edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History (6HI01/E)

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 or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

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

Summer 2015
Publications Code US041762

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 MarkPoint 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**	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. **Low Level 1: 1-2 marks** The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth. **Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks** As per descriptor **High Level 1: 5-6 marks** The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1. 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.
2	**7-12**	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. **Low Level 2: 7-8 marks** The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth. **Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks** As per descriptor **High Level 2: 11-12 marks** The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2. 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.

3	**13-18**	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. **Low Level 3: 13-14 marks** The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth. **Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks** As per descriptor **High Level 3: 17-18 marks** The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3. 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.
4	**19-24**	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. **Low Level 4: 19-20 marks** The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth. **Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks** As per descriptor **High Level 4: 23-24 marks** The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4. 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.

5	**25-30**	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. **Low Level 5: 25-26 marks** The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth. **Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks** As per descriptor **High Level 5: 29-30 marks** The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5. 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.

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
Total Marks	**60**	**60**
% Weighting	**25%**	**25%**

E1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	The question is focused on the movement towards greater Italian unity in the years 1815-49, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that Austrian opposition was the main reason for its slow progress. Answers may refer to the efforts used by Austria to undermine support for greater Italian unity such as the terms of the treaty of Vienna (1815), the diplomacy at the Congress of Laibach (1821), the use of the Holy Alliance to support conservative rulers in the 1820s, dynastic support for the rulers of the minor states such as Parma and Modena, and the use of military force against Italian revolutionaries in 1820-21, 1831-2 and 1848-9. Alternative reasons for slow progress may be suggested such as the limitations of *Risorgimento* politics and politicians such as Mazzini, the weaknesses of the revolutions including a lack of popular support, preparation and unity, a lack of cultural unity combined with strong localism, the role of the Catholic Church and the role of France. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address 'how far…most important', by considering the role of Austrian 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 use a range of factors to establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well, they will begin to consider the role of Austrian opposition by addressing its 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 be some narrative or descriptive passages. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, by addressing the role of Austrian opposition and/or the slow progress of Italian unity. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places.	30

	Level 1 responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	The question is focused on the creation of a unified Italy in the years 1850-70, and requires an analysis of, and judgment on, the suggestion that the role of Piedmont was the most significant factor in the process. Relevant responses will include those that define the role of Piedmont in relation to the actions of key individuals, such as Victor Emmanuel and Cavour. In support of this statement, responses may refer to developments such as the growth of political and economic stability and the increasing international standing of Piedmont under the rule of Victor Emmanuel and government of Cavour in the 1850s which, in turn, brought Piedmont to the forefront of the process of unification in the 1860s. Candidates might refer to the territorial gains of 1859, the outcome of the northern plebiscites, Garibaldi's decision to hand over Naples and Sicily at Teano and the creation and establishment of the Kingdom of Italy under Victor Emmanuel. Candidates may also consider other factors as being equally or more significant such as the role of individuals, for example, Garibaldi , the influence of the *Risorgimento* or the role of foreign influence including the decline of Austria and/or the interference of France. Higher Level responses might suggest that different factors influenced the unification process at different times or show the inter-relationship of different factors, for example, suggesting that, although Piedmont was growing stronger as a state, unification would have been unlikely without the decline of Austria, the help of France or the actions of Garibaldi. Some candidates may even suggest that far from creating a unified Italy the growing strength of Piedmont resulted in an annexation of the Italian peninsula. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address 'how far…most significant', by considering the role of Piedmont 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 conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well, they will begin to consider the significance of Piedmont's role by addressing its limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of material and/or consideration of the focus may lack balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding	30

	of the focus of the question, by addressing the role of Piedmont and/or the process of unification. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

E2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	The question is focused on the development of Prussia as the dominant German state in the years 1850-71, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that the growth of the Zollverein was the most significant factor in this development. Answers may consider the significance of the Zollverein in relation to Prussia becoming the dominant state with reference to its establishment before 1850, the growth in membership, its impact on the broader economic growth of Prussia, the isolation of Austria in the 1860s and the failure to establish an effective rival union, and the influence of its centralising tendencies on attitudes towards German political union. To establish significance responses may also consider the role of other factors such as the long-term consequences of the 1848 revolutions, the development of Prussian military strength, wider economic growth, the changing international situation, the decline in power of Austria and the role of key individuals, in particular, Bismarck's use of diplomacy. At the higher Levels candidates might suggest that the significance of the Zollverein changed over time or that it was an underlying factor in the development of Prussian dominance rather than the most significant factor. Better responses may evaluate its significance or show the inter-relationship of factors, for example, how the leadership of the *Zollverein* allowed Prussia to establish political as well as economic influence over other German states and to isolate Austria economically as well as internationally. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address 'how far…most significant', by considering the importance of the *Zollverein* 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 conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well, they will begin to consider the importance of the *Zollverein* by addressing its 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. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the role of the Zollverein and/or the emergence of Prussia as the dominant	30

	German state. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	The question is focused on the process of German unification in the years 1866-71, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the extent to which Germany became unified in these years. Candidates may suggest that the course of events over the years 1866-71 essentially created a unified German state. The defeat of Austria in 1866 led to the likelihood of a Prussian (*Kleindeutschland)* solution to the future control of Germany and to the formation of the North German Confederation with the remaining southern states independent but agreeing to a military alliance. The events leading up to, and the outbreak of war with France in 1870, created a nationalist atmosphere in Germany which Bismarck was able to exploit both domestically and internationally. The defeat of France led to the creation of a German Empire in 1871, which included all the major German states except for Austria, under the rule of a German emperor and a new constitution. In order to establish the extent to which Germany was unified, candidates may challenge the assertion of German unity by reference to the eventual *Kleindeutschland* solution, the use of force and coercion in bringing both northern and southern states into a confederation and the obvious domination of Prussia within the new federal structure. Responses may point out that the Kaiser became German Emperor rather than Emperor of Germany and that in theory the Empire was a voluntary association of states. At the higher Levels candidates should cover the whole time period but may still focus mainly either on the period of consolidation from 1866-70 or the nature of the new German Empire in 1871. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address the extent of unity, by considering the nature of 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 conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate the arguments to reach an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well, they will begin to consider the extent to which Germany was unified by addressing its 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	30

	or descriptive passages. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly explaining 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. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	This question is focused on the political and economic divisions in Italy, and the extent to which they increased in the years between 1896 and the March on Rome. Candidates might refer to the disunity that already existed more than twenty years after unification and to the reasons for continued disunity after 1896. Candidates may choose to consider political and economic disunity separately or together. By 1896 Italian governments had so far failed to deal with the economic disparity between the North and South, were dominated by political and social elites mainly from the north and had been unsuccessful in expanding into either *irredentist* or overseas territory. The political and economic disunity which this had caused created even further division over the next twenty-five years due to a variety of long-term reasons, such as resentment of the *Trasformismo* politics of Giolitti, the continued development of the North seemingly at the expense of the South and the growth of socialist and nationalist politics which were then further exacerbated by Italian involvement in World War 1. The subsequent failure to deal with the consequences of the War led to further disunity as socialists and nationalists vied to gain influence as the Liberal State appeared to collapse. Higher level responses should consider the extent to which political and economic disunity increased over the whole period. Responses may evaluate extent by identifying the nature of change over time, for example, suggesting that despite earlier political divisions the failure of the Liberal politicians to meet the needs of Italian citizens led to the rise of extreme politics or that the failures of World War 1 ultimately caused greater disunity. Other responses, might suggest that there was little real change with underlying political and economic divisions only being made worse by World War 1 and its consequences. Answers at **Level 5** will focus on political and economic division, considering the extent to which it increased during the time period, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. These answers will address a range of factors in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will focus on the question well, they will	30

	begin to consider the extent of political and economic divisions , 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. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, perhaps outlining political and economic divisions with implicit explanation or focusing on a limited range of factors; the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	The question is focused on Mussolini's control of Italy in the years 1922-43, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that his control was achieved mainly through the support of the Church and the traditional elites. References to the traditional elite may include the monarchy and the various political, economic and social groups who dominated Italy in the years after unification, including the army. Candidates might support the suggestion with reference to the role of the King and the Liberal elite in Mussolini's appointment as Prime Minister (1922) and consolidation of power to 1925, the negotiation and signing of the Lateran Pacts 1926-9, the support of the traditional civil service and judiciary and Mussolini's dealings with the army, industrialists and landowners. Some responses might also refer to the connection between the collapse in support from these groups and his eventual downfall from power during World War II. The extent to which Mussolini's control was achieved through such support might be challenged with reference to greater support from the majority of ordinary Italians and/or other means of control such as violence and intimidation, censorship and propaganda or the popularity/success of his policies. At the higher Levels candidates might suggest that different factors were more influential at different times or show the extent to which different factors were integrated, for example, how the threat of violence influenced support from the elites and popular social policies persuaded the Church to negotiate. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address 'how far…mainly due to', by considering the importance of the support for Mussolini from the Church and traditional elites in maintaining his control 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 conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the part played by the Church and the traditional elites 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.	30

	Level 3 answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the role of the Church and the traditional elites and/or the methods used by Mussolini to maintain control. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	The question is focused on the extent of support and control which the Nationalist and Republicans secured during the course of the Spanish Civil War, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that the Nationalists were able to control occupied areas more effectively than the Republicans. Candidates could discuss issues such as popularity and consent, the impact of political leadership and organisation, the use of terror, the impact of foreign intervention and the effect of geographical advantages and limitations on control in the zones of occupation. Although each side enjoyed some support in all areas of Spain, it was vital for eventual success that each side maintain both initial support and continued control of its occupied areas as the war progressed. In support of the suggestion responses may refer to the use by the Nationalists of traditional conservative forces such as the Church and landowners to maintain social and economic control, the imposition of martial law, fear of Republican reprisals and the relatively stable leadership under Franco in contrast to the disorganised control of Republican areas. Candidates may refer to the detrimental impact on Republican zones of the 'civil war within a civil war' and Soviet interference. Answers may point out that whereas Republicans controlled more territory in 1936 by 1939 the Republicans were losing support in their areas and the Nationalists were able to sustain control over occupied zones as they advanced. Although most candidates will probably agree to some extent with the suggestion, to create balance responses may refer to the limitations of Nationalist methods of control or show how the extent of effective control changed over time or in geographic areas. For example, it might be suggested that, although both sides used political terror against opponents within occupied zones, once established the Nationalists seemed to rely on repression while the Republicans relied on consent or that whereas the White Terror resulted in over 150 000 deaths the Red Terror accounted for less than 60 000. Republican zones did suffer from political disunity in the same way as its military organisation but in the early years of the War the social revolution in Catalonia and Aragon and the general stability in Madrid brought unity and popularity. It was only as the hardships of war progressed and the Republican in-fighting became more pronounced that order began to break down completely. Some	30

	responses might also suggest that effective Nationalist control was due to the advantages of having international support from Germany and Italy and better access to food and consumer goods. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address 'how far…more effectively', by considering the strengths of Nationalist control in relation to Republican control, 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 conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the effectiveness of Nationalist control 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. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly explaining the situation in Nationalist and/or Republican zones of control. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	The question is focused on the reasons why Franco was able to remain in power for so long, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that the most important reason was his ability to adapt to changing situations. Candidates may refer to changing internal and/or external situations. Franco managed to remain in power and in control of a conservative state with totalitarian and fascist elements for over twenty-five years until his death. In support of the suggestion that this was mainly due to his ability to adapt, answers might refer to Franco's responses at key points in the chronology when he was clearly under threat or faced with a changing international situation. For example, having remained neutral but with Fascist sympathies during World War II, initial international isolation was broken as Franco responded to the realities of Cold War politics by offering to support US defences in western Europe. In the late 1950s, as his style of personal politics and conservatism came under threat and the economic situation worsened, Franco responded by apparently distancing himself from direct government and introducing economic reforms which created a modern European economy. He introduced a series of laws between 1964-67 which appeared to modernise Spanish government and improved the standard of living of many Spaniards through his support of the tourist industry. As opposition began to emerge in the late 1960s and early 1970s he arranged for a succession based on the traditional Spanish royal family. To establish the extent to which Franco's adaptability was the main reason for his longevity candidates may refer to other factors such as the continued use of fear, repression and censorship which, although generally decreasing, continued throughout his rule, support from the traditional forces of conservatism and the Falange and his own personal popularity and control. Some answers might suggest his longevity was the result of a number of inter-related factors. For example, suggesting that Franco's position was established through an underlying use of repression by conservative forces which allowed him later to implement political reform and increase social consent through the development of a more modern economy. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address 'how far…main reason', by considering Franco's ability to adapt to changing situations 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 conflicting	30

	arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the importance of Franco's ability to adapt 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. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining his ability to adapt and/or the reasons for his longevity. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

F5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	The question is focused on the economic development in East and West Germany in the years 1949-61, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the suggestion that the most important reason for such contrasting development was US support for West Germany. Between 1949 and 1961, West Germany appeared to undergo a 'miracle' recovery from the economic devastation of World War II while the East German economy stagnated and the government was forced to build the Berlin Wall to prevent East German migration to the wealthier west. Candidates might support the suggestion of the importance of US support for West Germany with reference to the consequences of immediate post-War financial support including the creation of Bizonia, the announcement of the Marshall Plan and creation of the Deutschmark, continued investment in the 1950s and indirect support through the demand for military resources created by US involvement in the Korean War. However, the extent of importance might be established through reference to other factors such as the more advantageous economic resources available to the West, the deliberate underdevelopment and isolation of East Germany by the Soviet Union in the post-war years, the different economic beliefs of the domestic governments and the impact of individual West German leaders such as Adenauer and Erhard. Candidates might claim that an alternative factor was more important or suggest that that the contrasting development was so great because of a combination of both US support and Soviet interference in the economies of West and East Germany respectively. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address 'how far…most important', by considering the importance of US support for West Germany 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 conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the role of US support by addressing its strengths and limitations and/or other factors, but the selection of supporting material and/or consideration of the focus may lack	30

	balance or be less secure; there may still be some narrative or descriptive passages. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by outlining US support and/or the contrasting development of the two Germanies. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	The question is focused on the collapse of communism in East Germany in the late 1980s, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the significance of internal opposition in the collapse. Candidates should refer to the growth of internal opposition and the general collapse of communism in East Germany during the final years of the 1980s but responses which focus on the events of 1989 or even early 1990 may access the highest Levels of response. Responses may establish the significance of the role of internal opposition in the collapse of communism with reference to the long-term dislike of communist rule by many people in the GDR and reaction to the events in Poland in the early 1980s but more importantly the growth of Church opposition to the SED from 1986. In 1989 supporters of the New Forum began to organise openly in protest at the local government election results in May which many claimed had been manipulated in favour of the SED. In October large-scale demonstrations took place in Leipzig and Dresden during the forty year celebrations for the East German state. Unlike in previous decades the East German government did not suppress the demonstrations and were not given Soviet backing to do so, so when news leaked that the Berlin Wall was to be opened massive crowds forced its opening on the evening of November 9th and within days a reformist SED government was in place. To further establish the relative significance of the role of internal opposition, responses may refer to the importance of other factors in bringing about collapse or to the limitations of the internal opposition. Candidates might refer to the breakdown of communist rule in other parts of Eastern Europe, the emergence of Mikhail Gorbachev in the USSR, the end of the Brezhnev doctrine, the mistakes of the Honecker government or the short-term events of 1989. Some responses might show the inter-relation of factors suggesting that, although internal opposition was significant in both the long-term reasons and immediate cause of the collapse, the opposition was unlikely to bring an end to communist rule by itself and was more a reflection of the breakdown of communism in Europe in general, for example. Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address significance, by considering the relative importance of the role internal opposition either by establishing both its strengths and limitations or referring 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 conflicting	30

	arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the importance of internal 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. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining the effects of internal opposition and/or the collapse of communism. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	The question is focused on relations between Arabs and Jews in Palestine, and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the reasons for the rapid deterioration in relations in the years 1945-48. With the end of the Second World War long-standing tensions in Palestine resurfaced. Long-standing hostility between Jews and Arabs and the desire of both to gain independence from a war weary Britain meant that the question of partition re-emerged. Added to this was the Jewish determination to establish a permanent homeland in the aftermath of the Holocaust. Relations between Jews and Arabs deteriorated as Jewish groups began direct action, including terrorism, against the British mandate, American support for Jewish emigration to Palestine grew and British control weakened. When the UN voted for the Partition Plan in November 1947, the Jewish Agency accepted the Plan while the Arab Higher Committee rejected it. This was followed by escalating violence between the two sides which was further exacerbated with the British decision to withdraw their mandate by May 1948. Both sides sought to take advantage of the situation leading to a series of violent and escalating incidents, with Arab states sending armed support to Palestinians and Jewish groups attempting to provoke Palestinian emigration through attacks on Arab settlements such as Deir Yassin. When the British finally withdrew on 14th May 1948 the new Jewish state of Israel was declared and war broke out with the surrounding Arab states. Weaker responses may describe the deterioration in relations between Jews and Arabs while stronger answers will analyse with reference to a variety of reasons. Reasons suggested may include the effect of the end of the Second World War on the situation in Palestine, the impact of Jewish policies and actions, the effect of Arab policies and actions, the role of the US, reaction to the UN Partition Plan and the role of the British in both governing and withdrawing from its mandate. Higher Level band responses will evaluate the reasons with reference to the rapid deterioration in relations. These candidates may establish the relative importance of reasons or suggest an inter-relationship between the different reasons for the rapid deterioration in relations Answers at **Level 5** will have a secure focus on the question, will evaluate a variety of different reasons with regard to the rapid deterioration of relations, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth whilst coming to a judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will address the question well, supporting	30

	their analysis with accurate and mostly relevant material. Selection of material may lack balance and may focus mainly one factor, such as the role of the British. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, though supporting material is likely to be descriptive and/or lacking in both depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer a few simple statements about the focus of the question supported by limited though broadly accurate material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	This question is focused on Arab nationalism in the years before 1979 and requires an analysis of, and judgement on, the significance of General Nasser in its development. In the years before 1979 Arab nationalism tended to develop in relation to the political independence and unity of Arab states, support for the Palestinian people and opposition to the state of Israel. Most candidates will probably suggest that Nasser was very significant in the development of Arab nationalism with reference to his emergence as the charismatic leader of Egypt after 1952 and his determination to promote the Arab cause. Nasser's influence in opposing the Baghdad Pact, standing up to the 'West' at Suez, creating the UAR and supporting the establishment of the PLO brought some sense of unity to Arab states determined to oppose the state of Israel. Responses might suggest that it was only after his death in 1970 that post-war Arab nationalism began to disintegrate with the opening up of Arab-Israeli negotiations and the gradual rise of Islamist politics. In order to establish relative significance candidates might discuss the limitations of Nasser's influence, his changing significance over time or the role of other factors in the development of Arab nationalism. Responses might refer to the development of Arab nationalism before Nasser came to power, the creation of the state of Israel, Arab perceptions of 'western interference', the failure of the UAR, the influence of the PLO, the Arab-Israeli wars and the growth of Islamic fundamentalism. Some responses might suggest that Nasser's importance was already declining before his death and that new influences on Arab nationalism were already apparent, particular after the failure of the UAR and the defeat in the Six-Day War (1967). Answers at **Level 5** will clearly address significance, by considering the strength of his importance in relation to influence, time or other factors, and will support the analysis with a range of accurate factual material in some depth. These answers will establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate extent or integrate the factors into an overall judgement. At **Level 4** candidates will focus on the question well, they will begin to consider the importance of General Nasser 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	30

	narrative or descriptive passages. **Level 3** answers will attempt analysis with some understanding of the focus of the question, possibly by explaining his importance and/or the development of Arab nationalism to 1949. However, the supporting material is likely to be descriptive or lacking in depth and relevance in places, and there may be some inaccuracies. At **Level 2** will be those who offer some relevant simple statements about the question asked supported by limited, though broadly accurate, material in places. **Level 1** responses will consist of a few simple statements with some relevance to an aspect of the question asked.	

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL