

Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2011

GCE History (6HI01/E)

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 contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk

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

June 2011

Publications Code US028132

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

General Marking Guidance

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

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

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

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

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

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

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

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

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

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

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

Unit 1 Assessment Grid

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

E1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on the extent to which the territorial and political agreements relating to Italy made at the Vienna Congress (1815) had been overthrown by 1849. Candidates may establish extent by comparing the situation in 1815 with that of 1849. Answers may refer to the intent at Vienna to remove French influence, restore legitimate authoritarian rulers and to ensure the dominance of Austrian control over the Italian peninsula. Responses may refer to the main geographical settlement with the Two Sicilies under Bourbon control, the Papal States ruled from the Vatican, Piedmont-Sardinia controlled by the House of Savoy, Austrian influence firmly established in the Central Duchies and direct Austrian control in Lombardy and Venetia. Candidates may suggest that despite the actions of 1848-49 in Italy when the ideals of the Settlement were contested by liberal, nationalist, republican and constitutional challenges very little had actually changed by 1849. Answers may refer to the restoration of Austrian influence, the return of monarchical and papal rule and the failure of nationalist, liberal and republican causes. Other candidates may suggest that despite the apparent lack of change there were signs of change such as the weakening of Austrian influence, the attitude of other European powers and the emergence of a constitutional monarchy in Piedmont that gave hope to moderate nationalists. A simple descriptive outline of the settlement in 1815 and the situation in 1849 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 extent of change perhaps by referring to the lack of change, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the extent of change over time, although at this level response will tend to lack balance. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to assess the extent of change by direct comparison in a broadly balanced evaluation.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on the process of Italian unification in the years 1850-70 and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the significance of Victor Emmanuel in the promotion of Italian unity. Answers may focus on the role of Victor Emmanuel as king of the leading Italian state to challenge Austrian influence. Candidates may refer to his vocal challenges to Austria, his appointment of Cavour as Prime Minister (1851), his support for Cavour's diplomacy, his direct intervention in relations with Napoleon III in 1858 and his encouragement of the plebiscites and military actions which eventually unified Italy. In order to assess his significance candidates may refer to the role of other individuals, such as Cavour or Garibaldi, in attempting to unite Italy comparing their contribution in relation to that of Victor Emmanuel. Better answers may focus on the concept of 'promoting' Italian unification and suggest that Victor Emmanuel was more of an opportunist or was more concerned with expanding his personal power or the power of Piedmont rather than the unification of Italy. These answers may refer to his establishment of control at the beginning of his reign, his ambiguous attitude towards the agreement at Villafranca (1859) and his opportunistic response to Garibaldi's successes in 1860. A simple descriptive outline of the role of Victor Emmanuel in the process of unification 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 his contribution to the process of unification, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess his significance in comparison to other factors or individuals and/or his 'promotion' of Italian unification, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to address 'how significant', by presenting conflicting arguments or the relative significance of other factors in a broadly balanced response, while the best responses may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.</p>	30

E2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>The question is focused on the process of German unification and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the significance of Bismarck's diplomacy in achieving unification. In order to assess his significance candidates may refer to events before Bismarck was appointed Minister-President in 1862. Answers may focus on Bismarck's use of diplomacy to bring the German states under the influence of Prussia through a series of wars and agreements that resulted in the creation of the German Empire in 1871. Candidates may refer to Bismarck's apparent manipulation of events that led Prussia into victorious wars with Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870) and which allowed Bismarck to ensure Prussian economic dominance in Germany, Austrian exclusion from Germany and the agreement of both the northern and southern German Princes to a united Germany under Prussia. Answers may also refer to Bismarck's ability to maintain the neutrality of other European powers. Answers may question the extent of the significance of Bismarckian diplomacy with reference to other factors such as the military developments in Prussia, the favourable international situation in the 1860s, the development of increasing economic unity before 1862, the weakness of Austria and the role of Wilhelm I. A simple descriptive outline of events in the years 1862-71 or of Bismarck's diplomatic activity 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 Bismarck's role, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the significance of Bismarck's diplomacy perhaps in comparison to other factors, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to address 'how significant', by presenting conflicting arguments or the relative significance of other factors in a broadly balanced response, while the best responses may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>The question is focused on Bismarck's political relationship with the National Liberals and requires an analysis of the extent of change during the years 1871-90. Answers may include references to the 'liberal era' of Bismarck's government between 1871 and 1878 when Bismarck worked with the National Liberals, as the dominant political party within the Reichstag, to ensure national unity, economic progress and administrative reform. Candidates may suggest that this changed after 1878 when Bismarck moved away from supporting some of the major policies of the National Liberals such as free trade and <i>Kulturkampf</i> and gave support to more conservative economic and political policies such as protectionism and anti-socialist laws. Some candidates may establish extent by questioning the nature of Bismarck's alliance with the National Liberals from the start with reference to the lack of progressive constitutional reform, failure of the Reichstag to control military expenditure and continued press censorship, whilst others may refer to the popularity of the National Liberals over time in relation to Bismarck's willingness to work with them. Better answers might suggest that, despite the worsening of relations over time, Bismarck hoped that a coalition of Conservative and National Liberal votes in the Reichstag would help him in his final attempts to maintain political control in 1890. A simple descriptive outline of the change in relationship over time will be marked in Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material.</p> <p>At Level 3 will be those who begin to imply the extent of change perhaps by referring to the changes during 1878-79, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the extent of change over time perhaps with reference to the nature of the relationship, although at this level responses will tend to lack balance. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to assess the extent of change by direct reference to the relationship over the whole period in a broadly balanced evaluation.</p>	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for political instability in Italy in the years 1896-1922 and requires analysis, and judgement, of the extent to which Italy's attempts to become a great power was responsible for this instability. Answers may focus on the negative consequences of Italy's attempts to become a great power with reference to the Italian defeat at Adowa in 1896, the relative lack of respect for Italy in the Triple Alliance, the failure to uphold the Alliance in 1914, the change of support to the Entente powers in 1915 and the failure to achieve Italian aims at Versailles, all of which undermined the political stability of the Liberal State. Some candidates may suggest that even the relative success of the Libyan War (1911-12) led to further instability in that it encouraged nationalist extremism. Candidates may consider the extent to which Italian attempts to become a great power was 'responsible' for political instability in comparison to domestic factors such as the weak constitutional position in Italy, the lack of respect for the political integrity of the Liberal State, the threat of socialist and nationalist opponents, the opposition of the Catholic Church and economic and social problems. Some candidates may interpret 'great power' with reference to making Italy a stronger state domestically as well. However to achieve the higher levels, answers should refer to foreign policy as a major part of the overall desire to become a 'great power'. A simple description of Italian attempts to become a great power and/or Italian political instability 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 political instability, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on the role of Italian attempts to become a great power 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 the extent to which political instability was caused by the desire to be a great power 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 might suggest that although Italian attempts to become a great power undermined the stability of the Liberal State, the cause of instability was more deeply rooted in the domestic situation.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on reasons for the success of Fascist control in Italy during the years 1925-43 and the extent to which this was achieved by the use of propaganda. Answers may focus on the successful propaganda methods and campaigns promoted by the Fascist regime. Candidates may refer to the deliberate use of mass culture, such as film and the press, to promote popular policies such as the draining of the Pontine Marshes, the organisation and control of leisure time, particularly the promotion of sport, emphasis on the propagation of fascist ideas, such as the 'battles' for grain and births, and the self-promotion of Mussolini as <i>Il Duce</i>. To consider the extent to which control was the result of propaganda candidates may consider other factors or question the effectiveness of Mussolini's propaganda itself. Answers may suggest other factors such as the use of intimidation and the police state, the genuine success of various political and social policies, the effective leadership of Mussolini and the support of the Catholic Church. At the higher levels candidates may question the effectiveness of the propaganda with reference to the relative failure of the 'battles' for grain and births or may suggest that different factors were responsible for Fascist control at different times. A simple description of propaganda methods and/or other methods of control 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 propaganda and/or other factors in the development of Fascist control, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on effective propaganda as a factor in maintaining control 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.</p>	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the victory of the Nationalists in the Spanish Civil War and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the contribution of foreign support to the Nationalist cause. Answers may support the suggestion with reference to the initial supply of German and Italian aircraft and military technology to the Nationalist forces during the early months of the war, the support from Portugal and the supply of oil and materials by American companies such as Texaco and Ford. Responses may also refer to the recognition of Franco as Head of State by Germany and Italy in November 1936, which resulted in the deployment of German and Italian advisers and armed forces, the success of the Condor Legions and the role of Germany and Italy in the agreements that brought the war to an end. However, candidates may also challenge the suggestion with reference to the initial strengths of the Nationalists, the leadership of Franco, the 'non-intervention' of Britain and France, unity amongst the Nationalists and disunity within the Republican forces. A simple descriptive outline of the nature of foreign support for the Nationalists and/or the reasons for the success of the Nationalists 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 reasons for Nationalist success 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 contribution of foreign support compared to other factors, such as the divisions within Republican forces, 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 a overall judgement such as suggesting that, whilst support from Germany and Italy was influential, the initial strengths of the Nationalists combined with the divisions of the Republican forces contributed more significantly to the Nationalist victory.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question is focused on the extent to which Franco's repressive policies may have changed in the later period of his regime. Answers may focus on the nature of Franco's authoritarianism before 1960 with reference to his attempts to control the political, economic and social situation within Spain in favour conservative forces and the ways in which this may have changed from 1960 with reference to the economic reforms introduced to combat growing tensions in the 1950s, the social liberalisation resulting from increased tourism and moderate political reforms which led to less press censorship, religious toleration, the introduction of a form of parliamentary election and the decision to reinstate a form of constitutional monarchy on the death of Franco. Candidates may challenge the extent to which Franco's regime became less repressive by reference to continued political repression throughout the period and may suggest that, despite some minor reforms in the 1960s, as opposition to Franco's regime grew from workers and some elements of the Catholic Church repressive measures were reintroduced in the early 1970s. A simple description of Franco's policies or the situation in Spain from 1960 will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to focus on the authoritarian nature of Franco's regime, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed analysis. Level 4 answers will focus on the extent to which Franco's regime changed 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 Franco's regime became less repressive 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.</p>	30

E5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the West German 'economic miracle' and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the role of Adenauer in achieving economic growth and prosperity in the years 1949-63.</p> <p>Answers may support the suggestion with reference to Adenauer's stable leadership of West Germany from 1949, his support for a social market economy, his willingness to work with the western Allies, the redistribution of wealth in West Germany during the early 1950s and his overseeing of West German entry into the Common Market in 1957. However, to establish extent candidates may also challenge the suggestion with reference to other factors such as the willingness of the western Allies to enable West German economic progress in the face of communism, the infrastructure still available to West Germany after 1945, the stimulus of the Korean War and, in particular, the work of the Economics Minister Ludwig Erhard. At the higher levels candidates may challenge whether the economic growth and prosperity was as great as has been suggested. A simple descriptive outline of the role of Adenauer and/or the development of the West German economy will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who begin to analyse the role of Adenauer and/or other factors will access Level 3, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material or weakly developed supporting material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the extent to which Adenauer was responsible compared to other factors, 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 West Germany was in a good position to achieve economic growth after the war and that Erhard may have provided the effective economic policies, but it was Adenauer who laid the groundwork and stability in which progress could be achieved.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>The question is focused on the relationship between West and East Germany in the years 1945-91 and reason why events in Berlin appeared to play such a prominent role. Answers may focus on the Berlin Blockade (1948-49), the Berlin Wall Crisis (1961), the focus on the Berlin Wall as the symbol of East-West division from the 1960s onwards, the opening of the Berlin Wall (1989) and the restoration of Berlin as the capital of a united Germany (1989). Responses may suggest that Berlin was so important because of its symbolic and geographic significance as the capital of Germany before the division and its land-locked isolation within Communist bloc territory. Each of the main events can be seen to highlight different stages in the relationship between West and East Germany with the Blockade clearly establishing the likelihood of the formal division of Germany into two separate states, the building of the Berlin Wall emphasising the economic division between the two states, the opening up of transit between the two states in the 1970s reflecting the policies of Ostpolitik and the physical destruction of the Wall in 1989 admitting the failure of the East German government. It is possible that the extent of importance may be challenged by reference to events in Berlin as being more symbolic than real, with the events reflecting rather than influencing policies and the suggestion that relations between the two states was affected more by the policies of individual German leaders or by the external influences of the Western alliance and the Russian-led Communist bloc, but this is not required. A simple description of events in Berlin during the years 1945-91 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 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 importance, and will begin to compare reasons or challenge the suggestion, although balance is not necessary at this level. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate the reasons for events being 'so important', perhaps referring to the importance of one factor in relation to others and/or evaluating the extent to which the events were important 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.</p>	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the emergence of an independent Israel in 1948 and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the extent to which American support was responsible. Answers may support the suggestion with reference to support within America for Zionist groups in Israel, Jewish emigration to Israel and the influence of America on the UN partition plan. However, candidates may also challenge the suggestion with reference to other factors such as the situation post-1945, the withdrawal of the British mandate, the difficulties of implementing the UN plan and the rejection of partition by Palestinian supporters or may suggest that although American support was influential it was an underlying factor rather than the main cause.</p> <p>A simple descriptive outline of the events leading to the emergence of an independent Israel 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 American support 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 contribution of American support compared to other factors, such as the failure of the British mandate, 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.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>The question is focused on Arab disunity in the years 1945-79 and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the extent to which this was caused by the self-interest of Arab states. Answers may support the suggestion with reference to the different aims of individual states in the war of 1948, the actions of Egypt in the 1950s, Syria's role in the failure of the UAR, the reaction to Palestinian refugees in border territories, the actions of the oil-rich Gulf states and the move towards detente by Egypt in the late 1970s. However, candidates may also challenge the suggestion with reference to religious divisions with the Arab states, geographical expanse, differences in attitude towards the Palestinian situation, the ambitions of individual leaders such as Nasser, the success of Israel in various conflicts and the influence of foreign powers. A simple descriptive outline of Arab disunity in the years 1945-79 and/or the actions of individual Arab states 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 self-interest 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 self-interest compared to other factors, 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</p>	30

arguments into an overall judgement such as suggesting that disunity was caused by different factors at different times.	
--	--

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028132 June 2011

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

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

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

