edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Mark Scheme (Results)
January 2011

GCE

GCE History (6HI01/F)

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

A PEARSON COMPANY

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

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

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

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

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

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

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034

January 2011

Publications Code

US026443

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**	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 factual material 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%**

F1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	The question is focused on the extent to which revolutionary activity in Italy in the years 1848-49 was primarily caused by economic grievances. Answers may focus on the underlying economic grievances in the main areas of revolutionary activity, such as the increasing cost of living in the more economically advanced northern towns, the poverty of the agricultural south and the taxation burden in areas controlled by Austria. Candidates may refer to the influence of the *Riformisti* in encouraging industrial reform through political reform, the promise of economic reforms by Pope Pius IX and the tobacco strikes in Milan. Many candidates may challenge the given factor with reference to alternative causes such as growing liberal and nationalist ideas, the emergence of Piedmont or the Papacy as potential challenges to Austrian dominance, the actions of Austria and the general revolutionary atmosphere in Europe at the time. However, to access Level 4 these candidates must address the given factor directly to explain how and/or why economic grievances were not the primary cause of the revolutions. A simple description of the contribution of economic grievances and/or other factors will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address reasons for the outbreak of the 1848-49 revolutions, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on economic grievances as a factor and compare with other factors, although at this level balance is not required. Candidates may suggest, for example, that although economic grievances played a role in the outbreak of revolutionary activity political ideas and expectations were more influential. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate extent by considering a range of factors to establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement. Some candidates at this level may emphasise that as the Italian peninsula was made up different states there was more than one primary cause depending on the circumstances in individual states.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	The question is focused on the role of French intervention in the process of Italian unification and requires an analysis of the extent to which French intervention prevented Italian unification from being achieved more quickly. Answers may focus on the continued presence of a French garrison in Rome for most of the period and the failure of France in the Franco-Austrian War (1859), and the subsequent agreement at Villafranca, to expel Austria fully from Italy leading to the continued absence of Venetia and Rome from the kingdom of Italy after 1861, and the eventual loss of Nice and Savoy. Candidates may refer to Napoleon III's reluctance to support the widespread expansion of Piedmont into northern and central Italy after the defeats of 1859, the withdrawal and subsequent return of French troops to Rome in 1866 and the lack of progress in diplomatic attempts to gain French withdrawal from Rome up to 1870, thus preventing Rome becoming the capital of the new kingdom. Responses may, however, determine extent by the counter argument that without French intervention the dominance of Austria would not have been broken and the unification under Piedmont much slower. Some candidates may suggest that there were other obstacles to Italian unification such as the reluctance of Piedmont to expand into the less developed south, the continued strength of Austria to 1866 or the reluctance of the Papacy to relinquish control of Rome. A simple description of French intervention in Italy will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the extent and/or effect of French intervention, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on the extent of French intervention as an obstacle to unification, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate extent by considering a range of factors to establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement. For example, candidates may suggest that French intervention may have promoted the expansion of Piedmont but acted as an obstacle to Rome becoming the capital of a unified Italy until 1870.	30

F2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	The question is focused on the extent of progress towards German unification in the years 1848-52. Answers may focus on the failures of the Frankfurt Parliament, the rejection of the German crown by Friedrich Wilhelm, the failure of the Erfurt Union and the re-emergence of Austrian influence with the 'capitulation of Olmutz'. Candidates may also refer to the failure to establish German unity through liberal forces and the reluctance of German princes to accept a Prussian *kleindeutsch* solution. The accuracy of the statement may be challenged by the suggestion that although there may seem to have been little progress there were indications of the nature of future unification such as the initial success of the Frankfurt Parliament, the weakness of the Austrian Empire, moves toward economic unity and the emergence of Prussia as a potential challenge to Austrian power. A simple description of the failure to achieve unification between 1848-52 will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the extent of progress, though there may be passages of narrative or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will assess directly the accuracy of the statement, though balance is not required. Answers at Level 5 will include some attempt to evaluate the accuracy of the suggestion in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt an integrated overall judgement.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	The question is focused on the process of German unification and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the role of military force in the eventual outcome. Answers may support the suggestion with reference to the development of Prussian military power in the 1860s leading to war with Denmark over Schleswig-Holstein (1864), war with Austria (1866) and war with France (1870). Candidates may suggest that these wars led to the gradual unification of Germany under the influence of Prussia through developments such as the Gastein Convention (1865), the North German Confederation (1867) and the proclamation of the German Empire (1871). However, candidates may challenge the suggestion perhaps by reference to the role of Bismarck's diplomacy in manipulating the course of events leading to war and taking advantage of subsequent military victories or to other factors that contributed to the eventual outcome, such as the growth of Prussian economic power, the weakness of Austria, the reactions of the German princes and the actions of other European powers. A simple descriptive outline of military events in the years 1862-71 will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who offer some implicit analysis of the role of military force will access Level 3, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the role of military force compared to other factors, such as Bismarck's diplomacy, though the answer may be unbalanced. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to develop alternative arguments within a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate conflicting arguments into an overall judgement such as suggesting that without successfully taking advantage of the situation created by successive military victories the use of military force in itself was unlikely to have led to unification.	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	The question is focused on the success of the Liberal State in overcoming political problems from the 1890s to 1914.. Answers may focus on the threats to political stability in the 1890s and the extent to which *Giolittismo* had managed to overcome these problems by 1914. Candidates may refer to the limited nature of the Italian constitution, the corruption and lack of confidence associated with the politics of 'transformism' and the challenges from socialists, nationalists and the Catholic Church which led to peasant disorder, urban tension and the possibility of civil government being formally suspended in 1899. Responses may determine the extent to which these problems had been solved by 1914 by reference to the policies established under the influence of the Italian politician Giolitti. Answers may suggest that after 1900 there were attempts to apply 'transformist' policies to bring socialism and the Catholic Church into the mainstream, that reform legislation helped to stabilise the economy in the north and to improve conditions in the south, that the franchise was extended and that nationalists were appeased by successes in the Libyan War (1911-12). Candidates may also challenge the extent to which problems had been solved by reference to the continuous changes in political leadership, the continued success of extreme nationalists, the reluctance of socialists to accept political compromise, the difficulties faced by Italy in trying to be accepted as a great power and the continued economic and social divisions that threatened Italian unity. A simple description of attempt to overcome political problems from the 1890s to 1914 will be marked in Levels 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the success of attempts to solve such problems, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on the extent of success over time, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate the extent to which the problems had been solved in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	The question is focused on the rise of the Fascist Party in Italy in the years 1919-25 and requires an analysis, and judgement, as to whether Mussolini's leadership was the main reason for the rise to power. Answers may focus on Mussolini's leadership abilities with reference to his skill in keeping the party united through the development of a flexible political programme, his willingness to sponsor both legal and illegal methods to gain support, his charismatic appeal, his oratorical skills, his manipulation of political institutions and his reluctance to compromise. Candidates may refer to the establishment of the *Fasci di Combattimento* (1919), his resignation and reappointment as its leader (August 1921), the creation of the PNF (November 1921), his manipulation of the March on Rome (1922), and the consolidation of his personal power in the years 1922-25 culminating in the Matteotti affair. Candidates who focus specifically on the growth in power of the Fascist party 1919-1925 should be rewarded. The accuracy of the statement may be challenged by reference to other factors that influenced the rise of the Fascist Party such as the favourable political and economic situation at the end of World War I, the popularity of Fascist policies, the failure of Liberal politicians to provide an alternative solution, the role of the monarchy, the traditional elites and the Catholic Church in appointing a Fascist Prime Minister and the use of intimidation and violence in establishing and consolidating the power of the Party in Italy. A simple description of the rise of the Fascist Party and/or Mussolini's leadership will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the accuracy of the suggestion with reference to Mussolini's role as leader and/or the role of other factors, though there may be passages of narrative or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will assess directly the accuracy of the statement with reference to the contribution of Mussolini's leadership compared to other factors, though balance is not required. Answers at Level 5 will include some attempt to evaluate the accuracy of the suggestion in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt an integrated overall judgement.	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	The question is focused on the failure of republican government in Spain during the years 1931-36 and the extent to which this was caused by the opposition of the army. Answers may focus on the opposition of the army throughout the period but with particular reference to the final downfall of the Popular Front government in 1936. Candidates may refer to army responses to the anti-conservative reforms of 1931-32, particularly Azana's military reforms, General Sanjuro's attempted coup in 1932, the resentment of individual generals and the final preparations for a military uprising against the Popular Front, suggesting that the failure of the army to give unanimous support to the Republic contributed to its instability. Candidates may challenge the responsibility with reference to the role of the army in the creation of the Republic in 1931, the support of the army during the rightist government of Lerroux, Franco's suppression of the Asturias Rising, the appointment of Gil Robles as Minister for War and the lack of large-scale support for a military coup until after 1935. When considering extent candidates may refer to the role of other factors in the failure of republican government such as the lack of fulfilment of hopes raised by early radical reforms, the reaction of other conservative elements such as the Church, divisions amongst leftist supporters of the republic, increasing violence and separatist ambitions in Catalonia and the Basque region. A simple description of the opposition of the army or the failures in republican government will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the reasons for the failures of republican government, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on the extent to which the opposition of the army undermined the Republic in comparison to other factors, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate extent by considering a range of factors to establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	The question is focused on nature of the transition from dictatorship to monarchy in Spain in 1975. Candidates should refer to the reasons why the transition was so successful and their relative importance. Answers may refer to the groundwork laid by Franco to return the position of the monarch as Head of State from the late 1960s, the personality and promises of Juan Carlos, Juan Carlos' actions on the death of Franco, the support of conservative elements within Spain, the economic instability of the early 1970s, the power of the political framework created by Franco, the favourable international situation and the increased repression and return to more conservative policies after 1970. It is possible that the extent of success may be challenged by reference to the tensions created in 1975 by the economic recession, Basque separatism and the continued repression of political activity and the concerns that without substantial political concessions extreme politics would re-emerge in Spain, but this is not required. A simple description of the transition to monarchy will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address causation, though there may be substantial passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed supporting evidence. Level 4 answers will focus directly on the statement considering a variety of reasons for success, and begin to compare reasons, although balance is not necessary at this level. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate the reasons for success perhaps referring to the importance of one factor in relation to others and/or evaluating the extent to which transition was successful by considering a range of factors to establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response. The best responses may evaluate or integrate reasons into an overall judgement.	30

F5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	The question is focused on the political and economic development of East Germany in the years 1949-90 and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the significance of Soviet influence during those years. Answers may focus on the influence of the Soviet Union in East Germany with reference to Soviet occupation at the end of World War II, the development of a Communist state and socialist economic policies, the direct intervention of the Soviets in 1953, the use of East Germany as a symbol of Cold War politics and the collapse of Soviet influence in the 1980s leading to eventual reunification. In order to assess this significance, candidates may refer to other influences which affected political and economic development or to changes over time. Other influences may include the communist tradition in Germany, underlying economic advantages, reaction to events in the West, and the beliefs and policies of East German politicians such as Ulbricht and Honecker. A simple descriptive outline of the political and economic development of East Germany and/or Soviet influence will be marked in Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. At Level 3 will be those who begin to assess the influence of the Soviet Union and/or other factors, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the significance of Soviet influence compared to other factors, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to address 'how significant', by reference to the relative significance of other factors or change over time in a broadly balanced response, while the best responses may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	This question is focused on the role of West German government in the rapid reunification of Germany in the years 1989-91. Answers may focus on the activities of the West German government, and Chancellor Kohl in particular. Candidates may refer to Kohls' '10 Point' plan to reunify Germany announced on 28 November 1989, support gained by the CDU in the 1990 elections in West Germany, Kohl's diplomacy in gaining acceptance from both the USA and USSR and economic and political promises made to the East German electorate in the democratic elections of March 1990. Relevant factors that may be used to assess and evaluate the given factor may include the collapse of authority in East Germany in 1989 leaving a political vacuum, the support of President Bush, the neutrality of the Soviet Union and the support of the German population. Some candidates may suggest that the rapid reunification was due more to the individual will of Helmut Kohl than the actions of the West German government. At Level 1 the candidates may make simple statements about the actions of the West German government or the rapid move towards reunification. A response which provides a broadly accurate narrative of the role of the West German government or an alternative factor should be marked at Level 2. Level 3 responses may also provide broadly accurate narrative answers but with implicit or partial links to the significance of the West German government or will begin to assess extent but with weakly developed supporting evidence. At Level 4, candidates should consider explicitly the extent to which the West German government was responsible, perhaps with reference to the lack of support from other western European powers, and should analyse the extent of the importance of the given factor in comparison to other relevant factors, although balance related to judgement is not required at this Level. At Level 5, the focus of the question should be directly addressed and candidates will attempt to evaluate explicitly the extent to which the West German government was responsible for reunification.	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	The question is focused on reasons for the outcomes in successive Arab-Israeli conflict in the years 1948-73 and requires analysis, and judgement, of the role of foreign powers in these conflicts. Answers may focus on foreign intervention in the conflicts with reference particularly to foreign involvement in the Suez Crisis, the role of the UN security council in the final resolution of the Six Days War and the role of the USA and the USSR in the outcome of the 1973 War. Candidates may also refer to the foreign military support on both sides and the influence of Cold War politics. To establish extent candidates may refer to the importance of other factors such as Israeli military superiority and Arab disunity or refer to the specific outcomes of each of the four major conflicts. Better responses may suggest that, apart from the Suez Crisis, foreign powers often became involved in the resolution of the conflicts rather than the outcomes of the wars themselves. A simple description of Arab-Israeli conflicts in the years 1948-73 will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address foreign intervention and/or other factors, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on foreign intervention in comparison with other factors or with reference to the specific outcomes of different conflicts, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate extent by considering a range of factors or situations over time to establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	The question is focused on the reasons for instability in the Gulf region in the years 1979-2001 and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the role of the Iraqi government. Answers may support the suggestion with reference to Iraqi aggression against Iraq in 1979, Iraqi actions during the Iran-Iraq War, Saddam Hussein's military expansion in the 1980s and 1990s, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, Saddam Hussein's outspoken attacks on Israel and the uncertainty surrounding Iraq's nuclear and biological capabilities in the late 1990s. However, candidates may also challenge the suggestion with reference to other factors such the rise of an Islamist state in Iran, traditional Sunni and Shiite divisions, Israeli actions, Kuwaiti economic policies in the 1980s, the rise of Islamic fundamentalism and the role of foreign powers. Response may also refer to the influence of different factors at different times. A simple descriptive outline of instability in the Gulf region in the years 1979-2001 and/or Iraqi actions will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who offer some implicit analysis of the role of Iraqi actions and/or other factors will access Level 3, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the role of Iraq compared to other factors, such as the role of foreign powers, though the answer may be unbalanced. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to develop alternative arguments within a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate conflicting arguments into an overall judgement such as suggesting that although Iraqi actions did cause instability in the Gulf these actions were often influenced by other factors such as traditional Sunni-Shiite traditions and apparent encouragement of foreign powers.	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
13	The question is focused on the reasons for increased stability in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924-29 and requires an analysis, and judgement, of the role of Gustav Stresemann in achieving this stability. Answers may focus on the consequences of Stresemann's actions as Chancellor in 1923 and his role as Foreign Minister in the year 1924-29. Candidates may refer to the relative economic stability that emerged out of Stresemann's handling of the crises of 1923, the resulting reduction in political extremism and the increasing confidence that came with Stresemann's foreign agreements with reference to the 'golden years' of Weimar. To establish extent candidates may refer to other factors leading to stability such as the election of President Hindenburg, the role of Hans Luther in creating financial stability and the desire of Germany's wartime enemies to encourage international co-operation to prevent the collapse of Weimar. At the higher levels candidates may challenge the assumption that Germany did experience increased stability and that, although Stresemann may have contributed to a period of relative stability, Germany was still politically and economically unstable. A simple description of the policies of Gustav Stresemann and/or the situation in Germany in the years 1924-29 will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the role of Stresemann and/or other factors, though there may be substantial passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on the contribution of Stresemann in comparison with other factors, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate extent by considering a range of factors to establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
14	The question is focused on reasons for the defeat of Germany in World War II and the extent to which the failure of Nazi economic policy contributed to the defeat. Answers may focus on the economic difficulties faced by Germany in World War II and the effect that these had on the ability of Germany to fight the war effectively. Candidates may refer to the ways in which shortages of raw materials, shortages of labour, the inability to achieve autarky, reluctance to employ women in industry, conflicts between the production of military and domestic goods undermined the ability of Germany to consolidate initial victories and that the strain put on the workforce to increase industrial production and efficiency affected morale in the later stages of the war. To consider the extent of the contribution to Germany's defeat, however, candidates may refer to other factors that were relatively more or less important and/or to changing circumstances over time. Answers may refer to other factors such as the rapid conquest of European territory resulting in the stretching of resources, the effect of German campaigns such as Operation Barbarossa, the nature of Nazi bureaucracy, Hitler's leadership and the effectiveness of allied counter-offensives including allied bombing. Some candidates may suggest that, despite initial difficulties with economic production, in the final years of the war under the economic leadership of Todt and Speer increased war production contributed to Germany's ability to maintain the war effort with production being undermined by allied bombing rather than failures in policy. A simple description of the German war economy and/or the reasons for Germany's defeat will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the reasons for Germany's defeat, though there may be substantial passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on the failure of German economic policies as a factor in the defeat of Germany in comparison with other factors, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate extent by considering a range of factors or change over time to establish conflicting arguments in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.	30

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US026443 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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