

General Certificate of Secondary Education

History 3042/3047 *Specification B*

Paper 1

Mark Scheme

2005 examination - June series

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.

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 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 B2A/3. 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 have 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: Conflict in the Modern World

Section A: International History

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

Option V

Question 1

- (a) What does **Source A** tell us about the Schlieffen Plan used in 1914? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. to attack France first;

Use surprise;

Use almost all the German army against France;

Capture Paris;

Pass through Belgium;

Belgium not considered a problem;

Then fight Russia;

Thought Russia would take longer to mobilise;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) How accurate is the view in **Source B** of the attitude of the British government towards the German invasion of Belgium in 1914?

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

6

Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)

Level 1: EITHER

Learned response or simple response based on source

e.g. Germany did bully Belgium; Britain did support Belgium.

Accurate because it is primary; inaccurate because it is a cartoon, biased etc.

OR

Answer based on utility/content/description of source

e.g. it is accurate because it shows us Germany bullying Belgium

1

Level 2: EITHER

Combination of both parts of level 1

OR

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

e.g. refers to size of Germany and Belgium in cartoon and in reality; Germany did attack Belgium; Britain did defend Belgium; Explanation of NO THOROUGHFARE re neutrality of Belgium.

2-3

Level 3: EITHER

Evaluates the provenance of the source.

e.g. cartoon made at the outbreak of war - trying to ridicule Germany and show the support in Britain for Belgium and to justify going to war against Germany. Trying to blame war on Germany.

OR

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

e.g. uses knowledge of the neutrality of Belgium going back to 1839 Treaty of London; other reasons for the importance of Belgium to GB.

Uses knowledge of GB's relationship with Germany 1906-1914 – naval race, crises etc

4-5

Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3.

6

- (c) Describe the alliance system that existed in Europe in 1914. 6
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1-2**
 e.g. there were two alliances (1)
 There was the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente (2).
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
- Detailed description of limited aspects**
 e.g. describes one of the following:
 The members of one (3) or both alliances (4);
 Terms/nature of the alliances: defensive, secret, dates, formation reasons etc;
 Examples of how they worked in crises;
 Effect on policies of the powers - encirclement.
- OR**
- Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**
 e.g. outline description of alliances and their effects etc.
 General point – only reward alliances involving the Great Powers
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5-6**
 e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2;
 Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.
 Must mention both alliances for this level.

- (d) Which was the greater danger to the peace of Europe in the years 1905-1914:
- the rivalry between France and Germany in Morocco;
 - the rivalry between Austria-Hungary and the Serbs in the Balkans?
- You must refer to **both** rivalries when explaining your answer. 10

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2

Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge

e.g. France and Germany both wanted Morocco.

Austria-Hungary and the Serbs were rivals in the Balkans.

OR

Simple general causation statements

e.g. Morocco built up tension, the Balkans led to the outbreak of war.

MUST COVER BOTH EVENTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 2: EITHER 3-5

Develops one cause

This starts with description at bottom of level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on question.

e.g. describes what happened in Morocco (3);

Explains why GB/Russia intervened (4);

Assesses effect on tension, alliances etc. (5).

Describes the rivalry between Serbia and Austria-Hungary in the Balkans (3);

Explains how this involved Germany and Russia (4);

Assesses the effect of this on tension/the outbreak of war (5).

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

Description of both (4). Explanation of both (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 6-8

Must be at least some assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point for this level.

Reasoned arguments with judgement but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level.

Level 4: Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question. 9-10
e.g. assesses both parts relatively and in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level.

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

- (a) What does **Source C** tell us about the main aims of the League of Nations? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. to keep peace;

Use of collective security;

Encourage disarmament;

Act against aggressors;

Use economic or military sanctions against an aggressor;

Count any explanation or inference as one point

- (b) Describe the aims of Georges Clemenceau and Woodrow Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. **6**

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

Level 1: Basic description. **1-2**

e.g. Clemenceau wanted to punish Germany far more than Wilson (1).
Clemenceau wanted revenge, Wilson wanted reconciliation (2).

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Detailed description of limited aspects.

e.g. describes one of the following:

Clemenceau and reparations – cost of war to France;

Clemenceau and security of France – Rhineland, disarmament etc.;

Clemenceau and revenge – Alsace Lorraine etc.

Wilson’s idealism and views on treatment of Germany compared to French view;

Wilson’s Fourteen Points – examples;

The League of Nations – Wilson’s ideal;

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

e.g. outline description of their aims.

Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects. **5-6**

e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2;

Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

Must cover both statesmen for this level.

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source D** of the importance of the USA's membership of the League of Nations?
Use **Source D and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. **6**
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1**
- Learned response or simple response based on source.**
e.g. accurate because it is a primary source;
Inaccurate because it is by the American president, therefore biased.
- OR**
- Answer based on utility/content/description of source.**
e.g. it is accurate because it tells us that there will be another war if America does not join the League.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-3**
Combination of both parts of level 1.
- OR**
- Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of source, or general knowledge, accepting it at face value.**
e.g. accurate because the USA did not join the League and there was a war within 20 years (2);
Accurate because the USA was the keystone in the League which kept all the other countries together (3);
Inaccurate because it was said during an election (2) and Wilson would be trying to get the people to vote for him (3).
- Level 3: EITHER** **4-5**
Evaluates the provenance of the source.
e.g. examines the purpose of the source: it is a speech from the American Presidential election, so Wilson will be trying to frighten people by warning them of the consequences of not voting for him or points out USA's role in the world.
- OR**
- Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context.**
e.g. relevant knowledge of how America's absence from the League weakened it and led to its failure. Could refer to Manchuria or Abyssinia or any other aspect of the League, such as its weaknesses (no army etc).
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3** **6**
-

- (d) Which part of the Treaty of Versailles caused more anger in Germany:
- the loss of territory in Europe;
 - war guilt and reparations?
- You must refer to **both** parts when explaining your answer. 10

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to consequence (AO 6.1)

- Level 1: EITHER** 1-2
- Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge**
 e.g. Germany lost a lot of territory and wanted it back.
 Germany was blamed for the war and had to pay the costs.

OR

- Simple general statements on effect**
 e.g. Germany hated the war guilt clause because they thought that other countries were responsible for the war.
MUST COVER BOTH EVENTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

- Level 2: EITHER** 3-5
- Develops one cause**
 This starts with description at bottom of level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on question.
 e.g. lists the territory taken from Germany (3);
 Explains why the loss was hated in Germany in terms of amount of land, population, separation of land etc.(4);
 Assesses effect on German people – some losses unjustified – no self determination – led to hatred and desire for revenge etc. (5).
 Describes war guilt clause and/or the £6,600 million reparations (3);
 Explains why these were hated: war of defence, not afford etc. (4);
 Assesses effect on German people – moral condemnation; economic ruin. (5).

OR

- Covers both with some development or explanation**
 This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.
 Description of both (4). Explanation of both (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** 6-8
- Must be at least some assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point for this level.
 Reasoned arguments with judgement but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level.

- Level 4: Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the Question** 9-10
- e.g. assesses both parts relatively and in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level.

OPTION V

Question 3

OPTION W

Question 5

- (a) Describe how the Japanese were able to take control of Manchuria in the year 1931 to 33. **6**

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

Level 1: Basic description **1-2**
e.g. They attacked, defeated the Chinese (1) and the League was unable to stop them (2).

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. describes one of the following:
Japanese influence in Manchuria – army presence, weakness of China;
South Manchurian Railway – explosion – Japanese response and success;
Manchukuo – Chinese appeal to League;
League response – Lytton Commission – Japanese withdrawal from League.
Weakness of League of Nations if related to Manchuria.

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects
e.g. outline description of invasion.

Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects **5-6**
e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2;
Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

- (b) What does **Source E** tell us about Hitler's entry into Vienna, Austria in 1938? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. triumphant;

Welcoming/cheering/saluting/popular etc.; (max 2)

Open car;

Surrounded by Nazi flags/emoles;

Nazi salute given;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

Happened in March 1938, crowd if qualified.

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source F** of Hitler's aims in foreign policy in the 1930s?
Use **Source F and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. **6**

Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)

- Level 1: EITHER** **1**
Learned response or simple response based on source
e.g. accurate because it is a primary source;
Inaccurate because it is Hitler and he told lies.

OR

Answer based on utility/content/description of source
e.g. it is accurate because it tells us that Hitler only had one aim which was to abolish the Treaty of Versailles.

- Level 2: EITHER** **2-3**
Combination of both parts of level 1

OR

Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source, or general knowledge, accepting it at face value
e.g. accurate because Hitler re-armed, occupied Rhineland etc i.e. a list of events.

- Level 3: EITHER** **4-5**
Evaluates the provenance of the source
e.g. examines the purpose of the source – recognises that it was said during the war in 1941 and considers Hitler's possible motives – was it to get rid of opposition in Germany, to convince Britain that he was not opposed to them so they would withdraw etc.?

OR

Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context
e.g. relevant knowledge of Hitler's foreign policy to show how Hitler did reverse the Treaty of Versailles. Up to two examples (4 marks) 3 examples (5 marks). Or how he went beyond Treaty of Versailles e.g. Anschluss, Czechoslovakia, Poland, France. Up to 2 examples (4 marks). 3 examples (5 marks). Or other foreign policy aims, if explained – if listed. Up to 2 examples (4 marks) 3 examples (5 marks).

- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3** **6**

- (d) Which of the following events was the greater success in Hitler's foreign policy:
- the re-militarisation of the Rhineland in 1936;
 - the occupation of the Sudetenland in 1938?
- You must refer to **both** events when explaining your answer. **10**

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

- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge.
 e.g. Hitler sent his troops into the Rhineland in 1936.
 Hitler was given the Sudetenland at Munich in 1938.

OR

Simple general causation statements.

e.g. Hitler got permission to occupy the Sudetenland, but he used his army in the Rhineland.

MUST COVER BOTH EVENTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

- Level 2: EITHER 3-5**
Develops one cause.

This starts with description at bottom of level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on question.

e.g. describes what happened in the Rhineland (3);

Explains why it was successful, why GB and France did not resist (4);

Assesses success of Hitler, what he had gained, the risk he had taken etc. (5).

Describes Hitler's meeting(s) with Chamberlain (3);

Explains why Hitler was given the Sudetenland (4);

Assesses Hitler's success – was it a victory or a defeat? Had Chamberlain given in to him or prevented him from taking over the whole of Czechoslovakia? Had Chamberlain bought time to re-arm or had it strengthened Hitler's position in Europe? (5).

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation.

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

Description of both (4). Explanation of both (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. 6-8**

Must be at least some assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point for this level.

Reasoned arguments with judgement but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level.

- Level 4: Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question. 9-10**
 e.g. assesses both parts relatively and in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level.

OPTION W

OPTION X

Question 6

Question 7

- (a) Describe the aims and achievements of the Marshall Plan. 6

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

Level 1: Basic description. 1-2
e.g. In the Marshall Plan, the USA gave money (1) to the countries of Europe after the war (2).

Level 2: EITHER 3-4
Detailed description of limited aspects.
e.g. describes one of the following:
Aims of the Plan – to protect Europe from communism – to help Europe to recover from the devastation of the war – to assist the recovery of American trade;
the fund itself \$15-17 billion – where it went e.g. GB the most;
attitude of Stalin to the Plan;
effects of the Plan on the recovery of Europe.

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects.
e.g. outline description of the Plan.

Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects. 5-6
e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2;
Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.
Must cover aims and achievements for this level.
Accept consequences for achievements.

-
- (b) How accurate is the view in **Source E** of the Berlin Airlift?
Use **Source E and your own knowledge** to explain your answer. **6**
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER **1****
Learned response or simple response based on source
 e.g. accurate because it is a primary source;
 Inaccurate because it is a cartoon, a British source therefore biased.
- OR**
Answer based on utility/content/description of source
 e.g. it is accurate because it shows coal and food being taken to Berlin.
- Level 2: EITHER **2-3****
Combination of both parts of level 1
- OR**
Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source, or general knowledge, accepting it at face value
 e.g. it is not accurate because Stalin did not shoot the supplies down (2). It is accurate because Berlin had been blockaded and the only way to get supplies in was by air (3).
- Level 3: EITHER **4-5****
Evaluates the provenance of the source
 e.g. examines the purpose of the source – it is a British cartoon and is trying to ridicule Stalin’s attempts to cut off West Berlin.
- OR**
Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context.
 e.g. relevant knowledge of what happened in the Blockade e.g. explains Stalin’s dilemma, that if he shot down the planes it would be an aggressive act which could lead to war.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 **6****
-

- (c) What does **Source F** tell us about the membership and purpose of NATO? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. membership of NATO in 1949 (any two countries – maximum 2 marks);

Extension of NATO 1952/1955 – maximum of 2 for 2 named countries;

Agreed on joint support if attacked;

A defensive alliance;

Fears of USSR.

Count any explanation or inference as one point..

- (d) Which event had the greater effect on the relationship between the USA and the USSR:
- the U2 Incident in 1960;
 - the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961?
- You must refer to **both** events when explaining your answer. 10

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to consequence (AO 6.1)

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge.
 e.g. the USSR shot down an American spy plane.
 The USSR built a wall to divide Berlin.

OR

Simple general statements on effects.
 e.g. U2 led to an increase in the Cold War, Wall made a concrete division.
MUST COVER BOTH EVENTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 2: EITHER 3-5
Develops one cause.
 This starts with description at bottom of level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on question.
 e.g. describes the U2 Incident (3);
 Explains US lies and how they were found out (4);
 Assesses effect on Cold War – collapse of Summit etc. (5).
 Describes the Berlin Wall (3);
 Explains its purpose and the immediate danger (4);
 Assesses the effect of this on the Cold War – did it cause or prevent war?
 Kennedy speech. Was it a danger? (5).

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation.
 This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.
 Description of both (4). Explanation of both (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. 6-8
 Must be at least some assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the bullet point for this level.
 Reasoned arguments with judgement but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level.

Level 4: Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question. 9-10
 e.g. assesses both parts relatively and in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level

OPTION X

Question 8

- (a) What does **Source C** tell us about the movement of people from East to West Germany between 1949 and 1964? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. people were escaping from East to West;

Quotes figures such as almost 350000 in 1953; (max 1)

Contrasts figures after 1961 such as less than 50000 in 1962; (max 1)

Refers to effect of Wall;

Comments on pattern of graph;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

Highest in 1953. Wall did not stop defections completely, wall reduced defections – extra mark for comment e.g. reduced dramatically.

Allow inference such as death of Stalin 1953, wall built.

- (b) Describe the arms race and the space race between the USA and the USSR up to 1961 when the first men were put into orbit. 6

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

Level 1: Basic description. 1-2

e.g. the USA developed the atom bomb and the USSR copied them.
The USSR put a man in space and the USA copied them.

Level 2: EITHER 3-4

Detailed description of limited aspects.

e.g. describes one of the following:

Background: Hiroshima - USA only atomic power until 1949 – hydrogen bomb 1952 (USA), 1953 (USSR);

launch of Sputnik 1957 – effect on USA pride – effect on arms race – ICBMs – Polaris 1960;

description shows full understanding of idea of race – competition and fears;

location of nuclear missiles;

Gagarin, Shepherd and Glenn, 1961.

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects.

e.g. outline description of events.

Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects. 5-6

e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2;

Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

Must cover both arms and space race for this level.

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source D** on the reasons for American involvement in the Korean War 1950-1953?
Use **Source D and your own knowledge** to explain your answer **6**
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER **1****
Learned response or simple response based on source
e.g. accurate because it is a primary source;
Inaccurate because it is an American source therefore biased.
- OR**
- Answer based on utility/content/description of source**
e.g. it is accurate because it tells us that the Americans went into the Korean War to maintain prestige.
- Level 2: EITHER **2-3****
Combination of both parts of level 1
- OR**
- Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source or general knowledge, accepting it at face value**
e.g. it is not accurate because the Americans were not fighting the Soviets in Korea.
- Level 3: EITHER **4-5****
Evaluates the provenance of the source
e.g. examines the purpose of the source – it is a statement by the American Government in 1950 and appears to be justifying American involvement in the war. To impress world/keep US's position as a super power.
- OR**
- Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context**
e.g. relevant knowledge of the reasons the USA became involved such as explanation of the Truman Doctrine/the Domino effect or even of the part played by the USA in the war and their opponents, as long as it is focussed on the accuracy of the source.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 **6****
-

- (d) Which event was the greater threat to the Soviet control of East Europe:
- the Hungarian Rising of 1956;
 - the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia in 1968?
- You must refer to **both** events when explaining your answer. 10

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to consequence (AO 6.1)

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge.
 e.g. Hungary rebelled and was crushed by Soviet tanks.
 The Czech reforms were ended by Soviet troops.

OR

Simple general statements re consequence.
 e.g. Both could lead to the break up of the Soviet alliance in Eastern Europe.
MUST COVER BOTH EVENTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 2: EITHER 3-5
Develops one cause.
 This starts with description at bottom of level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on question.
 e.g. describes what happened in Hungary – riots, Nagy’s reforms (3);
 Explains why Nagy’s reforms were seen as a threat by USSR (4);
 Assesses effect of Soviet intervention on other satellite countries, the West etc. (5).
 Describes the Prague Spring and Soviet response (3);
 Explains why USSR intervened (4);
 Assesses the effect of this on East and West (5).

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation.
 This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.
 Description of both (4). Explanation of both (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. 6-8
 Must be at least some assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point for this level.
 Reasoned arguments with judgement but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level.

Level 4: Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question. 9-10
 e.g. assesses both parts relatively and in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level.

OPTION X

Question 9

- (a) What does **Source E** tell us about President Reagan’s attitude to communism **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. Reagan disliked communism;

Supported anti communists in Afghanistan;

Called communism ‘the Evil Empire’;

Intensified arms race;

Increased military spending;

Gave go ahead for SDI (Star Wars);

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b)** Describe the effects of Solidarity on events in Poland in the 1980s. **6**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description.** **1-2**
 e.g. Solidarity was a trade union in Poland which tried to get better working conditions (1) for shipyard workers (2).
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Detailed description of limited aspects.
 e.g. describes one of the following:
 Formation – conditions in Poland – Gdansk – Lech Walesa;
 Strikes – expansion – Soviet reaction – army manoeuvres;
 Jaruzelski – martial law – arrests – effect on Solidarity and Walesa – Nobel Peace Prize;
 Success of Solidarity in 1989 elections.
- OR**
- Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**
 e.g. outline description of activities of Solidarity.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects.** **5-6**
 e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2;
 Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source F** of the reasons for the re-unification of Germany in 1989? 6
Use **Source F and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** 1
Learned response or simple response based on source
e.g. accurate because it is a primary source;
Inaccurate because it is written by an ordinary person - biased.
- OR**
- Answer based on utility/content/description of source**
e.g. it is accurate because it tells us how Gorbachev's policies of glasnost and perestroika helped to free East Germany.
- Level 2: EITHER** 2-3
Combination of both parts of level 1
- OR**
- Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of Source or general knowledge, accepting it at face value**
e.g. accurate because Gorbachev did change the approach to communism and communist rule was ended in East Germany.
- Level 3: EITHER** 4-5
Evaluates the provenance of the source
e.g. examines the purpose of the source – it is by a West German citizen therefore will be excited by what has happened and happy at the triumph of democracy over communism. Expressing gratitude to Gorbachev.
- OR**
- Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context**
e.g. relevant knowledge of Gorbachev's policies of glasnost and perestroika and the events surrounding the re-unification of Germany.
Could put forward other reasons for the re-unification to challenge the view.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3** 6
-

- (d) In which decade did relations between the Superpowers improve more:
- the 1960s;
 - the 1970s?

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

10

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to consequence (AO 6.1)

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge.
 e.g. Relations improved more because there was a period of Détente.

OR

Simple general statements re consequence.
 e.g. Détente began in the 1960s, so this is more important.
MUST COVER BOTH EVENTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 2: EITHER 3-5
Develops one cause.

This starts with description at bottom of level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on question.

e.g. describes the main features of improving relations in the 1960s – aftermath of Cuba, Test Ban Treaty, Non Proliferation Treaty 1968(3);

Explains the reasons for improvement in the 1960s (4);

Assesses success/limitation of improvement in 1960s – Czechoslovakia, Brezhnev Doctrine. (5).

Describes the main features of Détente in the 1970s – Nixon – SALT – Helsinki(3);

Explains the reasons for Détente – inflation – weapons - Vietnam (4);

Assesses success of Détente in 1970s – SALT 2 – human rights – Afghanistan(5).

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation.

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

Description of both (4). Explanation of both (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. 6-8

Must be some assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point for this level.

Reasoned arguments with judgement but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level.

Level 4: Balanced well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question. 9-10

e.g. assesses both parts relatively and in depth. Must reach a reasoned judgement for top of level. Allow alternative approach which argues that the 1960s were a period of incidents (U2, Wall, Cuba)

SECTION B

OPTION Y

Question 10

- (a) What does **Source A** tell us about why people volunteered for the armed forces in Britain during the First World War?

3

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. patriotism;

Honour;

Duty;

Money;

Glamour;

Adventure;

Expected short war;

Peer pressure;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

-
- (b) Why was the poster in **Source B** distributed in Britain during the First World War?
Use Source B and your own knowledge to answer the question **6**
- 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** **1-2**
 e.g. encouraging people to eat less bread; comment on shortages, importance of women, kitchen etc.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Developed monocausal answer using source and/or own knowledge
 e.g. explains one of the following:
 Reasons for shortage of bread – U Boat Blockade of GB – unrestricted submarine warfare introduced in 1917;
 GB’s dependence on imports etc., introduction of food rationing 1918;
 Shortages of all types of food were so great that other methods had to be used – WLA; public parks etc.
 The propaganda aspect/purpose of the poster – explanation of the ‘key’-stressing the part played by the Home Front and women in opening the door to victory.
- OR**
- Multicausal answer which lacks development or explanation using source and/or own knowledge**
 e.g. lists the points above with no explanation.
- Level 3: Developed multicausal answer using source and own knowledge** **5-6**
 e.g. develops at least two of the reasons in the first part of level 2, but **must explain propaganda aspect of poster and use knowledge.**
-

- (c) How useful is **Source C** to an historian studying methods of warfare on the Western Front in the First World War?
Use Source C and your own knowledge to answer the question 8
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Accepts the content of the source at face value
e.g. It is useful because there were hand grenades, artillery, machine guns etc. used in trench warfare.
- OR**
Generalised or learned response
e.g. it is from a novel therefore will not be true.
Written by a German therefore biased.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source or own simple knowledge.
e.g. the source is limited because it only tells us of one attack. Use of general rather than specific knowledge to prove utility e.g. there was constant artillery fire before an attack; the trenches were defended by wire and machine guns. Describes conditions in trenches (max 3)
Knowledge of one limitation (4 marks)
- OR**
Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias.
e.g. a novel by a German therefore he was favouring the German defences. Written in 1929, therefore no censorship. Novel therefore exaggerated with no explanation.
- Level 3: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge or source evaluation 5-6**
EITHER
e.g. tests the source using **specific knowledge** of the methods of warfare on the Western Front related to the source e.g. comments on the aims and length of the bombardments – the type of attack that followed when the bombardment stopped – the effects, success/failure of the bombardment – the part played by the machine gun in defence; reward reference to specific battles such as the Somme.
Or limits the utility of the source by making specific reference to some aspect of warfare not in the source: e.g. air reconnaissance, use of tanks, speed of attackers etc.
Top of level can be achieved by two good explanations – there does not have to be both Utility and limitations.
Limitation, add gas, if a list give low Level 3 – explanation is top level.
- OR**
e.g. questions provenance of source: why was it written? Novel by a German soldier: is the purpose to support peace by telling the truth about war atrocities, to glorify the German defensive war or to make profit? Will it be exaggerated to make it more interesting? Uses evidence/reasoning to reach a conclusion.
-

Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness and/or limitations of the source using knowledge and source evaluation. Must test the source using own knowledge and source evaluation for this level **7-8**
e.g. both parts of level 3.

- (d) Do you agree with the interpretation of the Battle of Jutland given in **Source D**?
Use Source D and your own knowledge to answer the question **8**
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Describes the content of the source accepting it at face value (comprehension)** **1-2**
e.g. The Blockade did continue after Jutland; the Germans did destroy more ships; the strategic position was not changed etc.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about
e.g. written in 1968 using hindsight, research – German therefore biased – written by a member of the navy therefore will be knowledgeable.
- OR**
- Challenges/supports interpretation by using general knowledge of the topic**
e.g. there were no more major sea battles after Jutland; the Blockade continued and led to shortages in Germany etc.
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author
e.g. comments on the purpose of the German author – is he interested in serious research or trying to glorify or exaggerate the role of the German navy in the war?
- OR**
- Analysis of the content of the source using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation**
e.g. supports the source by giving the relative losses of the two fleets at Jutland; referring to the better shells and armour of the Germans; Germans concentrated on U Boats after Jutland as their main naval offensive; main fleet kept British fleet tied up guarding the North Sea. Alternatively points out limitations of source by reference to the effects of the Blockade on the people of Germany and how this led to surrender and the mutinies in the German fleet in 1918 due to inactivity.
- Level 4: Both parts of level 3** **7-8**
Must test accuracy using both source evaluation and own knowledge.
-

OPTION Z

Question 11

- (a) What does **Source E** tell us about why the Battle of Britain is referred to as the turning point in the Second World War? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. Spitfires and Hurricanes proved to be a match for German planes;

Hitler’s first defeat;

Morale boost for allies;

GB a base for bombing attacks;

GB launching pad for D-Day;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) Why was the poster in **Source F** distributed in Britain during the Second World War?
Use Source F and your own knowledge to answer the question **6**
- 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** **1-2**
e.g. encouraging women to join the Land Army.
Appeal to women, shortage of labour, men fighting war.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Developed monocausal answer using source and/or own knowledge
e.g. explains one of the following:
Shortages of food – U Boat Blockade of GB;
Britain’s dependence on imports of food led to rationing;
Other campaigns, Dig for Victory etc.;
Women replaced men going to war by working on the land (must be some link to the land).
The propaganda aspect/purpose of the poster – makes it look pleasant, interesting, glamorous and rewarding work, well worth doing.
- OR**
- Multicausal answer which lacks development or explanation using source and/or own knowledge**
e.g. lists the points above with no explanation.
- Level 3: Developed multicausal answer using source and own knowledge** **5-6**
e.g. develops at least two of the reasons in the first part of level 2, but **must explain propaganda aspect of poster and use knowledge.**

- (c) How useful is **Source G** to an historian studying the evacuation of children in Britain in the Second World War?
Use **Source G** and your own knowledge to answer the question. 8

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2

Accepts the content of the source at face value

e.g. It is useful because it describes the placing of a young boy in another home showing that evacuation did take place.

OR

Generalised or learned response

e.g. it is from a novel therefore will not be true.

Secondary therefore useless.

Level 2: EITHER 3-4

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

e.g. the source is limited because it only tells us of one evacuee. Use of general rather than specific knowledge to prove utility e.g. evacuees were forced on people; they did have labels with their names on them; they were often evacuated from London.

OR

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

e.g. a novel by a woman who was born after the war and had no first hand experience of evacuation.

Could have been researched or her parents could have been evacuated and told her about it. Written to entertain; written for money; could be exaggerated with no explanation.

Level 3: EITHER 5-6

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

e.g. tests the source using **specific knowledge** of the evacuation process e.g. why they were evacuated from London; the process of billeting; process of evacuation: train, hall, billeted etc; recognises that the incident described was before the outbreak of war, the first evacuation, and links this to the reasons for evacuation.

Or limits the utility of the source by making specific reference to some aspect of evacuation not in the source: e.g. where could it be? Why was it safer for evacuees? Should boy have had a gas mask etc.?

Top of level can be achieved by two good explanations – there does not have to be both Utility and limitations.

OR

e.g. questions provenance of source: why was it written? Novel written after the war: is purpose to tell the truth about evacuation or to write an interesting story so that the book will sell? Will it be exaggerated to make it more interesting? Not constrained by experience so could be broader in content. Uses evidence/reasoning to reach a conclusion

Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness and/or limitations of the source using knowledge and source evaluation. Must test the source using own knowledge and source evaluation for this level 7-8
e.g. both parts of level 3.

-
- (d) Do you agree with the interpretation of the Dunkirk evacuation given in **Source H**?
Use **Source H** and your own knowledge to answer the question **8**
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Describes the content of the source accepting it at face value (comprehension)** **1-2**
e.g. Dunkirk was a great success and many men were evacuated.
French were evacuated as well as British.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about
e.g. written immediately after the event, therefore not a considered interpretation, just an immediate reaction – German/anti Nazi therefore biased – stated by a member of the Luftwaffe therefore will be informed about the situation. Speaking to a friend if explained.(3 marks)
- OR**
- Challenges/supports interpretation by using general knowledge of the topic**
e.g. not all the men escaped, there were casualties; Hitler still went ahead with his attack on GB; escaped because of German mistakes etc.
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author
e.g. comments on the purpose of the German author – is he hoping that the attack on GB will not take place because he does not want to be involved in it? Or as an anti Nazi forced to join up, is he belittling Hitler’s success?
- OR**
- Analysis of the content of the source using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation**
e.g. supports the source by explaining in what ways Dunkirk was a miracle and giving details of how the men were evacuated, types of ship used, air cover etc. and their importance in GB’s future resistance.
Alternatively points out limitations of source by giving details of the losses at Dunkirk – the men, aircraft, weapons, ammunition left behind. It was a defeat for GB not Hitler. BEF had been forced to leave France, Hitler was now free to control France and could launch an attack on GB from France.
- Level 4: Both parts of level 3** **7-8**
Must test accuracy using both source evaluation and own knowledge.
-