



General Certificate of Secondary Education

History 3042/7 *Specification B*

Paper 3 British and World History

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 3: British and World History**Section A****Question 1**

- (a) Explain what **Source A** tells us about the role of middle class women in Britain in the early twentieth century. **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. good citizens, stayed at home, clean house, read bible.
- Level 2: Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source** **2-3**
e.g. hints at attitude – enormous amount of embroidery, beautiful larder, routine for visiting people.
General reference to women being forced to stay at home.
- Level 3: Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source** **4-5**
e.g. explains that the writer does not want to follow the same pattern of life by reference to the last sentence, routines cannot be broken.
Women find this life boring/repetitive (Bottom of level).

- (b)** How reliable is **Source B** to an historian studying the role of women before the First World War? **10**
 Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.
- 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)**
 Women think they should have the same wages as men;
 Women need to practice cleaning;
 Women trying to take over men's jobs.
- OR**
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source.
 Replying to letter in local newspaper;
 Accurate, written at the time;
 He worked with women.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-5**
- Combined both (simple) features of level 1**
- OR**
Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source.
 He did not seem to like women; shows attitudes of men.
 He must be complaining as he wrote to the newspaper.
 Response to a letter written by a woman.
- Level 3: EITHER** **6-8**
- Evaluates the provenance of the source and applies provenance to the question set**
 e.g. newspaper would want to show the views held at that time, men concerned as women were beginning to take up jobs in a range of industries and including office work.
- OR**
Uses own knowledge to support/ refute the reliability of the source
 e.g. other example of women in the workplace;
 Demands for equal pay.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3** **9-10**
- Top of level for use of knowledge to support both parts**
 e.g. references to the growing employment of women demands for equal pay before the Equal pay Act **or** not expected by most;

-
- Women left on marriage and pregnancy.
- (c) Do you agree that it was only the efforts of the peaceful suffragist movement, the NUWSS, which gained the vote for women in 1919? **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. petitions, letters and meetings);
It was only because of the war (unexplained).
- 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;
Suggests war was the major factor.
Discusses The 'failure' of the violent campaign.
- Level 4: Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement 12-15**
Comes to a balanced evaluation.- contribution by both organisations (explained);
Explains failure: Vote only after the war.
-

- (d) 'Increasing numbers of women were working in the media, on television and in politics between 1960 and 2000.' **15**
Do you agree that this shows that the battle for equality had been won by the year 2000?
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. women are/are not more equal because they can/cannot;
Media jobs include reading the news.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-7**
- Developed mono-causal answer;**
- OR**
- Narrative implying causation/consequence.**
General knowledge of women in society.
- OR**
- Multi-causal explanation which lacks development**
e.g. develops argument based on three elements –
Media & Political life;
Blair's babes;
J.K. Rowling
- 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 media, begins to challenge the role of women (say) Breakfast TV change in roll from 'eye candy' to serious political commentator.
Challenges the statement – lack of information.
- 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 role in politics and the media. makes a final judgement which is balanced drawing on a knowledge of legislation/politics, family demands at home, sexual freedoms, stereotypes and changing roles.

Question 2

- (a) How reliable is **Source C** to an historian studying the Easter Rising? **10**
 Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content **and your own knowledge**.

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.

He was a leader during the Easter Uprising so he would know what happened;
 Anti British, pro an independent Ireland.

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 speech intended for the press.

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 – he knew the likely outcome of the trial + major media coverage.
 Uses Source C to support reliability.

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 Anglo Irish Treaty of 1921. | 5 |
| | Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2) | |
| Level 1: | Answer that selects detail from the source Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding e.g. number of states, army and navy, loyalty to the crown. | 1 |
| Level 2: | Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source e.g. links gains to membership of the British commonwealth/loyalty. | 2-3 |
| Level 3: | Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source e.g. Develops explanation –hints at possible failure in the future Uses historical context to support complex inference; Clear understanding of membership of Commonwealth and the significance of the oath of loyalty. | 4-5 |

-
- (c) How did the political and economic problems in Northern Ireland between 1921 and 1965 lead to the Troubles in the late 1960's? **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 on the question set.**
- OR**
- Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence**
e.g. Catholics were poor and Protestants were rich
Elections were not fair (unexplained)
- Level 2: EITHER 4-7**
- Developed mono-causal answer.**
- OR**
- Narrative implying causation/consequence.**
- OR**
- Multi-causal explanation which lacks development.**
Lists events between 1960 and 1965 (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. develops a blend of short and longer term factors:**
Anglo Irish treaty, 1921;
Eire, 1937;
Republic of Ireland, 1949;
Post war political and economic inequality.
- 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. evaluates the long term causes (1921–1950s) and the more immediate causes in the late 1950s and early 1960s.
-

-
- (d) Do you agree that the actions of the civil rights marchers, the Provisional IRA and the UVF, and the British army, made a solution to the Irish Problem difficult in the 1960s and 1970s? **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.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-7**
Developed mono-causal answer.
- OR**
Narrative implying causation/consequence.
- OR**
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development:
Provisional IRA;
British army – seen on the side of the Protestants;
IRA campaign- terrorism, kidnapping, punishments, bombs (mainland);
UVF – its actions and British responses;
Civil Rights marches – clashes with the police and British army.
- 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. Provisional IRA;
British army – seen on the side of the Protestants;
IRA campaign- terrorism, kidnapping, punishments, bombs(mainland);
UVF – its actions and British responses;
Civil Rights marches – clashes with the police and British army.
- 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 impact of each area.
-

Question 3

- (a) Explain what **Source E** tells us about the start of the Suez Crisis, 1956 **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. the Israelis attacked on 29th October
- Level 2: Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing a basic inference from source** **2-3**
e.g. British knew it would happen.
The Israelis withdrew but it had been planned.
- Level 3: Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source** **4-5**
e.g. understands the planned nature of the crisis.

| | | |
|-----------------|--|-------------|
| (b) | How reliable is Source F to an historian studying the Falklands War? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content and your own knowledge. | 10 |
| Target: | Evaluation of source(s) for utility/reliability (AO2) | |
| Level 1: | EITHER Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension) OR Generalised or learned response which could apply to the testing of reliability of any source. Accurate as it was true / both claim to own the islands; Inaccurate as it is only an advert for a game. | 1-2 |
| Level 2: | EITHER Combined both (simple) features of level 1 OR Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source e.g. inaccurate; it's only a computer game so they are trying to make it exciting. | 3-5 |
| Level 3: | EITHER 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 Falklands War to challenge accuracy. | 6-8 |
| Level 4: | Combination of both parts of level 3. Not leaky ships but were proven to be easily damaged or attacked. Accuracy or inaccuracy of the casualty figures. | 9-10 |

- (c) “The sinking of the *General Belgrano* and the loss of *HMS Sheffield* weakened Britain’s position as a world power despite the final victory in the Falklands War.” **15**
Do you agree with this statement? 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. yes they lost ships;
yes they sank a ship that was not fighting.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-7**
- Developed mono-causal answer.**
- OR**
- Narrative implying causation/consequence.**
- OR**
- Multi-causal explanation which lacks development**
e.g. yes – Argentina was only a small military nation/ design fault in British ships;
no – they went on to win the war, other ships were not sunk.
- 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:**
- Balance between the two alternatives in level 2;
Weakness in design of new British ships;
Belgrano heading away from the exclusion zone;
War won in 72 days (May make other references to Source F).
- 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) | Do you agree that the victory in the first Gulf War, 1990, changed the views held at home and abroad towards Britain's role in world affairs? 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. another Gulf war followed; first Gulf war was a victory; Saddam Hussein stayed in power/ now dead. | |
| | 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 | |
| | 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; Patriotism at home – perceived greatness? Second Gulf War? | |
| | Level 4: Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement e.g. considers the list of points at Level 3, developing relative importance. | 12-15 |

Question 4

- (a) How useful is **Source G** to an historian studying the Gulf of Tonkin incident during the Vietnam War? **8**

Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content and your own knowledge.

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. references to official nature of the photograph;
Weakness of the 'fake' ship going the other way etc.

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. US photos used.
General references to propaganda.

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**

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

OR

Source evaluation

USS Maddox was in the Gulf at that time patrolling;
lead to increased US involvement

Level 4: Develops an argument about usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge AND source evaluation

USS Maddox was in the Gulf at that time patrolling;
lead to increased US involvement

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| (b) | Why did the USA begin Operation Rolling Thunder in 1965? | 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. 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 To damage industry/ break or improve morale/ bring war to an end (undeveloped). General links to bombing campaign throughout the war. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domino Theory • Protecting South Vietnam • Nature of jungle warfare • To end 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. To damage industry/ improve morale in the south/ bring war to an end (developed). Stop movement of troops and equipment from the North /(ref to failure?). | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linked to Gulf of Tonkin. • Response to losses e.g. Pleiku. | |

-
- (c) **Sources H and J** give a different view of what happened at My Lai in March 1968. **8**
 Why do you think they are different?
 Explain your answer.
- Target :** To comprehend, analyse and evaluate interpretations and representations (AO3)
- Level 1:** Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension) **1-2**
- Level 2:** 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**
 e.g. different areas of the attack;
 US v UK viewpoints on tactics and the human impact.
 US v UK;
 Cowardice v Bravery;
 2006 v Jan 2006 (after death of serviceman).
- Level 3:** EITHER **5-6**
- Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)**
 BBC – factual/irony of US casualty
 To commemorate the death of a hero.
- OR**
- An analysis of the content of the sources(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation given**
 e.g. motive of US writer to show alternative actions.
- Level 4:** As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context **7-8**
 e.g. impact of media reporting on My Lai.
 US still embarrassed by My Lai – should some US servicemen still took a moral stand point (J).
-

- (d) How effective were the methods used by the North Vietnamese army and the Vietcong in their attempt to defeat the French, American and South Vietnamese Army in the 1950s and 1960s? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:

Dien Bien Phu, 1954;

Guerrilla tactics, 1965-1973;

Tet Offensive, 1968;

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

Victory against the French;

Victory against the US;

Failed attack on Saigon.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Developed mono-causal answer.

OR

Narrative implying causation.

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. levels of victory against the French, the USA and attacking Saigon.

Victory against richer, better equipped Western armies.

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 and Level 4.

Dien Bien Phu, 1954;

Guerrilla tactics, 1965-1973;

Tet Offensive, 1968.

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

Evaluates the impact of politics/economy in France on decision by French to withdraw.

Evaluates the US reaction to guerrilla warfare by instigating search and destroy tactics.

Tet offensive evaluated as a “defeat” for both sides

N.B. Evaluation of each key area can get candidate to this level.

- (e) Why was a peaceful end to the Vietnam conflict difficult to achieve in the 1970s? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:

US withdrawal, 1973-1975;
 Fall of Saigon, 1975;
 Boat people and economic problems, 1975-1980.
 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. many people left Vietnam on boats;
 War left the country poorer.

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 and Level 4.

US withdrawal, 1973-1975;
 Fall of Saigon, 1975;
 Boat people and economic problems, 1975-1980.

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 important factor(s) at this level

USA withdrew to save face rather than create a peaceful Vietnam;
Saigon was central to political/economic life and therefore revenge/power struggle would impact on chances for peace;
The rich and middle classes fled Vietnam so destabilising the country even further.

Question 5

- (a) How did the Holocaust make it difficult for the British Government to control Palestine between 1944 and 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 – had to leave Germany;
The world was sorry for the Jews.

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, horrors of the camps became clearer, 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) | How useful is Source K to an historian studying the PLO and its leader Yasser Arafat? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content and your own knowledge. | 8 |
| | 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. Showed the leader, numbers, smiling officers, PLO “official” photographer. | |
| | 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 | |
| | Makes simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias. e.g. Posed photograph, official photograph, training camp references. | |
| | Level 3: EITHER | 5-6 |
| | Develops an argument about usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge e.g. knowledge of the PLO training camps. | |
| | OR | |
| | Source evaluation e.g. sees photographs as propaganda (explained). | |
| | Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge AND source evaluation | 7-8 |

| | | |
|-----|---|------------|
| (c) | <p>Sources L and M give different views on the Intifada. Why do you think they are different? Explain your answer.</p> | 8 |
| | <p>Target : To comprehend, analyse and evaluate interpretations and representations (AO3)</p> | |
| | <p>Level 1: Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension). Started in December 1987; People killed in road traffic accident.</p> | 1-2 |
| | <p>Level 2: Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about: e.g. when the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality. Israeli v Arab account; 1987 v 2006.</p> | 3-4 |
| | <p>Level 3: EITHER</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s).</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">OR</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Analysis of the content of the sources(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation e.g. Accident v killed; Israeli/Arab publication to justify events/ act as propaganda.</p> | 5-6 |
| | <p>Level 4: As level 3 , but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context e.g. other reasons why the Arab people felt they needed to act – economic felt surrounded, acts by Israelis, movement and new settlements Accepts some similarities in the accounts.</p> | 7-8 |

- (d) Why did the Arabs fail to defeat the Israelis on the battlefield in the years 1948 to 1973? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:
 War of Independence, 1948-49;
 Six Day War, 1967;
 Yom Kippur War, 1973;
 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. they lost the wars, poorer fighters, better fighters.

Level 2: EITHER 3-4

Developed mono-causal answer.

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence.

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development.

Military strength;
 Lack of surprise;
 No joint organisation/ leadership;
 Defending homeland/ surrounded.

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:

War of Independence, 1948-49;
 Six Day War, 1967;
 Yom Kippur 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

Candidate makes judgement on most important factor(s) at this level
Discusses the relative levels of success/failure for each side in the various wars;
Can expect greater detail on the Yom Kippur War of 1973.

- (e) How important was the role of the USA in bringing the Middle East closer to peace by the end of the twentieth century? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:
Camp David Agreement, 1978;
White House Agreement, 1993;
Peace Accord, 1995;
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.

The USA played a part in the talks;
The USA was a strong country – they had to do what they said.

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Developed mono-causal answer.

OR

Narrative implying causation.

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development.

e.g. role for Super powers;
Willingness on all sides to look for peace.

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.

Camp David Agreement, 1978;
White House Agreement, 1993;
Peace Accord, 1995.

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

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Camp David Agreement | Personal role of Jimmy Carter Financial aid from US to Egypt and Israel after the agreement was signed |
| White House Agreement | Role of Bill Clinton Importance of Rabin and Arafat Shaking hands on agreement (political risks) Norwegian support for the peace process |
| Peace Accord | Clinton as figurehead for talks Secret PLO and Israeli talks in Oslo (significant) |

Question 6

- (a) How useful is **Source N** to an historian studying the Ku Klux Klan? **8**
Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source as well as using its content and your own knowledge.
- 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 uniforms of the KKK;
Shows a ceremony/US flag
- 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. shows the KKK ceremonies and their level of secrecy.
- 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 (official nature).
Venue, use of the flag (WASP).
- Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge using knowledge AND source evaluation. 7-8**
-

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| (b) | How did the Black Power movement in the 1960s and 1970s try to get equality for African Americans? | 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 fought for the end of racism. | |
| | Level 2: EITHER | 3-4 |
| | Developed mono-causal answer. | |
| | OR | |
| | Narrative implying causation/consequence. | |
| | OR | |
| | Multi-causal explanation which lacks development; Violent and non violent methods, protest actions civil unrest. | |
| | 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. Link to Muslim beliefs, own communities, violence if needed; Wanted separate black communities within US rather than integration; Anti-white stance. | |

| | | |
|-----|--|------------|
| (c) | <p>Sources O and P give different views on the Washington March 1963. Why do you think they are different? Explain your answer.</p> | 8 |
| | <p>Target : To comprehend, analyse and evaluate interpretations and representations (AO3)</p> | |
| | <p>Level 1: Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension).</p> | 1-2 |
| | <p>Level 2: Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about: e.g. when the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality. Important v not important (simple explanation); No other place to be v nothing really happened (simple explanation).</p> | 3-4 |
| | <p>Level 3: EITHER</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s).</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">OR</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">An analysis of the content of the sources(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation. Emotive language versus newspaper language; Eye witness v benefit of hindsight.</p> | 5-6 |
| | <p>Level 4: As Level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context. Candidate makes judgement on most important factor(s) at this level; Judgement on the real impact of voting rights – legal v practical rights; Judgement on the growing influence of black politicians.</p> | 7-8 |

- (d) How were racist attitudes towards African Americans challenged in the 1950s and 1960s? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:
 Montgomery Bus Boycott, 1955-56
 Little Rock High School, 1957
 Freedom Marches, 1963
 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
 e.g. stopped using the buses and went by car or walked;
 Demanded to go to the same high schools as the white students.

Level 2: EITHER 3-4

Developed mono-causal answer.

OR

Narrative implying causation.

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development.
 Impact of the state troopers being used in Little Rock;
 Pressures from national government.

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.

Little Rock High School, 1957 (challenged by the state);
 Montgomery Bus Boycott, 1955-56 (individual protest movement);
 Freedom Marches, 1963 (organised mass protest).

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.
Little Rock High School, 1957 (challenged by the state);
Montgomery Bus Boycott, 1955-56(individual protest movement);
Freedom Marches, 1963(organised mass protest).

- (e) How far has racial equality been achieved in the USA since the death of Martin Luther King? **8**

You should refer in your answer to:
 Civil Rights Acts, 1968;
 Social and economic changes since 1968;
 Racism in the USA since 1968;
 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

New laws have helped
 Black Americans on the media and in politics
 End of racism in the USA including the south?

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.

Civil Rights Acts, 1968;
 Social and economic changes, 1968-2000;
 Racism in the USA, 1968-2000.

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:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Civil Rights Act | legal success v practicality |
| Social/Economic | still mixed e.g. poor wages for some blacks Attitudes in southern states still link back to Inter war years |
| Racism | KKK still in existence and active in political areas. |