



General Certificate of Secondary Education

History 3042/3047

Specification B

Paper 1

Mark Scheme

2006 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 it is expected candidates will use in answering the question and is directly based on the relevant assessment objectives. However, it does not mean that other answers which have merit will not be rewarded.

- **Identification of Levels of Response**

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

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

- **Placing an answer 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** 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.

As a general rule, give credit for what is accurate, correct or valid.

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.

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 been included in the mark scheme, etc. To familiarise themselves with a variety of responses, examiners should sample the range of questions in scripts from several centres and across the full range of ability in so far as practicable. Any preliminary marking **must** be completed in pencil and reviewed following the standardising meeting in the light of the revised mark scheme and advice given.

- **The Final Mark Scheme**

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

- **Post-Standardising Meeting**

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

Paper 1

Section A

Question 1

- (a) What does **Source A** tell us about the Alliance System that existed in Europe before the outbreak of war in 1914? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)

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

e.g. gives the names of the agreements (max 2).

Names the countries in the agreement (max 2).

Points out the geographical position of Triple Alliance and Entente.

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) How accurate is the view in **Source B** of Germany's foreign policy before the First World War? **6**
Use **Source B and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.

Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)

Level 1: EITHER **1**

Learned response or simple response based on source

e.g. accurate because it is written by a German, it is secondary etc.

Inaccurate because it is biased, written after the event, using hindsight etc.

OR

Answer based on utility/content/description of source

e.g. it is accurate because it says that Germany's foreign policy was based on her desire for growth.

Level 2: EITHER (max 2) **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. Germany did want to occupy more lands and did make alliances etc.

Germany started WW1.

It was written in 1966 by an historian, so it will have been researched.

Level 3: EITHER **4-5**

Evaluates the provenance of the source

e.g. written by a German historian in 1966 – questions Fischer's motive, such as recognising that he is a German blaming Germany for having expansionist aims and causing the war, therefore cannot be accused of bias so he must be seeking the truth.

OR:

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

e.g. gives examples of Germany's aggression – Morocco, Arms Race, Empire etc. or of Germany making agreements – Alliances, Morocco 1911 etc.

Produces alternative that Germany was not being aggressive but defending against encirclement, trying to catch up others who had an Empire etc.

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

- (c) Describe the assassination of Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo in June 1914. **6**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1-2**
e.g. Franz Ferdinand was shot (1) by Gavrilo Princip (2).
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. describes one of the following:
nature of the visit – status of Sarajevo/Bosnia since 1908;
Black Hand Group – aims – role of Serbia.
main features – 2 attempts – change of plan – shots etc;
immediate aftermath – ultimatum – war. (max 3)
- OR**
Limited description of a wider range of aspects
e.g. outline description of visit and assassination.
- 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.

- (d) Which was the more important reason for Great Britain joining the First World War in 1914: **10**
- the Arms (Naval) Race with Germany, 1906–1914;
 - the Schlieffen Plan?
- You must refer to **both** reasons when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO6.1)

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge
e.g. Germany tried to build more Dreadnoughts than Britain; the Schlieffen Plan was Germany's plan to attack France.

OR

Simple general causation statements

e.g. the Naval Race caused Britain to distrust Germany, the Schlieffen Plan led to Britain joining the war.

MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 2: EITHER **3-5**
Develops one cause.
This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question
e.g. describes the Naval Race (3); explains why Germany's fleet worried Britain – effects of geography, Dreadnoughts etc (4); assesses the effect of this on relations between Britain and Germany – was it a reason for war/the reason for Britain seeking allies, or was it over by 1912? (5).
Describes the Schlieffen Plan (3); explains the neutrality of Belgium (4); assesses how/if it was this that led to Britain entering the war – sanctity of treaties, proximity of Belgium to Britain, commitment to France etc. (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.

e.g. description of both (4); explanation of both (5).

N.B. An answer that explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument **6-8**
e.g. an answer that explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of this level (6).
Reasoned arguments with judgements but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level (6).
Assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point should be placed at this level (6-7).
Assessment of both with focus on the question should be placed at the middle or top of this level (7-8) unless there is in depth treatment which would lift the answer to level 4.

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question **9-10**
e.g. assesses both parts in depth or reaches a reasoned judgement based on relative assessment. Must have both for top of level.

Question 2

- (a) Describe the territorial changes made by the Treaty of Versailles. **6**

Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO6.1)

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

e.g. Germany lost a lot of territory which had previously been owned by them (1); one area named, e.g. Alsace/Lorraine (2) loss of colonies (2) lost 10-15% of land (2) Rhineland demilitarised (2).

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Detailed description of limited aspects

e.g. describes one of the following:

Alsace/Lorraine to France; Land in Russia; Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium; North Schleswig to Denmark.

West Prussia to Poland – effect of this on Germany.

Memel, Danzig and Saar to League of Nations.

Loss of colonies - explained

No Anschluss and/or Rhineland demilitarised – explained (max 3).

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects

e.g. outline description of territory lost.

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 C** tell us about Hitler's aims in foreign policy? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)

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

e.g. to make Germany into a great power.

To destroy the Treaty of Versailles.

To build up the army.

To recover lost territory.

To bring all Germans within the Reich – with example(s) Anschluss, Czech and Polish territory (max 2).

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

-
- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source D** of the importance of the decisions made at Munich in September 1938? **6**
Use **Source D and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1**
Learned response or simple response based on source
e.g. accurate because it is written by Chamberlain and he was there, it is primary etc.
Inaccurate because it is biased etc.
- OR**
Answer based on utility/content/description of source
e.g. it is accurate because it says that the Munich Agreement brought peace etc.
- Level 2: EITHER (max 2)** **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. not accurate because war broke out (2).
Chamberlain followed a policy of appeasement and he wanted to tell people that it worked (3).
- Level 3: EITHER** **4-5**
Evaluates the provenance of the source
e.g. said by Chamberlain – questions his motives – trying to justify his policy of appeasement, his reasons for flying out to meet Hitler – trying to convince the people of Britain that there was no need to fear a war.
- OR**
Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context
e.g. shows knowledge of the Sudeten Crisis and what was agreed at Munich and how it avoided a war – the nature of the agreement between Hitler and Chamberlain signed after the Munich Agreement etc.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3** **6**
-

- (d) Which of these two events in 1935–1936 made world war more likely to happen in the later 1930s: 10
- the invasion of Abyssinia, 1935–1936;
 - the re-militarisation of the Rhineland 1936?
- You must refer to **both** events when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO6.1)

- Level 1: EITHER** 1-2
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge
e.g. the Abyssinian Crisis was when Mussolini took over Abyssinia.
Hitler sent troops into the Rhineland.

OR

Simple general causation statements

e.g. the Abyssinian Crisis was the failure of the League of Nations.
The remilitarisation was the beginning of Hitler's aggression.

MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

- Level 2: EITHER** 3-5
This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.
e.g. describes the invasion of Abyssinia/the Abyssinian Crisis (3); explains why Britain, France and the League did not take direct action etc (4); assesses the effect of the crisis on the League of Nations and how this could have brought war nearer (5).
Describes the remilitarisation (3); explains why it was successful, why Britain and France did not resist (4); assesses the effect of the remilitarisation on Hitler and his foreign policy – did it bring war nearer? (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.

e.g. description of both (4); explanation of both (5).

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

- Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument** 6-8
e.g. an answer that explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of this level (6).
Reasoned arguments with judgements but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level (6).
Assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point should be placed at this level (6-7).
Assessment of both with focus on the question should be placed at the middle or top of this level (7-8) unless there is in depth treatment which would lift the answer to level 4.
-

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer covering both points, focused on the question **9-10**
e.g. assesses both parts in depth or reaches a reasoned judgement based on relative assessment. Must have both for top of level.

Question 3

- (a) What does **Source E** tell us about the differences between the USA and the USSR in 1945? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)

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

e.g. USSR communist, USA capitalist.

USSR one party government, USA democratic.

USSR no free elections, USA free elections.

USSR state-owned industry and agriculture, USA privately owned (2).

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

If answer only comments on one country, but centres on differences can still obtain 3 marks.

- (b) Describe the decisions made at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of 1945. **6**

Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO6.1)

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

e.g. They planned the end of the war (1) and what to do with Germany (2).

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Detailed description of limited aspects

e.g. describes one of the following:

The division of Germany and Berlin.

The role of USSR in Eastern Europe – influence but free elections.

Poland – conflict between Stalin and West.

Stalin and Japan – compensation.

Change in personnel at Potsdam and its effect.

Germany to pay reparations – details – disarmament, banning of Nazi Party, war criminals.

Conflicts over atom bomb/Poland/recovery of Germany.

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects

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

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.

N.B. Must cover decisions of both conferences for this level.

-
- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source F** of Soviet policy in Europe after the Second World War? **6**
Use **Source F and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy(AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1**
Learned response or simple response based on source
e.g. accurate because it is primary etc.
Inaccurate because it is a cartoon, biased etc.
- OR**
Answer based on utility/content/description of source
e.g. it is accurate because Soviet Russia did expand in Europe after WW2.
- Level 2: EITHER (max 2) 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. explains ‘liberated from freedom’ – describes, mentioning by name, some of the countries who had been taken over by Soviet communism after the war.
- Level 3: EITHER 4-5**
Evaluates the provenance of the source.
e.g. a British cartoon ridiculing Stalin by exaggerating his control and the amount of power he has – trying to warn Britain of the dangers of Stalin and world communism – trying to gain support for the policies of USA etc.
- OR**
Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context.
e.g. shows knowledge of Soviet expansionism in the East and the irony of the caption – points out inaccuracies by naming some of the countries in the cartoon that were never attacked by Soviet Russia: could point out that this indicates the mistaken fears that the west had about Soviet aims – makes some relevant comment on the position of the switches, supported by own knowledge – gives Stalin’s view of the expansion – the creation of a buffer zone and the reasons for this.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 6**
-

- (d) Which was more important as a reason for the development of the Cold War: 10
- the Truman Doctrine, 1947;
 - the Berlin Blockade, 1948–1949?
- You must refer to **both** reasons when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO6.1)

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge
e.g. the Truman Doctrine was issued by the USA; the Berlin Blockade was carried out by the USSR.

OR

Simple general causation statements

e.g. the Truman Doctrine was the start of the USA's open opposition to the USSR.
The blockade was an attempt to get rid of the West from Berlin.

MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 2: EITHER 3-5
Develops one cause
This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.

e.g. describes the Truman Doctrine (3); explains why Truman issued this doctrine – fear of the spread of communism etc. (4); assesses the effect of the Truman Doctrine on the development of the Cold War – could be explicitly linked to Marshall Plan and the effect that this had on USSR's attitude to the USA (5).

Describes the Berlin Blockade (3); explains why Stalin blockaded Berlin – what he hoped to gain – response of the Allies (4); assesses the danger of open war – its part in the development of the Cold 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.

e.g. description of both (4); explanation of both (5).

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument 6-8

e.g. an answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of this level (6).

Reasoned arguments with judgements but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level (6).

Assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point should be placed at this level (6-7).

Assessment of both with focus on the question should be placed at the middle or top of this level (7-8) unless there is in depth treatment which would lift the answer to level 4.

Level: 4 **Balanced, well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question**
e.g. assesses both parts in depth or reaches judgement based on relative assessment.
Must have both for top of level.

Question 4

- (a) What does **Source G** tell us about the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact in 1955? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)

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

e.g. Extraction of data: - East Germany has an army of 90,000; Bulgaria has a total strength of 154,000 etc. (max 2).

Gives total forces: army 835,000; air force 200,000; navy 51,000 (3).

Any comparison using data: e.g. army stronger than air force, Poland has largest forces, Hungary the smallest etc. (1 mark for each comparative comment).

USSR not included in source therefore not whole of Warsaw Pact.

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

-
- (b) How accurate is the view in **Source H** of the reasons for the USSR’s reaction to the Hungarian Rising of 1956? **6**
 Use **Source H and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER **1****
Learned response or simple response based on source
 e.g. accurate because it is primary etc.
 Inaccurate because it is biased etc.
- OR**
Answer based on utility/content/description of source
 e.g. it is accurate because Hungary is a neighbour of Soviet Russia.
- Level 2: EITHER (max 2) **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. explains that the USSR action involved an invasion of Hungary.
- Level 3: EITHER **4-5****
Evaluates the provenance of the source
 e.g. a Soviet minister trying to explain the Soviet invasion to the UN, therefore he is trying to justify the invasion, trying to make the UN think that the Soviets went into Hungary to defend themselves.
- OR**
Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context
 e.g. shows knowledge of the Hungarian Rising and the demands of the government under Nagy, especially their desire to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact – explains the Soviet need for a buffer zone.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 **6****
-

- (c) Describe the U2 Incident of 1960. **6**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1-2**
e.g. An American spy plane (1) was shot down over the USSR (2).
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Detailed description of limited aspect
e.g. describes one of the following:
the background of peaceful co-existence – the use of U2 planes by the USA – why they were suitable for spy missions.
The fate of Gary Powers and the U2 – use of SAM missile – capture of pilot and plane.
American response – excuse, weather, plane etc.
Khrushchev proved the USA excuses were lies – demanded an apology.
Eisenhower’s refusal – collapse of Paris Summit.
Trial and imprisonment of Powers – exchange after 17 months.
- OR**
Limited description of a wider range of aspects
e.g. outline description of fate of spy plane and its pilot.
- 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.

- (d) Which was the greater threat of war between the USA and the USSR: 10
- the Korean War, 1950–1953;
 - the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962?

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

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO6.1)

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge
 e.g. the Korean War involved the UN and the USA fighting in Korea; the Cuban Missile Crisis was between the USA and USSR over missiles in Cuba.

OR

Simple general causation statements

e.g. Korea because there was a war, but in Cuba it was only crisis (1); Cuba involved USA and USSR directly, Korea did not (2).

MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 2: EITHER 3-5
Develops one cause

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

e.g. describes the Korean War (3); explains why the USA became involved – role of UN – part they played resisting communism (4); assesses the effect of the war on relations between the USA and USSR – involvement of China, another communist power – lack of direct involvement by USSR in Korea – was there a threat of war between USA and USSR? – views of MacArthur and Truman (5).

Describes the Cuban Missile Crisis (3); explains Khrushchev’s reasons – the danger of the missiles to the USA. (4); assesses the danger of nuclear war and the possible results of this (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.

e.g. description of both (4); explanation of both (5).

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument 6-8

e.g. an answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of this level (6).

Reasoned arguments with judgements but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level (6).

Assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point should be placed at this level (6-7).

Assessment of both with focus on the question should be placed at the middle or top of this level (7-8) unless there is in-depth treatment which would lift the answer to level 4.

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question **9-10**
e.g. assesses both parts in depth or reaches a reasoned judgement based on relative assessment. Must have both for top of level.

Question 5

- (a) What does **Source J** tell us about the reasons for the development of Détente? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)

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

e.g. the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Danger of nuclear war.

Reduce spending on armaments.

Quarrel between USSR and China.

USSR had to improve relations with USA.

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) How accurate is the view in **Source K** of the policy of the Czechoslovakian government during the Prague Spring? **6**

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

Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)

Level 1: EITHER **1**

Learned response or simple response based on source

e.g. accurate because it is primary etc.

Inaccurate because it is biased etc.

OR

Answer based on utility/content/description of source

e.g. it is accurate because Czechoslovakia did not lose the alliance with Soviet Russia in 1968.

2-3

Level 2: EITHER (max 2)
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. Czechoslovakia broke away from communist USSR in 1989.

Level 3: EITHER **4-5**

Evaluates the provenance of the source

e.g. Dubcek is saying this in an attempt to prevent an invasion by the USSR and the Warsaw Pact – trying to avoid what had happened in Hungary in 1956.

OR

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

e.g. shows knowledge of the Prague Spring and its aims – the idea of ‘socialism with a human face’ – why this was feared by USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries.

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

- (c) Describe the main features of Détente in the 1970s. **6**
- Target: description of key features and characteristics (AO6.1)**
- Level 1 Basic description 1-2**
e.g. Détente was a period of improved relations (1) between the USA and USSR (2).
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
Detailed description of limited aspect
e.g. describes one of the following:
SALT 1 1972 – 5 year agreement – limited ICBMs and ABMs – use of spy satellites – followed by SALT 2 in 1979.
Helsinki Agreement 1975 – signed by 35 countries – all frontiers of East Europe, including Germany recognised – trading agreements for grain and oil – agreed to improve human rights.
Political visits/space co-operation: Nixon to Moscow 1972, Brezhnev to Washington 1974; - Apollo/Soyuz space link up July 1975.
USA and China: ‘ping pong’ diplomacy.
- OR**
Limited description of a wider range of aspects
e.g. outline description of agreements and visits.
- 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.

- (d) Which was the more important reason for the collapse of communism in the USSR and Eastern Europe: 10
- the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan, 1979–1989;
 - the policies of President Gorbachev?
- You must refer to **both** reasons when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO6.1)

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge
 e.g. the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in 1979 and their withdrawal in 1989 led to the collapse of communism; Gorbachev’s policies led to greater freedom in the communist countries.

OR

Simple general causation statements

e.g. the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan weakened the control of the communists. Gorbachev’s policies encouraged countries to challenge communism.

MUST COVER BOTH PARTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 2: EITHER 3-5
Develops one cause
This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.
 e.g. describes the Soviet invasion and war in Afghanistan (3); explains the reasons for Soviet involvement – the opposition of the USA – why the Soviets were unable to win (4); assesses the effect of the war on the strength of the USSR – cost of war – effect on economy – effect on communism – reasons for pulling out etc. (5).
 Describes Perestroika/Glasnost (3); explains reasons for policies – need to reduce arms – need to update communism – abandon the Brezhnev Doctrine – better relations with the west (4); assesses the effects of the changes on the USSR and the satellite states – relaxation of censorship meant more criticism, more opposition as did freeing of political prisoners – opposition in satellite states allowed to surface – Red Army not to be used (March 1989) – withdrawal of Soviet troops led to free elections – defeat of communism in Poland (June 1989), end of Berlin Wall (November 1989), free elections in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria 1990.
 Answer that assesses how the policies affected the end of communism in any one state such as Poland is sufficient for assessment (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.

e.g. description of both (4); explanation of both (5).

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

- Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument** **6-8**
e.g. an answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of this level (6).
Reasoned arguments with judgements but little supporting evidence should be placed at this level (6).
Assessment of one bullet point with focus on the question and explanation of the other bullet point should be placed at this level (6-7).
Assessment of both with focus on the question should be placed at the middle or top of this level (7-8) unless there is in-depth treatment which would lift the answer to level 4.
- Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer covering both parts, focused on the question** **9-10**
e.g. assesses both parts in depth or reaches a reasoned judgement based on relative assessment. Must have both for top of level.

Section B**Option Y Britain in the First World War****Question 6**

- (a) What does **Source L** tell us about the contribution of the British Empire and its troops in the First World War? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)

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

e.g. New Zealand provided the highest percentage.

Gives statistics (max. 2 marks) – New Zealand 100,000; Australia 332,000; Canada 365,000; India 1,000,000.

Quotes casualties – New Zealand 58,000; Australia 318,000. (max. 1 mark)

India provided most soldiers.

Australia had more casualties than New Zealand.

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) Why was the poster in **Source M** published in Britain during the First World War? **6**
Use **Source M and your own knowledge** to answer the question.

Target: Explanation of reasons using source and own knowledge (AO6.1) (AO6.2)

Level 1: Simple, basic reason drawing on source/own knowledge **1-2**

e.g. it was propaganda.

Encouraging men to volunteer for the forces.

There was a shortage of soldiers.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Developed mono-causal answer using source AND/OR own knowledge

e.g. explains one of the following.

Britain’s was a volunteer army in 1914 – no conscription.

Losses in battle – mention of campaigns/type of warfare.

Explains the propaganda aspect/appeal of the poster – use of emotion to get people to join up – feeling that they were needed, they were missing out on something, many others had joined up etc.

OR

Multi-causal answer which lacks development or explanation using source AND/OR own knowledge

e.g. lists the points above with no explanation.

Level 3: Developed multi-causal 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 cover context of poster using own knowledge and explain the propaganda aspects/appeal of the poster.**

- (c) How useful is **Source N** to a student studying trench warfare on the Western Front in the First World War? **8**
Use **Source N and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**
Accepts the content of the source at face value
e.g. it is useful because ladders, barbed wire, machine guns, helmets etc. were used on the Western Front.
- OR**
Generalised or learned response
e.g. it is an exhibit, in a museum, so it will not be true.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source or own simple knowledge
e.g. the source is limited because it only shows us part of the trench experience.
Use of general rather than specific knowledge to prove utility e.g. there was barbed wire on the edge of the trench, explanation of ‘over the top’, does not show the attacks or the weapons that were used etc.
- OR**
Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias. Meant to inform – no explanation.
e.g. it is in a museum therefore will have been researched and accurate in detail.
In a British museum therefore could be biased and favouring the British soldiers.
A museum exhibit therefore not the same as reality – could be exaggerated for effect etc.
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Develops an argument about the utility/limitations of the source using knowledge or source evaluation
e.g. tests the source using **specific knowledge** of trench warfare by developing the information in the source such as explaining the purpose of the barbed wire – the reasons for trenches – the nature of attacks etc.
Or using knowledge to limit the utility of the source by making specific reference to some aspect of trench warfare not in the source such as describing the conditions in the trenches and naming other weapons that were used.
- OR**
e.g. develops the provenance of the source, explaining the purpose of this exhibition – meant to inform with explanation e.g. to, enable people to experience or relive events, therefore likely to be accurate and therefore useful – attracts people into museum (explained).
- Level 4: Develops an argument about the utility AND/OR limitations of the source using knowledge AND source evaluation** **7-8**
e.g. both parts of level 3.
-

-
- (d) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source O** of the importance of civilian workers in Britain in winning the First World War? **8**
Use **Source O and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO6.3) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: Describes the content of the source accepting it at face value (comprehension) 1-2**
e.g. civilians did play a large part in the war, they worked in factories, made ammunition etc. Hindsight without explanation.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
Simple explanation of how the interpretation came about
e.g. published in 2002, therefore, based on research; a military historian therefore a specialist in warfare, therefore reliable etc.
- OR**
Agrees/disagrees with the interpretation by using general knowledge of topic
e.g. Germans had to be defeated on land and sea, therefore fighting men were more important.
Forces would have been useless and unable to win war if they did not have enough weapons etc.
- Level 3: Agrees or disagrees with interpretation using knowledge AND/OR source 5-6**
e.g. agrees: uses evidence such as shell shortage etc., or the need to develop new weapons to overcome the stalemate on the Western Front.
Agrees: explains the background of a military historian – would be expected to support the military, but is arguing that civilians were just as important, therefore it seems a balanced view, not a biased one trying to prove a point.
- Disagrees: points out that civilians played a much greater role than the author suggests – agriculture, transport etc. Uses knowledge of fighting on Western Front or the war at sea to explain the final victory was due to the armed forces.
Disagrees: refers to the title of the article – concentrating on the Home Front, therefore could be looking to prove its importance in the war and this could lead to exaggerated assertions from the author. Alternatively, points out that there is some bias in the source as the author is a military historian and he quotes civilian work which supported the armed forces – uniforms, guns etc.
- MUST USE SOURCE AND OWN KNOWLEDGE FOR TOP OF LEVEL.**
- Level 4: Balanced answer that agrees and disagrees with the interpretation 7-8**
e.g. combination of both aspects of level 3.
- NB** Agreement and disagreement must both be at level 3 for this level. If one is level 2 and the other level 3, answer must be placed at level 3.
- MUST USE SOURCE AND OWN KNOWLEDGE FOR TOP OF LEVEL.**
-

Option Z Britain in the Second World War

Question 7

- (a) What does **Source P** tell us about internment in Britain during the Second World War? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)

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

e.g. caused by the worry of a lot of spies.
Involved Germans and Italians (2 marks).
Used prisoner of war camps.
Many of those imprisoned had opposed fascism.
Scare died down after Summer 1941.
Only 5,000 kept in prison.
Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) Why was the poster in **Source R** published in Britain during the Second World War? **6**
Use **Source R and your own knowledge** to answer the question.

Target: Explanation of reasons using source and own knowledge (AO6.1) (AO6.2)

Level 1: Simple, basic reasons drawing on source/own knowledge 1-2

e.g. as propaganda: encouraging women to work (part-time).
There was a shortage of workers.
Encouraging women to fight Hitler.
Raising morale.

Level 2: EITHER 3-4

Developed mono-causal answer using source AND/OR own knowledge
e.g. explains one of the following:
work done by women, food shortages
conscription of men and its effect on the labour force.
Types of women it would appeal to – why would they only be part-time?
Explains the propaganda aspect/appeal of the poster – use of Hitler, the enemy – effect that the woman is having on Hitler – makes them seem part of the attack/war against Hitler.
Raising morale – explained.

OR
Multi-causal answer which lacks development or explanation using source AND/OR own knowledge
e.g. lists the points above with no explanation.

Level 3: Developed multi-causal 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 cover context of poster using own knowledge and explain the propaganda aspects/appeal of the poster.**

- (c) How useful is **Source S** to a student studying the effects of the Blitz in Britain during the Second World War? **8**
Use **Source S and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Accepts the content of the source at face value
e.g. it is useful because houses and pubs were damaged during the Blitz.
- OR**
Generalised or learned response
e.g. it is an exhibit, in a museum, so it will not be true.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source OR own simple knowledge
e.g. the source is limited because it only shows us one part of one street.
Use of general rather than specific knowledge to prove utility e.g. attacks were at night, bombs caused a lot of damage, they were dropped on areas where people lived.
- OR**
Simple comments on the usefulness OR limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias. Meant to inform – no explanation.
e.g. it is in a museum, therefore will have been researched and accurate in detail.
In a British museum, therefore could be biased and show the British fighting spirit.
A museum exhibit, therefore not the same as reality – could be exaggerated for effect etc.
- Level 3: Develops an argument about the utility/limitations of the source using knowledge OR source evaluation 5-6**
EITHER
e.g. tests the source using **specific knowledge** of the Blitz by developing the information in the source such as explaining the cause of the rubble, the nature and purpose of the bombing attacks, details and examples of bombing attacks and their results – Coventry, London etc.
Or using knowledge to limit the utility of the source by making specific reference to some aspect of the Blitz not in the source such as describing the defences against air raids, ARP, shelters, the reaction of people etc.
- OR**
e.g. develops the provenance of the source, explaining the purpose of this exhibition – meant to inform with explanation e.g. to, enable people to experience or relive events, therefore likely to be accurate and therefore useful – attracts people into the museum (explained).
- Level 4: Develops an argument about the utility AND/OR limitations of the source using knowledge AND source evaluation 7-8**
e.g. both parts of level 3.

- (d) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source T** of the importance of the Battle of Britain in the Second World War? **8**
Use **Source T and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.

Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO6.3) in context (AO6.1)

Level 1: Describes the content of the source accepting it at face value (comprehension) **1-2**
e.g. the Germans did lose more planes than the British in the Battle of Britain, so it was a victory for Britain etc. Hindsight without explanation.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Simple explanation of how the interpretation came about
e.g. published in 1990, therefore, based on research; a journalist, not a professional historian, therefore could be limited research.

OR

Agrees/disagrees with the interpretation by using general knowledge of topic
e.g. Britain had been saved from invasion by the Battle of Britain.
Victory was not guaranteed – Battle of Britain was followed by the Blitz, it did not mean the end of attacks on Britain etc.

Level 3: Agrees or disagrees with interpretation using knowledge AND/OR source **5-6**
e.g. agrees: uses evidence such as Battle of Britain was a turning point, Hitler's first defeat, boost to morale of British, Britain could be used as a launching pad for D-day etc.
Agrees: Explains the role of a journalist, could have had a team of researchers, historians to advise, written to celebrate an anniversary etc.

Disagrees: points out it was only in 1940 and explains why there was a long way to go before the war ended – Britain could have been defeated by the Blitz – they did not have a foothold in Europe after Dunkirk, so there was no hope of victory over Hitler in 1940 – support of USA needed for D-day etc, they were not even in the war in 1940 etc.

Disagrees: Refers to the date of the article – concentrating on celebrating the anniversary of the Battle of Britain, therefore would be concentrating on glorifying this and not the final victory which could lead to exaggerated assertions from the author. As the author is a journalist, his purpose could be to exaggerate the effect of the Battle of Britain to create a 'feel good' factor etc. Questions if the level of research undertaken by a journalist would have the same rigour as that undertaken by a professional trained historian.

MUST USE SOURCE AND OWN KNOWLEDGE FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Level 4: Balanced answer which agrees and disagrees with the interpretation **7-8**
e.g. combination of both aspects of level 3.

NB agreement and disagreement must both be at level 3 for this level.
If one is at level 2 and the other at level 3, answer must be placed at level 3.

MUST USE SOURCE AND OWN KNOWLEDGE FOR TOP OF LEVEL.