



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCSE

History B

3042

Paper 3

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

HISTORY SPECIFICATION B

A: INTRODUCTION

- **Consistency of Marking**

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a choice of specifications and a choice of options within them. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply this marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of all the other History specifications and options offered by the AQA.

- **The Assessment Objectives**

The revised specifications have addressed subject content through the identification of ‘key questions’ which focus on important historical issues. These ‘key questions’ give emphasis to the view that History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages all candidates, but particularly the more able, to make judgements grounded in evidence and information. For this reason, assessment objective 6.1 (recall, select and deploy knowledge) underpins candidate attainment in the other two objectives, 6.2 and 6.3.

The schemes of marking for the revised specifications reflect these underlying principles.

- **Levels of Response Marking Schemes**

The mark scheme which follows is of the ‘levels of response’ type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History. All candidates take a common examination paper – there is no tiering. Consequently, it is reasonable to expect to encounter the full range of attainment and this marking scheme has been designed to differentiate candidates’ attainment by **outcome** and to reward **positively** what the candidates know, understand and can do.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall and in deciding on a mark within that particular level.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. This mark scheme provides the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in a subject like History, which in part relies upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content.

B: QUESTION TARGETS & LEVELS OF RESPONSE

- **Question Targets**

The mark scheme for each question is prefaced by an assessment objective ‘target’. This is an indication of the skill which it is expected candidates will use in answering the question and is directly based on the relevant assessment objectives. However, it does not mean that other answers which have merit will not be rewarded.

- **Identification of Levels of Response**

There are several ways in which any question can be answered – in a simple way by less able candidates and in more sophisticated ways by candidates of greater ability. In the marking scheme different types of answers will be identified and will be arranged in a series of levels of response.

Levels of response have been identified on the basis that the full range of candidates entered for the GCSE examination will be able to respond positively. Each ‘level’ therefore represents a stage in the development of the candidate’s **quality of thinking**, and, as such, recognition by the assistant examiner of the relative differences between each level descriptor is of paramount importance.

- **Placing an answers within a Level**

When marking each part of each question, examiners must first place the answer in a particular level and then, and only then, decide on the actual mark within the level, which should be recorded in the margin. **The level of response attained should also be indicated at the end of each answer.** In most cases, it will be helpful to annotate the answer by noting in the margin where a particular level has been reached, e.g. Level 1 may have been reached on line 1, L3 on line 5 and L1 again on line 7. When the whole answer has been read and annotated in this way, the highest of the Levels **clearly attained** and **sustained** should be awarded. Remember that it is often possible to reach the highest level **without** going through the lower levels. Marks are **not cumulative** for any question. There should be no ‘totting up’ of points made which are then converted into marks. Examiners should feel free to comment on part of any answer if it explains why a particular level has been awarded rather than one lower or higher. Such comments can be of assistance when the script is looked at later in the awarding process.

If an answer seems to fit into two or more levels, award the higher or highest level.

- **What is a sustained response?**

By a **sustained response**, we mean that the candidate has **applied** the appropriate level of thought to the **particular issues** in the sub-question.

A response does not necessarily have to be sustained throughout the whole answer, but an answer in which merely a few words seem to show a fleeting recognition of historical complexity is not sufficient to attain a higher level.

In some cases, as you read an answer to a sub-question, it will be clear that particular levels have been reached at certain points in the answer. If so, remember to identify them in the margin as you proceed. At the end of the sub-question, award the highest level that has been sustained.

In other cases you may reach the end of the sub-question without having been able to pinpoint a level. In such cases, simply record the level awarded at the end of the sub-question.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

A particular level of response may cover a range of marks. Therefore, in making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the **mid-range within the level**, where that level covers more than two marks. If the range covers an even number of marks, start at the higher mark, e.g. start at 3 in a 4-mark range, or at 2 in a 2-mark range. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. At all times, therefore, examiners should be prepared to use **the full range of marks** available for a particular level and for a particular question. Remember – mark **positively** at all times.

Move up or down from this mid-range mark by considering whether the answer is:

- precise in its use of supporting factual information.
- appropriately detailed.
- factually accurate.
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others.
- set in the historical context as appropriate to the question.
- displaying appropriate **written communication skills** (see Section D).

Note about Indicative Content.

The mark scheme provides **examples of historical content** (indicative content) which candidates may deploy in support of an answer within a particular level. Do bear in mind that these are **only examples**; exhaustive lists of content are not provided so examiners might expect some candidates to deploy alternative information to support their answers.

This indicative content must **not** however determine the level into which an answer is placed; **the candidate's level of critical thinking determines this**. Remember that the **number** of points made by a candidate may be taken into account only **after** a decision has been taken about the quality (level) of the response.

- **Some things to remember**

Mark positively at all times.

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from that lowest point. This will depress marks for the question paper as a whole and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification or with those of other specifications.

Do **not** be afraid to award maximum marks within a level where it is possible to do so. Do not fail to give a maximum mark to an appropriate answer because you can think of something (or the marking scheme indicates something) that **might** be included but which is missing from the particular response.

Do **not** think in terms of a model answer to the question. Every question should be marked on its merits.

If in doubt about a mark, a little generosity is the best policy. As a general rule, give credit for what is accurate, correct or valid.

Under no circumstances should you reduce a mark, or more importantly, the notional maximum for a question, **solely** because of the existence of an **error** or an **inaccuracy**. For instance, do **not** think “I have what is really a good answer here that has a lot in it and deserves Level 3. It does, however, include a very silly mistake and therefore I will give it only 8 marks instead of 10 marks”.

Obviously, **errors can be given no credit** but, at the same time, the existence of an error should not prejudice you against the rest of what could be a perfectly valid answer.

If it is possible to ignore the mistake, do so and pretend that it does not exist. On the other hand, if the error devalues the rest of what is said, it cannot be ignored.

It is important, therefore, to use the full range of marks where appropriate.

Do not use half marks.

D: QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS

There is no longer a separate mark to be awarded to the candidate for accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar. Instead, as outlined in Section C above, the candidate’s quality of written communication skills will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark within a level of response the examiner will award an answer – particularly a more extended one. In reading an extended response the examiner should therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, i.e. is the answer:

- **presenting relevant information in a form that suits the purpose**
- **legible, with accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar**
- **in an appropriate style with a suitable structure?**

E: SOME PRACTICAL POINTS

- **Answers in note form**

Answers in note form to any question should be credited in so far as the candidate’s meaning is communicated. You must not try to read things into what has been written.

- **Diagrams, etc**

Credit should be given for information provided by the candidates in diagrams, tables, maps etc., provided that it has not already been credited in another form.

- **Answers which run on to another sub-section**

If a candidate starts to answer the next sub-section in an earlier one, by simply running the answer on, give credit for that material in the appropriate sub-section.

- **Answers which do not fit the marking scheme**

Inevitably, some answers will not fit the marking scheme but may legitimately be seen as worthy of credit. Assess such answers in terms of the difficulty/sophistication of the thought involved. If it is believed that the “thought level” equates with one of the levels in the marking scheme, award it a corresponding mark.

Make sure you identify such cases with an A (for alternative) in your sub-total, e.g. as L2A. Also write a brief comment to explain why this alternative has been awarded.

If in doubt, **always** telephone your Team Leader for advice.

F: THE PRE-STANDARDISING AND STANDARDISING MEETING

- **The review of the mark scheme between the examination and standardising meeting**

After the examination but before the main Standardising Meeting, the Principal Examiner and the Team Leaders will have met to discuss the mark scheme in the light of candidates’ actual responses and re-draft where necessary. The re-draft of the mark scheme will be made available to Assistant Examiners at the Standardising Meeting. Through this *post-hoc review procedure* the marks will have been allocated in the expectation that candidates will achieve all the levels identified and no others. Adjustments will have been made to cater for candidates reaching higher levels than those provided for, to remove marks allocated to levels which candidates have not reached, or to enhance discrimination in cases where large numbers of candidates are bunched at the same level.

- **Prior Marking**

It is important that all examiners scrutinise at least 25 scripts before the main standardising meeting and note such things as: alternative interpretations of questions made by candidates; answers which do not fit into the mark scheme; levels which are not reached by the candidates; additional levels which are not included in the mark scheme, etc. To familiarise themselves with a variety of responses, examiners should sample the range of questions, scripts from several centres and across the full range of ability in so far as practicable. Any preliminary marking **must** be completed in pencil and reviewed following the standardising meeting in the light of the revised mark scheme and advice given.

- **The Final Mark Scheme**

The final mark scheme will be decided at the standardising meeting after full discussion of both the mark scheme and the scripts selected by the Principal Examiner for marking at the standardising meeting. At all stages, care will be taken to ensure that all candidates are treated fairly and rewarded for their positive achievements on the paper.

- **Post Standardising Meeting**

After the examiners' standardising meeting, examiners may encounter answers which do not fit the agreed mark scheme but which are worthy of credit. These should be discussed with the Team Leader over the telephone. Such answers should be assessed in terms of the difficulty/sophistication of the thought involved. If it is believed that the "thought level" equates with one of the levels in the mark scheme, it must be awarded a corresponding mark, with a brief note provided on the script to explain why.

PAPER 3**1: The Changing role and Status of women in Britain since 1900**

- (a) Explain what **Source A** tell us about government attitudes to working women at the beginning of the century. (5 marks)

Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2)

- Level 1** **Answer that selects detail from the source**
Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding.
'Resign'; enough to keep her occupied. 1
- Level 2** **Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source**
e.g. The government thought.....The family magazine thought.....
The government came up with the rules. 2-3
- Level 3** **Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source**
e.g. The government thought that....because women had not got the vote.
The magazine was trying to encourage Victorian values/ideas.
Compelled to resign. 4-5

- (b) How reliable is **Source B** to an historian studying the arson campaign of 1912?
Use **Source B and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Target: Evaluation of source(s) for reliability (AO2)

- Level 1** **EITHER**
Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension)
- OR**
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source 1-2
- Level 2** **EITHER**
Combines both features of level 1, with argued application of content of the source to the question, at face value.
- OR**
Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source.
e.g. It was written by a Pankhurst who was a suffragette (explained).
Desire to show the authorities are weak. 3-5

Level 3	<p>Evaluates the provenance of the source, or analyses reliability using cross-references to other sources / own knowledge. e.g. Explains Sylvia Pankhurst as the sister of the leader of the arson campaign and develops her as a suffragette therefore will be accurate. References to the detail given within the source. Do not award Level 4 if candidate guesses at the family relationship. Origins of the arson campaign/failure of the Reform Bill.</p>	6-8
Level 4	<p>Evaluation in Level 3 is linked to testing the content of the source against the candidate's own knowledge of the content, to arrive at a reasoned judgement. e.g. Arson attacks against specific houses, pillar boxes, specific churches or references to other violent methods as further examples of the violent campaigns. Weak authorities, explained with knowledge. Links to prison sentences/cat and mouse act.</p>	9-10
<p>(c) Do you agree that the violent methods of the suffragettes led to votes for women in 1918? Explain your answer. <i>(15 marks)</i></p>		
Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)	
Level 1	<p>EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.</p> <p>OR Simple generalised statement of causation e.g. Candidate tends to discuss violent methods without reference to other factors or their impact.</p>	1-3
Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer</p> <p>OR Narrative implying causation tends to be chronological and ignoring the question set.</p> <p>OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development e.g. Links the violent campaign to publicity. Sees the importance of the war in general terms.</p>	4-7
Level 3	<p>EITHER Developed multi-causal</p>	

	OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors e.g. Links the violent campaign to publicity but sees the war as more significant. Negative impact of arson campaign; positive views of NUWSS.	8-11
Level 4	Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement e.g. Considers the role of the WSPU, NUWSS, Parliament, violent and non-violent methods, war work and the war Bottom of level if centred on war work (positive) – violence (negative) Asquith v Lloyd George WRAFF, nurses, living with rationing	12-15
(d)	Had the battle for equality been won by women by the end of the 20th century? Explain your answer.	<i>(15 marks)</i>
Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)	
Level 1	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.	
	OR Simple generalised statement of causation	1-3
Level 2	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer	
	OR Narrative implying causation	
	OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development e.g. Considers views of women at work and in the home. Sees as ‘won’ by reference to voting rights and working opportunities.	4-7
Level 3	EITHER Developed multi-causal (arguments for/against)	
	OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question e.g. Considers the impact of technology, legislation, TV, politics.	8-11

Level 4	Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement e.g. Considers Level 3 points and evaluates relative effectiveness in different areas: politics, rich/poor, media influence on attitudes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glass ceiling • Better wages/lower wages • Appearance still seen as important (e.g. TV) • Household appliances targeted towards women. 	12-15

2 Britain and Ireland since 1916

- (a) Explain what **Source A** tell us about the problems in Ireland at the beginning of the 1920s. (5 marks)

Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2)

Level 1	Answer that selects detail from the source Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding.	1
Level 2	Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source e.g. The treaty was finally accepted by only a few votes which meant.....	2-3
Level 3	Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source e.g. The government thought that a division on political/religious grounds would bring peace, but an oath of loyalty was difficult for Irish nationalists like members of Sinn Fein to accept.	4-5

- (b) How reliable is **Source B** to an historian studying the Civil Rights Movement in 1968?
Use **Source B and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Target: Evaluation of source(s) for reliability (AO2)

Level 1	EITHER Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension)	
	OR Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source	1-2
Level 2	EITHER Combines both features of level 1, with argued application of content of the source to the question, at face value.	

	OR Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source. e.g. It was written by an eye-witness who was part of the Civil Rights Movement. Written with hindsight as part of a celebration of events.	3-5
Level 3	Evaluates the provenance of the source, or analyses reliability using cross-references to other sources / own knowledge. e.g. Explains that the first element of the source is factual and the second section anecdotal evidence.	6-8
Level 4	Evaluation in Level 3 is linked to testing the content of the source against the candidate's own knowledge of the content, to arrive at a reasoned judgement. e.g. Links into other incidents within the Civil Rights campaign and movement.	9-10
(c)	How important was the Civil War, 1919 to 1921, in the events that led to the division of Ireland in 1921? Explain your answer.	(15 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)

Level 1	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.	
	OR Simple generalised statement of causation e.g. Candidate tends to outline the key events, possibly referring to the Easter Rising.	1-3
Level 2	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer	
	OR Narrative implying causation	
	OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development e.g. Discusses a range of issues within the period of the Civil War. Begins to look into the detail of the negotiations which followed.	4-7
Level 3	EITHER Developed multi-causal	
	OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors e.g. Impact of the Easter Rising Growing support for Sinn Fein (election of MPs / boycott of Westminster) Failure of Government of Ireland Act – only offering Home Rule Role of IRS, failure of RIC, use of Black and Tans Act of 1922.	8-11

Level 4 **Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement**
 e.g. Considers the list of points at Level 3, developing relative importance. Assesses the failure of Lloyd George. Develops role of de Valera, impact of WW1. **12-15**

(d) Why was a solution to the Irish Question not achieved in the 1970s?
 Explain your answer. *(15 marks)*

Target: **Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)**

Level 1 **EITHER**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.

OR
Simple generalised statement of causation **1-3**

Level 2 **EITHER**
Developed mono-causal answer

OR
Narrative implying causation

OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
 e.g. Considers impact of IRA but does not develop other significant areas. **4-7**

Level 3 **EITHER**
Developed multi-causal

OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
 e.g. Considers impact of :
 Civil Rights Movement
 British Army in Ireland
 Internment
 Incidents such as Bloody Sunday
 Direct Rule, 1972
 IRA, UVF **8-11**

Level 4 **Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement**
 e.g. Considers Level 3 points and evaluates relative impact. **12-15**

3 Britain's changing role in the world since 1956

- (a) Explain what **Source A** tell us about the causes of the Falklands War, 1982. (5 marks)

Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2)

Level 1 Answer that selects detail from the source
Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding. 1

Level 2 Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source
e.g. The Argentine government thought..... Britain thought..... 2-3

Level 3 Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source
e.g. The issue of ownership had lasted a long time and the British Government did not want to lose the islands at a time when it was unpopular. 4-5

- (b) How reliable is **Source B** to an historian studying the recapture of Port Stanley, 1982?
Use **Source B and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Target: Evaluation of source(s) for reliability (AO2)

Level 1 EITHER
Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension)

OR
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source 1-2

Level 2 EITHER
Combines both features of level 1, with argued application of content of the source to the question, at face value.

OR
Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source.
e.g. website linking to victory for British. 3-5

Level 3 Evaluates the provenance of the source, or analyses reliability using cross-references to other sources / own knowledge.
e.g. few civilian casualties; quick surrender; not driven into the sea.

Level 4 Evaluation in Level 3 is linked to testing the content of the source against the candidate's own knowledge of the content, to arrive at a reasoned judgement. 9-10

- (c) How did the Suez Crisis in 1956 weaken Britain's position as a major world power?
Explain your answer. (15 marks)

Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)	
Level 1	<p>EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.</p> <p>OR Simple generalised statement of causation e.g. Candidate tends to outline the key events, possibly referring to the blocking of the canal.</p>	1-3
Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer</p> <p>OR Narrative implying causation</p> <p>OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development e.g. Discusses a range of issues within the period of the Crisis; French/Israeli support but US/USSR opposition.</p>	4-7
Level 3	<p>EITHER Developed multi-causal</p> <p>OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors e.g. USSR threats USA threats Secret agreements Oil crisis Blocking of canal Clear changes in world order – growth of UN powers</p>	8-11
Level 4	<p>Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement e.g. Considers the list of points at Level 3, developing relative importance. Assesses the failure of British PM and increased role for UN.</p>	12-15

- (d) Did the Gulf War, 1990 to 1991, change the position of Britain as a major world power?
Explain your answer. (15 marks)

Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)	
Level 1	<p>EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.</p> <p>OR Simple generalised statement of causation e.g. Candidate tends to outline the key events, possibly referring to the joint action with the USA.</p>	1-3
Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer</p> <p>OR Narrative implying causation</p> <p>OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development e.g. Discusses a range of issues within the period of the Crisis; UN action, failure to fully defeat Saddam Hussein.</p>	4-7
Level 3	<p>EITHER Developed multi-causal</p> <p>OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question e.g. Origins of the conflict UN sanctions Military action / Desert Storm Kurdish Revolt Saddam Hussein Post war reactions More popular/strengthen government Increased trade USA/Britain – “Special Relationship”</p>	8-11
Level 4	<p>Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement e.g. Considers the list of points at Level 3, developing relative importance. Assesses the feeling of success by allies and the new methods of warfare and international peace keeping.</p>	12-15

4 Vietnam since 1939

- (a) How did the Domino Theory help to bring about USA involved in the Vietnam conflict?
(6 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)

Level 1 EITHER
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.

OR
Simple generalised statement of causation
e.g. The Americans were frightened it would spread.
Communism taking over the world. **1-2**

Level 2 EITHER
Developed mono-causal answer

OR
Narrative implying causation

OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
e.g. The Americans feared the spread of communism from one country to the next. **3-4**

Level 3 EITHER
Developed multi-causal

OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
e.g. The Domino Theory gave the US an excuse to support the capitalist south against the North and so show they would not accept the spread of communism or the influence of Russia or China.
US support for France
Macarthyism.
Views of John Foster Dallas. **5-6**

- (b) Sources A and B give different views on the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Why do you think they are different? Explain your answer using Sources A and B and your own knowledge.
(8 marks)

Target: To comprehend, analyse and evaluate interpretations and representations (AO3)

Level 1 Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension) **1-2**

Level 2 Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about
e.g. When the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality. **3-4**

Level 3	<p>EITHER Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)</p> <p>OR Analysis of the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation e.g. Johnson was speaking to the US/public and would want to With the 30 year gap there was no need to Top of Level if used Johnson quote in B to challenge Source A.</p>	5-6
Level 4	<p>As Level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context e.g. The USA needed an excuse to increase their military in Vietnam. The Gulf of Tonkin provided them with a useful excuse. They could now begin bombing Northern Vietnam. Refers to current (1990s) view held in the USA of the Vietnam War.</p>	7-8
(c)	<p>How useful is Source C to an historian studying the North Vietnamese Army? Use Source C and your own knowledge to explain your answer. <i>(8 marks)</i></p>	
Target:	Evaluation of source(s) for utility (AO2)	
Level 1	<p>EITHER Accepts the content of the source at face value</p> <p>OR Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source e.g. Generalised response centred on the value of photographic evidence.</p>	1-2
Level 2	<p>EITHER Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source or own simple knowledge e.g. “It doesn’t show.....” Soldiers look unhappy/stressed.</p> <p>OR Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias e.g. References to uniforms or weapons (or lack of them). Unknown photographer.</p>	3-4
Level 3	<p>Develops an argument about usefulness/limitations of the source using own knowledge or source evaluation e.g. How the sources were produced and their purpose – used as postcards etc.</p>	5-6
Level 4	<p>Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using own knowledge AND source evaluation e.g. Uses knowledge to suggest that morale could be broken if women killed. Reference to NZA military failures e.g. failed attack on US embassy. Reaction of US to women in NVA/Vietcong army.</p>	7-8

(d) How effective were the US bombing campaigns of the Vietnam War? (8 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)

Level 1 EITHER
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.

OR
Simple generalised statement of causation 1-2

Level 2 EITHER
Developed mono-causal answer

OR
Narrative implying causation

OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development 3-4

Level 3 EITHER
Developed multi-causal

OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the question 5-6

Level 4 Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement 7-8

Candidates must make clear references to TWO of the following areas to reach Levels 3 and 4:

- Rolling Thunder
- Agent Orange
- Napalm
- US bombing of the North 1970-1972

(e) How did reactions in the United States to the Vietnam War lead to the growth in the Peace Movement? (8 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)

Level 1 EITHER
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.

OR
Simple generalised statement of causation
e.g. They did not like what they saw on TV. 1-2

Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer</p> <p>OR Narrative implying causation</p> <p>OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development e.g. TV, newspapers and talking to Veterans told them how bad it was and this led to protests.</p>	3-4
Level 3	<p>EITHER Developed multi-causal</p> <p>OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the question e.g. Develops the My Lai incident, references to the enquiry.</p>	5-6
Level 4	<p>Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement e.g. Balances the relative importance of My Lai and Kent State.</p>	7-8
	<p>Candidates must make clear references to TWO of the following areas to reach Levels 3 and 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> My Lai Massacre, 1968 TV and media coverage Kent State University protests Failure to complete domestic reforms (funds used in war effort). 	

5 The Arab Israeli Conflict

- (a) How did the events of the Holocaust make it difficult for Britain to control Jewish immigration into Palestine after 1945? *(6 marks)*

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)

Level 1	<p>EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.</p> <p>OR Simple generalised statement of causation e.g. The number of Jews wanting to leave Europe and live in Israel went up rapidly.</p>	1-2
Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer</p> <p>OR Narrative implying causation</p>	

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. The British wanted to control the numbers of immigrants coming to Israel and therefore tried to reduce immigration. This made them unpopular. **3-4**

Level 3

EITHER

Developed multi-causal

OR

A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question

e.g. The Holocaust increased sympathy for the plight of the Jewish people at a time when Jewish immigration figures were causing some concern to Arabs living in Palestine. **5-6**

- (b) **Sources A and B** give different views on the start of the War of Yom Kippur. Why do you think they are different? Explain your answer using **Sources A and B and your own knowledge**. *(8 marks)*

Target: **To comprehend, analyse and evaluate interpretations and representations (AO3)**

Level 1 **Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension)** **1-2**

Level 2 **Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about**
e.g. When the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality. **3-4**

Level 3 **EITHER**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)

OR
Analysis of the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation **5-6**

Level 4 **As Level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context**
e.g. The Israelis seemed to face defeat for the first time. Only US support made it possible for them to have the weapons with which to fight back. **7-8**

- (c) How useful is **Source C** to an historian studying the Intifada? Use **Source C and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. *(8 marks)*

Target: **Evaluation of source(s) for utility (AO2)**

Level 1 **EITHER**
Accepts the content of the source at face value

	OR Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source e.g. It shows a tank being attacked by a youth with a mine.	1-2
Level 2	EITHER Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source or own simple knowledge	
	OR Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias e.g. The photo is propaganda. We do not know what else was going on at the time.	3-4
Level 3	Develops an argument about usefulness/limitations of the source using own knowledge or source evaluation	5-6
Level 4	Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using own knowledge AND source evaluation e.g. Propaganda photograph v success of the Intifada in getting world sympathy.	7-8

(d) Why did Britain fail to make a success of its Mandate in Palestine in the years 1922 to 1939?
(8 marks)

Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)	
Level 1	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.	
	OR Simple generalised statement of causation	1-2
Level 2	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer	
	OR Narrative implying causation	
	OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development	3-4
Level 3	EITHER Developed multi-causal	
	OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the question	5-6

Level 4 **Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement** **7-8**

Candidates must make clear references to TWO of the following areas to reach Levels 3 and 4:

McMahon Letter
Balfour Declaration
British Mandate
Arab Revolt

(e) How close were the Arab nations to defeating the Israelis on the battlefield in the years 1948 to 1973? (8 marks)

Target: **Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)**

Level 1 **EITHER**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.

OR
Simple generalised statement of causation
e.g. They almost won the War of Yom Kippur when they caught the Israelis by surprise. **1-2**

Level 2 **EITHER**
Developed mono-causal answer

OR
Narrative implying causation

OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development **3-4**

Level 3 **EITHER**
Developed multi-causal

OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the question
e.g. Discusses the relative successes of each war. Links to other tactics. **5-6**

Level 4 **Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement**
e.g. Balances the relative importance of wars against terrorism. **7-8**

Candidates must make clear references to TWO of the following areas to reach Levels 3 and 4:

War of Independence, 1948-1949
Six Day War, 1967
Yom Kippur War, 1973

6 Race Relations in the USA post 1945

- (a) How useful is **Source A** to an historian studying the actions of the KKK in the 1920s? Use **Source A and your own knowledge** to answer the question.

(8 marks)

Target: Evaluation of source(s) for utility (AO2)

Level 1 EITHER

Accepts the content of the source at face value

OR

Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source

e.g. Proof of attacks on Blacks.

1-2

Level 2 EITHER

Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source or own simple knowledge

e.g. no members of KKK in the picture (bottom of level)

OR

Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias

e.g. Shows the poverty of living in the South.

3-4

Level 3

Develops an argument about usefulness/limitations of the source using own knowledge or source evaluation

e.g. Other actions of the KKK – over-reaction/hysteria.

5-6

Level 4

Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using own knowledge AND source evaluation.

7-8

- (b) **Sources B and C** give different views on the incident at Central High School. Why do you think they are different? Explain your answer using **Sources B and C and your own knowledge**.

(8 marks)

Target: To comprehend, analyse and evaluate interpretations and representations (AO3)

Level 1

Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension)

1-2

Level 2

Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about

e.g. When the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality.

Mature reporter v immature student

Northern view v southern view.

3-4

Level 3

EITHER

Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)

	OR Analysis of the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation e.g. The newspaper is trying to..... The student is writing after the event in a college magazine.	5-6
Level 4	As Level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context e.g. Levels of racism in North v South.	7-8
(c)	Explain how the Black Power movement grew in the 1960s and 1970s.	<i>(6 marks)</i>
Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)	
Level 1	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.	
	OR Simple generalised statement of causation e.g. Martin Luther King told people about his dream Malcolm X, Nation of Islam, Black Panthers.	1-2
Level 2	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer	
	OR Narrative implying causation	
	OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development	3-4
Level 3	EITHER Developed multi-causal	
	OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question e.g. The impact of the freedom marches Civil Rights Act Race riots Impact of the assassination of Martin Luther King – split into violent/non-violent Delay in Civil Rights reforms.	5-6

- (d) Why did inequality exist between black and white Americans in the USA in the first half of the 20th century? (8 marks)

Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)	
Level 1	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.	
	OR Simple generalised statement of causation	1-2
Level 2	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer	
	OR Narrative implying causation	
	OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development	3-4
Level 3	EITHER Developed multi-causal	
	OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the question	5-6
Level 4	Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement	7-8

Candidates must make clear references to TWO of the following areas to reach Levels 3 and 4:

- Segregation laws
- Voting Rights (tests and Poll Tax laws)
- Life in the Southern States / KKK – northern states
- World War II
- Economics

- (e) Why was Martin Luther King so important to the Civil Rights Movement? (8 marks)

Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause (AO1)	
Level 1	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.	
	OR Simple generalised statement of causation e.g. He was a great public speaker. He was killed.	1-2

Level 2	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer	
	OR Narrative implying causation	
	OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development e.g. Martin Luther King – narrative of life story, dream, assassination.	3-4
Level 3	EITHER Developed multi-causal	
	OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the question e.g. Marches, Riots, assassination.	5-6
Level 4	Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement e.g. Balances the relative importance of factors below.	7-8

Candidates must make clear references to TWO of the following areas to reach Levels 3 and 4:

- Freedom marches
- Civil Rights Act
- Nobel Peace Prize
- Riots 1968
- King and assassination
- King – moderate
- King and JFK/JFK administration
- Focus on Southern states.