initially the Nationalist forces were as divided as the Republicans, their views of what they wanted the future to hold for Spain were mixed. Some wanted a dictatorship while others wanted a different kind of state. Thankfully for the Nationalists, and significantly, Franco was able to unite his nationalist forces during the civil war and produce a coherent military force ready to follow his command.

The reasons Franco was very significant in helping the Nationalists to victory was that Franco was viewed as a hero. He was the leader of the elite army of Africa and his army had every confidence in him. ~~There~~ He apparently lost a leg during war and to all his armed forces he was the perfect example.

He was also a shrewd politician and didn't give much away about his future plans for Spain which helped him, there wouldn't be opposition to his political views from within the nationalist side. What Franco significantly helped the nationalists to win the civil war due to the tactics he deployed. He believed in a slow

(This page is for your first answer.) war with a quite dated military tactics compared to the modern war. An example of this was when Franco had a decision on whether to siege Madrid in which it was a great opportunity to do so, or divert to rescue soldiers in Alcazar. He opted for the latter despite there being a no real significance to the

Alvarez and a real chance of seizing Madrid. Despite this 'missed opportunity', the soldiers rescued were very popular, almost less, and Franco received many plaudits and praise from the army for his decision.

~~In addition to this~~ Franco's tactics suited the war and his focusses of attack helped to isolate the republicans. He and the Nationalists cut off the direct link between Catalonia in the north of Spain and the rest of republicans nearer the south. This left them isolated and a had a severe lack of support. In addition to this Franco ordered the Nationalists to blockade the north part of Spain to stop supplies reaching them by using the navy, again another masterpiece by Franco and a significant reason in the Nationalist victory.

If any disputes were to emerge within the Nationalist side and possibly derail their progress in the civil war Franco was there to settle these disputes. For example General Mola and Sparta of the Condor Legion both were disputing over different tactics but Franco stepped forward and resolved these ~~and was seen as the~~ <sup>differences.</sup> <sup>only</sup> ~~peer~~ resulting in greater popularity for him. His leadership qualities, tactical expertise and ability to write and

(This page is for your first answer.) inspire were all extremely significant in the Nationalist civil war victory.

~~However, Franco~~

However, Franco didn't achieve this all on his own. He was helped by the fact the Republicans had many divisions among them. The republicans were formed of anarchists, communists, Socialists, Trotskyites, Poles, middle class liberals. Some of them agreed with each other such as the anarchists and Spanish Socialist party wanting a revolution. However, some were divided such as

The communists not believing Spain was yet ready for a revolution. In addition to this, the Republicans were split on the best way to fight the civil war. Some wanted a slow traditional war yet some found this went against their undemocratic ways. They were united on one thing only, their dislike for the Nationalists.

An example of their divisions was when the communists ordered a dramatic offensive which involved 40,000 soldiers attacking the Nationalists. Largo Caballero spoke out against this move and he subsequently lost his job and was replaced. Therefore the Republicans were severely affected by their divisions and this lack of unity and cohesion was very significant in making the Nationalists victory come about under the guidance of Franco.

Another reason for the Nationalists victory was due to foreign support. While Britain countries signed the non intervention pact,

(This page is for your first answer.) This didn't stop Italy and Germany from assisting Franco and Nationalists in their victory. An extremely crucial part of the war was during the early stages when the Republicans were close to victory. Had it not been for Germany using planes to carry Franco's elite army of Africa over to Spain then quite possibly the Nationalists would have been defeated. The significance of this particular foreign support cannot be understated. The Republicans also received support however it was poor quality from Russia and they demanded instant repayment in gold. Italy and Germany on the other hand were more relaxed about repayment. Italy and Mussolini ended up sending Franco 1,500

aeroplanes and sent 75,000 volunteers to help them.

The Republicans did receive help from the international brigades, where around 35,000 volunteers helped to fight, however, they lacked cohesion and the divisions continued. The major assistance given to Franco's Spain was very significant in their victory in the civil war. ~~to~~ without their intervention ~~the~~ the Nationalists may not have achieved the victory Franco inspired them to do.

Overall it is fair to say all the factors mentioned were significant in helping the Nationalists achieve a victory in the civil war. However, the role played by Franco was the extremely significant as he was the orchestrator in this historic victory - without him the Nationalists

(This page is for your first answer.) may not have achieved the required the foreign support that desperately helped them. Despite the Republic's ~~to~~ divisions the Nationalists still needed strong leadership ~~so~~ and Franco provided that, and thus the victory.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 response. It clearly understands that the focus of the question is Franco himself. This can be seen from the plan which does not refer to Franco and other factors but is a yes/no plan - ways in which he was significant and ways in which he was less significant. All the way through this response the answer returns to Franco's significance and when addressing other factors does so in relation to his contribution.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always make sure that introductions show and understanding of the focus of the question, and conclusions come to a judgment. Here the introduction shows that Franco is the focus but also outlines other factors which were involved. The conclusion is not extensive but it sums up the significance of Franco within the context of the argument made in the main body of the essay - it portrays him as the orchestrator of events and suggests that despite Republican failings the Nationalist still needed a strong leader in order to gain victory.

## E5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

### Question 9

As in previous years the candidates for this topic were very well grounded in the overall context and themes of the post-war period for Germany. Knowledge was good but there was a tendency to focus on questions which candidates wanted to answer rather than the questions on the paper itself. This led to responses which had some relevance but were not focused enough to achieve beyond mid-Level 4. This was also highlighted by the selection of supporting evidence which may have had some relevance and allow some analysis but which was not relevant enough to give a response to the exact question asked.

Q9. This was the more popular of the two questions. Most responses were well-focused with a sound grounding of the events leading to the partition. However, as mentioned in the general comments to Option E, most candidates would have profited from clear reference to the creation of the separate states in 1949 early on in the response. Candidates were able to discuss a range of points about US actions, with the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Bizonia and currency reform all being dealt with in most answers. Similarly most candidates were able to discuss the Soviet contribution especially with regard to the Berlin Blockade. Some candidates were able to go further back and look at differences between the Allies and the USSR at Potsdam and make more general points about the Cold War context. Some candidates were able to effectively discuss internal factors, particularly the roles of Adenauer and Ulbricht. A significant number of responses provided a description of events from 1945 – 1949 and failed to analyse the responses systematically. Less able candidates discussed the emergence of the Cold War between 1945 and 1949 rather than focusing specifically on Germany.

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.)

USA = PARTITION OF GERMANY 1945-1949?

YES	NO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• P</li><li>• MARSHALL PLAN - Truman</li><li>• BIZONIA + CURRENCY REFORM</li><li>• NATO</li><li>• FRG</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• COMECON</li><li>• BERLIN BLOCKADE</li></ul>

(This page is for your second answer.) By 1949, Germany had split into two states. This was mainly due to the actions of the USA - however there were other factors - such as actions carried out by the USSR - that resulted in the partition of Germany in 1949.

~~After the Potsdam conference~~ One of the reasons for the partition of Germany into two states was because of the increasing tensions. After the Potsdam Conference of 1945 tensions between Western allies and the USSR were already high. This was due to disagreements about reparations and denazification. The USSR stopped their eastern zone of Berlin for all raw materials where as the Western allies did not want to leave Germany in the state that it had been in after World War One - as a result of reparation. Tensions were further increased in the summer of 1946 - where the USSR failed to complete part of their agreement with the USA to lend eastern goods - such as food to the West. This resulted in food shortages in the West and in retaliation - the USA stopped sending raw materials - which stunted the economic growth in East Germany. This shows that the tensions between the allies - ~~as a result~~ the resulted in the partition of Germany as the USSR and the Western ~~other~~ powers could not ~~agree~~ effectively agree on ~~how~~ the development of Germany - and wanted to control their zones differently. Therefore this shows that it was not just the fault of the USA but ~~also~~ collectively - all the allies - ~~as a result~~ which caused Germany's partition.

(This page is for your second answer.) On the other hand, the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine - both issued in ~~1947~~ 1947 were actions carried out by the USA - which contributed to the partition

of Germany. The Marshall Plan was used to stop the spread of communism ~~by~~ in the form of aid, whilst the Truman Doctrine denounced ~~the~~ communism and stated that the USA would do all they could to stop the spread of communism. This alerted the USSR - as they were a communist society - and as a result - they prevented all ~~other~~ states in the eastern bloc from receiving it. This resulted in the partition of Germany as the Marshall Aid gave the West German economy a head start (as they received \$1.4 billion) whilst the economy in the East of Germany was lagging behind. Therefore as the USA ~~had~~ ~~been~~ ~~posed~~ a threat to the USSR and all other ~~countries~~ communist countries the USSR stopped Eastern bloc countries from receiving aid - which increased tensions between the two countries and between East and West Germany.

Furthermore, the currency reform was implemented by the USA in June 1948. This changed the ~~old~~ currency <sup>in the West</sup> from the Reichsmark to the Deutschmark (DM). This contributed to the separation of Germany into two states as there was now a currency ~~dividing~~ dividing the two zones. Furthermore - it helped ~~to~~ ~~for~~ economic growth as the ~~the~~ West Germans now had incentives to work and

(This page is for your second answer.) wanted to earn the new hard currency. Therefore - the currency reform - introduced by the USA resulted in the splitting of Germany as the two zones were now ~~dis~~ separated by a ~~new~~ new currency which made ~~the~~ the partition more likely.

However, the Berlin Blockade was an event implemented by the USSR that increased the likelihood of Germany separating. This is because the USSR sealed off all land and water routes for the western powers into Berlin. Their Western zone of Berlin in hopes that they would surrender their zones. ~~Howe~~ This lasted for 11 months. This ~~resulted~~ <sup>contributed</sup> in ~~the~~ to the partition of Germany into two states as ~~it~~ it was the Western powers that the USSR wanted full control of the East, ~~there~~ and was not able to ~~strictly~~ comply with the agreements they had made previously at ~~the~~ the Potsdam conference. Therefore this shows that the partition of Germany was also due to the Berlin blockade of 1949 implemented by the USSR.

To conclude, ~~there~~ there are arguments to show that it was mainly the actions of the US & USA in the formation of the FRG in 1949 - as they posed many threats to the USSR. However, it is not fair to say that it is ~~simply~~ the fault of the USA's actions ~~and~~ on the USSR ~~played~~.

(This page is for your second answer.) ~~a~~ major role in Germany's partition.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. It explains in detail the contribution of various factors to the separation of Germany. Each factor is outlined with some suggestion of the inter-linking of events but this is not explicit. The actions of the US is seen as one of several contributory factors rather than as the main focus of the question. The question of US responsibility is really only evaluated in the conclusion.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to focus from the beginning on the stated factor in a multi-factor question and evaluate responsibility/importance/significance etc in relation to other factors rather than writing about different factors and coming to a conclusion at the end.

## **Question 10**

Q10. This was the less popular of the two questions. There were some good responses to this question, which saw well written answers that were able to assess continuity and change in both economic and political relations in a strongly analytical framework. Many answers found it easier to discuss political change rather than economic aspects. The political changes mainly focused on *Ostpolitik* and the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, with the treatment of the 1950s being far vaguer. However, a surprising number of responses made little reference to the 1980s. The more able candidates could point out the continuities of hostility and suspicion, and used propaganda campaigns and the superficiality of *Ostpolitik* to support this. When it came to economic policy, candidates tended to stress the lack of interaction produced by the different economic systems, though the increasing importance of West German loans in the GDR economy was a point made by several candidates. However, the main problem with many answers was that they gave a narrative account of changing relations between 1949 and 1990, and often found it difficult to explain and analyse the extent of change, with some less able candidates resorting to outlining the differences between East and West Germany. Some candidates also gave a lot of detail about the period 1945 – 1949 without linking it to the period identified in the question.

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

### ***Question 11***

Once again this was a popular topic and, as in previous years, although candidates were generally well prepared there was still a tendency for responses to lack secure chronology. This often led to confused responses with a lack of overall coherence. Also following on from last year, it was clear that centres are increasingly confident in delivering the post-1979 period of the specification and responses were often interesting and well organised with appropriate supporting material.

Q11. This was by far the most popular question. As stated in the general comment to Option E, most responses would have profited from a clear definition of the key elements of the question in the introductory sentences. The mark scheme acknowledged that the 'growing power of Israel' might be defined in several different ways and so a clear introduction would have created a more coherent response; as would the acknowledgement that the focus of the question was the cause of Arab-Israeli hostility rather than Arab hostility towards Israel. Many responses were severely undermined by chronological confusion. The more able candidates were those who identified a number of factors which created hostility across the period and discussed these in relation to the growing power of Israel. Many effective responses referred to the role of external influences and the changing circumstances in relation to the consequences of events for the Palestinians.

## Question 12

Q12. This question focused on the increase in radical Islamist activity in the Middle East and Gulf regions in the 1990s. Most candidates were able to discuss the effects of western involvement in the First Gulf War on the growth in the activity and also suggested a variety of other factors which contributed, such as events in Palestine, Arab-Israeli relations and the growth in political Islam. The more able candidates were able to show the inter-linking of various factors in relation to the stated factor. Some less able candidates listed different factors discussing each separately and so found it difficult to establish the extent to which western involvement in the First Gulf War was responsible for the increase. A few less able candidates focused on western involvement in general rather than the effects of the intervention in the First Gulf War specifically.

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.) Radical Islamist activity 1991-2001.  
Western Involvement First Gulf War - Iraq, Operation Desert Storm

Palestinian Question - homeland, Intifadas, normal citizens + larger groups → Fatah, Hamas.

Islamic Fundamentalism post-1979 - Al Qaida, Jihad, 9/11  
Failure of peace process - Oslo Accord → not implemented.

The increase in radical Islamist activity in the years 1991-2001 was caused by a variety of factors. One of the most significant reasons for the increase was because of western involvement in the First Gulf War. However, there were other factors such as the Palestinian Question, the rise of Islamic fundamentalism and the failure of peace processes.

One factor why radical Islamist activity increased from 1991-2001 was because of western involvement in the

(This page is for your second answer.) First Gulf War. After the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, Western forces occupied Saudi Arabia in an attempt to make Saddam back down. However, when Iraq continued with aggressive action, the West started Operation Desert Storm, a full ground invasion which eventually defeated Iraq. Western intervention was controversial as the US bombed a bunker full of citizens and attacked members of the Republican Guard when they were retreating, and this led to anti-Western feeling and increased radical Islamist activity. The West stopped short of removing Saddam from power, but their involvement was a key factor in why radical activity increased from 1991-2001. However, there were also other factors such as the Palestinian Question, the rise of Islamic fundamentalism and the failure of peace processes.

The Palestinian Question was a factor which increased radical Islamist activity from 1991-2001. The Palestinians wanted to regain their homeland in Palestine, and this led to the First Intifada from 1987-93. Many ordinary civilians were involved as they boycotted Jewish shops and were pictured throwing stones at Israeli tanks. The Intifada gave rise to the formation of Hamas, which used radical techniques and acts of terrorism, for example by blowing up buses and cafés,

(This page is for your second answer.) against Israel. There was also a degree of sympathy for the Palestinians as the Israeli troops used lethal ammunition against civilians. The increase in radical Islamist activity was also caused

by the formation of Hezbollah following the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982. Hezbollah were another terrorist organisation which implemented radical techniques against Israel during the 1990's.

The rise of Islamic fundamentalism is also a key factor why radical Islamist activity increased from 1991-2001. Following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, groups such as the Mujahideen and Al Qaida were aided by Western aid who helped to train and arm the organisations. Al Qaida became more powerful after the Western aid, and cells were set up which attracted other fundamentalists from Arab nations. Fundamentalists groups were the cause of much radical activity from 1991-2001, as they opposed Western influence and culture. This culminated in the September 11th attacks, which followed US embassy bombings in Nairobi and Dar-e-Salaam in 1998. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism was key to radical activity from 1991-2001.

The failure of peace processes also increased radical

(This page is for your second answer.) Islamist activity from 1991-2001

The Arabs and Israel met in Madrid in 1991, but the Israeli leader Shamir was unwilling to change his views on Palestine. A major breakthrough came after the Oslo Accords in 1993 and 1995, in which Israel agreed to withdraw from the occupied territories, release Palestinian refugees and set up the Palestinian Authority to govern the West Bank and

Gaza. Despite the promise of peace, only the elections were ever completed in full because the two sides disagreed on the size of Palestine and what should be done about Israeli settlements in Gaza + the West Bank. The Israelis believed that they would remain in overall control, whereas the Palestinians believed it was the first step to independence. The failure of the peace processes led to the start of the Second Intifada in 2000, and the continued use of radical activity against Israel.

In conclusion, it is clear that Western involvement during the First Gulf War was mainly responsible for the increase in radical Islamist activity from 1991-2001. The Western intervention fuelled anti-Western sentiment which developed after the emergence of Islamic fundamentalism as groups like Al Qaida called for global Jihad. The Western influence was also a factor which caused the  
(This page is for your second answer.) increase of radical Islamist activity in Palestine in the years 1991-2001.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. It explains the contribution of the stated factor and other factors to the rise in Islamist activity during the period. However, it does not link the factors and makes a statement in the conclusion which has not been clearly shown in the main body of the response.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try to create a discussion about the hypothesis or statement in the question. Instead of writing about each factor in turn and then weighing up your answer in the conclusion. Analyse the contribution of the stated factor or main focus in the opening paragraphs and develop the other factors in relation to the 'weight' you have given to the main factor. This way you are evaluating the reasons so that your conclusion can be sustained.

## Paper Summary

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

- Do not attempt to limit your revision by trying to predict questions or by producing model answers based on past questions. This may lead to a lack of choice or a lack of focus on the demands made by the question.
- Try to analyse causation by using a variety of different methods. This year the factors which influence causation have been largely addressed with confidence. Differentiation between candidates' answers has often arisen when candidates come to evaluate and weigh up the relative significance of conditional against contingent factors and then suggest which factor seems the most important.
- Try to understand issues concerning change and continuity over the whole timescale of your period of study. Consider how things stayed the same, how they changed and, most importantly, why change did or did not take place.
- Develop the skill of using appropriate historical terms with fluency and use these in your answers where appropriate.
- Plan your answer beforehand. This will help you to organise your thoughts before you start to write.
- Familiarise yourself with the format of the examination booklet. You should begin your first answer on page 4 and your second on page 12. On each of these pages you should place a cross to indicate which answer you have chosen. Knowing the format of the examination in advance should help to relieve the stress of the examination overall.

## **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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



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