

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2014

GCE History (6HI01/F)

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](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).

## **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)

Summer 2014

Publications Code US039074

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## **GCE History Marking Guidance**

### **Marking of Questions: Levels of Response**

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

### **Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level**

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4 would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

### **Assessing Quality of Written Communication**

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>

<b>5</b>	<b>25-30</b>	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which directly addresses the focus of the question and which demonstrates explicit understanding of the key issues contained in it. It will be broadly balanced in its treatment of these key issues. The analysis will be supported by accurate, relevant and appropriately selected which demonstrates some range and depth.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing extended writing will be in place.</p>
----------	--------------	--

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### **Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

#### **Unit 1 Assessment Grid**

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>% Weighting</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>

**F1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on the role of Victor Emmanuel in the process of Italian unification in the years 1850-70, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that his role was no more than that of a figurehead.</p> <p>Candidates may agree with the statement by referring to the symbolic role of Victor Emmanuel in the unification process. Responses may refer to his position as king of Piedmont, in appointing Cavour, encouraging the war of 1859, accepting the states of Naples and Sicily at Teano in 1860 and his subsequent role as the King of Italy. These answers may establish that he was 'no more than a figurehead' by contrasting his role with the more direct contributions of individuals such as Cavour and Garibaldi or by reference to foreign influence.</p> <p>Other responses may suggest a counter-argument that he was much more than a figurehead in the process with reference to his direct support for Cavour's diplomacy, direct intervention in the events of the war of 1859 and the subsequent plebiscites, the meeting with Garibaldi at Teano and his role in the eventual take-over of Rome in 1870.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will have a secure focus on the question, considering the extent to which Victor Emmanuel was 'no more than a figurehead', and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent or integrate the arguments into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the extent to which Victor Emmanuel was a figurehead by addressing strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, probably by either agreeing or disagreeing with the suggestion. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on the process of Italian unification in the years 1858-70, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which France was responsible for the pattern of unification.</p> <p>Answers may focus on continued French interference in the process of Italian unification and/or the inter-relationship between major events and French actions. Responses may refer to French dominance in the events leading to and during the war of 1859, and the subsequent agreement at Villafranca which led to the loss of Nice and Savoy and continued Austrian presence in Venetia. It may also be suggested that French action/influence was directly related to Garibaldi's decision to launch his expedition to Sicily, the annexation of Venetia in 1866 and the eventual take-over of Rome. In particular, candidates may refer to the continued presence of the French garrison in Rome which prevented Italy becoming geographically unified until 1870. Responses may determine the extent of responsibility by suggesting that, despite being dominant at Villafranca, the plebiscites which unified the northern states were carried out in spite of Napoleon III's disapproval and that unification with the southern states leading to the creation of the Kingdom of Italy was due to the actions of Italians.</p> <p>Some candidates may suggest that other factors were responsible such as the growing power of Piedmont or the role of Austria or that the actions/policies of the French was only one of many inter-linking factors which shaped Italian unification.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will have a secure focus on the question, will consider the extent to which French actions were responsible for the shape of Italian unification, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth unification across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the extent to which France was responsible by addressing strengths and limitations and/or the role of other factors, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, probably by explaining the role of France in Italian unification. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

## F2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>The question is focused on the impact of the 1848-49 revolutions, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which the outcomes of the revolutions influenced the process of German unification in the years 1850-71.</p> <p>Some candidates may suggest that the outcomes of the 1848-49 revolutions had a significant long-term influence on the process of German unification with reference to the failure of liberal-nationalism, the emergence of a potential <i>Kleindeutschland</i> under Prussia and, despite its apparent re-emergence as the dominant power, an Austria grown weaker and increasingly pre-occupied with matters in eastern Europe. This long-term significance, however, may be balanced with reference to the emergence of more significant short-term influences such as the role of Bismarck or by the equally long-term influence of economic factors.</p> <p>Other candidates may suggest that the outcomes of the revolutions had relatively little influence as the revolutionaries were comprehensively crushed, Prussia proved too weak to take advantage of events and Austria re-established its dominant position at Olmutz. This lack of influence might be highlighted, for example, by the suggestion that economic factors were of greater influence or that it was not until after 1859 that the forces which would lead to eventual unification began to emerge.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address the extent of influence, by considering the significance of the outcomes of 1848-9 for the unification process, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent or integrate the arguments into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the influence of the outcomes of 1848-9 by addressing strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly explaining the consequences of the 1848-9 revolutions and/or the influences on the process of German unification. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>The question is focused on the process of German unification in the years 1862-71, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that it was driven by Bismarck's diplomacy.</p> <p>Candidates may approach this question in a variety of ways in order to establish extent. Answers may focus on Bismarckian diplomacy suggesting that, despite underlying causes such as Prussian economic and military strength, after Bismarck's appointment as Chancellor in 1862 a clear chain of events unfolded in which Bismarck manipulated the international situation in order to create a united Germany. These responses might refer to the events surrounding Prussia's involvement in the Polish Rebellion and Schleswig-Holstein question, war with Denmark (1864), war with Austria (1866) and war with France (1870) which resulted in the isolation of Austria and the advancement of Prussia on the international stage.</p> <p>Extent might also be established by concentrating on the limitations of Bismarck's diplomacy suggesting that rather than being driven by diplomacy the process of unification was dependent on opportunity and chance.</p> <p>Other responses might consider the role of other factors such as Prussian economic strength or Prussian military strength or suggest that unification was achieved through inter-related factors showing how Prussian economic strength provided Bismarck with the means to back up his diplomacy with military strength, for example.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address extent, by considering the strengths and weaknesses of Bismarck's diplomacy or its significance in relation to other factors in the process of unification, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of Bismarck's diplomacy by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, by explaining the role of Bismarckian diplomacy and/or the process of unification in the years 1862-71. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**F3 The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on support for Fascism in the years 1919-22 and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that fear of socialism was the most important reason for its growth.</p> <p>In support of the suggestion that growing support for Fascism was influenced by a fear of socialism, candidates might refer to the impact of direct action by socialists on the effectiveness of the Liberal State prior to 1919 and particularly during the <i>Biennio Rosso</i> of 1919-20, and the extent to which the Fascist ideology developed by Mussolini was a reaction to these events. Responses might also suggest that the main core of Fascist supporters were those Italians directly threatened by the rise of socialism such as the rural and urban middle and lower- middle classes along with nationalists, landowners and industrialists. With the Liberal State increasingly unable to respond to socialist threats to law and order many Italians turned to the Fascist <i>squadristi</i> to maintain order instead.</p> <p>However, to establish extent some responses may refer to the contribution of other factors such as the growing desire for an alternative government to the collapsed Liberal State, the charisma of Mussolini's leadership or the attractive promises made in the New Programme. Some answers might suggest that other factors were more important or that the different factors were inter-related suggesting that the failure of the Liberal State encouraged radical ideologies with Fascism being less threatening to the elites and lower-middle classes than socialism, for example.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address 'how far...most important', by considering the fear of socialism in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the importance of fear of socialism by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the impact of the fear of socialism and/or other factors on growing Fascist support. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on Mussolini's control of Italy, and requires an analysis, and judgement, of the significance of his personal popularity in his ability to maintain control in the years 1925-43. Discussion of the consolidation of power before 1925 may be mentioned but is not required and, at length, may detract from the focus of the question.</p> <p>Once the cult of <i>Il Duce</i> was firmly established after 1925, Mussolini maintained his personal popularity throughout most of the period up to World War II with only a brief downturn in the early 1930s under the strains of a world depression and difficulties with the Pope. He was able to present himself as the embodiment of Italian greatness with his 'hands-on' involvement in the Battle for Grain, the invasion of Abyssinia and as a power broker in international affairs. Many of his policies had elements of success which added to his popularity but by cultivating personal popularity through propaganda Mussolini was often able to deflect attention away from the failures of domestic policy or the repressive nature of the state and blame others both at home and abroad for Italian difficulties. Candidates might argue that without his personal popularity the weaknesses in his leadership and the extent of repression might have created opposition to his rule earlier. It was only after the defeats of World War II that Mussolini's personal popularity began to wane resulting in his downfall in September 1943; even the Germans believed that once rescued from prison his personal popularity would allow him to establish a new power base in northern Italy.</p> <p>In considering the significance of his personal popularity responses might refer to the limitations of his popularity and/or the significance of other factors. It might be argued that although he appeared popular this was more of an illusion of propaganda and that his ability to control Italy was based more on his skilful manipulation of legitimate politics to create a dictatorship and/or his subsequent use of censorship, repression and the support of the traditional elites to remain in power until the disasters of World War II. The best responses might show how all of these factors were inter-related and/or clearly establish relative significance.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address significance, by considering the strengths and limitations of Mussolini's personal popularity in his ability to maintain power, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent or integrate other factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, by addressing strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining Mussolini's personal popularity and/or the means by which he controlled Italy during the period. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**F4 Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question is focused on the weakness of government in the Second Republic in the years 1931-36, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which this was due to conservative opposition. Candidates may refer to conservative opposition as single factor and/or identify different elements of conservatism such as the army, Church, monarchists, landowners etc.</p> <p>In reference to the impact of conservative opposition on the government of the Republic in years 1931-36 candidates might suggest that after the successful introduction of a range of reforms, conservative opposition undermined the republic in a number of ways. Examples of conservative reaction might include the attempted army rising in 1932, the formation of CEDA to represent right-wing opinion resulting in election success in November 1933, the counter-reforms introduced under Gil Robles, General Franco's suppression of the miners' strike in Asturias and the eventual decision to carry out a military coup against the Popular Front in 1936.</p> <p>To establish extent, responses might suggest that other factors also led to weak government or show that a different factor had greater responsibility. Other factors which might be considered include the weak foundations of the republican government established in 1931, the consequences of rapid reform 1931-2, the lack of further reform after 1932, the difficulties of maintaining coalition governments, internal divisions amongst the left and mistakes made by governments throughout the period. Some candidates might suggest that weak government was due to the inter-relationship between factors showing that the rapid reforms of 1931-32 led to fierce conservative opposition which undermined the initial successes leading to mistakes and highlighted internal divisions.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address extent, by considering the role of conservative opposition in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the effect of conservative opposition by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the nature of conservative opposition and/or the weakness of republican government. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question is focused on the success of the Nationalists in the Spanish Civil War, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the significance of Franco in this success.</p> <p>To establish the significance of Franco answers may focus on his strengths. These may include his role in the attempted coup in 1936 and his emergence as a figure of stability after the initial setbacks, his leadership skills, both political and military, including his ability to hold together various right-wing groups whilst remaining above factional politics, and his ability to gain direct diplomatic and military support from fascist governments in Germany and Italy while maintaining diplomatic links to the democratic governments of Britain and France through the Non-Intervention Committee. In particular Franco's military skills put the Nationalists in a position to win the war, for example, his Army of Africa won a series of early victories which created a foothold on the mainland and his decision not to advance on Madrid with Mola but to take Toledo instead, although giving the Republicans time to regroup in the short-term, created the long-term conditions of steady consolidation that allowed the Nationalists ultimate success.</p> <p>Although most candidates will probably suggest that his role was very significant the extent of his significance may be established with reference to criticism of his military tactics and the existence of divisions amongst the Nationalists or to other significant factors such as the divisions and weaknesses within the republican forces, in particular, the in-fighting between the moderates, communists and anarchists and the role of direct foreign intervention including military assistance from Germany and Italy, the more volatile support for the republicans from the USSR and the non-interventionist policy of Britain, France and the USA. A few candidates might refer to the element of chance/luck by which he emerged as the military and political leader of the Nationalists, for example, the death of General Sanjurjo.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address significance, by considering the strengths and weakness of Franco's contribution to Nationalist success and/or his contribution in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate his significance or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider Franco's importance by addressing his strengths and limitations and/or the role of other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining Franco's role in the Nationalist success. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

F5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the partition of Germany into two separate states in 1949, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which US action in the years 1945-49 was responsible for the partition.</p> <p>Responses might suggest that US actions had a considerable impact on the partition of Germany with reference to the policies of President Truman once the division of Germany agreed at the Yalta Conference (February 1945) was ratified at the post-World War II Potsdam Conference. Truman's support for the political and economic development of the Allied sectors of Germany through the establishment of Bizonia, the announcement of the Marshall Plan, rejection of a Soviet proposal for a central German government and the introduction of the Deutschmark currency forced the USSR to react by 'protecting' the Soviet sector of Berlin in 1948 through a blockade. US determination to break the blockade led to both the creation of NATO and the organisation of the Western sectors into one economic and administrative unit which meant that once the USSR abandoned the blockade in May 1949 both sides sponsored the creation of the separate states of West and East Germany.</p> <p>The extent to which US actions were responsible for these events, however, might be challenged by reference to the greater importance of other factors or the inter-relationship of variety of factors. Other factors might include the situation in Germany at the end of World War II, the direct actions of the USSR, the Cold War environment including the expansion of Soviet influence in eastern Europe and the desire of 'west' German politicians to create a post-war democracy. Answers might suggest that Soviet provocation was of much greater importance or that a chain reaction of Cold War events resulting from the collapse of Germany in 1945 led inevitably to partition.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address extent of responsibility, by considering the actions of the US in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the actions of the US by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the process by which Germany became partitioned and/or the role of the US. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>The question is focused on the political and economic relationship between East and West Germany in the years 1949-90, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which these relationships changed over time. The question covers a period of forty years and it is expected that candidates will select a range of key dates/events within the chronology with which to illustrate change over time; detailed discussion of events cannot be expected.</p> <p>From 1949-89 the political and economic relationship between East and West Germany was essentially one of separation but there were changes in the relationship over time. Political separation was embodied in the Hallstein Doctrine by which West Germany ensured the diplomatic isolation of East Germany from all but other communist countries and the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961. However, a policy of détente was established under the Ostpolitik of West Germany's Willy Brandt in the 1970s and the political relationship thawed until the emergence of the 'second Cold War' in the early 1980s. Economic relationships were quite open in the early years but as the East German economy suffered in relation to West Germany the Soviet-influenced government chose to break relations completely with the building of the Berlin Wall. During the 1970s East Germany took advantage of détente to establish greater economic links in the Basic Treaty (1972) and this continued despite the less conducive political climate in the 1980s when West Germany loaned the East almost 2 billion Deutschmarks. The most decisive change in relations came with the collapse of the communist controlled East German government and the destruction of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Within twelve months the West German Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, had engineered the political reunification of Germany. In considering extent candidates might suggest that there was very little change at all until 1989, that changing relationships were dependent on the Cold War environment or that despite political separation East Germany had effectively been reliant on West Germany economically for over a decade before reunification.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address extent, by considering the changing political and economic relationship between East and West Germany across most of the time period, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material while reaching an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the nature of the changing relationships, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the political and/or economic relationships. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked, supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**F6 The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	<p>The question is focused on Arab-Israeli hostility in the years 1948-1973, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that this was mainly caused by fear of growing Israeli power. Growing Israeli power could refer to policies of development and expansion, military build-up and support for Israel within the wider international community but the awarding of Levels will depend on the extent to which a sustained argument has been established with reference to a relevant definition.</p> <p>Candidates may approach the question by focusing on hostility across the period or by referring to the specific conflicts such in 1948-49, 1956, 1967 and 1973. Candidates may support the suggestion by reference to Israeli actions across the time period including the implementation of Plan D and the creation of the Israeli state in 1948, the Israeli attack on Gaza in 1955, continued support for Jewish emigration and the development of settler communities/kibbutzim, military expansion and the treatment of the occupied territories after the 1967 War.</p> <p>In order to establish the extent to which fear of growing Israeli power was the main cause of hostility, responses may refer to other factors and influences such as long-term hostility, Arab desire to regain territory, Arab support for the Palestinian cause, external influences such as Cold War politics and the actions of individual Arab states such as Egypt. At higher Levels candidates might suggest that although Israeli policies were important Arab-Israeli hostility involved the complex interaction of a variety of long-term issues and short-term trigger points.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address 'how far...most important', by considering the role of fear of growing Israeli power in relation to other factors and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider fear of growing Israeli power by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly explain the effects of Israeli actions and/or the reasons for Arab-Israeli hostility. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>The question is focused on the growth of radical Islamist activity in the years 1991-2001, and requires an analysis of, and judgment on, the extent to which this was due to western intervention in the First Gulf War. In the 1990s radical Islamist activity increased with, for example, the development of al-Qaida and other groups, direct action against perceived enemies including Arab states, international bombing campaigns, and the resurgence of radical Palestinian politics. The question is focused on events in the Middle East and Gulf regions and so specific references to attacks outside of the region cannot be expected. However, candidates may refer to attacks such as that on the World Trade Centre in 2001 as an example of wider aims and consequences.</p> <p>In establishing the influence of western intervention in the First Gulf War on these developments, responses might refer to the ideological reaction to the 'West' imposing its solution to a disagreement between Arab states and the effect of the long-term consequences such as the consolidation of US military bases in the Middle East, particularly Saudi Arabia, and the implementation of continued economic sanctions against Iraq. Islamist aims to be independent of foreign intervention, to bring Islamic ideals to the governance of Arab states and to support a separate Palestinian state were, therefore, all undermined.</p> <p>However, to establish the extent of responsibility, candidates might suggest alternative reasons for increased activity. Answers might refer to the support of the Taliban movement in Afghanistan after the end of the Cold War, the break-down of the Israeli-Palestinian 'peace talks' and Oslo Accords, the outbreak of the second <i>Intifada</i>, the reaction of Arab states to radical groups, the general desire to rejuvenate Islam in Muslim societies and the continued influence of the Islamist government in Iran. Some candidates might suggest that although an important underlying reason for increased activity, western intervention was not wholly responsible but it was one of a series of inter-related factors that allowed radical activity, in particular al-Qaida, to thrive in the Middle East and Gulf region during the decade.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address extent, by considering the responsibility of western intervention in the First Gulf War for increased activity in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of western intervention by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly explain the effect of western intervention and/or the nature of increased radical Islamist activity. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

**F7 From Second Reich to Third Reich: Germany 1918-45**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p><b>13</b></p>	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the failure of the Weimar Republic, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that this was mainly caused by the rise of the Nazi Party.</p> <p>In support of the suggestion responses may refer to the parallel rise of the Nazi Party with the decline of the Weimar Republic and the extent to which the use of both extra-legal and legitimate political methods allowed the Nazi Party to undermine the Weimar Constitution and present a viable alternative form of government. Answers might refer to electoral gains leading to inclusion in coalition politics, such as the referendum on the Young Plan (1929), the growing popularity of Hitler in relation to mainstream Weimar politicians or the use of violent agitation against perceived socialist threats to law and order. Support may focus on the extent to which Hitler was able to use support for the Nazi Party to manipulate the Weimar Constitution in his seizure of power and overthrow of Weimar politics in 1933.</p> <p>To establish the extent to which the collapse of Weimar was caused by the rise of the Nazi Party responses may focus on the weaknesses of the Weimar Republic itself or alternative external factors. Candidates may refer to inherent or contradictory weaknesses in the Constitution, such as, the effects of proportional representation or the power of the President to use Article 48 and to the inability of the Weimar politicians to win the support of much of the electorate during the economic crisis after 1929. In particular, candidates might suggest that the long-term effects of the Versailles Treaty or the short-term impact of the Depression were more important. Some candidates might also focus on the inevitability of the collapse or show how factors were inter-related showing how the early problems of the Weimar Republic made it difficult to respond to the economic crisis after 1929 and that the Nazis took advantage of a favourable situation rather than causing the collapse, for example.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address ‘how far...main reason’, by considering the importance of the Nazi Party in relation to other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role played by the Nazi Party addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the rise of the Nazi Party and/or the collapse of the Weimar Republic. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	<p>30</p>

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
14	<p>The question is focused on the outbreak of war in Germany in 1939, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that Germany was fully prepared for war. Candidates can refer to events post-1939 to highlight the extent to which Germany was prepared for war and should be accordingly rewarded. The specification suggests that candidates will mainly refer to the extent to which the German economy (including the military aspects) and society were prepared for war. Foreign policy is not explicitly referred to in the specification and so it cannot be expected that candidates will refer specifically to foreign policy to reach the higher Levels of the mark scheme. However, responses which do refer to political or external factors should be rewarded.</p> <p>Much of the Nazi social and economic policy in the 1930s was directed towards the ability of Germany to fight a war in Europe. The Four Year Plan introduced by Goering from 1936 was designed to prepare Germany for war, military conscription was responsible for much of the decrease in unemployment and Nazi youth policy was directed towards encouraging militaristic ideas, particularly for boys. Candidates might support the suggestion that Germany was fully prepared for war in 1939 with reference to military strength, growing economic self-sufficiency, popular support and rapid initial victories. With Hitler in personal command of the armed forces Germany was able to use <i>Blitzkrieg</i> to invade Poland and to move into western Europe soon after.</p> <p>Counter-arguments might suggest that Germany was far from fully prepared in 1939 with the Four Year Plan not yet fully established or that, despite being relatively successful early on, later failures were caused by the lack of preparation in 1939. Answers might refer to the short-comings of the autarky policies which failed to arm and resource the massive army and airforce sufficiently, the chronic lack of raw materials for future development, the impact of conscription on a male-dominated workforce and a lack of confidence amongst the army generals in Germany's ability to fight a long war.</p> <p><b>Level 5:</b> answers will clearly address 'how far', by considering the extent to which Germany was fully prepared, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth across most of the time period. These answers will establish arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 4:</b> candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the extent of preparation by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages.</p> <p><b>Level 3:</b> answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by focusing on the economic situation in 1939. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies.</p> <p><b>Level 2:</b> answers will offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.</p> <p><b>Level 1:</b> responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.</p>	30

