



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCSE

### History B

3042(Full Course): 3047 (Short Course)

### Paper 1

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 1****SECTION A**

**N.B. Where questions are repeated across options, sources will have different letters to identify them.**

**OPTION V****Question 1**

- 1(a)** What does **Source A** tell us about the growth of armies in European countries between 1900 and 1914? *(3 marks)*

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

Mark on a ‘penny points’ system – reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks).  
 e.g. one accurate figure lifted from source such as French army in 1900 was 0.7 million (maximum of 1 for this type of information);  
 France, A/H, Germany and Italy increased numbers;  
 Britain decreased;  
 Russia increased to 1910 then decreased;  
 Count any explanation or inference as one point. **3**

- 1(b)** Describe the Schlieffen Plan used by Germany at the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. *(6 marks)*

**Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**

**Level 1 Basic description.**  
 e.g. they attacked Belgium and France. **1-2**

**Level 2 EITHER**  
**Detailed description of limited aspects.**  
 e.g. describes one of the following:  
 the attack on the West through Belgium;  
 the theory behind the plan;  
 how the plan was changed in 1914;  
 strengths and weaknesses of the plan.

**OR**

**Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**

e.g. outline description of plan/theory/attack on Belgium before East etc. **3-4**

**Level 3 Detailed description of several aspects.**  
 e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2 **5-6**



**1(c)** How reliable is **Source B** to an historian studying the responsibility for the outbreak of the First World War?

Use **Source B and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.

(6 marks)

**Target:** Evaluation of a source for reliability (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1).

**Level 1**

**EITHER**

**Learned response or simple response based on source.**

e.g. Reliable because Germany was responsible; the Germans agreed.

Unreliable because it is biased.

**OR**

**Answer based on utility/content of source.**

e.g. it is reliable because it tells us...

1

**Level 2**

**EITHER**

**Combination of both parts of level 1.**

**OR**

**Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source, accepting it at face value.**

e.g. reliable because Germany had to pay for losses and damage under the terms of Versailles.

2-3

**Level 3**

**EITHER**

**Evaluates the provenance of the source.**

e.g. questions the purpose of the clause and its connection with reparations payments; motive of allies.

**OR**

**Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source, placing it into context.**

e.g. considers Germany's responsibility for the war; the Kaiser's aims; the circumstances in 1918-19 when the treaty was drawn up; why Germany signed it.

4-5

**Level 4**

**Combination of both parts of level 3.**

6

<b>1(d)</b>	Which was more important as a cause of the First World War: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Moroccan Crises, 1905 and 1911;</li> <li>• the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand at Sarajevo in Bosnia, 1914?</li> </ul> <p>You must refer to both causes when explaining your answer. <span style="float: right;"><i>(10 marks)</i></span></p>
<b>Target:</b>	<b>Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 6.1).</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>EITHER</b>  <b>Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic.</b>  e.g. describes how the assassination at Sarajevo was in 1914 and led to war so it was more important.</p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Simple general causation statements.</b>  e.g. Germany and France quarrelled in Morocco and ended up fighting each other in WW1.  <b>MUST COVER BOTH EVENTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>1-2</b></span></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>EITHER</b>  <b>Develops one cause.</b>  e.g. examines events in Morocco explaining how they affected the Entente and relations between GB and Germany.  Examines the assassination, explaining how it affected Russia and A/H– its effect on A/H’s policy in 1914 and linking it to the alliances and the outbreak of war.</p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Covers both with some development or explanation.</b></p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Narrative approach implying causation.</b>  e.g. narrative of Morocco and Sarajevo with little focus on the question. <span style="float: right;"><b>3-5</b></span></p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question and establishing some argument.</b>  e.g. covers two developed points from level 2 above or a narrative approach which makes some assessment.  Reaches reasoned judgement without substantiating evidence. <span style="float: right;"><b>6-8</b></span></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p><b>Balanced, well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question.</b>  e.g. covers both parts in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level. <span style="float: right;"><b>9-10</b></span></p>

**OPTION V****OPTION W****Question 2****Question 4**

**2/4(a)** What does **Source C/A** tell us about the League of Nations in 1920?

*(3 marks)*

**Target:**        **Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

Mark on a 'penny points' system – reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks).

e.g. League of Nations was the idea of the Americans;

names a country in the League from cartoon (maximum of 1 mark for this);

USA did not join;

USA the 'key' to the League;

left bridge(League) incomplete;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

**3**

**2/4(b)** How reliable is **Source D/B** to an historian studying the aims of the League of Nations?

Use **Source D/B and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.

*(6 marks)*

**Target:**        **Evaluation of a source for reliability (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1).**

**Level 1****EITHER**

**Learned response or simple response based on source.**

e.g. reliable because it was said by Wilson who was present at time.

Unreliable because it is biased.

**OR**

**Answer based on utility/content of source.**

e.g. it is reliable because it tells us.

**1**

**Level 2****EITHER**

**Combination of both parts of level 1.**

**OR**

**Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source, accepting it at face value.**

e.g. reliable because it shows that the main aim of the League was to keep peace by working together. Nations did not work together and so did not prevent the start of WW2.

**2-3**

**Level 3****EITHER**

**Evaluates the provenance of the source.**

e.g. questions the purpose of the statement: Wilson was pushing the League, it was his idea, so he was likely to use arguments like this.

	<b>OR</b> <b>Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source, placing it into context.</b> e.g. uses knowledge of the failure of the countries to co-operate, putting self interest before peace, leading to the failure of the League and the outbreak of WW2.	<b>4-5</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Combination of both parts of level 3.</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2/4(c)</b>	Describe how the organisation of the League of Nations was meant to keep peace.	<i>(6 marks)</i>
<b>Target:</b>	<b>Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)</b>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Basic description.</b> e.g. countries worked together to prevent war.	<b>1-2</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Detailed description of limited aspects.</b> e.g. describes/explains one of the following: the theory of collective security; the Assembly and its function; role of the Council; the International Court of Justice.	
	<b>OR</b> <b>Limited description of a wider range of aspects.</b> e.g. outline description of the organisation of the League	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Detailed description of several aspects.</b> e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2	<b>5-6</b>

- 2/4(d)** Which was more important as a reason for the failure of the League of Nations:
- its handling of the Manchurian Crisis 1931-32;
  - its handling of the Abyssinian Crisis 1935-36?

You must refer to **both** reasons when explaining your answer.

(10 marks)

**Target:**            **Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 6.1).**

**Level 1**            **EITHER**

**Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic.**

e.g. describes how the League could do nothing about Mussolini taking Abyssinia and this led to the failure of the League.

**OR**

**Simple general causation statements.**

e.g. the League failed more because of the Abyssinian Crisis because it was nearer to the West than Manchuria.

Must cover both events for top of level.

**1-2**

**Level 2**            **EITHER**

**Develops one cause.**

e.g. examines the Manchurian Crisis explaining how it weakened the League; what the League did and why it failed.

Examines the Abyssinian Crisis, why the League failed and the effects of the crisis on the future of the League.

**OR**

**Covers both with some development or explanation.**

**OR**

**Narrative approach implying causation.**

e.g. narrative of Manchuria and Abyssinia with little focus on the question.

**3-5**

**Level 3**

**A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question and establishing some argument.**

e.g. covers two developed points from level 2 above or a narrative approach which makes some assessment.

Reaches reasoned judgement without substantiating evidence.

**6-8**

**Level 4**

**Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question.**

e.g. covers both parts in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level.

**9-10**

**OPTION V****OPTION W****Question 3****Question 5**

**3/5(a)** What does **Source E/C** tell us about the reasons for Britain following the policy of appeasement in the 1930s? *(3 marks)*

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

Mark on a ‘penny points’ system – reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks).

e.g. grievances of Versailles were genuine;

people in Britain supported it;

wanted to avoid another war with loss of life;

GB not ready – re-armament;

fear of communism;

failure of League – something needed to replace it.

Count any explanation or inference as one point. **3**

**3/5(b)** Describe how Chamberlain helped to prevent war over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia in September 1938. *(6 marks)*

**Level 1 Basic description.**  
e.g. by using appeasement; by negotiating; by the Munich Agreement. **1-2**

**Level 2 EITHER Detailed description of limited aspects.**  
e.g. describes one of the following:  
The theory behind appeasement;  
Munich Agreement;  
Meetings at Berchtesgaden and Godesberg;  
Chamberlain and the Czechs.

**OR**  
**Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**  
e.g. outline description of Chamberlain as the ‘winged messenger of peace’. **3-4**

**Level 3 Detailed description of several aspects.**  
e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2. **5-6**

**3/5(c)** How reliable is **Source F/D** to an historian studying Hitler's policy towards Czechoslovakia in the years 1938 and 1939?

Use **Source F/D and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.

(6 marks)

**Target:** Evaluation of a source for reliability (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1).

**Level 1** EITHER

**Learned response or simple response based on source.**

e.g. reliable because it was said by Hitler to Chamberlain.

Unreliable because it is biased, Hitler could not be trusted.

OR

**Answer based on utility/content of source.**

e.g. it is reliable because it tells us.

1

**Level 2**

EITHER

**Combination of both parts of level 1.**

OR

**Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source, accepting it at face value.**

e.g. reliable because it was written just after the Anschluss and Hitler had no intention of attacking Czechoslovakia at that time. He needed to integrate Austria into the Reich etc.

2-3

**Level 3**

EITHER

**Evaluates the provenance of the source.**

e.g. questions the purpose of the statement: Hitler was trying to reassure Chamberlain after the Anschluss, trying to prevent him from worrying about other conquests.

OR

**Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source, placing it into context.**

E.g. uses knowledge of Hitler's aims in Czechoslovakia – the Sudeten Germans; the eventual fate of Czechoslovakia.

4-5

**Level 4**

**Combination of both parts of level 3.**

6

**3/5(d)** Which was the more important factor in allowing Hitler to succeed in his foreign policy in the 1930s:

- the Treaty of Versailles;
- Chamberlain’s policy of appeasement?

You must refer to both reasons when explaining your answer.

*(10 marks)*

**Target:**            **Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 6.1).**

<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>EITHER</b>  <b>Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic.</b>  e.g. describes how the Treaty of Versailles treated Germany harshly and many people wanted to change it.</p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Simple general causation statements.</b>  e.g. appeasement gave in to Hitler and encouraged him to go further leading to the outbreak of the war.  Must cover both events for top of level.</p>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>EITHER</b>  <b>Develops one cause.</b>  e.g. examines the Treaty of Versailles explaining how unjust some of the terms appeared to be, giving examples, and illustrating how it led to some leaders in the West having sympathy for Hitler.  Examines appeasement, explaining the rationale behind it and linking it to Hitler’s foreign policy.</p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Covers both with some development or explanation.</b></p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Narrative approach implying causation.</b>  e.g. narrative of Versailles and appeasement with little focus on the question.</p>	<b>3-5</b>
<b>Level 3 A</b>	<p><b>selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question and establishing some argument.</b>  e.g. covers two developed points from level 2 above or a narrative approach which makes some assessment.  Reaches reasoned judgement without substantiating evidence.</p>	<b>6-8</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p><b>Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question.</b>  e.g. covers both parts in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level.</p>	<b>9-10</b>



**OPTION W****OPTION X****Question 6****Question 7**

**6/7(a)** Describe the decisions made at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of 1945. (6 marks)

**Level 1****Basic description.**

e.g. The two conferences planned the end of the war and what to do with Germany afterwards.

**1-2****Level 2****EITHER****Detailed description of limited aspects.**

e.g. describes one of the following:  
 the division of Germany and Berlin;  
 the role of USSR in Eastern Europe – influence but free elections;  
 Poland – conflict between Stalin and West;  
 Stalin and Japan – compensation;  
 change in personnel at Potsdam and its effects;  
 Germany to pay reparations – details –disarmament, ‘war criminals’;  
 conflicts over atom bomb/Poland/recovery of Germany.

**OR****Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**

e.g. outline view of both conferences with no differentiation between them.

**3-4****Level 3****Detailed description of several aspects.**

e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2, covering both conferences.

**5-6**

**6/7(b)** What does **Source E/A** tell us about relations between the USA and Soviet Russia in 1960? (3 marks)

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

Mark on a ‘penny points’ system – reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks).

e.g. USA used spy planes.

they planned Summit Meetings;

USA prepared to lie;

USA refused to back down even though wrong;

prepared to end peace talks.

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

**3**

**6/7(c)** How reliable is **Source F/B** to an historian studying the U2 incident of 1960?  
Use **Source F/B and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. (6 marks)

**Target:** Evaluation of a source for reliability (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1).

**Level 1** EITHER

**Learned response or simple response based on source.**

e.g. reliable because the U2s were spy planes.

Unreliable because it is biased; President would not paint a plane.

**OR**

**Answer based on utility/content of source.**

e.g. it is reliable because it tells us.

1

**Level 2** EITHER

**Combination of both parts of level 1.**

**OR**

**Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source, accepting it at face value.**

e.g. USA publicly talking about peace but still sending spy missions over USSR.

2-3

**Level 3** EITHER

**Evaluates the provenance of the source.**

e.g. questions the purpose of the cartoon; it is a Soviet cartoon so the purpose would be to embarrass the USA and gain a political victory from the incident.

**OR**

**Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source, placing it into context.**

e.g. any additional background to U2 Crisis; details of Space Race; Paris Summit etc.

4-5

**Level 4** Combination of both parts of level 3.

6

**6/7(d)** Which was more important as a reason for the development of the Cold War in the years 1948 to 1955:

- the Berlin Blockade 1948 to 1949;
- the Korean War 1950 to 1953?

You must refer to both reasons when explaining your answer.

*(10 marks)*

**Target:**            **Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 6.1).**

**Level 1**            **EITHER**  
**Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic.**  
 e.g. describes the Blockade and how it started the Cold War.

**OR**  
**Simple general causation statements.**  
 e.g. points out that the Korean War spread the Cold War to the Far East.  
 Must cover both events for top of level.

**1-2**

**Level 2**            **EITHER**  
**Develops one cause.**  
 e.g. explains the reasons for the Blockade; the Airlift; its results and how it affected relations between East and West.  
 Explains the situation in the North and South Korea; USA's fears; UNO involvement; results and effect on Cold War.

**OR**  
**Covers both with some development or explanation.**

**OR**  
**Narrative approach implying causation.**  
 e.g. narrative of Berlin Blockade and Korean War with little focus on the question.

**3-5**

**Level 3**            **A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question and establishing some argument.**  
 e.g. covers two developed points from level 2 above or a narrative approach which makes some assessment.  
 Reaches reasoned judgement without substantiating evidence.

**6-8**

**Level 4**            **Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question.**  
 e.g. covers both parts in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level.

**9-10**

**OPTION X****Question 8**

- 8(a)** What does **Source C** tell us about the number of nuclear warheads in the USSR and the USA between 1967 and 1981? *(3 marks)*

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

Mark on a ‘penny points’ system – reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks).

e.g. one accurate figure lifted from source such as USA had between 4 and 5 thousand in 1967 ( maximum of 1 for this type of information);

USA and USSR were both increasing their numbers;

the gap between them was narrowing;

Gap at its widest in 1975.

Count any explanation or inference as one point. **3**

- 8(b)** Describe what was agreed at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I, 1972 and SALT II, 1979) and at Helsinki in 1975. *(6 marks)*

**Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**

**Level 1** **Basic description.**  
e.g. they reduced nuclear arms. **1-2**

**Level 2** **EITHER**  
**Detailed description of limited aspects.**  
e.g. describes one of the following:  
Limitation of missiles: ICBM; ABM; SLBM;  
agreement on spy satellites;  
human rights;  
effect on trade;  
acceptance of frontiers.

**OR**

**Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**  
e.g. outline view of agreements. **3-4**

**Level 3** **Detailed description of several aspects.**  
e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2, but must cover SALT agreement and Helsinki for this level. **5-6**

**8(c)** How reliable is **Source D** to an historian studying the SALT II agreement?  
Use **Source D and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. (6 marks)

**Target:** Evaluation of a source for reliability (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1).

**Level 1** **EITHER**  
**Learned response or simple response based on source.**  
e.g. reliable because it is by the American President and he signed the agreement.  
Unreliable because it is biased.

**OR**  
**Answer based on utility/content of source.**  
e.g. it is reliable because it tells us. **1**

**Level 2** **EITHER**  
**Combination of both parts of level 1.**

**OR**  
**Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Sources, accepting it at face value.**  
e.g. it went further than SALT 1 so statement must be true;  
uses Source D to support/oppose statement. **2-3**

**Level 3** **EITHER**  
**Evaluates the provenance of the source.**  
e.g. questions the purpose of the statement: Carter had signed the agreement therefore he had a vested interest in its success, hence he could have been exaggerating to gain support and popularity.

**OR**  
**Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source, placing it into context.**  
e.g. the problems they had on human rights – the short lived nature of the agreement – Afghanistan cut it short. **4-5**

**Level 4** **Combination of both parts of level 3.** **6**

**8(d)** Which was more important as a reason for improving relations between the USA and USSR during the Cold War:

- the effects of the Cuban Missile Crisis 1962;
- the economic problems in the USSR and the USA in the 1970s?

You must refer to both reasons when explaining your answer. (10 marks)

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 6.1).</b>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>EITHER</b>  <b>Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic.</b>  e.g. describes the Cuban Crisis and how it made people afraid of war.</p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Simple general causation statements.</b>  <i>E.g. points out that there were economic problems in USA and USSR and they did not have the money to spend on arms.</i>  <b>MUST COVER BOTH EVENTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.</b></p>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>EITHER</b>  <b>Develops one cause.</b>  e.g. examines results of Cuban Missile Crisis – Test Ban Treaty – Hotline and how the Crisis appeared to improve relations in the 1960s, but was it real? – Czechoslovakia 1968.  Examines economic problems: inflation in USA; spending on Vietnam War; expenditure on arms too great.  USSR: wanted to improve living standards at home.  Both were concerned about the conflict in the Middle East because of oil supplies.</p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Covers both with some development or explanation.</b></p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Narrative approach implying causation.</b>  e.g. narrative of Cuban Crisis and economic problems with little focus on the question.</p>	<b>3-5</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question and establishing some argument.</b>  e.g. covers two developed points from level 2 above or a narrative approach which makes some assessment.  Reaches reasoned judgement without substantiating evidence.</p>	<b>6-8</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p><b>Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question.</b>  e.g. covers both parts in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level`</p>	<b>9-10</b>

**OPTION X****Question 9**

- 9(a)** What does **Source E** tell us about the United States objections to Soviet expansion in the 1970s? *(3 marks)*

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

Mark on a 'penny points' system – reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks).

E.g. concerned about the setting up of puppet governments;

Soviet military strength was increasing;

thought the USSR wanted World domination;

afraid the USSR wanted to control oil supplies of Persian Gulf;

could control USA's economy.

Count any explanation or inference as one point. **3**

- 9(b)** Describe the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan from the invasion in 1979 to the withdrawal in 1989. *(6 marks)*

**Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**

**Level 1 Basic description.**

e.g. USSR invaded in 1979 but were unsuccessful and withdrew in 1989. **1-2**

**Level 2 EITHER**

**Detailed description of limited aspects.**

e.g. describes one of the following:

Invasion – events, capture of Kabul, death of Hafizullah Amin; setting up of new government.

Reaction of the World to the invasion – opposition of the USA and China; economic sanctions.

Continuation of the war – guerrilla warfare; the Mujaheddin; problems for the Soviets; withdrawal.

**OR**

**Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**

e.g. outline of course of war. **3-4**

**Level 3 Detailed description of several aspects.**

e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2. **5-6**

- 9(c)** How reliable is **Source F** to an historian studying the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan from the invasion of 1979?  
Use **Source F and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. (6 marks)

**Target:** Evaluation of a source for reliability (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1).

- Level 1** **EITHER**  
**Learned response or simple response based on source.**  
e.g. reliable because it is from a Russian newspaper and it is condemning the war.  
Unreliable because it is biased.
- OR**  
**Answer based on utility/content of source.**  
e.g. it is reliable because it tells us. **1**
- Level 2** **EITHER**  
**Combination of both parts of level 1.**
- OR**  
**Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source, accepting it at face value.**  
e.g. source was written in 1990 therefore using hindsight. **2-3**
- Level 3** **EITHER**  
**Evaluates the provenance of the source.**  
e.g. questions the purpose of the statement or the motive of the author: was it written by an opponent of communism? Comments on the significance of 1990.
- OR**  
**Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source, placing it into context.**  
e.g. explanation of the fighting methods and why the Russians could not win; uses knowledge of background to invasion to explain the interference of the Russians. **4-5**
- Level 4** **Combination of both parts of level 3.** **6**



- 9(d)** Which was a more important reason for the collapse of Communism in Central and Eastern Europe:
- ‘Solidarity’ in Poland;
  - the policies of Mikhail Gorbachev?

You must refer to both reasons when explaining your answer.

(10 marks)

**Target:** Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 6.1).

<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>EITHER</b>  <b>Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic.</b>  e.g. Solidarity was a trade union movement in Poland which challenged the communist government.</p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Simple general causation statements.</b>  e.g. Mikhail Gorbachev was the Soviet leader who introduced new policies which led to demands for more freedom and the overthrow of communism.</p> <p>Must cover both events for top of level.</p>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>EITHER</b>  <b>Develops one cause.</b>  e.g. examines events in Poland – conditions; demands; strikes; Lech Walesa; effect on world opinion and its results in 1989.  Explanation of Perestroika and Glasnost ending the Brezhnev Doctrine; effects on Eastern Europe.</p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Covers both with some development or explanation.</b></p> <p><b>OR</b>  <b>Narrative approach implying causation.</b>  e.g. narrative of Solidarity Movement, Perestroika and Glasnost with little focus on the question.</p>	<b>3-5</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question and establishing some argument.</b>  e.g. covers two developed points from level 2 above or a narrative approach which makes some assessment.  Reaches reasoned judgement without substantiating evidence.</p>	<b>6-8</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p><b>Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question.</b>  e.g. covers both parts in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level.</p>	<b>9-10</b>

**SECTION B****OPTION Y****Question 10**

**10 (a)** According to **Source A**, why were women employed in engineering in Britain in the First World War? (3 marks)

**Target:** **Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

Mark on a ‘penny points’ system – reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks).

e.g. shortages of engineers;

more munitions needed for war;

men were needed in the forces;

government was setting the example.

Count any explanation or inference as one point. **3**

**10(b)** Why was **Source B** distributed in Britain in 1917?  
Use **Source B** and **your own knowledge** to answer the question. (6 marks)

**Target:** **Explanation of causation using source and own knowledge (AO 6.1) (AO 6.2)**

**Level 1** **Simple, basic reason drawing on source/own knowledge.**

e.g. encouraging people to save food; praising the bravery of the seamen; comments on food shortages. **1-2**

**Level 2** **EITHER**  
**Developed monocausal answer using source and/or own knowledge**

e.g. explains one of the following:

unrestricted submarine warfare and its effect on supplies of food in 1917;

the serious nature of the shortages: GB’s dependence on imports etc. rationing 1918;

shortages were so great that other methods had to be used – WLA; public parks etc;

the propaganda effect/purpose of the poster – the importance of the sea to GB.

**OR**

**Multicausal answer which lacks development or explanation using source and/or own knowledge.**

e.g. lists the points above with no explanation. **3-4**

**Level 3** **Developed multicausal answer using source and own knowledge.**

e.g. develops at least two of the reasons in the first part of level 2, but must use both source and knowledge. **5-6**

<b>10(c)</b>	How useful is <b>Source C</b> to an historian studying conditions on the Western Front in the First World War? Use <b>Source C and your own knowledge</b> to answer the question.	<i>(8 marks)</i>
<b>Target:</b>	<b>Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1).</b>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Accepts the content of the source at face value</b> e.g. it shows the Western Front; shows the condition of the ground, therefore useful.  <b>OR</b> <b>Generalised or learned response.</b> e.g. it is a painting so it is not true.	<b>1-2</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source or own simple knowledge.</b> e.g. the source is limited because it was only finished in 1921; it shows only a small part of the Western Front etc.  <b>OR</b> <b>Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias.</b> e.g. a British artist therefore biased and only showing parts that will support Britain, would have been censored etc.	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge or source evaluation</b>  <b>EITHER</b> e.g. tests the source using own knowledge of conditions on the Western Front: mud; shell craters; water; barbed wire; effects of bombardment etc.  <b>OR</b> e.g. questions provenance of painting: was it by an official war artist? Was it affected by censorship as it was completed after war? Comments on how points like this would affect the utility of the painting.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Develops an argument about the usefulness and limitations of the source using knowledge and source evaluation. Must cover at least one reason from own knowledge and one from source for this level.</b> e.g. both parts of level 3.	<b>7-8</b>

**10(d)** Is **Source D** an accurate interpretation of the part played by Britain in the defeat of Germany in the First World War?

Use **Source D** and **your own knowledge** to answer the question.

(8 marks)

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Analysis and evaluation of interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)</b>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Describes the content of the source accepting the interpretation at face value (comprehension)</b> e.g. the Blockade was important because it did lead to starvation and rebellion in Germany.	<b>1-2</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about.</b> e.g. British therefore biased; effect of hindsight; written by a naval historian therefore an expert.	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author.</b> e.g. written by a naval historian therefore he would be trying to glorify the part played by the navy in the war.  <b>OR</b> <b>Analysis of the content of the source to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation.</b> e.g. explains the part played by the navy in the victory: the Blockade; Channel escorts etc. but points out limitations to the interpretation e.g. was Jutland a victory? The part played by the British army e.g. the BEF in 1914; at the Somme – could the Germans have been defeated without the army?	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Both parts of level 3.</b>	<b>7-8</b>

**OPTION Z****Question 11**

**11(a)** According to **Source E**, why were women employed in Britain in the Second World War? *(3 marks)*

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

Mark on a 'penny points' system – reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks).

e.g. needed more aeroplanes etc.;  
 more food needed to be produced;  
 men were conscripted;  
 women needed to replace them.

Count any explanation or inference as one point. **3**

**11(b)** Why was **Source F** distributed in Britain in 1940?  
 Use **Source F and your own knowledge** to answer the question. *(6 marks)*

**Target: Explanation of causation using source and own knowledge (AO 6.1) (AO 6.2)**

**Level 1 Simple, basic reason drawing on source/own knowledge.**  
 e.g. encouraging mothers to keep their children in the countryside, not to reverse evacuation. **1-2**

**Level 2 EITHER**  
**Developed monocausal answer using source and/or own knowledge**  
 e.g. explains one of the following:  
 Background to evacuation;  
 first evacuation – success or failure – effect on evacuees and their parents;  
 Phoney War and its effects;  
 stresses the propaganda aspect/purpose of the poster – use of Hitler etc.

**OR**  
**Multicausal answer which lacks development or explanation using source and/or own knowledge.**  
 e.g. lists the points above with no explanation. **3-4**

**Level 3 Developed multicausal answer using source and own knowledge.**  
 e.g. develops at least two of the reasons in the first part of level 2, but must use both source and own knowledge. **5-6**

**11(c)** How useful is Source G to an historian studying the evacuation from Dunkirk, 1940?

Use **Source G** and **your own knowledge** to answer the question.

(8 marks)

**Target:** Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1).

**Level 1** EITHER

**Accepts the content of the source at face value**

e.g. it shows the beaches at Dunkirk; the ships taking the men off the beaches; German aircraft firing at them etc.

OR

**Generalised or learned response.**

e.g. it is a painting so it is not true.

1-2

**Level 2** EITHER

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

e.g. limited because it does not show events as they happened, it is an artist's impression; only shows a small part of the beach; does not show what is happening on land or results of evacuation etc.

OR

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

e.g. a British artist therefore biased and only showing parts that will support Britain, would have been censored etc.

3-4

**Level 3** Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge or source evaluation.

EITHER

e.g. tests the source using own knowledge of Dunkirk: lasted 9 days; tactics of Luftwaffe; casualties, ships used; victory or defeat?

OR

e.g. questions provenance of painting: it was by an official war artist, so it was to raise morale etc; would be subject to censorship with explanation; purpose to make a victory out of a defeat etc. Comments on how points like this would affect the utility of the painting.

5-6

**Level 4** Develops an argument about the usefulness and limitations of the source using knowledge and source evaluation. Must cover at least one reason from own knowledge and one from source for this level.

e.g. both parts of level 3.

7-8

**11(d)** Is **Source H** an accurate interpretation of the part played by Britain in the defeat of Germany in the Second World War?

Use **Source H** and **your own knowledge** to answer the question.

(8 marks)

**Target:**            **Analysis and evaluation of interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**

**Level 1**            **Describes the content of the source accepting the interpretation at face value (comprehension).**

e.g. the Battle of the Atlantic was important because it the U Boats were defeated; Churchill thought it was important.

**1-2**

**Level 2**            **Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about.**

e.g. British therefore biased; effect of hindsight; written by a naval historian therefore an expert.

**3-4**

**Level 3**            **EITHER**

**Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author.**

e.g. written by a naval historian therefore he would be concentrating on the part played by the sea forces in the war – this could lead to exaggeration etc.

**OR**

**Analysis of the content of the source to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation.**

e.g. explains the part played by the Battle of the Atlantic in the victory: aims and tactics of the U Boats – British measures to protect their ships convoys, sonar, radar. Was Britain successful? Did success in Atlantic depend on America's help? Refers to other parts of Britain's contribution to victory to evaluate the interpretation: Battle of Britain; bombing of Germany etc.

**5-6**

**Level 4 Both parts of level 3.**

**7-8**