

GCSE 2004

June Series



Mark Scheme

History Specification B Paper Three (3042/3047)

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX. *Dr Michael Cresswell Director General*

GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION
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 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) How reliable is Source A to an historian studying the role of women before the First World War? Use Source A and your own knowledge to explain your answer. (10 marks)

Target	Evaluation of source(s) for reliability (A02).	
Level 1	<p>EITHER Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension). Verbatim.</p> <p>Or Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source. e.g. rewording of content.</p>	1-2
Level 2	<p>EITHER Combined both features of level 1, with argued application of content of the source to the question, at face value. Rewording of content.</p> <p>Or Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source. e.g. It was written by a trade unionist who as a woman might be sympathetic to the low status of women in the workplace. Sees emotive language as accurate of a view ‘that we pay them’.</p>	3-5
Level 3	<p>EITHER Evaluates the provenance of the source Challenges emotive language ‘kind’ ‘good citizens’.</p> <p>OR Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source. e.g. uses knowledge to support the description in the source or places in context of suffrage movement. Supports the official role of the trade union and its attempt to raise women’s wages.</p>	6-8
Level 4	<p>Combination of both parts of level . At least 2 × provenance + 2 × knowledge for top of level.</p>	9-10

(b) Explain what **Source B** tells us about career women at the end of the twentieth Century. (5 marks)

Target: Comprehension and inference of an historical source (AO2).

Level 1	Answer that selects detail from the source. Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding. e.g. they work much harder than men. Only one in ten think women make a better boss.	1-2
Level 2	Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source. e.g. Women still have to run the home and therefore cannot always get promotion. Simple reference to some ‘famous women’.	3-4
Level 3	Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source. e.g. Thatcher as PM, JK Rowling as millionaire author, Anita Roddick as examples of successful women explaining the work life balance argument. Sees importance in some women holding senior positions. Award complex inference if candidate links Source B to tenure of Source A. Explanation of glass ceiling, home and work references – Level 3.	5

(c) Do you agree that war work was more important than suffragette action in gaining votes for women in 1918?

Explain your answer.

(15 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (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/consequence. e.g. Candidate tends to discuss war work or suffragette tactics without reference to other factors or their impact.</p>	1-3
Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer.</p> <p>OR Narrative implying explanation which lacks development.</p> <p>OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development. e.g. links to other factors such as violence . Sees the importance of the war work in general terms.</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. links the violent campaign to publicity but sees the war work or suffragette actions as more significant.</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 role of WSPU, NUWSS, Parliament, violent and non-violent methods, war work and the war and comes to a balanced evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • War work • Suffragettes • Suffragists • Cat and Mouse Act • Changing political views 	12-15

(d) Did legislation such as the Equal Pay Act 1970 and the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 give women equality in British Society?

Explain your answer.

(15 marks)

Target: **Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence. (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/consequence.
 e.g. women can now earn equal pay with men but some do not.

1-3

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

OR
Narrative implying causation/consequence.
 e.g. begins answer with gaining vote in 1919.

OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development.

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 the terms of the two acts and the reality in the workplace.

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 of legislation over a significant period. Makes a final judgement which is balanced drawing on a knowledge of legislation, economics, family demands, glass ceiling.

12-15

2 Britain and Ireland since 1916

(a) How reliable is **Source A** to an historian studying the Easter Rising of 1916?

Use Source A 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. It was an eyewitness account.	1-2
Level 2	EITHER Combined 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 in Ireland. Written with hindsight and recognising its significance to Irish history.	3-5
Level 3	EITHER Evaluates the provenance of the source. Discusses the issue of family spirit over independence.	
	OR Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source. e.g. Positive/negative views of the source origin. Questions whether it is a republican source, would the purpose of the source be to enhance Irish history?	6-8
Level 4	Combination of both parts of level 3. 2 × provenance + 2 × knowledge for top of level.	9-10

(b) Explain what **Source B** tells us about the Good Friday Agreement of 1998. (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. Disarmament. US involvement. Catholic issue. Verbatim.	1-2
Level 2	Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source. e.g. reached agreement and looked to disarmament. No official agreement was reached.	3-4
Level 3	Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source. e.g. balanced answer looks at gains for both sides. Suggests that ultimate success was unlikely by focus on “but no agreement was reached”.	5

- (c) Was the Easter Rising the turning point that led to the partition of Ireland?
Explain your answer. (15 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1).

Level 1	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set. Candidates falling back on Source A to be marked at this level.	
	OR Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence.	1-3
Level 2	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer. The impact of World War One.	
	OR Narrative implying causation/consequence.	
	OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development (See L3 List) e.g. Single point developed such as the impact of the Easter Rising on the hopes of an independent Ireland.	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 Easter Rising, 1916 Bristol Response Civil War 1919-1921 Government of Ireland Act, 1920	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

(d) How did events in the late 1960s and early 1970s such as Bloody Sunday prevent a solution to ‘the troubles’ in Northern Ireland?
Explain your answer. (15 marks)

Target: **Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (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. any trouble in Ireland makes peace difficult.</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 at a simple level a range of issues within the period of British occupation in Northern Ireland including internment and Bloody Sunday.</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. Growing dislike of British troops in Northern Ireland Failure of Internment Rioting and growing terrorism/bombings.</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 L3, developing relative importance.</p>	12-15

3 Britain's changing role in the world since 1956

- (a) How reliable is Source A to an historian studying the Suez Crisis, 1956?
Use Source A 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). Suez is in North Africa so was the historian.	
	OR Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source. Accurate due to hindsight.	1-2
Level 2	EITHER Combined 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 North African who might not like the British.	3-5
Level 3	EITHER Evaluates the provenance of the source.	
	OR Uses own knowledge to question the reliability of the source. e.g. written with hindsight (explained). Written well after it became known that Britain had planned the invasion of Egypt. Challenges Nasser as an 'unreal' hero.	6-8
Level 4	Combination of both parts of level 3. 2 × provenance + 2 × knowledge for top of level.	9-10

(b) Explain what Source B tells us about the Kurdish Revolt of 1991. (5 marks)

Target	Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2).	
Level 1	Answers that select detail from the source. Candidates tend to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding. Chemical weapons. Rebellions in Iraq. Tendency to verbatim response.	1-2
Level 2	Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source. e.g. the Kurds in the north needed US/UN support because they offered comfort. Reworking of content.	3-4
Level 3	Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source. e.g. links to more recent issues, role for UN, USA, Britain. Identifies 'temporary' nature of support for the Kurds.	5

(c) Was the seizure of the Suez Canal the main reason why Britain invaded Nasser’s Egypt in 1956?
Explain your answer. (15 marks)

Target:	Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence. (AO1).	
Level 1	<p>EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set. Canal is important (unexplained)</p> <p>OR Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence. e.g. Britain was very angry at the seizure of the dam which they owned.</p>	1-3
Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer. Yes – relates events. No – fear of growing power of President Nasser. Describes importance of trade/ownership of canal.</p> <p>OR Narrative implying causation/consequence.</p> <p>OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development. e.g. Discusses single issues within the period of the Crisis e.g. financial support of Nasser by USSR.</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. purpose of Aswan Dam project Nasser as an Arab Leader France and Algeria Britain and Suez Canal Israel and Arab Threat Cold War and USSR</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.</p>	12-15

- (d) How did the Falklands War change the view held at home and abroad about Britain's position as a world power?
Explain your answer. (15 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1).

Level 1	<p>EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set. Britain was more powerful. Britain won.</p> <p>OR Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence. e.g. Candidate tends to outline the key events, possibly referring to the reaction in the rest of the world.</p>	1-3		
Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer.</p> <p>OR Narrative implying causation. e.g. Narrative of the war (bottom of level).</p> <p>OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development. e.g. Discusses a range of issues within the period of the Crisis; Questions the use of the exclusion zone.</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. sinking of the Belgrano – naval power. Losses – naval weakness. Changing opinion at home...some anti war feeling some increased war mongering reaction of USA/UN attempts at a peaceful solution. Britain's viewed success of war and re-elected Mrs. Thatcher as PM/Conservatives to power.</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. Range of immediate and longer term consequences.</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military power • Pro-war attitudes • Increased status • Thatcher re-elected • Relationship with US strengthened. </td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naval weakness • Anti-war attitudes • Weakened status • Weak government re-elected • Relationship with US weakened </td> </tr> </table>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military power • Pro-war attitudes • Increased status • Thatcher re-elected • Relationship with US strengthened. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naval weakness • Anti-war attitudes • Weakened status • Weak government re-elected • Relationship with US weakened 	12-15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military power • Pro-war attitudes • Increased status • Thatcher re-elected • Relationship with US strengthened. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naval weakness • Anti-war attitudes • Weakened status • Weak government re-elected • Relationship with US weakened 			

4 Vietnam since 1939.

(a) How did the battle of Dien Bien Phu, 1954, help bring about the French withdrawal from Vietnam?
(6 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequences (AO1).

Level 1	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set. The battle led to French losses. OR Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence. e.g. The French had lost the battle and left.	1-2
Level 2	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer. e.g. Guerrilla tactics worked against the French. OR Narrative implying causation. e.g. An account of the battle showing French failure. OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development. e.g. The French people did not have the heart to continue fighting. French realised they could not win a guerrilla war.	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. poor economic times for the French Less interest in maintaining an empire. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shock of military defeat in France• Failure of military tactics• Determination of Vietnamese• Post-war economics• Lack of US military support.	5-6

- (b) How useful is **Source A** to an historian studying the Tet Offensive, 1968?
Use **Source A and your own knowledge** to answer the question.

(8 marks)

Target: Evaluation of source(s) for utility at face value.

Level 1 EITHER

Accepts the content of the source at face value.
Shows dead Vietcong troops outside radio station.

OR

Generalised or learned responses which could apply to any source.
e.g. generalised response centred on the value of photographic evidence.

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. does not show any US dead.

OR

Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the sources in terms of provenance, reliability or bias.
e.g. references to unknown soldiers in foreground (Vietcong or South Vietnamese or civilians). Accurate – it was taken just after the attack (reference to firemen).

3-4

Level 3

EITHER

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

OR

Source evaluation.

e.g. Centres on possible uses of the photo by a US camera man wanting to show the positive or negative sides to the Tet Offensive.

5-6

Level 4

Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitation of the source using knowledge and source evaluation.

e.g. uses knowledge to suggest that Tet was a victory for either side.

Explains impact that the radio station was damaged.

Useful – US victory/defeat

Limited – only one incident

– one part of Saigon (US Embassy)

2× Source + 2×knowledge equals top of level.

7-8

(c)	<p>Sources B and C give different views on the fall of Saigon, 1975. Why do you think they are different? Explain your answer using Sources B and C and your own knowledge. (8 marks)</p>	
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	<p>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. One lives in USA. One still lives in Vietnam. Hindsight verses eyewitnesses.</p>	3-4
Level 3	<p>EITHER Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purpose of the author(s).</p> <p>OR Analyse the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation. e.g. Vietnamese woman living in the USA must have escaped as she lives as a refugee. Author of Source C clearly pro communist because he/she still lives in Saigon. Source C suggests a very quick return to normal life.</p>	5-6
Level 4	<p>As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical content. e.g. the escape of many to the USA, boat people? Analysis of the emotive language used to identify pro communist viewpoint.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boat People • Treatment of pro-US Vietnamese 	7-8

- (d) Why were guerrilla tactics used against the US army during the Vietnam War?
You should refer in your answer to
Theory of guerrilla warfare,
Guerrilla tactics 1965-1973,
US responses to guerrilla tactics.
Explain your answer. (8 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1).

- Level 1 EITHER**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic than a specific focus of the question set.
The jungle made it the best way to fight.
- Or**
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence.
They worked because the US lost. **1-2**
- Level 2 EITHER**
Developed mono-causal answer.
- OR**
Narrative implying causation.
- OR**
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development.
e.g. description of My Lai to illustrate its success/failure.
Brief details of theory, tactics, response. **3-4**
- Level 3 EITHER**
Developed multi-causal.
Clear understanding of bullet points 2=5, 3=6 marks
- OR**
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of 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.**
- Candidates may make clear references to the following areas to reach level 3&4
Theory of guerrilla warfare (Why it should work)
Guerrilla Tactics 1965-1973 (Examples with impact)
US responses to guerrilla tactics.
Relative strengths of armies
Impact of terrain/geography. **7-8**

- (e) Why was a successful peace difficult to achieve in Vietnam in the years after the war?
 You should refer in your answer to
 The Boat People,
 Economic problems,
 The long term effects of chemical warfare.
 Explain your answer. (8 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence. (AO1).

- Level 1** EITHER
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set.
 Unexploded bombs. Lots of people killed in war.
- OR
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence.
 The war had destroyed large areas of land. 1-2
- Level 2** EITHER
Developed mono-causal answer.
- OR
Narrative implying causation.
- OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development.
 Typically, causes will not be linked in any way. 3-4
- Level 3** EITHER
Developed multi-causal.
 Clear understanding of bullet points 2=5, 3=6 marks.
- OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question.
 e.g. Flight of people to USA
 Boat People
 Economic problems
 Long term effects of chemical warfare. 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 key areas.
- Candidates must make clear references to the following areas to reach levels 3 &4
- Fear of those left in Vietnam
 - Boat People
 - Economic problems
 - Long term effects of chemical warfare. 7-8

5 The Arab Israeli Conflict

- (a) How did the McMahon letter, 1915 and the Balfour Declaration, 1917 make it difficult for Britain to control Palestine after the First World War? (6 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (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/consequence. e.g. The British had made promises to both sides. Britain had to try and control two sides.</p>	1-2
Level 2	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer. Developed on the McMahon letter/Balfour declaration only.</p> <p>OR Narrative implying causation.</p> <p>OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development. e.g. The British would find opposition in Arabs and Jews once they were given the Mandate to control Palestine after the war. Failure to control the Arab Revolt.</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 demands of the question. McMahon letter Balfour Declaration British Mandate Arab Revolt Impact of holocaust and Jewish Immigration.</p>	5-6

- (b) How useful is **Source A** to an historian studying the Palestine Liberation Organisation?
Use **Source A** and your own knowledge to answer the question. (8 marks)

Target: Evaluation of source(s) for utility (A02).

Level 1	EITHER Accepts the content of the source at face value. The PLO was ready to fight in 1972.	
	OR Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source. e.g. It shows the support of young people, the weapons they had, training.	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. Useful for guns/uniforms/training camps.	
	OR Simple comments on the usefulness or limitation 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. Taken by a Palestinian as only a Palestinian would get in one of the camps.	3-4
Level 3	EITHER Develops an argument about usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge or source evaluation. PLO fighters are children (discuss propaganda techniques).	5-6
Level 4	Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge AND source evaluation. 2 × knowledge + 2 × sources for top of level.	7-8

- (c) **Sources B and C** give different views on the Munich Olympics, 1972.
 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). Quotes figures (Source B). Both say there were 8 terrorists.	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). Clear understanding of bullet points 2=5, 3=6. OR Analysis of the content the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation. e.g. IOC official website centres on sport not politics. Both claim different lasting impressions.	5-6
Level 4	As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context. e.g. The US supported the Israelis, so would CNN. Identifies errors in the sources (numbers killed) athletes and officials.	7-8

- (d) Why were a range of tactics used against the Israelis in the 1970s and 1980s?
You should refer in your answer to
Conventional warfare,
Terrorism
Oil War.
Explain your answer. (8 marks)

Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1).

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

OR
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence.
They tried something different when something would not work. 1-2

Level 2 EITHER
Developed mono-causal answer.
e.g. Centres on a range of terrorist actions – bombings/murder/hijacking.

OR
Narrative implying causation/consequence.

OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development.
They tried different things to get their cause on the front of newspapers.