

London Examinations

GCE Ordinary Level

Mark Scheme and Examiners' Report
for History 7262

May/June 2000

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 contact our International Customer Relations Unit:

Tel + 44 20 7758 5656

Fax + 44 20 7758 5959

International@edexcel.org.uk

www.edexcel.org.uk/international

May/June 2000

Order Code: UO010856

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Foundation 2001

Mark Scheme and Chief Examiner's Report
May/June 2000

HISTORY 7262

Mark Scheme

Page 2 of 25

Chief Examiner's Report

Page 19 of 25

Grade Boundaries

Page 25 of 25

HISTORY 7262, MARK SCHEME

Section A

Question 1

(a), b) & c) 8/8/4 inflexible)

(a) Mark each answer out of 4

L1: Basic statement indicating what an idea or policy was, probably in a specific context. **1-2**

L2: Developed statements, which attempt to place ideas in context - *e.g.* refers to how these ideas related to the enlightenment as a whole: law intending to ensure parity and justice; education aimed at widening opportunities; government concerned with notions of representation if not rights. **3-4**
8 marks

(b) Target here is description, though best answers should also relate to criteria for enlightenment. Without this, maximum of 5. Use general criteria paras 3-5 for generic guidance on indicators to reward. Key elements in this answer will depend upon which ruler is chosen. Credit responses on only ONE. On Russia, concern might be with the appointment of Reforming Commission (1767) and its proposals; abolition of capital punishment except for political crimes; election of Zemstvo; *Nakaz* as indicators of her principles in respect of law giving (but vague as a guide to particular laws); enabling nobles to free serfs if they wanted; preference for free trade in economic policy; proposals for religious toleration; educational initiatives: ideal of state schooling but not carried through. On Frederick, in respect of education - attempt to produce a national system of schooling; opposition to ritual in religion, aiming at toleration; army reforms. On Joseph, new laws (in excessive numbers?) and administrative and government reforms aimed at reducing powers of nobility; creation of an administrative bureaucracy; church (trying to reduce its privileges); education; abolition of serfdom.

8 marks

(c) Target here is historical judgement. For further description allow maximum of two, but reserve highest marks for a reasoned conclusion about extent of success. At this level it is permissible to have a list of successes and failures provided reasons are given.

4 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 2

Candidates choose THREE here and maximum of 8 for any one. Main target is on causes of the French Revolution, so reserve marks of 6-8 for those who explicitly discuss how the factor chosen contributed to the revolution. *NB* be careful to distinguish developed argument from standard account of what happened and the briefest assertion that this helped cause the revolution. Pure description of what happened, or what, for example, the privileges were, has max of 5. (*e.g.* how the ideas of the philosophers were used by those who attacked what they saw as the unearned privileges of monarchy and nobility; or how economic and social conditions contributed to the effect bankruptcy of the French government and the need for urgent, but destabilising, attempts at reform.

Total: 20 marks

Question 3

(a), b & c) 6/8/6 inflexible)

(a) Target here is on description. Best candidates (5 and 6) are likely to be able to identify clear stages. Weaker candidates are likely to provide a biographical treatment with little or no distinction between pre- and post-1799. Given the phrasing of the question, it is valid to begin the description with Napoleon as consul and take things forward to his assumption of the title of Emperor. For general guidance, see para 5 of generic guidance above.

6 marks

(b) Target here is on identification of key features, in this case Napoleon's domestic reforms. Candidates should know about reforms in central and local government, legal and educational reforms, church, titles, financial and economic management etc. Excessive concentration in one area suggests max of 5 marks. For general guidance, see para 5 of generic guidance above.

8 marks

(c) Target here is historical judgement so use para 8 of generic guidance. Additional material, up to 3 marks, may be credited if deployed descriptively but do not credit material already awarded in b). Best candidates are likely to give a balanced treatment, perhaps noting the success, indeed permanence, of many administrative and legal reforms but the difficulties of reforming the Church. Legitimate also to ask how much the reforms depended on Napoleon's continued success in wars, and thus his position on the throne, but do not reward material on French wars which is not clearly linked to evaluation of *domestic* success.

6 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 4

Target here is historical judgement related to a key individual. Note that candidates should discuss Alexander's domestic and international achievements. Excessive concentration on one side suggests 14 max. Similarly, candidates should be assessing so use paragraph 8 of generic guidelines. Answers which are purely descriptive will not go beyond 12 marks. On domestic side, valid to ask how much Alexander's attempted reforms in respect of foreign countries like Finland and Poland actually achieved, similarly how far a backward country was modernised. There are also some attempts at constitutional, education and landed reforms, but better candidates will probably know that few of these were pursued beyond 1815; Alexander faced rebellion in 1818-19. Decembrist rebellion of 1825 takes place after Alexander's death. Abroad, candidates should consider Alexander's agreement and then war with Napoleon and his role in indicating Russia's interests at the Vienna settlement and in the subsequent Congress diplomacy. Candidates should know about the Holy Alliance.

Total: 20 marks

Question 5

(a), b) & c) 4/8/4 inflexible)

(a) Target here is on identification of change made at Vienna. Essential point here is the unification of Belgium and Holland as a buffer state. Belgium is placed under control of House of Orange. Reward precise information and crucial to maximum marks to note that Belgium did not receive independence.

4 marks

(b) Focus here is on cause: descriptions of the revolt will have maximum 5. Candidates might mention the example of Greece and also the July Revolution in France. Spur for revolt also in the support for Belgian independence by Britain and Prussia. See paragraph 8 of generic guidelines.

8 marks

(c) Target here is description of key feature. Candidates should know that Dutch resisted Belgian claims. Great Powers accept Belgian independence as an objective from early 1831; Louis Philippe rejects election of duc de Nemours in 1831; Leopold I proclaimed King of Belgium with a liberal constitution; French capture Antwerp and force Dutch to recognise Belgian independence in 1832. Formal recognition with Treaty of London, 1839 with dissolution of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. Belgium becomes neutral and independent under Great Power protection. Best answers will show understanding of stages, perhaps arguing that Belgian independence all but recognised by 1833 but that formal recognition takes longer. See paragraph 5 of generic guidelines.

8 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 6

(a), b) & c) 5/10/5 inflexible)

- (a) Focus here is on identification of problems facing the Monarchy. These are likely to concentrate on problems from nationalism and liberalism and challenges to Habsburg authority especially in Bohemia and Hungary. Valid also to mention both economic backwardness within the empire and poor quality of leadership from Frederick I

5 marks

- (b) Focus here is on description of Metternich's policies, designed above all to keep the Empire intact. Legitimate also to say that one aspect of keeping the Empire intact was keeping the peace, so some comment on Metternich's diplomacy is valid but it should be clearly related to problems which concerned internal security. Importance of Carlsbad Decrees of 1819, increasing control over Universities and press. Centralisation of administration but Metternich also restored provincial diets and created an imperial *Reichsrat* to discuss budget and legislation. Also some support for local literary revivals to try to head off full-scale nationalism. Basically, candidates might say, Metternich's instincts were anti-reformist but he did try to strengthen the empire by indulging in limited reforms and palliatives. Use paragraph 5 of generic guidelines. NB the question does say years to 1848', so concentration on 1848 itself is not justified. Only very limited credit (max 2 marks) can be given on 1848 itself.

10 marks

- (c) Target here is historical judgement so use paragraph 8 of generic guidance. Additional material on Metternich's policies, up to 2 marks, may be credited if deployed descriptively but do not credit material already awarded in b). Best candidates are likely to give an informed assessment concentrating on strengths and weaknesses. They may wish to argue that Metternich failed to stave off major challenges to authority in 1848 but that he preserved stability in the Empire for the most part at a time of major tension and challenge from both liberalism and nationalism.

5 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 7

(a), b) & c) 4/6/10 inflexible)

- (a) L1: Basic statement indicating what Ultras were: opponents of new ideas or strong supporters of restored monarchy **1-2**
- L2: Developed statements, which attempt to place definition into context - e.g. refers to their support for increasingly repressive policies, especially during the reign of Charles X. Also support for reintroduction of censorship in early 1820s etc. **3-4**

4 marks

- (b) Focus here is on description, so use paragraph 5 of the generic mark scheme. Concentration should be specifically on the two years cited, probably beginning with the appointment by Charles X of the Polignac administration and the Ordinances of St Cloud; importance of Thiers and the intellectuals and journalists in challenging what they saw as extreme right-wing government: the circumstances of the July revolution, including role of Lafayette and the National Guard. Candidates might also identify who Louis Philippe was.

6 marks

- (c) Focus here is on assessment of success of the selected reign. Use paragraph 8 of the generic mark scheme. Candidates should have max of 6 for pure description of the selected reign. Do not credit material on more than one reign. With Napoleon III, the focus should be on his period as Emperor, but allow max 2 for description of his period in office as Louis Napoleon. Focus is on domestic policy so references to foreign policy are not relevant unless specifically linked to material on the domestic issues.

10 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 8

(a), (b) & (c), 6/8/8 inflexible)

- (a) Focus here is on identification of key features working against Italian Unification. Most candidates will concentrate on issues such as Austrian rule and concern to prevent nationalist expressions of support becoming too insistent. Also the role of the Papacy which had no interest in unification. Some candidates might also discuss divisions within nationalist ranks, though it is important to ensure that these relate only to the period to 1850. For maximum marks, it is possible merely to identify the obstacles, with brief explanations of why they were so.

6 marks

- (b) Focus here is on description. Use paragraph 5 of the generic guidelines. Cavour's role as editor of *Il Risorgimento* from 1847 and as Prime Minister of Piedmont from 1852, nature of his support and exploitation of situation in war with Austria. His commercial links with other European countries. His role in respect of the French in 1859. Garibaldi's role in 1848. His importance with the Thousand in sustaining the revolution beyond a point at which Cavour would have stopped. The Sicily Revolt; his ability as a leader. Reward precisely selected material which shows a clear sense of chronology.

8 marks

- (c) Focus here is on historical judgement. Use paragraph 8 of generic guidelines. Most candidates will concentrate on French intervention, perhaps including discussion of Napoleon III's aims. It is possible to obtain maximum marks from detailed analytical treatment of 1859-61, but candidates might also mention the alliance with Bismarck before the Seven Weeks War in 1866 which provided Venetia and the significance of the Franco-Prussian war for establishing Rome as

Italy's capital in 1870. Some very good candidates may wish to assess the importance of foreign intervention in the context of other factors and this must be rewarded, though the emphasis in treatment should be on foreign intervention. Maximum of 4 for mere description.

6 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 9

(a), b) & c) 5/5/10)

- (a) Focus here is on explanation of importance of a key factor. Good candidates should understand not only what the Zollverein was but also how it helped to reveal economic prosperity in Northern Germany and especially of Prussia. Maximum of 2 marks for explanation of the key term without any discussion of its wider significance.

5 marks

- (b) Focus here is on historical judgement. Use paragraph 8 of the generic mark scheme. Candidates might argue either way, but should concentrate on revolutions in many places, perhaps particularly Bavaria, Cologne and Berlin and the summoning of a Constituent Assembly. For description of events in 1848-9 maximum of 3. The remaining marks must be reserved for discussion of how, or whether, these events actually helped nationalist advance or eventually played into the hands of counter-revolutionaries.

5 marks

- (c) Focus here is on description. Use paragraph 5 of the generic mark scheme. The description might well begin with Bismarck's appointment as Minister-President of Prussia. Both foreign and domestic factors should be referred to. Relevant issues include: rejection of Austrian plans for a revamped Diet; Schleswig-Holstein issue; increased tensions between Prussia and Austria leading to the Seven Weeks War. Establishment of the North German Confederation; the Constitution from 1867; importance of the Hohenzollern candidature; southern states support for North German Confederation in war with France; Proclamation of William I as Emperor in 1871; adoption of the Imperial Constitution in April 1871. Best descriptions will cover the chronology and have a reasonable range of issues. It is valid to concentrate on foreign policy, but the implications for domestic developments should be explicit in all Band 4 answers.

10 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 10

(a), b & c) 8/8/4 inflexible)

- (a) Focus here is on cause. Use paragraph 8 of generic guidelines.b, and especially medium and short-term causes of the Crimean War. Main factors will include:

Perceived Turkish weakness in south-eastern Europe; Russian support for Orthodox Christians in Turkish empire and hope for Austrian support in SE Europe; Turkish resistance to Russian demands in 1853, supported by Britain; Britain's growing resentment of Russian expansionism; invasion Moldavia and Wallachia by Russia in 1853; Anglo-French alliance 1854. Up to 5 for narrative of key events; 6-8 to those who can show how factors interlinked to produce war.

8 marks

- (b) Focus here is on description of the war, which may include description of outcomes of battles (Alma, Balaclava & Inkerman) . Maximum 5 marks for consideration of only one side (probably the war). Candidates should have knowledge of the terms of the Peace of Paris, which guaranteed Turkish independence and made Black Sea neutral with Russian fortifications destroyed and minor Russian territorial losses.

8 marks

- (c) Focus here is on why a term might be appropriate. Candidates should understand meaning of the term. Up to two marks for explaining term in context of 1850s and 1860s and three or four marks for explaining why the Crimean War had not solved the issue of Turkish territories in Europe. Relevant to mention continued instability in the area.

4 mark

Total: 20 marks

Question 11

- (a) Target: comprehension

L1: Basic statements showing some understanding - e.g. understands that things cannot stay the same. Maximum of one mark for straightforward quotation from source without explicit understanding. **1-2**

L2: Developed statements showing clear understanding of the argument which Alexander deploys here - e.g. arguing that change was inevitable and that timely reform would keep control in the hands of the Tsar and Nobility **3**

3 marks

- (b) Target: identification of a key feature: opposition. Response should be from own knowledge but candidates might also infer from Extract

L1: Basic statements about opposition from nobility: e.g. not informing serfs of what was going on. Attacking the plans before 1861 **1-2**

L2: Developed statements which have precision and which identify opponents: e.g. may infer from Extract A that Alexander expected nobility to do nothing and also provides examples of what opposition they offered. In addition to Level 1, look for rounded statement about nature of opposition and the recognition that there was more than one facet to it: perhaps talking both about principle and practice. **3**

3 marks

(c) Target: evaluation of utility of presented source material

L1: Basic statements about utility of the source. *e.g.* it is useful because it gives us information about what happened. Conclusions will be at face-value and not developed. We may allow one mark for basic indication of what information it conveys. Reserve the second mark for some specific examples of what information is given, but do not re-reward material credited in b) **1-2**

L2: Developed statement about utility. Candidate at this level should be able to say that this impression was foreign and thus either idealised or otherwise slanted. The impression may reflect too English a representation. Or might ask questions about how long after the event the impression was created. For maximum marks there should be discussion both of what the picture shows and what is said about it. What conclusion is reached does not matter so long as it shows evidence of having asked appropriate questions about value of source. **3-4**
4 marks

(d) Targets: Identification and discussion of the importance of a key historical event. to get beyond 6 marks candidates must discuss both advantages and disadvantages. Under the former, the recognition by the government that a form of slavery no longer survived and potential for genuine independence. Under the latter, the practical problems and to continued control of the commune; serfs needed, in practice, to buy their freedom; redemption payments and debt. Use generic mark scheme, paragraphs 3-5 and 8 for overall guidance. In the first part, there is a mass of material to select from. Do not expect massive coverage given the limited marks available, but reward precise material over broad-brush generality. Given the phrasing of the question, mere identification of advantages and disadvantages will suffice for maximum marks if done well. However, most candidates earning 8 or more will want to offer comment on the balance of advantage/disadvantage and this must be rewarded. Most will presumably argue that there were more disadvantages than advantages. **10 marks**

Total: 20 marks

Question 12

(a) & b) 4/10/6 inflexible)

(a) L1: Shows basic understanding of the term, *e.g.* makes reference to emphasis on machines and/or town development **1-2**

L2: Provides developed understanding in context, *e.g.* shows how industrial revolution depends on machinery, but also brings greater urbanisation, concentration of people and expansion of rates of economic growth. Reward any valid contextualisation and/or development **3-4**
4 marks

- (b) Focus here is on description, so reward precise information. Candidates can get to 8 marks by consistent description of the key features of industrialism in the country chosen. As indicators of quality, look for a range of factors and some precision, perhaps in indicating *which* new industrial towns, how textiles or transport became mechanised etc. etc. Beyond 8 (and relating to the criteria in the general guidance paragraph 5 above) candidates should make some attempt to show that the changes *were* in stages: *i.e.* perhaps indicating that less sophisticated machinery introduced first and that greater investment brought increase in scale later. Or indicates that some early machines were not necessarily located in industrial towns from the beginning.

10 marks

- (c) Focus here is on judgement about consequence. Thus, maximum of three for further information of a descriptive nature (and do not credit any repeated material). Candidates might discuss impact of conditions in towns or new opportunities for earnings or any key factor related to consequence. What is decided is less important than that there should be an evaluation of the impact of the changes on the ordinary people. Most will concentrate on the working classes, but material on the middle classes may be chosen. Reserve five or six marks (pro rata band 4 of generic descriptors in paragraph 8 above) for a considered judgement based on appropriate selection of evidence in period.

6 marks

Total: 20 marks

Section B

Question 13

Target here is judgement on the role of a key individual. Use paragraph 8 of generic marking guidelines. Descriptions or biographical treatment should have 12 max because the requirement is to make a critical assessment. Most candidates will talk about Bismarck's aims, particularly in securing continued dominance of Prussia within the Reich, the power of the Junker classes and resisting revolution from the left. His opposition to political parties. Material is likely to focus on *Kulturkampf*, struggle against the Roman Catholic Church with laws on civil marriage and state control of church discipline. His attack on the socialists; social welfare legislation; Germanisation of Polish, Danish and ex-French national minorities within the Reich. Critical comment on achievement might note Bismarck's longevity in power and limited challenge to his authority; his failure to suppress political parties; failure of *Kulturkampf*

Total: 20 marks

Question 14

(a,b & c, 6/6/8 inflexible)

- (a) Focus here is on cause. Most will concentrate on the Bulgarian nationalist risings, how the Ottomans put them down and why the great powers intervened. Also valid to mention Pan-Slavism and rebellions in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1875.

Descriptions of the crisis to 1878, including Russo-Turkish war and Treaty of San Stefano will get maximum 3. Cause focus required for 4 and above and there might be comment on both long-term and short-term causes. On long-term valid to mention persistent instability. **6 marks**

(b) Focus here is on the resolution of the crisis by great powers, especially Britain and Germany. Key points are the reduction of Big Bulgaria agreed at San Stefano and creation of Eastern Rumelia as a virtually independent Christian state. Candidates might mention the roles of Disraeli and Bismarck in brokering peace and could also indicate whether the peace was likely to be long-lasting. **6 marks**

(c) Focus here is on description of instability in Balkans. Full marks can be obtained by discussion of problems in the Balkans. To get maximum marks, candidates should offer reasonable chronological range, including perhaps material on Bulgarian crisis of 1885-7 and war with Serbia, Austro-Russian hostility in the area; closer alliance between Serbia and Austria, although Serbo-Croat nationalist activity in early years of 20th century; Bosnian Crisis of 1908-9, when Serbia protests at Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina; Balkan League 1912 and its activities leading to First Balkan war, with Serbia leading Montenegro, Greece and Bulgaria against Ottomans. Second Balkan War 1913, Serbia against Bulgaria. For concentration exclusively on 1908-13 max 5. Material on 1914 and the immediate causes of the First World War lies outside chronological scope of the question. **8 marks**

Total: 20 marks

Question 15

(a, b & c, 6/8/6 inflexible)

(a) Focus here is on overall assessment. Description of the achievement of final Unification in 1870 should have max 2 since focus is quite different. Material before 1870 is not relevant to this question. Strengths might seem to be concerted nationalist activity and growing sense of nationhood in all parts of Italy; clear leadership of Italy by Piedmont in person of Victor Emmanuel. Weakness might concern: diverse nationalist activity; substantial differences within the new country, not least over language and economic diversity. Untried political system. **6 marks**

(b) Focus here is on historical judgement about government of Italy in the given period. Candidates are likely to know about Depretis as a political manager, and the development of education. Attempts to produce liberal transformation. Political system almost guaranteed political instability. There was also political corruption. Crispis rule is associated with development of aggressive nationalism and growth of anti-French policies. Pure description will have maximum of 5 given the focus. Challenges can be interpreted widely: political, economic, social or cultural or more narrowly as political or economic. Be flexible in response to legitimate attempt at judgement based on relevant selection of material. **8 marks**

- (c) Focus here is on description (paragraph 5 of generic guidance): Giolitti's reforms: nationalisation of railways; new labour legislation; financial reforms; agricultural reforms aimed at solving the problem of the South; extension of franchise in 1911-12; provincial system of elementary education. Giolitti's political manoeuvres included fashioning a new alliance with the Catholic party after overtures to the socialists had been rebuffed. For excessive concentration on one policy maximum of 4. Very best candidates will comment not only on ways but on *how* the policies aimed to improve confidence of the Italian people, but range of descriptive material will suffice for maximum marks.

6 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 16

Candidates choose FOUR aspects of the war here and each attracts maximum of five marks. Focus is on explaining importance; therefore accounts of what happened with no attempt to explain significance or importance will get maximum of three in each case. In terms of explaining importance, candidates are free either to emphasise wider strategic implications or more narrow significance within a particular sector or front. Which focus is taken is likely to depend upon the choices made. The Spring Offensive, for example, is likely to lead to wider-ranging discussion of long-term significance than the Gallipoli campaign. However, be flexible in what is credited if there is a real attempt to show importance.

Total: 20 marks

Question 17

Focus here is on historical judgement about the role of a key individual. Descriptions or biographies of Lenin's career will therefore attract a maximum of 12. See paragraph 8 of generic guidance. General biographical treatment should be restricted to the period when Lenin was in power. Candidates should know about Lenin's role in the October revolution, about his leadership in the civil war and about the key economic policies: war communism and the New Economic Policy. It is also valid to comment on the significance of Lenin's determination to withdraw Russia from World War I. On achievement, most are likely to argue that he was crucial to the success of the Revolution, providing it with focus, ideological clarity and steely, ruthless determination to make it work. It is possible to take a less favourable overall view, though, particularly if Trotsky's involvement in ensuring that the Whites were defeated in the civil war is taken into account. It is also possible that his control over Russia slackened markedly after his first stroke in 1922.

Total: 20 marks

Question 18

(a) & b) 8/12 inflexible)

- (a) Focus here is predominantly on description, though linked to some understanding of nature of threat. Candidates choose TWO and each choice attracts a maximum of four marks. Better candidates should be able to focus

their material on each of the options in terms of threat specifically to a *democratic* regime and this should involve understanding of the nature of each threat: Spartacists from the revolutionary Communist left, Kapp by Free Corps officers concerned about reductions in armament size, Beer Hall Putsch threat from Hitler and National Socialists.

8 marks

- (b) There are two foci here. Maximum of eight marks for each. On how, it is important to reward candidates who can develop the narrative precisely from the Wall Street Crash to Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in January 1933. Do not reward material outside this time frame. On why it is possible to allow reflections which go before 1929 because candidates may choose to emphasise long-term (failure of the Weimar Republic to gain support from a sufficiently wide cross-section of community; festering resentment at the perceived injustice of the Versailles settlement) as well as short term factors. Short-term factors will include the economic depression and unemployment which caused substantial opposition and the challenge from both the left and right with their broad-brush solutions. The collapse can also be explained in terms of short-term political manoeuvrings and miscalculations, not least that many in the political classes believed that Hitler could be brought within the pale and tamed.

12 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 19

(a, b & c 4/8/8 inflexible)

- (a) The focus here is on description and candidates should know about the establishment of the League as part of the peace process and to try to ensure international harmony and co-operation. It is relevant also to mention Wilson's fourteen points. Candidates should be rewarded for precise information about origins

4 marks

- (b) Focus is on explanation of mechanism of League through its Covenant. Candidates should know about the roles of the deliberative Assembly, executive Council and permanent Secretariat. Good candidates will give specific information about the Court of International Justice, Mandates and Minorities Commissions and the social & economic organisations: International Labour Organisation, Health Organisation etc. Reward knowledge of how the League was intended to operate and max of 6 for pure knowledge on this. Reserve 7 and 8 for candidates who can discuss the significance of the mechanism in terms of international harmony.

8 marks

- (c) Focus here is on historical judgement. Use paragraph 8 of the generic mark scheme. Candidates should stick to the chronology here and may well argue that it was successful in settling territorial disputes, especially over Aaland Islands and

between Iraq and Turkey, Bulgaria and Greece and between Poland and Lithuania. Failure of the League to broker Italian evacuation from Corfu, which dispute was settled by the Great Powers. Candidates may mention failure of League to prevent Japanese aggression in Manchuria in 1931, but this is not strictly necessary on a European paper. Maximum of 5 marks for material on peace-keeping activities. Candidates should also provide overall assessment of success of initiatives such as mandates and problems created by initial absence from League of Germany and Russia.

8 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 20

(a) Target: comprehension and inference

L1: Basic statements about Mussolini's speech: Italy in the right; Abyssinia unworthy

Do not reward material which comes from outside Extract A **1-2**

L2: Developed statements about Mussolini's justification from Extract A. At this level, candidate will make inference about overall justification: Italy had just rights to the territory and Abyssinia could be invaded because everyone who mattered agreed that it was uncivilised. Best candidates may make the inference that Mussolini believes League should not intervene because Abyssinia does not come up to European standards of civilisation. **3**

3 marks

(b) Focus here is on cross reference to reach a valid historical judgement

L1: Basic statements which provide, or imply, some cross-reference: *e.g.* Extract A asserts that Britain will not spill blood but Cartoon A provides indication that Britain is prepared to fight. On the face of it, there is no support. At this level, candidates might merely select evidence from the two sources, leaving integration implicit. Visual evidence will be taken at face value. **1-2**

L2: Developed statements from both sources which reach a valid judgement. Candidate at this level can argue either way, but must reach an overall judgement. Can argue that there is no support because of what is said in cartoon and the apparently menacing posture of John Bull (though do not expect this visual recognition as necessary to reach Level 2). Alternatively, candidate might note the sardonic tone of Cartoonist who clearly argues that Britain and France are only posturing. On this interpretation, the Cartoon actually supports Mussolini's assertion, though not necessarily for the reasons he might give. **3-4**

4 marks

(c) Target: reaching a judgement about attitude of cartoonist on basis of presented evidence

L1: Basic statement of opinion from source, Cartoon is handled at face value. At this level, candidate should appreciate that cartoonist is opposed and might quote a specific piece of evidence from the cartoon: either visually or comment on mild disapproval **1-2**

L2: Developed statements about cartoonist's attitude. At this level, candidate must both appreciate the candidates hostility to British and French reaction and be able to discuss why: the cartoonist is being bitterly ironic: we shall probably issue. Candidate could also use the visual element to note that all Britain and France are doing in response to aggression is wagging fingers. Best candidates will pick up the irony of awful warning **3-4**
4 marks

(d) Target here is explanation of consequence. There appear to be two foci here but they are so closely linked that it is possible to reach maximum marks by discussing them together. The fate of the League by this stage is intimately bound up with the actions of France and Britain anyway. Use criteria in paragraph 8 of the generic mark scheme. Good candidates will have some precise material on consequences: demonstrating the inadequacy of the League to handle determined aggression and the reaction of France and Britain in terms of appeasement of the dictators. Candidates might mention the inadequacy of sanctions. It is also relevant to mention the importance for the dictators. Many will argue that this incident proved to Mussolini that aggression was justified, a lesson which was not lost on Hitler anyway. Some very good candidates could argue that this particular crisis was of little significance in determining German foreign policy anyway. Maximum of 5 for candidates who merely describe key issues in international relations related to aggression and appeasement between 1935 and 1939. To get beyond this, candidates should demonstrate how later events were influenced as reactions to Mussolini's success in facing down threats of the League and the democratic powers.

9 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 21

(a), b) & c 6/6/8 inflexible.)

(a) Focus here is on cause. Description of events in Fourth Republic can reach 3 only. Most candidates will comment on weakness of leadership and on problems facing the republic in terms of: rebuilding after a devastating war; political stability - frequent changes of government, in part because of proportional representation; colonial challenges, especially in Algeria; defeats in Indo-China and over Suez.

6 marks

- (b) Focus here is on description, though candidates might also see this as an opportunity to explain as well. Either approach can be credited but see particularly paragraphs 3-5 of generic mark scheme. Most answers will probably concentrate on difficulties of the Fourth Republic in Algeria; loss of confidence by military in civilian government of France; rather than risk civil war President Coty and Prime Minister Pflimlin resigned and de Gaulle was invited to become chief minister. Reserve marks beyond 3 for specific and precise description and/or explanation.

6 marks

- (c) Two foci here: description and on judgement. Use both paragraphs 5 and 8 of the generic mark scheme. Maximum 5 for exclusive concentration on one, probably on ways in which de Gaulle brought stability. New constitution with greater greater power to the President. De Gaulles choice of prime ministers who supported his views. Strong position on a number of foreign policy issues, including taking decisive line on Europe; independence from NATO directives. Domestic stability included economic reforms and social service changes. On extent, relevant to mention increasing opposition to de Gaulle's authoritarianism, especially by trade unions and students. Ultimately, de Gaulle was not able to face down the challenges of 1968, which threatened French stability. Predominant emphasis should be on domestic stability but relevant to mention how de Gaulle used foreign policy as a weapon to demonstrate national unity and to invoke patriotism to demonstrate French unity.

8 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 22

(a), b) & c) 5/8/7 inflexible)

- (a) Target here is description of key features of Khrushchev's attack. Use paragraphs 3-5 of the generic mark scheme. Candidates are not required to explain why Khrushchev acted as he did. Key aspects concern Khrushchev's assertion that Stalin abused his powers, attacked loyal communists without proper reason, failed to prepare for the war and, once in it, made huge blunders costing thousands of lives.

5 marks

- (b) Two foci here and maximum of 5 for exclusive concentration on one. Key element here is dismantling of Stalin's tight system of economic controls. Agricultural policy devolved much more to regions. Virgin lands scheme. Lesser emphasis on artistic censorship and more western influences allowed into the Soviet Union. Candidates may answer that Soviet Union enjoyed some benefits from these policies but that mistakes in economic management and other domestic policies ensured that less was achieved than had been anticipated.

8 marks

- (c) Focus here is on explanation of change. Description of the policies of Brezhnev will get maximum of 4 marks. Beyond this, candidates must make comment on similarity and difference. Similarity in tight central control and use of the Communist party. New constitution issued. Main difference may be in Brezhnev's greater belief in central direction and planning. Image of Brezhnev is also of greater discipline and authoritarianism but best candidates may answer that there was relatively little fundamental change.

7 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 23

(a), b) & c) 4/8/8 inflexible)

- (a) L1: Basic definition of term: anything which implies understanding of movement from colonial to independent governments **1-2**

L2: Developed explanation of term which shows what it is and locates this in particular context. Most likely here example might be given of nations which had received their independence or would shortly do so. Best candidates might be able to note the significance of Macmillan's speech in South Africa, which would prove the most resistant to the wind of change. **3-4**

4 marks

- (b) Focus here is on cause. Reward material only on one country, although the basic arguments might cross national barriers. Differences of view derive from perceptions about the value, or otherwise, of colonial relationship: extension of power and an indication of the nation's prestige on the one hand, or an increasing drag on resources and manpower on the other. Also differing responses to independence movements.

8 marks

- (c) Focus here is on description. Use paragraph 5 of generic mark scheme. Precise material selected will depend on the nation and colonial power chosen. Some countries were prepared for independence over quite a long period; others had independence thrust upon them almost unawares. Reward precise material which concentrates on the run-up to independence.

8 marks

Total: 20 marks

Question 24

Focus here is on explanation of change. Description of Thatcher's policies will reach 12 max. Use paragraph 5 of generic mark scheme. Also, max of 12 for excessive concentration on one part of this answer. On Europe, valid to mention determination to get reduced contribution to EU budget and generally abrasive relations. Also, however, her policies led to greater involvement with Europe. On standing in world

affairs, valid to mention decisive stand in certain areas: anti-Communism, great support for Reagan. Also, Britain's successful defence of the Falklands against Argentina which led to increased respect for British military and naval power. Good candidates might challenge how far the Thatcher years brought real change in Britain's standing rather than merely perception that the nation was somehow punching its weight again.

Total: 20 marks

HISTORY 7262, CHIEF EXAMINER'S REPORT

General Comments

Performance in the 2000 paper failed to match that of 1999 and candidates overall scored considerably lower marks. It was difficult to be sure about the reasons for this surprising change. The structure of the paper was identical to that set in 1999, when some innovations had been introduced. The candidature demonstrated a degree of volatility with a number of new Centres entering and some leaving. It is possible that some of the incoming Centres were not familiar with the demands of the paper as revised with effect from 1999, although no hard evidence was produced to back this theory. The lack of precise information was a pervasive weakness of many answers and it is important to stress that examiners are always generous in their reward of material which conveys information crisply and accurately. Generalised statements about what 'the people' felt or overly simple assertions about what monarchs wished to achieve will always carry limited weight with examiners.

Certainly, a number of popular questions, however, scored fewer marks than anticipated. It may be that Questions 1 and 2, which were among the most frequently answered on the paper, contributed to the weaker overall performance this year since they tended to obtain lower marks. The absence of a question on the Partitions of Poland seems also to have had a depressive effect. This topic is well known, but on a paper where twelve questions are set on the whole period 1763- 1870, it cannot be expected to appear every year. Another possible reason for lower overall scores was weak performance on parts (a) to (c) of Question 11, which was a popular question. In response to the candidates' evident perception that this paper was more difficult than its immediate predecessor, the grade thresholds were reduced,

Since a number of new Centres appeared in 2000, it may be worth repeating the guidance first given last year in respect of the structure of questions which candidates may expect.

1. As before, each Section will include an optional document question. Candidates may answer both questions if they choose. Both document questions (one in each chronological section) contain four, and only four, sub-questions. Document questions will remain optional.
2. There will normally be two Sources for candidates to use. One will normally be a written source and one non-written, as for example a cartoon, a photograph, a table of simple statistical information, etc.
3. These four sub-questions will each have a predominant focus:
 - 3.1 Question (a) will ask for an identification or for a basic piece of information to be extracted from the presented source material. Usually, the skill tested will be that of comprehension.
 - 3.2 Question (b) will normally ask for candidates to make an inference, or a simple judgement, based on understanding of one source.
 - 3.3 Question (c) will be one of two types. It may ask for candidates to obtain material from two sources by exercising skills of cross-reference. This cross-reference may itself require a simple judgement. Alternatively, it may ask

candidates to make judgements about the usefulness or the reliability of a source for a particular purpose.

3.4 Question (d) will ask candidates to make a historical judgement. This judgement should be sustained by reference both to own knowledge **and** to information or evidence from the presented sources. These questions always have the highest mark tariff and candidates should consider them as mini-essays.

4. The mark allocations for document questions will vary only within narrow parameters. Thus, the final question will carry either 9 or 10 marks. The remaining three questions will each carry either three or four marks.
5. Most of the non-source questions also follow a standard format. Most will be in three parts. At least one of these three parts will require candidates to describe key events or aspects of the lives of important individuals. At least one of the three parts will have an analytical focus, by requiring candidates to identify causes or consequences of events, or to reach judgements about key events, developments or individuals.
6. In each section of the paper, one question will not normally be subdivided in terms of marks, though different tasks may be set. Such questions may be complete essays, or they may require students to write about the importance of a number of key events or individuals.
7. A small number of two-part questions may be set when the subject matter demands it.

This is an Ordinary level examination and examiners do not expect great sophistication or extensive development of analytical points. A large number of descriptive sub-questions will continue to be set. As the mark scheme makes clear, also, even when the focus of a sub-question is analytical, a predominately or even exclusively descriptive response will still get reasonably credit, if the information on display is precise and accurate. The highest marks will go to candidates who not only have a secure knowledge of the subject matter but who also use their knowledge selectively to support an argument or judgement.

As in previous years, candidates in Syllabus 7262 congregate much more in the early part of the period than the latter. Approximately 75% of answers came from candidates answering Section A of the paper with questions 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 and 9 as the most popular in the Section.

Section A

Questions 1 & 2

It is worth spending some time on Questions 1 and 2. Many candidates failed to understand what was required by the phrase 'Explain the ideas...' which preceded part (a) of Question 1. Most candidates wrote about policies of particular monarchs rather than discussing ideas as required. Since so few candidates responded as required, the mark scheme was adjusted to permit candidates to score up to half marks by discussing specific policies on education, law, etc. However, the lack of precise information at

most candidates' disposal floored them. Question (b) performed rather better although a number of candidates merely repeated material already credited in part (a). Part (c) enabled most candidates to score half marks but few could provide the evaluation required.

The phrasing of Question 2 also seems to have caused greater problems for candidates than anticipated. It had been hoped that giving candidates a good choice of causal factors and asking them to explain their importance would act as useful stimulus. In fact, the reverse happened. Identifying causes deprived weak candidates of a mark when it was clear that they could not go beyond very general statements about, say, the ideas of the *philosophers* or about Turgot and Necker. While a number of candidates knew the story of the late 1770s and 1780s in France in considerable detail, most could not get beyond hazy generalities. Very few candidates could offer precise evidence either about what Turgot and Necker were aiming to do beyond 'improve finances' and 'reduce debt' and specific evidence about the Assembly of Notables was also at a premium.

On both Questions 1 and 2, therefore, a large number of candidates scored in the region of 6 – 8 marks out of 20, when other questions on enlightened despotism and the origins of the French Revolution in previous years have seem even moderate candidates obtaining 8 – 10. Without this being remotely the intention, the examiners seem to have uncovered what candidates did *not* know about key topics rather than what they did.

Question 3

Marks for Question 3 ran a little higher. Candidates in general had sufficient knowledge of Napoleon's early career in 3 (a) to score adequately and some were very well informed indeed. However, more moderate candidates tended to write at least as much on the period to 1799 as after. Answers to question (b) were somewhat less convincing and what the Code Napoleon specifically comprised was not in general well known. Only able candidates could debate the extent of Napoleon's success in these years; most tended to assume that he was totally successful. Only a few candidates strayed into prepared material on the war.

Question 4

Answers to Question 4 were relatively few in number. Candidates who attempted this question were usually reasonably successful and answers were adequately balanced between domestic and international affairs.

Question 5

Question 5 attracted the largest number of candidates on the paper and responses were generally secure. Knowledge of the Vienna Peace Settlement in respect of Belgium was adequate and a fair number of maximum marks were awarded. The causal focus in 5 (b) was clearly appreciated and many prepared answers were offered which met the terms of the question well. Maximum marks were earned by candidates who could offer some specific material on 1830 itself and thus show understanding of short-term causes as well as broader reasons for Belgian frustration with Dutch rule. In 5 (c) many candidates began their answers with the 1830 Revolt. Specific knowledge on the period 1831-39 was less prevalent than understanding of why the Revolt

occurred, though most showed at least some appreciation of the importance of foreign intervention.

Question 6

Not many candidates answered Question 6. Candidates attempting it could cope adequately with the dangers threatening internal security, although there was excessive concentration on one or two key events, especially concerning Kotzebue. Too many candidates included material on Metternich's foreign policy in 6 (b) and few were able to make a clear evaluation of the success of his policies in 6 (c).

Question 7

In Question 7 (a), maximum marks were awarded to candidates who understood the meaning of the term 'Ultra' and who could identify a key event or figure. Answers to 7 (b) rarely concentrated, as required, on 1829 – 30. Many took a leisurely, and frequently unspecific, route through Charles X's unpopularity. A number of very strong answers were seen to 7 (c), with Napoleon III the more popular alternative. However, a fair number of candidates offered material on foreign policy, apparently misreading the question and ignoring the phrase 'within France'.

Question 8

Answers to Question 8 tended to be better than most in this Section. The phrasing of the question seemed to fit the notes candidates had and far fewer introduced material from one section which would have been better placed in another than was the case in other questions. In 8 (b) more wrote on Cavour than Garibaldi, but, irrespective of which leader was chosen, a number of candidates satisfied themselves with indiscriminate biography when specific pointing to implications for Italian Unification was needed.

Question 9

Question 9 attracted fewer candidates, perhaps because of the presence of 9 (a), for which many candidates were evidently unprepared and 9 (b), which called for evaluation which was beyond the abilities – and the notes – of most. 9 (c), however, did produce a range of good answers. The descriptive focus was appreciated and the topic clearly well known. It was not at all clear from some answers, however, that the events described (often in great detail) did actually relate to Unification.

Question 10

Question 10 was popular and fairly well done. The weakest element of the answers in terms of factual knowledge concerned the events of the Crimean War, which rather surprised the examiners. However, the causes of the conflict were well known and most candidates had at least a reasonable outline of the outcome in terms of the peace treaty. Answers to 10 (c) tended to be weak because candidates did not focus their attention on the 1850s and 1860s. Almost any period which validated the description seemed to be fair game.

Question 11

Question 11 saw some very good answers to question (d), where knowledge about the consequences of Emancipation of the Serfs was usually quite extensive. A significant number of answers from 7 upwards were seen from candidates who had clearly been well prepared. The other answers were somewhat more problematic. Most candidates could achieve 1 or 2 marks in their answers to (a), but candidates were in general unable to make the basic inference about fear of unrest or revolution as a motivating factor. Question (b) required candidates to offer information which very few of them possessed. Although only three marks were on offer, on reflection it would have been better to ask a question which required candidates to make a simple judgement from the source. This, after all, is the normal focus of the new-style question (b), and departure from this principle seems to have left candidates exposed without alternative knowledge. As mentioned above, weak performance here was one of the reasons why the grade thresholds were lowered in this paper in comparison with 1999. Question (c) allowed a number of candidates to get 2 marks from effective use of the visual source. In particular, a number of candidates noted the position of prostration adopted by the serf being freed and commented usefully upon it. However, very few indeed made use of the provenance. It had been hoped that more would wish to comment on the fact that this picture was a British source and therefore at some distance from the events it was depicting.

Question 12

Very few answers were seen to Question 12, and very few candidates could offer much beyond broad generalities in response to it.

Section B

This Section requires less detailed comment, partly because it attracts relatively few candidates anyway, and partly because they tend to bunch the early part of the section. It is rare indeed to see responses to questions that focus on the period after 1945.

Question 13

Question 13 offered candidates what was clearly a welcome opportunity to provide detailed information about Bismarck's domestic policy. Although few could provide the critical appraisal which the question required, a number of marks in the region 11 – 14 were achieved from strong narratives which steered clear of any reference to foreign policy. The main discriminators in this question were the specificity of knowledge at candidates' disposal and the ability to keep both to the period and to the domestic focus. Within these parameters, knowledge was good.

Questions 14 & 15

Few answers were seen to Question 14 and none to Question 15. In Question 14 there was much chronological confusion in answers to part (c) and detailed knowledge about the Congress of Berlin and its outcome was not available to many candidates.

Question 16

Question 16 was one of the most popular on this Section of the Paper and reasonably well done. The Schlieffen Plan was much the most popular option, and some candidates knew both its purpose and its outcome in considerable detail. A number of maximum marks were awarded for this part. A fair amount was also known about the Battle of the Somme and the Treaty of Brest Litovsk.

Questions 17 & 18

Answers to Question 17 and 18 were variable in quality. In Question 17, too many candidates provided an undifferentiated biography of Lenin, making no attempt to concentrate on the period from the success of the October revolution. In Question 18 (b), too many candidates ignored the dates and wrote far too generally about pervasive long-term weaknesses of the Weimar Republic.

Question 19

Only a few candidates attempted Question 19. Wilson's role was generally well known and a number of maximum marks were earned in part (a). Candidates generally found it difficult to relate the nature of League organisation to its peace objectives, but they could be rewarded for their basic organisation (though this was not infrequently confused with that of the United Nations more than twenty years later). Clearly a number of candidates did not appreciate the fact that 19 (c) ended in 1933. Most candidates obtained credit for their knowledge of Japan and Manchuria from 1931 but fewer had sufficient knowledge of League activity in Europe in the 1920s, as for example over the Aaland Islands, over the Greek invasion of Bulgaria in 1925 or even over Mussolini's bombardment of Corfu.

Question 20

The only other question which attracted a significant number of candidates on this Section of the paper was the documentary question on Mussolini and the Abyssinian Crisis (Question 20). Most candidates coped well in part (a) and many marks of 2 or the maximum 3 were awarded for noting that Mussolini did not expect any hostility from Britain. Answers to part (b) discriminated well. Most candidates argued that the evidence of the cartoon did support the message of Mussolini's speech, although some suggested that the 'mild disapproval' nevertheless represented a contradiction of Mussolini's assertion. Either response could receive maximum marks so long as the case was argued. 20 (c) proved to be a good discriminator since those who failed to understand the cartoon tended to argue that the cartoonist either approved of British and French reaction or failed to make any judgement at all, merely indicating what they could see in the cartoon. Answers to 20 (d) covered a wide range both in terms of quality and the material selected. The main weakness lay in the lack of chronological coverage. Many candidates merely recounted what they remembered of European foreign policy in the period, leaving the League of Nations almost entirely out of the picture.

Questions 21 - 24

So few answers were seen to any of the Question 21 – 24 that specific comment is superfluous. It is clear that candidates offering this Syllabus are not prepared for any topics after 1945.

HISTORY 7262, GRADE BOUNDARIES

Grade	A	B	C	D	E
Lowest mark for award of grade	55	47	40	35	28

Note: Grade boundaries may vary from year to year and from subject to subject, depending on the demands of the question paper.

Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4LN, UK

Tel + 44 1623 450 781

Fax + 44 1623 450 481

Order Code: UO010856

For more information on Edexcel qualifications please contact us:

International Customer Relations Unit,

Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London, WC1B 5D

Tel + 44 20 7758 5656

Fax + 44 20 7758 5959

International@edexcel.org.uk

www.edexcel.org.uk/international

Edexcel Foundation is a registered charity and a Company Limited
By Guarantee Registered in England No. 1686164

