

Mark scheme

Sample assessment materials for
first teaching September 2015

GCE History (9HI0/2D)
Advanced

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2D.1: The unification of
Italy, c1830–70

Option 2D.2: The unification of
Germany, c1840–71

Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

Section B

Target: AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: indicative content

Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, c1830–70

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the extent to which Napoleon III was an obstacle to the process of Italian unification in the years 1849–59.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a letter sent by a man who is aware that he will soon be executed, so he arguably has nothing to lose • The purpose of the letter appears to be to persuade Napoleon III to rethink his position about Italy • The fact that Napoleon III allowed it to be published suggests that he had an agenda in seeing it widely available. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent to which Napoleon III was an obstacle to the process of Italian unification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It suggests that the impact of the involvement by France in the outcome of the 1848–49 revolutions is referenced ('the very fault of the French') • Orsini refers to Napoleon III as having 'destroyed the hope of liberty' in Italy – this suggests he was a clear obstacle • It provides evidence of Orsini's view of the potential benefits that are available if Napoleon III revises his views, thus suggesting that he did not think Napoleon was an obstacle. 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An army of 20,000 was sent from France in 1849 to help the Pope bring an end to the Roman Republic • The agreement reached between Napoleon and Cavour at Plombieres to work together • It could be argued that one of Napoleon's aims was to use Italian affairs to advance his own prestige rather than to aid in the process of Italian unification and his actions reflected this. <p>Source 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the terms of an agreement between France and Piedmont – a legal document • The terms of the agreement had been directly negotiated between Napoleon III and Cavour • The terms of the agreement appear to anticipate a future war with Austria.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the extent to which Napoleon III was an obstacle to the process of Italian unification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence that Napoleon III was committing France to support Piedmont in a war against Austria • It suggests that the likely outcome of such a war was the creation of 'the Kingdom of Northern Italy' • It provides evidence that Napoleon III was planning for France to benefit from involvement in the war – new territory to be gained ('Nice and Savoy') at no cost as the Kingdom of Northern Italy should bear the cost. <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting at Plombières was a secret meeting • The truce with Austria at Villafranca in 1859 drove Austria out of Lombardy, even though Piedmont believed this was a French betrayal • Nice and Savoy had links to France and many would not have considered them to be an integral part of Italy. <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been suggested that the assassination attempt by the author of Source 1 led to the agreement outlined in Source 2 • It has been suggested that Napoleon may have used the attempt on his life as an excuse to intervene in Italy, something that he was planning to do anyway • There is a clear contrast between the official language of Source 2 and the emotional plea of Source 1.

Option 2D.2: The unification of Germany, c1840–71

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the reasons for the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament.</p> <p>Source 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author was a leading member of the Frankfurt Parliament and involved in the decision-making process at a high level ('secretary to the committee') • The nature of the comments indicate that the author favoured a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> approach over a <i>Grossdeutschland</i> approach • This is reinforced by the fact that the author left the Parliament once King Frederick William IV had refused the throne. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It suggests the existence of divisions in the Frankfurt Assembly between the <i>Kleindeutschland</i> and <i>Grossdeutschland</i> approaches • It suggests that the Assembly would be unlikely to be able to create a united Germany and satisfy all interests • It provides evidence of the close relationship that already existed between Germany and Prussia. 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Frankfurt Assembly was divided between the majority of liberal members who wanted a moderate settlement and a radical and a conservative minority whose aims were very different • The failure to resolve the debate over the <i>Kleindeutschland</i>/<i>Grossdeutschland</i> approach • Both Prussia and Austria wished to maintain their position. <p>Source 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author was a participant in the events he is describing • The author may have had access to high-quality information through his newspaper • The author has a clear perspective on the events he is describing • Notwithstanding the perspective of the author, the tone of the piece seems quite balanced – this may be the result of the benefit of hindsight that he brings to it.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides evidence of divisions between those seeking change: there was 'little sympathy' from the liberals when the republican rising in South Germany was put down • It suggests the apparent importance of the liberals in decision making, and the limited scope of their demands • It suggests that too much time was spent on debating, rather than action • It points to the development of opposition from King Frederick William IV. <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Frankfurt Assembly did not have the support of the masses – it was the product of a middle-class, liberal revolution • The length of time that was spent in discussion and the difficulty this posed for reaching decisions, e.g. over the constitution • The refusal of King Frederick William IV of Prussia to accept the crown • The failure of the Assembly was linked to the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions. <p>Sources 3 and 4</p> <p>The following points could be made about sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source 3 seems to be optimistic about the future, but Source 4 is less so • Differing perspectives on the role played by Prussia; Source 3 is positive, but Source 4's view changes as events progress • Source 3 would appear to be only a moderate supporter of change as he left the Assembly when Frederick William IV refused the crown, whereas Source 4 appears to be more committed.

Section B: indicative content

Option 2D.1: The unification of Italy, c1830–70

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that the strength of Austrian opposition to Italian unification was the principal reason for the slow progress made in the years 1830–48.</p> <p>The ways in which the strength of Austrian opposition contributed to the slow progress towards unification in the years 1830–48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Habsburg Empire was opposed to unification since there was no desire for a united Italy on the southern border of the Empire • Austrian control over parts of the peninsula impeded any moves towards unification • Austria's commitment to maintaining its control through military means, e.g. in putting down the revolution in Modena in 1831 and winning the battle of Custoza in 1848 • Piedmont was the only power with a sizeable army and even Piedmont was too weak to act by itself. <p>Other factors that contributed to the slow progress towards unification in the years 1830–48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The separation of the peninsula into seven states – all of the rulers, whatever their background, wanted to maintain the status quo • Fragmentation of Italian society and culture meant there was not a strong sense of unity • Divisions amongst the liberal and nationalist groups within Italy over what direction to take • The opposition to unification from Spanish interests that were represented in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies • It had been hoped that France would intervene in 1831 to support the revolutions, but this help did not materialise. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that Garibaldi's contribution to the unification of Italy was outweighed by the problems he created.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence for the importance of Garibaldi's contribution to Italian unification should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He was a follower of Mazzini and was involved in the Young Italy movement, thus setting the scene for the process of unification • His involvement in the defence of the Roman Republic of 1849, even though this failed • The expedition to Sicily and the campaign in Naples meant that unification was not confined to the north • Handing over the south to Victor Emmanuel so that unification of most of the peninsula was achieved by 1860. <p>Arguments and evidence that Garibaldi posed problems should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although there was opposition to the regime in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, there was no consideration as to whether unification under Piedmont was the right approach for the south • Impatience in his approach to unification meant that he often acted before considering the consequences of his actions • He tended not to be aware of the potential impact of his actions in the international context, e.g. the plans to march on Rome in 1860, 1862 and 1867 • He never managed to incorporate Rome – and might have posed problems had he done so. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Option 2D.2: The unification of Germany, c1840–71

Question	Indicative content
5	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the suggestion that the development of nationalist feeling in Germany had limited political significance in the years 1840–48. Candidates should range across the time period and not focus responses exclusively on events in 1848.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence about the ways in which the development of nationalist feeling in the years 1840–48 had only limited political significance should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a minority, even of those who were liberal, were nationalist in their views • There was no agreement amongst those who were nationalist about what their future direction should be • Metternich's control in Austria limited the impact of nationalism • Nationalism emerged strongly only at times of crisis • Nationalism was a by-product of economic development, which was more significant • Significant divisions remained amongst the German states: religious, economic and cultural. <p>Arguments and evidence that the development of nationalist feeling did have political significance should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of the 1840 crisis with France and the 1846 crisis with Denmark in generating a sense of a common enemy to be faced and unifying people within the German states • The emergence of poetry and songs that encapsulated nationalist sentiments in the wake of the 1840 crisis and promoted further growth towards unity, e.g. <i>Deutschland über alles</i> – the song of the Germans • The links between nationalism, liberalism and the move towards unification • The Hippenhelm Meeting of 1847 and its impact • Events in 1848 as an expression of nationalist views. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the accuracy of the suggestion that Bismarck's political skills were primarily responsible for the success of German unification in the years 1862–71.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence of the role played by Bismarck's political skills in the process of German unification in the years 1862–71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether there was a long-term strategy to create a united Germany through the process of war against Austria and France in place from the start or an opportunist politician who was able to take advantage when a crisis arose and use it to good effect – both approaches would support the view of a continuing political skill • Apparent manipulation of events that led Prussia into wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870) • Ability to maintain the neutrality of other European states during the various conflicts, e.g. by the moderate treatment of Austria in the Treaty of Prague • Bismarck's political skills in key meetings, which contributed directly or indirectly to the process: Alvensleben Convention with Russia (1863), Gastein Convention with Austria (1865), meeting with Napoleon III at Biarritz (1865) • Manipulation of the Hohenzollern Candidature crisis (1868–70). <p>Arguments and evidence of the role played by other factors in the process of German unification in the years 1862–71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mistakes made by other protagonists in the conflicts in which Bismarck was engaged, e.g. Napoleon III's miscalculation over Luxembourg • Prussian military strength • Prussian economic strength • Favourable international situation in the 1860s • The role of William I. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>