



General Certificate of Secondary Education

History 3042/7 *Specification B*

Paper 1 Conflict in the Modern World

Mark Scheme

2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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** 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, scripts from several centres and across the full range of ability in so far as practicable. Any preliminary marking **must** be completed in pencil and reviewed following the standardising meeting in the light of the revised mark scheme and advice given.

- **The Final Mark Scheme**

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

- **Post Standardising Meeting**

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

Paper 1: Conflict in the Modern World
Section A**Question 1**

- (a) What does **Source A** tell us about the reasons why Britain went to war in 1914? **3**
- Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**
- Mark on a 'penny points' system - reward **any three** relevant points (1 x 3 marks) **3**
- e.g. to keep the balance of power;
to prevent Germany becoming too powerful;
to protect Belgium;
to carry out treaty obligations to Belgium;
to prevent a powerful rival coming too close to GB;
count any explanation or inference as one point.
- (b) Describe the Schlieffen Plan used by the Germans in 1914. **6**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1-2**
e.g. they attacked Belgium and France.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
- Detailed description of limited aspects**
e.g. describes one of the following:
The attack on the West through Belgium;
The theory behind the plan; how it was changed in 1914;
Strengths and weaknesses of the plan – why it failed.
The aims of the plan.
- OR**
- Limited description of a wider range of aspects**
e.g. outline description of plan/theory/attack on Belgium before East etc.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5-6**
e.g. at least **two** of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.
Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source B** of the settlement made in the Treaty of Versailles in 1919? **6**
 Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1**
- Learned response or simple response based on source**
 e.g. accurate because it is a comment from Clemenceau who was one of the leaders who made the Treaty etc.;
 Inaccurate because it is biased, primary, a cartoon etc.
- OR**
- Answer based on utility/content/description of source**
 e.g. it is accurate because it says that the Treaty made peace but there was cannon fodder in the future
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-3**
- Combination of both parts of level 1 (max 2)**
- OR**
- Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of source or general knowledge, accepting it at face value**
 e.g. identifies the men shown in the cartoon; shows understanding in general terms of the title Peace and future cannon fodder or gives a simple reason for the child crying or links 1940 to WW2.
- Level 3: EITHER** **4-5**
- Evaluates the provenance of the source**
 e.g. sees it as a political cartoon criticising the Treaty, ridiculing the efforts of the peacemakers because what they have done will lead to future war.
- OR**
- Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context**
 e.g. shows understanding of the cartoon by giving examples of terms of the Treaty and how they support or oppose the cartoon, such as the formation of the League of Nations should have prevented future war, the weakening of Germany left her with grievances and the potential to recover and cause another war. etc.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of Level 3.** **6**

- (d) Which caused more tension between the Great Powers in the years 1905 to 1911: **10**
- events in Morocco, 1905–1911;
 - events in Bosnia, 1908–1909?

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

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**

Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge

e.g. There were disputes in Morocco involving Germany.
Events in Bosnia involved Austria-Hungary.

OR

Simple general causation statements.

e.g. Morocco caused the strengthening of the Entente; Bosnia led to Germany supporting Austria-Hungary.

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 Moroccan Crisis (Crises) (3);

Explains the opposition between Germany and France and why GB became concerned by Germany's action. (4);

Assesses the effect of this on relations between the two alliances -

how it strengthened the agreement between GB and France, involvement of Russia. Its contribution to the outbreak of war in 1914. (5)

Describes the Bosnian Crisis (3);

Explains the reasons for the involvement of Serbia, Russia and Germany (4);

Assesses how this affected the relationship between A/H and Germany, A/H and Russia, A/H and Serbia, Russia and Serbia, and how this affected events in 1914 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.

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

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 2

- (a) What does **Source C** tell us about the Council of the League of Nations in 1920? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. it was a smaller group than the Assembly;
met several times a year;
met during emergencies;
had permanent members (1) with example (2);
USA should have been on it;
Had non permanent members elected by Assembly;
Non permanent members served for 3 years;
Permanent members had powers of veto.
Count any explanation or inference as one point.

(b)	How accurate is the view in Source D of Britain's attitude towards the League of Nations during the Abyssinian Crisis 1935–1936? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content and your own knowledge .	6
	Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)	
	Level 1: EITHER	1
	Learned response or simple response based on source e.g. accurate because it is by the British foreign minister. Inaccurate because it is a speech, primary, written before the Abyssinian Crisis etc.	
	OR	
	Answer based on utility/content/description of source e.g. it is accurate because it says that the League stands for collective security and GB supports this.	
	Level 2: EITHER	2-3
	Combination of both parts of level 1 (MAX 2)	
	OR	
	Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of source or general knowledge, accepting it at face value e.g. shows a general understanding of the source such as Hoare says that GB will support the League, but when Mussolini invaded Abyssinia he was able to resist the League.	
	Level 3: EITHER	4-5
	Evaluates the provenance of the source e.g. considers the purpose of the source such as to the Assembly before Italy's invasion, therefore is Hoare trying to warn off Mussolini; reassure the League of Nations if explained.	
	OR	
	Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context e.g. refers to any aspect of the League's response to Italy's invasion, their attitude to sanctions, the Hoare Laval Pact etc. to challenge the source.	
	Level 4: Combination of both parts of Level 3.	6

- (c) Describe how Hitler took full control of the Saar in 1935 and of the Rhineland in 1936. **6**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description. 1-2**
 E.g. Hitler had a plebiscite and they voted for him then he marched into the Rhineland.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
- Detailed description of limited aspects.**
 E.g. describes one of the following:
 Status of the Saar after Versailles;
 Result of plebiscite and importance for Germany;
 Status of Rhineland at Versailles;
 Hitler's action in 1936 – risk he took;
 Foreign response and reasons for it;
 Importance for Germany;
 Remilitarisation;
 Comparison of different methods.
- OR**
- Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**
 E.g. outline description of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects. 5-6**
 E.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.
 Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.
 Must cover both events for this level.

- (d) Which was the greater threat to world peace in the 1930s: 10
- the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, 1931;
 - the unification of Germany and Austria (Anschluss), 1938?

You must refer to both events when explaining your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2

Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge

e.g. the Japanese invaded Manchuria in China and occupied it.
Hitler joined Austria to Germany because they were German speaking.

OR

Simple general causation statements

e.g. the Japanese left the League of Nations after Manchuria.
Anschluss was against the Treaty of Versailles.

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 invasion of Manchuria (3);
Explains the failure of the League to deal with the invasion. (4);
Assesses the effect of this on the strength of the League and its contribution to the failure of the League in the 1930s. (5)
Describes the Anschluss (3);
Explains Hitler's methods, why he wanted Anschluss and how he prepared the way for it after failure in 1934 (4);
Assesses if this was a threat to world peace – the reaction of the other powers, appeasement, how it strengthened Hitler's position in Europe 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
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

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 3

- (a) What does **Source E** tell us about the effect of the Munich Agreement on Czechoslovakia? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. gave 11000 square miles of territory to Germany;
lost 2,800,000 Germans;
lost 800,000 Czechs;
lost vast fortifications;
lost raw materials and industrial power (2 if an example);
Czechoslovakia divided;
Czechoslovakia bankrupt;
count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) Describe the main features of Neville Chamberlain's policy of appeasement. **6**

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

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

e.g. Chamberlain's policy of appeasement meant giving in to Hitler in order to prevent war.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Detailed description of limited aspects.

e.g. describes one of the following:
The meaning/theory of appeasement;
Chamberlain's reasons for adopting appeasement – failure of league, belief in personal diplomacy, state of GB's arms etc.
Appeasement at work – Czechoslovakia and Munich etc.
Reasons for failure of appeasement.
Why appeasement was supported – explained.

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects.

e.g. outline description of how the policy worked

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

e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.
Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

(c)	How accurate is the view in Source F of Hitler's aims in foreign policy? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content and your own knowledge .	6
	Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO .61)	
	Level 1: EITHER	1
	Learned response or simple response based on source e.g. accurate because Hitler said it was his last will. Inaccurate because the notes were unofficial.	
	OR	
	Answer based on utility/content/description of source e.g. it is accurate because it says that Hitler wanted to defend Germany and enlarge it	
	Level 2: EITHER	2-3
	Combination of both parts of level 1 (MAX 2)	
	OR	
	Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of source or general knowledge, accepting it at face value e.g. Hitler says that he wanted to take Austria and Czechoslovakia and he did. He also wanted living space for Germany. It was secret therefore it must be true/lies. Unexplained Lebensraum/Sudetenland	
	Level 3: EITHER	4-5
	Evaluates the provenance of the source e.g. considers the nature and purpose of the source such as Hitler is speaking to the leaders of the armed forces, so he would trust them and tell them his plans etc. Challenges provenance/authenticity of source, going beyond level 2. Alternatively he could simply be telling them what they wanted to hear because any programme of expansion would make them more important to the Reich.	
	OR	
	Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context e.g. refers to Hitler's foreign policy showing how it proves or disproves the source, such as an explanation of lebensraum and how Hitler tried to obtain it; Hitler took Austria before Czechoslovakia; considers other stated aims of Hitler such as in Mein Kampf.	
	Level 4: Combination of both parts of Level 3	6

- (d) Which event of 1939 made war more likely: **10**
- Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia, March 1939;
 - the Nazi-Soviet Pact, August 1939?

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

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**

Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge

e.g. Hitler took the whole of Czechoslovakia in March 1939.

The Nazi Soviet Pact was made between Hitler and Stalin.

OR

Simple general causation statements.

e.g. Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia was the end of appeasement.

The Nazi Soviet Pact was more important because it was made just before the outbreak of WW2.

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 invasion of Czechoslovakia (3);

Explains why this occupation was different from previous ones – non German speaking, broken the promises of Munich etc. (4);

Assesses the effect of this on the policy of other countries, particularly Chamberlain, - the danger to Poland - and how the invasion brought war nearer – Chamberlain's promises to Poland and other countries (5).

Describes the terms of the Nazi Soviet Pact (3);

Explains why Hitler and Stalin made the Pact, what they had to gain from it, why it surprised other countries. (4);

Assesses how it was a threat to the peace of Europe, how it made war more certain – events following from the Pact – invasion of Poland and its effect 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.

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

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 4

- (a) What does **Source G** tell us about the results of the Korean War? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. it was a costly war;
4 million people died;
Parts of Korea were destroyed;
Increased the arms race;
Development of the hydrogen bomb by USA and USSR;
UN had proved it could raise an army;
UN had stood up to aggression;
Preserved South Korea;
count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) Describe what Khrushchev meant by 'peaceful co-existence' and show how he tried to put his policy into practice between 1956 and 1960 **6**

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

Level 1: Basic description **1-2**
e.g. Peaceful co-existence meant trying to live with your enemies in peace.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Detailed description of limited aspects

e.g. describes one of the following:
The changes introduced by Khrushchev after the death of Stalin – idea of destalinisation.
Effect on the Cold War – the thaw – Summits – U2;
Competition and rivalry continued – the arms and space races, in sport etc.;
Effect on the countries of the Warsaw Pact – Hungarian Rising;

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects

e.g. outline description of the policy and the effect it had.

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

(c)	How accurate is the view in Source H of the reasons for the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content and your own knowledge .	6
	Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)	
	Level 1: EITHER	1
	Learned response or simple response based on source e.g. Inaccurate because it is a cartoon, it is biased.	
	Answer based on utility/content/description of source e.g. it is accurate because the Berlin Wall was erected in 1961.	
	Level 2: EITHER	2-3
	Combination of both parts of level 1 (MAX 2)	
	OR Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of source or general knowledge, accepting it at face value e.g. identifies in simple terms the meaning of the source e.g. the Wall was built to prevent people fleeing from East to West Berlin, people did get killed crossing the wall.	
	Level 3: EITHER	4-5
	Evaluates the provenance of the source e.g. considers the nature and purpose of the source: an American source so it will be trying to make fun of the Soviets and show how they are prepared to kill to preserve their rule which depends on force.	
	OR Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context e.g. refers to the American version of why the Wall was built – to prevent defections, explaining the cause and effects of the Wall. Alternatively discusses Soviet reasons for the building of the Wall: previous invasions of the USSR, their fears of a revived Germany etc.	
	Level 4: Combination of both parts of Level 3	6

- (d) Who gained more from the Cuban Missile Crisis: 10
- Kennedy and the USA;
 - Khrushchev and the USSR?

You must refer to **both** bullet points when explaining your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2

Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge

e.g. Kennedy gained more because the missiles were dismantled.

Khrushchev lost because he had to withdraw the missiles.

OR

Simple general consequence statements.

e.g. The USA now felt safer, the USSR claimed to have acted to preserve peace.

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 part played by Kennedy in the Crisis (3);

Explains the danger of the missiles to the USA and how Kennedy succeeded in getting rid of them. (4);

Assesses the effect of this on the position of Kennedy as a world statesman - the contrast to previous meetings with Khrushchev.(5)

Describes the part played by Khrushchev in the Crisis (3);

Explains what Khrushchev hoped to achieve and what he actually achieved (4);

Assesses the effect of this on the position of Khrushchev as a world statesman – was he a peacemaker or a failure? – part in his fall 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.

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

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.

N.B. Answers are likely to describe the Crisis as one event, covering both Kennedy and Khrushchev. Award at either Level 2 or Level 3 as above, depending on whether the answer describes, explains or assesses the part played by the leaders.

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 SALT? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. they were Strategic Arms Limitation Talks;
lasted from 1969 to 1972;
two documents agreed (2 if an example);
signed on 26 May 1972;
to last five years;
strategic ballistic missiles kept at the level of 1972;
construction of extra land-based silos prohibited;
count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) Describe the reforms of Alexander Dubcek in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the reaction of the USSR to them. **6**

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

Level 1: Basic description

e.g. Dubcek's reforms were known as the Prague Spring and the USSR stopped them. **1-2**

Level 2: EITHER

Detailed description of limited aspects

e.g. describes one of the following:
Reforms of Dubcek – socialism with a human face - details of Prague Spring;
Reasons for concern in USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries –
Dubcek's attempts to allay them;
Use of force by USSR and response of Czechs;
Results of invasion – fate of reforms, Dubcek and Czechoslovakia. **3-4**

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects

e.g. outline description of the reforms and the Soviet invasion

Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects

e.g. at least two of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.
Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.
Must cover both parts for this level. **5-6**

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source K** of the attitude of the Soviet government to the signing of the Helsinki Agreement in 1975? **6**
 Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1**
- Learned response or simple response based on source**
 e.g. accurate because it is secondary, using hindsight.
 Inaccurate because it is biased.
- Answer based on utility/content/description of source**
 e.g. it is accurate because it says that the Soviets had signed the Helsinki Agreement in 1975 and they did.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-3**
- Combination of both parts of level 1 (MAX 2)**
- OR**
- Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of source or general knowledge, accepting it at face value**
 e.g. Helsinki Agreement was about more than Human Rights. Soviets were pleased with parts of the agreement. SALT 2 collapsed partly because the USSR had not kept the human rights clauses of Helsinki etc.
 Biased because it is written by anti communists – only an opinion, not necessarily fact.
- Level 3: EITHER** **4-5**
- Evaluates the provenance of the source**
 e.g. considers the nature and purpose of the source: it is from an anti communist website so it will be trying to discredit communism developed.
- OR**
- Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context**
 e.g. points out that the USSR was pleased with the agreement on boundaries at Helsinki, but points out that their human rights record did not improve and was criticised by Jimmy Carter. It was Carter's attempts to tie in improvement in human rights to reduction in arms that partly led to the collapse of the SALT 2 talks.
 Could refer to the treatment of Dissidents such as Sakharov in the USSR.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of Level 3.** **6**

- (d) Which was the more important reason for the movement towards Détente in the 1970s: **10**
- the consequences in the USA of the Vietnam War;
 - the policy of President Nixon towards China?

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

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2

Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge

e.g. The Vietnam War cost the USA a lot.

China was a communist country, Nixon wanted to improve relations with the USSR and China.

OR

Simple general causation statements.

e.g. the USA wanted to spend less money on arms after the Vietnam War.

Nixon improved relations with China through 'ping pong' diplomacy

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 consequences of the Vietnam War in the USA (3);

Explains the effect of this on USA – opposition at home – USA's reputation in the world – effect of involvement on USSR and China etc. (4);

Assesses the effect of this on the USA's attitude towards Détente, the need to reduce spending – need some success – futility of war developed etc. (5)

Describes the emergence of China and Nixon's policies – marks can be awarded for Nixon alone. (3);

Explains the importance of relations with China and the change in policy associated with Nixon. (4);

Assesses the contribution of China to Nixon's policies and to the change of heart in the USSR, together with the effects of Nixon's policies, both formal and informal, on Détente 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.

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

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 6

- (a) What does **Source L** tell us about how President Carter ended Détente? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. pulled USA out of Moscow Olympics;

refused to agree SALT 2;

cut trade between USA and USSR;

stopped selling food to USSR;

stopped the export of technological goods to USSR;

count any explanation or inference as one point.

(b)	How accurate is the view in Source M of the aims of Solidarity in 1980? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content and your own knowledge .	6
	Target: Evaluation of a source for accuracy (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)	
	Level 1: EITHER	1
	Learned response or simple response based on source e.g. accurate because it is taken from their demands in 1980. Inaccurate because it is not all of the 21 demands.	
	Answer based on utility/content/description of source e.g. it is accurate because Solidarity wanted more pay, an end to censorship etc	
	Level 2: EITHER	2-3
	Combination of both parts of level 1 (MAX 2)	
	OR	
	Makes simple inferences using either ascription or content of source or general knowledge, accepting it at face value e.g. Solidarity was a trade union, so it would want free trade unions; Walesa and most of the Polish people were Catholic, so they would want more freedom for the Church.	
	Level 3: EITHER	4-5
	Evaluates the provenance of the source e.g. considers the nature and purpose of the source: they are a series of demands – are they toned down or exaggerated in order to be able to compromise?	
	OR	
	Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context e.g. refers to the role of Solidarity in Poland in the 1980s – none of the demands are political and yet Solidarity took power in 1989. Response of the Soviets in 1981 shows that they thought that Solidarity was political.	
	Level 4: Combination of both parts of Level 3.	6

(c)	Describe the changes brought about by the policies of President Gorbachev.	6
	Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)	
	Level 1: Basic description e.g. Gorbachev changed communism and allowed more freedom.	1-2
	Level 2: EITHER Detailed description of limited aspects e.g. describes one of the following: Perestroika – changes in economic policies; Glasnost – more open debate etc. Foreign policy – change in relations with USA; Reasons for change in policies and their connection with the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. Accept the effects of Perestroika and Glasnost.	3-4
	OR Limited description of a wider range of aspects e.g. outline description of policies.	
	Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects 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.	5-6

- (d) Which was the greater threat to the Soviet Union in the 1980s: 10
- the war in Afghanistan
 - the attitude of President Reagan towards the USSR?

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

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2

Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge

e.g. The Mujaheddin fought against the USSR in Afghanistan;
President Reagan hated communism.

OR

Simple general causation statements.

e.g. the USSR could not win the war in Afghanistan and were forced to withdraw.

Reagan became much friendlier towards Gorbachev.

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 war in Afghanistan (3);

Explains why the Soviets were unable to defeat the Mujaheddin. (4);

Assesses the effect of this on the weakening and break up of the USSR – could cover economic or political effects. (5)

Describes Reagan's view of communism. (3);

Explains how Reagan tried to counteract communism –increased defence spending, neutron bomb, SDI etc. (4);

Assesses the threat of this to the USSR – end of the balance of power – USA superiority led to START talks – coming to power of Gorbachev led to meetings and reduction in arms spending 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.

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

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
Question 7

- (a) What does Source N tell us about the reasons for the employment of more women during the First World War? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. shortage of workers;
more food and clothing needed;
more armaments needed
army and navy had to be supplied;
more men joining forces and had to be replaced;
count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) Why was the poster in **Source O** distributed in Britain in 1915 during the First World War? **6**

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

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

Level 1: Simple, basic reason drawing on source/own knowledge **1-2**
e.g. it was propaganda;
showing that everyone had a part to play in the war;
to recruit people.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Developed monocausal answer using source and/or own knowledge
(i) uses knowledge to explain context:
e.g. explains one of the following:
The idea of total war, not just a war between armies;
Reliance of GB on volunteers, need to publicise.
Identifies what the needs are and why – soldiers and sailors to fight, women to replace them making munitions, nurses to tend the wounded etc.
(ii) explains the propaganda aspect/appeal of the poster – must focus on Source O, not on other similar sources - use of emotion, making people feel that they were needed, that they were part of a team, that they were missing out if they did not help in some way – patriotism shown by flag – personalised by 'You'. etc.

OR

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

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

Level 3: Developed multicausal answer using source and own knowledge. **5-6**
e.g. develops at least two of the reasons in the first part of level 2, but **must cover (i) context of poster using own knowledge and (ii) explain the propaganda aspects/appeal of the poster.**

- (c) How useful is **Source P** to an historian studying the Western Front in the First World War? **8**
Use **Source P** and **your own knowledge** to answer the question.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**
- accepts the content of the source at face value**
e.g. it is useful because it tells us that letters were sent home and the soldier does comment on his chances of death and his hopes for an end to the war.
- OR**
- generalised or learned response**
e.g. it is primary source, a postcard so anyone could read it, it is not dated.
- 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 refers to one part of the front and the experiences of one soldier.
Use of general rather than specific knowledge to prove utility e.g. many people did die on the Western Front.
- OR**
- Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias.**
e.g. the letter has been censored, so it will not show the soldier's true feelings; the soldier is writing home, so he will not want to worry them too much.
- 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 life on the front to comment on the content of the source. Such as the method of fighting that made soldiers see it as 'murder', conditions in trenches were so bad that they wanted the war to end as soon as possible; the weapons that caused the killing so that they would be lucky to survive, some idea of casualties perhaps in a specific battle etc.
- Specific knowledge such as this can be used to explain the utility of the source or to limit its value –either argument is valid for this level.
- OR**
develops the provenance of the source, explaining the purpose of censorship, what the soldiers were allowed to write in letters home and what was forbidden and how this would affect the value of the source.
- 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) **Source R** is about the importance of the Royal Navy in the defeat of Germany in the First World War. **8**
- Do you agree with the interpretation in **Source R**?
Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Describes the content of the source accepting it at face value (comprehension). 1-2**
e.g. the Blockade was extremely important in the defeat of Germany because it led to the surrender of Germany. British therefore biased.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-4**
Simple explanation of how the interpretation came about
e.g. published in 1983, therefore using hindsight, based on research; a naval historian therefore biased in favour of the navy etc.
OR
Agrees/disagrees with the interpretation by using general knowledge of topic
e.g. The German army had to be defeated therefore the British army was every bit as important as the navy.
Home Front was equally important in winning the war etc.
Without the navy, Britain would have starved etc.
- Level 3: Agrees or disagrees with interpretation using knowledge and/or source 5-6**
e.g. agrees: using some knowledge of the part played by the Royal Navy, such as:
the protection of convoys; keeping troops and supplies moving to France; protecting GB; could be some reference to the results of Jutland; the effect of the Blockade on the final defeat of Germany.
Agrees: explains that the author is a naval historian – as a naval historian he should be a specialist in naval warfare, therefore reliable; title of book shows the nature of his research.
Disagrees: points out that the army played the biggest role by reference to factors such as the BEF in 1914 or the contribution of the British army to the Somme or the defeat of the German army in 1918
- Can also explain the contribution of the Home Front to the victory by giving specific examples of its work.
- Disagrees: refers to the title of the book, concentrating on the War at Sea or the fact that the author is a naval historian and explaining how either of these points could influence the author and lead to exaggerated assertions as he could be writing to try to prove the importance of the navy in the war.
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 level 2 and the other level 3, answer must be placed at level 3.
MUST USE SOURCE AND OWN KNOWLEDGE FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

Question 8

- (a) What does **Source S** tell us about the activities of the BEF in France in 1940? **3**

Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)

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

e.g. joined with French forces;
advanced into Belgium;
surprised by Blitzkrieg in danger of being cut off;
ordered to evacuate;
evacuated from Dunkirk;
began on 27 May;
lasted until 4 June;
338,000 evacuated;
stop Germans.
count any explanation or inference as one point.

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

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

Level 1: Simple, basic reason drawing on source/own knowledge **1-2**
e.g. it was propaganda;
encouraging to work;
wanted to increase the number of crops grown in GB.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Developed monocausal answer using source and/or own knowledge
(i) uses knowledge to explain context:
e.g. explains one of the following:
Shortages of food – U Boat Blockade of GB;
To encourage 'Grow your own' campaign to make up for shortages;
Rationing had already been introduced.
(ii) explains the propaganda aspect/appeal of the poster – must focus on Source T, not on other similar sources – linking 'digging with victory'; everyone has a part to play; importance of the Home Front in achieving victory.

OR

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

Level 3: Developed multicausal answer using source and own knowledge. **5-6**
e.g. develops at least two of the reasons in the first part of level 2, but **must cover (i) context of poster using own knowledge and (ii) explain the propaganda aspects/appeal of the poster.**

- (c) How useful is **Source V** to an historian studying the D Day landings in the Second World War? **8**
Use **Source V** and **your own knowledge** to answer the question.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**
accepts the content of the source at face value
e.g. it is useful because it tells us what happened, they did leave southern England etc.
- OR**
generalised or learned response
e.g. he took part in the landings so it is useful; he is 81 so he will not remember.
- 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 refers to one beach and the soldier got injured in the attack so it does not tell us much about it.
Use of general rather than specific knowledge to prove utility e.g. the British did land on Gold Beach; the landings were supported by aircraft, battleships and cruisers.
- OR**
Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias.
e.g. a British newspaper therefore biased and wanting to favour the war veteran.
- 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 D Day such as the role of the aircraft and paratroops, an explanation of the landing craft that were used etc.
Could limit its usefulness by explaining that GB was only involved in landings on 3 of the 5 beaches and resistance was different on each of them illustrating by comment on Omaha.
Could also refer to parts of landings that are not mentioned such as the preparations, the attempts to deceive Hitler, the use of PLUTO etc.
- OR**
develops the provenance of the source, explaining the purpose of the article commemorating the 60th anniversary of the landings therefore will be part of the celebrations, not a balanced account.
- 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) **Source W** shows that Bryn Griffiths' life as an evacuee was an improvement on his life in Swansea. **8**
 Do you agree with the interpretation that evacuees had a better life in their new homes? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- Target: Analysis and evaluation of an interpretation (AO 6.3) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Describes the content of the source accepting it at face value (comprehension).** **1-2**
 e.g. children were evacuated during the Second World War, they were billeted on people and moved away from cities because of bombs etc.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Simple explanation of how the interpretation came about
 e.g. published in 1968, therefore using hindsight to choose suitable reminiscences, based on research, written by an evacuee and the collection is by an evacuee therefore reliable.
- OR**
Agrees/disagrees with the interpretation by using general knowledge of topic
 e.g. Children were evacuated from cities to the countryside so they would have had healthier lives and would have been safe from the bombs.
- Level 3: Agrees or disagrees with interpretation using knowledge and/or source** **5-6**
 e.g. Agrees: explains the benefits of evacuation for many of the children: contrasts the slums they came from with the fresher food, greater cleanliness, running water, life on a farm etc.
 Agrees: explains that it is a first hand account from someone who had no reason to lie, so Griffiths' description would be true. Even the writer of the book had been evacuated so he would have had no reason to include something that was not true.
 Disagrees: refers to the down side of evacuation: the homesickness; some foster families only took them as cheap labour, others were forced to take them and regarded them as a burden; the foster families were not used to dealing with children like the evacuees and many treated them cruelly; families were separated by the billeting process; many had problems at school.
 Disagrees: it is a collection and this is just one of the stories in the book, the remainder may tell of horrible experiences. The author may have exaggerated certain stories. He may have been trying to thank those who looked after him during the war.
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 level 2 and the other level 3, answer must be placed at level 3.
MUST USE SOURCE AND OWN KNOWLEDGE FOR TOP OF LEVEL