



General Certificate of Secondary Education

History 3042/3047 *Specification B*

Paper 3

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 3

SECTION A

QUESTION 1: The changing role and status of women in Britain since 1900

- (a) How reliable is **Source A** to an historian studying the Suffragette Derby, 1913? **10**
Use **Source A and your knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of source(s) for reliability (AO2)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension)
- OR**
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source
e.g. she flung herself under the King's horse.
Emily Davison was killed.
The book was written after she died so it will be accurate/inaccurate (time gap).
- Level 2: EITHER 3-5**
Combined both (simple) features of Level 1
- OR**
Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source
e.g. it was written by a man writing about the life of the Prime Minister.
It has the benefits of hindsight.
General reference to use of emotive language (not developed).
Incorrect spelling of name/incorrect date of death.
Place provenance which mixes biography/autobiography at this level.
- Level 3: EITHER 6-8**
Evaluates the provenance of the source and applies provenance to the question set
e.g. 41 years after the event/women already had the vote.
- OR**
Uses own knowledge to support/refute the reliability of the source
e.g. Lloyd George was PM at time of the violent campaign.
Main purpose of book is life of Lloyd George not suffrage. Candidate refers to the purpose of biographies.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 9-10**
Top of level for use of knowledge to support both parts.
e.g. uses knowledge of the anger of many men to the disruption of the race, through an analysis of the emotive language used to support the account.

- (b) Explain what **Source B** tells us about the work women did during the First World War. **5**
- Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2)**
- Level 1: Answer that selects detail from the source** **1**
Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding.
e.g. worked as aircraft engineers and in munitions factories.
- Level 2: Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source** **2-3**
e.g. explains the role and why there were clearly important dangers faced by women in these roles.
Women doing men's work so they could go off and fight.
- Level 3: Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from source** **4-5**
e.g. technical knowledge explained.
Working alongside men/men in charge.
Reward use of additional knowledge where it supports complex inference.
Refers to attitudes towards women in the workplace changing during the war. At Level 2/3 expect reference to both pictures for top of level.

Answer **either** part (c) **or** part (d).

- (c) Do you agree that the suffragettes were more effective than the suffragists in gaining support in their campaigns for votes for women by 1918? **15**
Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-3
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. candidate tends to discuss the violent campaign.

Answer centres on one organisation rather than both.

Level 2: EITHER 4-7
Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. violence v Non-violence.

Narrative of events in ten years before WW1.

Centres on individual event, e.g. Cat and Mouse Act or other specific campaign.

Level 3: EITHER 8-11
Developed multi-causal

OR

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

e.g. discusses the contribution played by both organisations (no evaluation).

Considers political and media campaigns.

Sees suffrage as one issue facing the government of the day - therefore other influential factors.

e.g. need to maintain war production led to support for all women.

Level 4: Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement 12-15

e.g. comes to a balanced evaluation - contribution by both organisations (explained).

Explains failure: Vote only after the war.

Contribution by either organisation explained and candidate comes to a clear judgement on that organisation.

Any Level 3 answer coming to a reasoned judgement is placed at Level 4.

A judgement based on both organisation is top of Level (14-15)

- (d) Laws such as the Equal Pay Act have made little difference to the status of women. Changing attitudes since 1945 have been more important. Do you agree? Explain your answer. **15**
- Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set
- OR**
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence
e.g. women are/are not more equal because they can/cannot.....
- Level 2: EITHER 4-7**
Developed mono-causal answer
- OR**
Narrative implying causation/consequence
- OR**
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
e.g. develops argument based on two or three elements – Equal Pay Act
Other legislation
Changing attitudes
- Level 3: EITHER 8-11**
Developed multi-causal
- OR**
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
e.g. considers the impact of legislation and the reality in the workplace.
Impact of changing popular culture/impact of WW2.
- Level 4: Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement 12-15**
e.g. considers Level 3 points and evaluates relative effectiveness of legislation over a significant period. Makes a final judgement which is balanced, drawing on knowledge of legislation/politics, family demands at home, sexual freedoms.
-

QUESTION 2: Britain and Ireland since 1916

- (a) How reliable is **Source C** to an historian studying the Troubles in Northern Ireland in the years 1969 to 1975? **10**

Use **Source C and your knowledge** to explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension)

OR: Generalised or learned response which could apply to the testing of reliability of any source

e.g. he was a Sinn Fein leader so he would know what happened.

Level 2: EITHER **3-5**
Combined both (simple) features of Level 1

OR

Makes simple inference using either ascription AND/OR content of source

e.g. it was written by a Catholic/Irishman who must have been there.

Level 3: EITHER **6-8**
Evaluates the provenance of the source and applies provenance to the question set

OR

Uses own knowledge to support/refute the reliability of the source

e.g. uses knowledge of Civil Rights movement to justify/challenge the reliability.

Uses Source D to support reliability.

Media coverage of the Troubles

Uses knowledge to agree that original purpose of British troops in Ireland was to keep the peace between Catholics and Protestants.

Level 4: Combination of both parts of Level 3 **9-10**
top of level for use of knowledge to support both parts.

- (b) Explain what **Source D** tells us about the actions of the British Army in Northern Ireland in 1970. **5**
- Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2)**
- Level 1: Answer that selects detail from the source** **1**
Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding.
e.g. uniform.
Attacks on civilians.
Arrested Catholics.
- Level 2: Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source** **2-3**
e.g. stresses the unarmed man/boarded up doorway/observer/need for helmets, shields and batons.
- Level 3: Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source** **4-5**
e.g. develops explanation - fear/lack of fear.
Level of control (3v1).
Uses knowledge to support complex inference.
Explains that the British Army was equipped to deal with civil rioting and protest marches.
Look for clear inference at this Level e.g. the observer shows no fear of the British army as he is used to these sort of tactics by the troops.

Answer **either** part (c) **or** part (d).

- (c) How far did the Easter Rising of 1916 and the Anglo-Irish War of 1919–1921 lead to the partition of Ireland? **15**
Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-3
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. many Irish wanted Ireland to be independent of Britain.

The Easter Rising made many Catholic heroes.

The problems of the Civil War led to the partition of Ireland.

Level 2: EITHER 4-7
Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. discusses events between 1910 and 1921 (chronological approach).

Level 3: EITHER 8-11
Developed multi-causal.

OR

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

e.g. covers all three areas (Rebellion, legislation, war).

Develops a blend of short and longer term factors.

Level 4: Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement 12-15
e.g. sees the Easter Rising as the most significant event in raising the profile of independence as it created martyrs.

- (d) ‘Political actions such as the Anglo-Irish Agreement, 1985 and the Good Friday Agreement, 1998 failed to bring peace to Northern Ireland. The increased rejection of violence has been more important.’ Do you agree?
Explain your answer. 15
- Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set
- OR**
Simple, generalised statement of causation/consequence
- Level 2: EITHER 4-7**
Developed mono-causal answer
- OR**
Narrative implying causation/consequence
- OR**
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
e.g. Anglo-Irish Agreement, 1985.
Good Friday Agreement, 1998.
Decommissioning of arms.
Attitudes of paramilitary groups.
Economic changes in Northern Ireland.
Social changes in Northern Ireland.
- Level 3: EITHER 8-11**
Developed multi-causal
- OR**
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
e.g. considers impact of:
Anglo-Irish Agreement, 1985.
Good Friday Agreement, 1998.
Decommissioning of arms.
Attitudes of paramilitary groups.
Economic changes in Northern Ireland.
Social changes in Northern Ireland.
- Level 4: Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement 12-15**
e.g. considers level 3 points and evaluates relative impact.
Makes a judgement which assesses the relative importance of increased rejection of violence.
-

QUESTION 3: Britain’s changing role in the world since 1956

- (a) How reliable is **Source E** to an historian studying the Falklands War, 1982? **10**
 Use **Source E and your knowledge** to explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension)

OR
Generalised or learned response which could apply to the testing of reliability of any source
 e.g. accurate/Inaccurate as it is a British newspaper.
 Accurate as it was written at the time.
 Inaccurate as it is only an extract.

Level 2: EITHER **3-5**
Combined both (simple) features of level 1

OR
Makes simple inference using either ascription AND/OR content of source
 e.g. links sun newspaper (tabloid) to patriotism.
 Links to its date – in middle of the war.

Level 3: EITHER **6-8**
Evaluates the provenance of the source and applies provenance to the question set

OR
Uses own knowledge to support/refute the reliability of the source
 e.g. challenges specific language used.
 Uses knowledge of the sinking of the Belgrano to challenge accuracy.
 Explains the role of tabloid v broadsheet press (with examples).

Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 **9-10**
 e.g. uses knowledge of tabloid newspapers linked to factual accuracy of statement.
 Knowledge that the General Belgrano did sink with a significant loss of life.

- (b)** Explain what **Source F** tells us about the attacks on Royal Navy vessels in the Falklands War. **5**
- Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2)**
- Level 1: Answer that selects detail from the source** **1**
Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding.
e.g. it blew up, it was hit by a missile, it was hit by an exocet.
- Level 2: Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source** **2-3**
e.g. the ship blew up quite easily.
The missiles were effective.
- Level 3: Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source** **4-5**
e.g. suggests surprise that it was hit while in San Carlos Bay (safety).
Uses knowledge to support complex inference.
e.g. Inherent poor design of British ships.
Superior design of exocet missiles.

Answer **either** part (c) or part (d).

- (c) ‘The British Government challenged President Nasser of Egypt over the Suez Canal in 1956 because he threatened Britain’s position as a world power.’ Do you agree?
Explain your answer. **15**
- Target: Analysis and explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set
OR
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence
 e.g. Nasser was challenged because he took over the canal/dared to challenge the British.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-7**
Developed mono-causal answer
OR
Narrative implying causation/consequence
OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
 e.g. yes – imperialism. Britain as a world power, canal belonged to Britain, oil.
 No – use of UN, joint ownership with France, diplomatic pressure, Israel.
 No justification to keep the canal – could still use it.
- Level 3: EITHER 8-11**
Developed multi-causal
OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
 e.g. based on list at L2.
 Balance between the two alternatives in level 2.
 May discuss secret support of Israel at this time.
- Level 4: Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement 12-15**
 e.g. considers the list of points at L3, developing relative importance.
 Final judgement made.

- (d) Did the First Gulf War 1990–1991 weaken Britain’s position as a major world power? **15**
Explain your answer.
- Target: Analysis & explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set
- OR**
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence
e.g. Britain won the war/quick victory.
USA & Britain special relationship.
Britain depended on the USA.
Weak enemy/easy victory.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-7**
Developed mono-causal answer
- OR**
Narrative implying causation/consequence
- OR**
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
e.g. considers military victory and growing role as world policeman.
Economic impact re oil.
- Level 3: EITHER 8-11**
Developed multi-causal
- OR**
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
e.g. joint US and British victory.
Special relationship.
Economic power (oil).
Role within UN.
Patriotism at home – perceived greatness?
Election victory for Conservatives-sustained existing government – Margaret Thatcher’s role on the world stage.
- Level 4: Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement 12-15**
e.g. considers the list of points at L3, developing relative importance.
-

QUESTION 4: Vietnam since 1939

- (a) **Sources G and H** give different views of guerrilla warfare. **8**
Why do you think the views are different?

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

- Level 1: Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension)** **1-2**
e.g. North Vietnamese vs. American
Guerrillas usually killed or captured.
- Level 2: Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about: When the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view** **3-4**
1950s v 1988
U.S. veteran vs. North Vietnamese leader
To frighten the French vs. to show U.S. success against guerrilla tactics.
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)
- OR**
An analysis of the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation given
e.g. veteran wants to display it as a victory/defeat/benefit of using informant.
Ho Chi Minh talking about theory to frighten the French.
- NB Place weak references to My Lai at Level 3.
- Level 4: As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context** **7-8**
(1) Search in Source H is organised vs. uncontrolled events such as at My Lai.
(2) Successful capture of guerrillas was quite rare.
(3) Source G was true but still a theory – all sides take time to recover from heavy losses.

- (b) How useful is **Source J** to an historian studying the use of the media coverage during the Vietnam War in 1968? **8**
Use **Source J and your knowledge** to answer this question.
- Target Evaluation of source(s) for utility (AO2)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Accepts the content of the source at face value
- OR**
Generalised or learned response that could apply to any source
e.g. shows that civilians could be hurt.
Shows a brave/kind/strong soldier.
- 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
- OR**
Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias
e.g. posed to get support.
Shows civilians at the centre of warfare.
- Level 3: EITHER 5-6**
Develops an argument about usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge
- OR**
Source evaluation
Might be used by authorities to show a better side of the actions of U.S. troops.
Shows signs of poverty in Vietnam.
U.S. photograph for U.S newspapers (explained).
- Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge AND source evaluation 7-8**
-

-
- (c) Why did the US bomb North Vietnam in the years 1970 to 1972? **6**

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2

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

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence
e.g. to try and win the war/cause damage/fight back etc.

Level 2: EITHER 3-4

Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. to damage industry/break morale/bring war to an end (undeveloped).
Answers centre on explanation of bombing at any time in the Vietnam War.

Level 3: EITHER 5-6

Developed multi-causal

OR

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

e.g. to damage industry/break morale/bring war to an end (developed).

e.g. Ho Chi Min Trail

Paris Peace Talks

Promises to get out of war – Nixon

Vietnamisation

Answer **either** part (d) **or** part (e).

- (d) Why did the USA become increasingly involved in Vietnam in the years 1946 to 1965? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:

Domino Theory

Government of Ngo Dinh Diem, 1956–1963

Attacks at the Gulf of Tonkin, 1964 and on the US Pleiku military base, 1965

Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. Communism would win – countries topple like a row of dominoes.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. fear of Domino Theory explained in clear terms of countries (named).

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**
Developed multi-causal

OR

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

Candidates may make clear references to the following areas to reach level 3 & 4.

Domino Theory.

Government of Ngo Dinh Diem 1956 – 1963.

Attacks on the Gulf on Tonkin, 1964.

US Pleiku military base, 1965.

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

Candidate makes judgement on most important factor(s) at the level.

- (e) What was the most important factor in the growth of the peace movement in the USA during the Vietnam War? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:

My Lai 1968
TV coverage of the War, 1968–1973
Student Protest, 1968–1973

Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer

OR
Narrative implying causation

OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**
Developed multi-causal

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

Candidates may make clear references to the following areas to reach level 3 & 4..

My Lai, 1968.
TV coverage of the war, 1968-1973.
Student Protest, 1968-1973.

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

Candidate makes judgement on most importance factor(s) at this level.
e.g. Candidate sees the TV coverage as the most important factor as it triggers student protest and shows the American people the events of My Lai.

QUESTION 5: The Arab Israeli conflict

- (a) Why did the Jews fight against British rule in Palestine in the years 1945 to 1947? **6**

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence
e.g. they wanted a place to live.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer

OR
Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
e.g. promised a homeland, holocaust, WW2 had ended.

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**
Developed multi-causal

OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
e.g. Holocaust, immigration into Palestine, impact of use of terrorism.
British desire to leave Palestine, fear of Arab states.

-
- (b) **Sources K and L** give different views on why Palestinians left their homes in 1948. **8**
 Why do you think the views are different?
- Target: To comprehend, analyse and evaluate interpretations and representations (AO3)**
- Level 1: Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension)** **1-2**
 e.g. Red Cross worker v Israeli Government.
 Forced to leave, left so they could return.
- Level 2: Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about** **3-4**
 e.g. when the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality.
 1950 v 1990 Day after v much later (hindsight).
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)
- OR**
Analysis of the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation
 e.g. shocked after Deir Yassin (day later – its impact).
 Government publication to justify events/act as propaganda.
- Level 4: As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context** **7-8**
 e.g. gives detail of attack on Deir Yassin. Expected victory for Arab States who surrounded and outnumbered the Israelis – true?
-

- (c) How useful is **Source M** to an historian studying attempts at a peaceful solution to the Arab Israeli Conflict in the years 1995 to 1996? **8**
Use **Source M and your knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of source(s) for utility (AO2)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Accepts the content of the source at face value
- OR**
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source
e.g. must have worked – smiling – use of the word Peace.
Both leaders together. They met to organise peace.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source or on own simple knowledge
- OR**
Makes simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias
e.g. posed/reference to death of Yitzhak Rabin.
- Level 3: EITHER 5-6**
Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge
- OR**
Source evaluation
e.g. knowledge of agreement/future events.
Knowledge of Peres/Arafat and their aims.
Challenges events e.g. soon after assassination – feelings still running high.
- Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge AND source evaluation 7-8**
-

Answer **either** part (d) **or** part (e).

- (d) Why did Britain fail to control Palestine in the years between 1922 and 1939? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:

The McMahon letter, 1915
The Balfour Declaration, 1917
The Arab Revolt, 1936

Explain your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events: Causes and consequence (AO1)

- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**
simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. Britain had broken promises.
The war made the Jews really want a homeland.
Hard to keep both sides under control.

- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

May explain the McMahon Letter and Balfour Declaration but not the Arab Revolt of 1936 at this level.

- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed multi-causal

OR

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

Candidates may make clear references to the following areas to reach level 3 and level 4:

The McMahon letter, 1915.
The Balfour Declaration, 1917.
The Arab Revolt, 1936.

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

Candidates makes judgement on most important factor(s) at this level.

(e) Why were different methods used in the fight for a Palestinian homeland? 8

You should refer in your answer to:

Arab military failure
Hijackings and kidnappings
Oil War, 1973

Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. Israelis always won wars.
The world needed oil for cars.
Hijacking and kidnapping worked.

Level 2: EITHER 3-4
Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. simple links between War of Yom Kippur and growth of terrorist tactics.
Success of hijacking and kidnapping and link to media.
Economic impact of rising oil prices.

Level 3: EITHER 5-6
Developed multi-causal

OR

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

Candidates may make clear reference to the following areas to reach level 3 and level 4.

Arab military failure.
Hijackings and kidnappings.
Oil War, 1973.

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

e.g. balances the relative impact of wars against other methods.
Economic pressure and the use of the media (well publicised hijackings).

Candidate makes judgement on most important factor(s) at this level.

QUESTION 6: Race Relations in the USA post 1945

- (a) How useful is **Source N** to an historian studying events at Little Rock Central High in 1957? **8**
Use **Source N and your own knowledge** to explain your answer.
- Target: Evaluation of source(s) for utility (AO2)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Accepts the content of the source at face value
- OR**
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source
e.g. shows the Federal Guard and their weapons.
Shows a racist student, photo shows the press/media/photographer. Photographs are posed. The student is not even frightened.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source based on the information in the source OR own simple knowledge
- OR**
Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias
e.g. shows the interest the press took in events – lots of camera men.
- Level 3: EITHER: 5-6**
Develops an argument about usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge
- OR**
Source evaluation
e.g. purpose of the photo discussed.
Analysis of the provenance – “persuaded to leave”, “racist student”.
Knowledge of the media impact on the whole of the USA.
Knowledge of many white students’ attitudes to invasion by Federal guardsmen.
- Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge AND source evaluation 7-8**

- (b) How did the 1964 and 1968 Civil Rights Acts try to improve race relations in the USA? **6**
- Target: Analysis and explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set
- OR**
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence
e.g. it made racism illegal.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer
- OR**
Narrative implying causation/consequence
- OR**
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
- Level 3: EITHER 5-6**
Developed multi-causal
- OR**
A selective and structured account establishing some links between factors clearly focused on the demands of the question
e.g. end of discrimination on grounds of colour, religion, national origin, employment laws, end of segregated schools, sale and rent of housing, voting registration (1965).

-
- (c) **Source O** and **Source P** give different views on the life and work of Martin Luther King. **8**
Why do you think the views are different?
- Target: To comprehend, analyse and evaluate interpretations and representations (AO3)**
- Level 1: Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension)** **1-2**
e.g. non-violent v violent.
Kennedy Award v Communist.
Man of the year vs. spy.
- Level 2: Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about:** **3-4**
e.g. when the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality
e.g. KKK viewpoint v biographical approach.
Dedicated areas to MLK v attempt to ban holiday dedicated to MLK.
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)
- OR**
An analysis of the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation
e.g. racist motivation of KKK.
Motivation of pro-MLK website.
- Level 4: As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context** **7-8**

Candidate makes judgement on most important factor(s) at this level.
-

Answer **either** part (d) **or** part (e).

- (d) What prevented the establishment of civil rights in the first half of the twentieth century in the USA? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:

Segregation laws and voting rights
Attitudes in the Southern states
The Ku Klux Klan

Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation

e.g. the KKK attacked blacks. Some Americans were racist.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**
Developed multi-causal

OR

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

Candidates may make clear references to the following areas for level 3 and level 4.

Segregation Laws and voting rights.
Attitudes in the southern states.
The KKK.

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

Candidate makes judgement on most important factor(s) at this level.

- (e) What progress was made in the 1950s in the fight for civil rights in the USA? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:

Brown versus the Board of Education, Topeka, 1954

Little Rock High School, 1957

The Montgomery Bus Boycott, 1955–1956

Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus of the question set

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence.

May look back to Source N – award at top of Level 1.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**
Developed multi-causal

OR

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

Candidates may make clear references to the following areas for level 3 and level 4.

Brown versus the Board of Education, Topeka, 1954.

Little Rock High school, 1957.

The Montgomery Bus Boycott, 1955-1956.

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

Candidates makes judgement on most important factor(s) at this level.