



## **General Certificate of Secondary Education**

# **GCSE History 3042/7/1**

*Specification B*

## **Paper 1**

# **Mark Scheme**

*June examination - 2008 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](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2008 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 agreement which Britain made with France in 1904? **(3)**

**Target: Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)**

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

e.g. called the Entente Cordiale;  
settled old arguments;  
France accepted GB's occupation of Egypt;  
To consult regularly (1) on naval and military matters (max 2);  
An understanding;  
Not an alliance (1) – explanation of why (1);  
Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) Describe the events of the Moroccan Crises 1905 – 1911. **(6)**

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

**Level 1: Basic description** **1-2**  
e.g. Germany tried to prevent France from taking control of Morocco.

**Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**  
**Detailed description of limited aspects**  
e.g. develops one of the following:  
1905: Kaiser and Morocco – French ambitions – Algeciras;  
1911 – Fez – Agadir – gunboat – GB's involvement;  
Kaiser's aims – purpose of his involvement in Morocco;  
Effect of Morocco on alliances.

**OR**

**Limited description of a wider range of aspects**  
e.g. outline description of crises and their effect 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.  
Must cover both crises for top of this level.

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source B** of the attitude of the Serbian Government towards Austria-Hungary in the years 1908-1914? (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 (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1**  
**Learned response or simple response based on source**  
 e.g. accurate because it is a declaration signed by Serbia, it is primary etc.  
 Inaccurate because the Serbs were forced to sign it.
- OR**
- Answer based on utility/content/description of source**  
 e.g. it is accurate because it says that the Serbs promised to live on good terms with Austria.
- 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. explains likely effect of being 'forced' to sign – not a willing participant to the declaration therefore not bound by it.  
 Inaccurate because the Serb government allowed the Black Hand to grow, it was Serbs who assassinated Franz Ferdinand etc.  
 Accurate because A/H wanted to weaken Serbia.
- Level 3: EITHER 4-5**  
**Evaluates the provenance of the source**  
 e.g. considers purpose: either explains context of why Serbia was forced to sign it or explains why AH was trying to protect itself by forcing Serbia to sign it; A/H wanted to preserve the A/H Empire which had Slavs in it; wanted to weaken Serbia, their main rival for rule of the Slavs in the Balkans, as Serbia wanted a Slav state led by Serbia therefore A/H forced Serbia to sign an agreement which would help A/H to achieve their aims.
- OR**  
**Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context**  
 e.g. shows understanding of the context of the source by reference to events such as the Bosnian Crisis or explains fully the reasons why Serbia and A/H quarrelled over Bosnia, or explains the reasons Serbia backed down in 1909, or explains the effect that Bosnia had on Serbian foreign policy and the aims of the Black Hand etc.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 6**

- (d) Which was the more important reason for the outbreak of the First World War in 1914: **(10)**
- the arms race
  - the assassination of Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914?

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

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

**Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**  
**Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge**  
 e.g. all countries built up their weapons;  
 Gavrilo Princip assassinated Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo.

**OR**

**Simple general causation statements**  
 e.g. arms race made people expect war; assassination was the immediate cause of the war.

**N.B. 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.  
 With arms race, could concentrate on military or naval build up.  
 e.g. describes the build up of arms/Dreadnoughts (3);  
 Explains the reasoning behind it: weapons mean power; built up to ensure peace (balance of power); prevent invasions; fear of other alliances (terms secret); GB an island, felt vulnerable etc. (4);  
 Assesses and illustrates the effect of this on the causes of World War One: countries were spending on weapons so people expected them to be used; rivalries led to competition and fears, effect on alliances? Attitude of Germany and the Kaiser to militarism – GB felt threatened by naval race etc. (5)  
 Describes the events of the assassination (3);  
 Explains the aftermath of the assassination (4);  
 Explains the reasons for the involvement of Russia and Germany;(4);  
 Assesses and illustrates how this affected the outbreak of war – the role played by the alliance system and the war plans. (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.

**N.B.** Description of both (4). Explanation of both (5)

**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) In 1919, the Treaty of Versailles took land from Germany. (6)  
Describe **other** ways in which the Treaty of Versailles punished Germany for the First World War.

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

**Level 1: Basic description.**

**1-2**

e.g. Germany had to pay reparations (1) and was blamed for the war (2 if both or similar are given).

**Level 2: EITHER**

**3-4**

**Detailed description of limited aspects.**

e.g. develops one of the following:

Military: army 100,000; no conscription; no tanks or U Boats; only 6 battleships; Rhineland de-militarised, no military aircraft allowed.

Reparations: theory explained; £6,600m set in 1921 to be paid over 42 years and other economic consequences such as losing the coal in the SAAR.

War Guilt – meaning and effect; Diktat; exclusion from L of N; Anschluss.

**OR**

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

e.g. outline description of clauses.

**Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects.**

**5-6**

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

Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

- (b) What does **Source C** tell us about the action taken by the League of Nations when Manchuria was invaded by Japan? (3)

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)**

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

e.g. set up Commission of Inquiry;

took a year to publish report

Japan had acted unlawfully;

Manchuria should be returned to China;

Accepted by all members except Japan;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source D** of how the League of Nations dealt with the invasion of Abyssinia (Ethiopia) 1935-1936? **(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 (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**

- Level 1: EITHER** **1**  
**Learned response or simple response based on source**  
 e.g. accurate because it is by Haile Selassie who was the leader of Abyssinia (Ethiopia) at the time  
 Inaccurate because it is biased, primary, etc.  
**OR**  
**Answer based on utility/content/description of source**  
 e.g. it is accurate because it says that Mussolini invaded Abyssinia with mustard gas and the L of N did nothing about 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. refers to Mussolini's attack and the use of modern weapons against the primitive weapons of Abyssinia or to the action taken by the L of N in general terms or simple reasons why the League did not take full action. Trying to win more support from the League against Mussolini
- Level 3: EITHER** **4-5**  
**Evaluates the provenance of the source**  
 e.g. purpose was to obtain greater sanctions on Italy by the League, therefore emotive, could be exaggerating – use of language 'abandoned' 'justice'. Criticising the allies of Italy (GB and France) – trying to get them to change.  
**OR**  
**Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context**  
 e.g. shows knowledge of the crisis and how the League of Nations dealt with it – Mussolini's aggression – use of sanctions and why limited – Hoare Laval Pact etc.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3** **6**

- (d) Which was the more important reason for the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939: (10)
- Hitler's aims in foreign policy
  - Chamberlain's policy of appeasement, 1938-1939?

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

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

**Level 1: EITHER 1-2**

**Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge**

e.g. Hitler wanted to get rid of the Treaty of Versailles;

Chamberlain wanted to avoid a war.

**OR**

**Simple general causation statements.**

e.g. Chamberlain thought he could prevent war by finding out Hitler's aims – what Hitler wanted.

**N.B. 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 some of Hitler's aims (3);

Explains how he put his aims into effect (4);

Explains the reasoning behind the aims and the crises this led to (could use events/crises such as Saar, Rhineland, Anschluss, Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia 1938-39, Poland). (4);

Assesses and illustrates the effect of this on the outbreak of World War Two:

- links Hitler's aims to the events/crises and shows how they led to war. (5)

Describes the meaning of appeasement (3);

Explains Chamberlain's reasons for it and how it worked in practice (could consider points such as: belief that Hitler was reasonable; Treaty of Versailles unfair; fear of war after losses and cost of WW1; fear of Soviet Union and communism; GB needed time to re-arm and also Chamberlain and Anschluss and the Munich Conference.) (4)

Assesses and illustrates how this affected the outbreak of war – effect of appeasement on Hitler, the events after Munich and reasons for the failure of appeasement. (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 decisions reached at Yalta in 1945? (3)

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)**

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

e.g. a success;  
several agreements reached;  
UNO set up;  
Germany divided into three zones;  
Berlin divided into three zones;  
French zone added later;  
Free elections allowed in eastern Europe;  
Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b) How accurate is the view in **Source F** of the Truman Doctrine? (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 (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**

**Level 1: EITHER**

**Learned response or simple response based on source**

e.g. accurate because it is primary etc.  
Inaccurate because it is a cartoon, American therefore biased etc.

**OR**

**Answer based on utility/content/description of source**

e.g. it is accurate because Stalin did not like Truman's program, shows it choking him.

**1**

**Level 2: EITHER**

**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 that the Truman Doctrine was meant to upset Stalin; it was meant to 'contain' communism, cartoon shows it choking Stalin, linked to containment.

**2-3**

**Level 3: EITHER**

**Evaluates the provenance of the source**

e.g. an American cartoon which is ridiculing Stalin and whose purpose was probably to obtain support in America for the Truman Doctrine by showing how successful it was.

**OR**

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

e.g. shows understanding of the cartoon by giving details of the Truman Doctrine and the support given to Greece and Turkey. Could challenge cartoon by explaining Stalin's aims, buffer to prevent another invasion etc.

**4-5**

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

**6**

- (c) Describe the events of the Berlin Blockade and Airlift between June 1948 and May 1949. (6)

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

**Level 1: Basic description** 1-2  
 e.g. Stalin blockaded it (1) and tried to starve all the people out (2).

**Level 2: EITHER** 3-4  
**Detailed description of limited aspects**  
 e.g. develops one of the following:  
 The situation between West and East Berlin/Germany;  
 Closure of all links and how Stalin expected this to affect West Berlin;  
 Problem for the allies;  
 The Airlift – details;  
 Problem for Stalin – end of blockade.

**OR**

**Limited description of a wider range of aspects.**  
 e.g. outline description of the Blockade and Airlift

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

- (d) Which was the more important reason for the development of the Cold War: (10)
- the Potsdam Conference, July 1945
  - the Marshall Plan, 1947?

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

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

**Level 1: EITHER 1-2**

**Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge**

e.g. leaders disagreed at Potsdam;

Marshall Plan was an American attempt to help after the war.

**OR**

**Simple general causation statements.**

e.g. Potsdam was the first disagreement since the war, Stalin was suspicious of the Marshall Plan.

**N.B. 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 who attended and what was agreed at Potsdam (3)

Explains the reasons for conflict at Potsdam (Truman's view of communism; reparations and the recovery of Germany; atom bomb etc; changes of personnel.) (4)

Assesses and illustrates the effect of this on the start of the Cold War: (souring of relations and beginning of rivalries (Greece, Turkey, Iron Curtain, division of Europe etc.) (5)

Describes the Marshall Plan: \$15-17 billion etc. (3)

Explains the thinking behind it: (poverty leads to communism, therefore part of Truman Doctrine to contain communism) (4)

Assesses and illustrates the effect of this on Stalin and why it concerned him and led to the Cold War (economic imperialism by USA, fear of growth of Germany, east Europe were not allowed to receive Aid, led to Comecon and further division. (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) Describe the main events of the Korean War, 1950-1953. (6)

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

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

e.g. USA sent an army to Korea (1) to fight against the communists who were supported by USSR/China (2) USA supported South Korea which was attacked by the communist North Korea (2)

**Level 2: EITHER** 3-4

**Detailed description of limited aspects**

e.g. develops one of the following:

Situation in Korea in 1950 – start of war – success of N Korea to reach Pusan, attitude of UN – absence of USSR from debate; - UN resolution;

Reasons for US involvement – Domino Theory, Truman Doctrine;

Part played by USA in the UN force – details of campaign, Inchon, Yalu River;

Role of MacArthur – reasons for dismissal;

Part played by China – volunteers – stalemate and ceasefire.

**OR**

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

e.g. outline description of the Korean War.

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

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

Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

- (b) What does **Source G** tells us about the effects of the launch of Sputnik in 1957? (3)

**Target: Target: Comprehension of source (AO 6.2)**

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

e.g. damaged US pride;

rocket could carry a nuclear weapon;

increased the potential range of nuclear weapons;

USA developed rockets;

Led to space race;

Led to build up of ICBMs;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (c) How accurate is the view in **Source H** of the results of the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962? (6)  
Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as its content **and your own knowledge**.

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

- Level 1: EITHER 1**  
**Learned response or simple response based on source**  
 e.g. accurate because it is a primary source;  
 Inaccurate because it is a Soviet source therefore biased etc.  
**OR**  
**Answer based on utility/content/description of source**  
 e.g. it is accurate because Cuba is still an independent socialist country near the USA.
- 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. it could not have been a triumph for Khrushchev and USSR because he was forced from power 2 years later; he was forced to withdraw missiles from Cuba etc.
- Level 3: EITHER 4-5**  
**Evaluates the provenance of the source**  
 e.g. examines the purpose of the source – it is by the Soviet leader who is looking back and will be trying to justify his own stance at the time of Cuba, trying to defend his actions.  
**OR**  
**Uses own knowledge to question the accuracy of the source, placing it into context**  
 e.g. relevant knowledge of what happened in crisis or the situation in Cuba after the crisis. Could challenge the view by making comments on Cuba as a defeat for USSR or support it by comparing USA's ambitions in Cuba with Castro's relationship with USSR.
- Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 6**

- (d) Which was the greater threat to peace in the years 1949-1963: (10)
- the formation of NATO (1949) and the Warsaw Pact (1955)
  - the building of the Berlin Wall, 1961?

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

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

**Level 1: EITHER 1-2**

**Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge**

e.g. NATO was the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.

Warsaw Pact was the Soviet reply to NATO.

Berlin Wall divided Berlin into East and West.

**OR**

**Simple general causation statements**

e.g. the Berlin Wall was more of a threat to peace because the two opposing armed alliances had already been formed.

**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 membership/purpose of NATO and/or the Warsaw Pact.(3)

Explains the need for the alliances – must include NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Explains why they were set up – mutual defence; mounting fears; domination by USA and USSR; military division of Europe. (4)

Assesses and illustrates their threat to peace: - NATO partially surrounding the Warsaw Pact; importance in the arms race; internal problems of Soviet dominated Europe. (5)

Describes the establishment of the Berlin Wall (3);

Explains the reasons for it: standard of life in East and West Berlin; defections; danger of spies etc. (4)

Assesses and illustrates the threat the Wall was to peace: stand off of tanks; propaganda victory for USA (Kennedy's visit 1963); was the Wall a threat to peace or did it stabilise the situation? (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.

**N.B.** Description of both (4). Explanation of both (5)

**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 5**

- (a) What does **Source J** tell us about the improvements in relations between the USA and communist countries in the 1970's? (3)

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)**

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

e.g. USA supported China's admission to the UN;  
 'ping pong' diplomacy;  
 Nixon visited China;  
 met Mao Zedong;  
 visits: Nixon to Moscow; Brezhnev to Washington (2 if both are given);  
 SALT 1 signed;  
 USA and USSR developed trade links;  
 Count any explanation or inference as one point

- (b) How accurate is the view in **Source K** of the importance of the SALT 1 Agreements of 1972? (6)

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

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

**Level 1: EITHER**

**Learned response or simple response based on source**

e.g. accurate because it is a primary source;  
 Inaccurate because it is a Soviet source therefore biased etc.

**OR**

**Answer based on utility/content/description of source**

e.g. it is accurate because SALT 1 did check the build up of arms.

1

**Level 2: EITHER**

**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. was important because the number of missiles was reduced and checks were put in place. Inaccurate because it only lasted 5 years and was not renewed. Uses Source J e.g. helped USA and USSR to develop trade links.

2-3

**Level 3: EITHER**

**Evaluates the provenance of the source**

e.g. examines the purpose of the source – trying to win support for SALT in the USSR by pointing out the benefits of the agreements (money could be used for other purposes such as raising the standard of living etc.).

**OR**

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

e.g. relevant knowledge of SALT: reasons why talks were held, the problems within USA and USSR that led to the talks; details of the agreements and its strengths and weaknesses; significance for short term and long term with example

4-5

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

(6)

- (c) Describe the events in Poland in the 1980s which led to the collapse of communism there in 1989.

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

**Level 1: Basic description**

**1-2**

e.g. a trade union, Solidarity, opposed communism (1) and formed a non communist government in 1989. (2)

**Level 2: EITHER**

**3-4**

**Detailed description of limited aspects**

e.g. develops one of the following:

economic situation in Poland and the protests of 1980 – Gdansk shipyard strikes – formation and growth of Solidarity;

General Strike – Russian army manoeuvres – Jaruzelski and martial law - arrest of Solidarity leaders;

Role of Lech Walesa – hero – world figure – Nobel Peace Prize 1983;

Solidarity underground – financing from West - opposition in mid 1980s –

effect of Gorbachev's reforms – free elections in Poland 1989 – Walesa becomes the first non communist leader in eastern Europe.

**OR**

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

e.g. outline description of Poland in the 1980s.

**Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects**

**5-6**

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

Two covered well or three adequately for top of level.

- (d) Which was the greater threat to world peace in the years 1968 to 1989: (10)
- events in Czechoslovakia in 1968
  - the collapse of Détente, 1979-1984?

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

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

- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
- Simple descriptive statement based on own knowledge**  
 e.g. the USSR used force against Czechoslovakia in 1968; Détente failed because of the war in Afghanistan.
- OR**
- Simple general causation statements**  
 e.g. Czechoslovakia only involved USSR whereas the collapse of Détente involved the superpowers.

**N.B. 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 reforms of the Prague Spring and the Soviet response (3)  
 Explains why the USSR acted in this way – their fears for the E Bloc and the Warsaw Pact – explains the attitude of the Czechs to the Soviet invasion and why they acted in this way;(4)  
 Assesses and illustrates the effect of this on the USSR and the rest of the world (Brezhnev Doctrine and disapproval but non intervention) was there a risk of war? (5)  
 Describes the collapse of Détente: failure of SALT 2, Moscow Olympics, attitude of Reagan towards communism (3);  
 Explains the reasons for the collapse: (human rights issues; war in Afghanistan etc.). (4)  
 Assesses and illustrates the danger to peace: MAD - Reagan's policies and the development of arms – USA ahead, did this mean less danger? – beginning of START talks 1982. (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 the part played by aircraft in 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. used for reconnaissance;

to photograph enemy positions;

dogfights;

Zeppelins bombed English towns and cities;

Bomber planes attacked south coast;

1,000 killed;

Houses and shops damaged;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- (b)** Why was the poster in **Source M** distributed in Britain in 1917 during the First World War? **(6)**  
Use **Source M** and **your own knowledge** to answer the question.
- Target: Explanation of reasons using source and own knowledge (AO6.1) (AO6.2)**
- Level 1: Simple, basic reasons drawing on source/own knowledge** **1-2**  
e.g. it was propaganda; showing that everyone had a part to play in the war; to reduce the amount of food eaten; to help the fleet; there were food shortages.
- 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:  
Reasons for shortages: danger of bringing goods to GB because of U Boats; unrestricted submarine warfare 1917;  
Shortages of food explained: GB not self sufficient; depended on imports; only 6 weeks left in 1917; voluntary rationing leading to rationing of certain goods (beef, butter and sugar) in 1918;  
Other ways of increasing food production – DORA, WLA etc.  
**(ii)** explains the propaganda aspect/appeal of the poster – must focus on Source M, not on other similar sources.  
e.g. use of fleet in background – idea that if you eat less bread you are helping the war effort because it meant less danger for the fleet – explains the idea of total war etc.  
**OR**  
**Multi-causal answer which lacks development or explanation using source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. lists the points above with no explanation.
- Level 3: Developed multi-causal answer using source and own knowledge** **5-6**  
e.g. develops at least two of the reasons in the first part of level 2, but **must cover (i) context of poster using own knowledge and (ii) explain the propaganda aspects/appeal of the poster.**

- (c) How useful is **Source N** to an historian studying the work done by women in the First World War? **(8)**  
Use **Source N and your own knowledge** to answer the question.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**  
**accepts the content of the source at face value**  
e.g. it is useful because it shows us that women worked in factories making munitions.  
**OR**  
**generalised or learned response**  
e.g. it is a painting, so is not real therefore not useful.
- 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 factory and one type of job that women did.  
Use of general rather than specific knowledge to develop level 1 points and prove utility e.g. they were called ‘munitionettes’; shows that men worked alongside women in the munitions factories; had to work because the men were fighting; women did other jobs as well.  
**OR**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias.**  
e.g. develops the attribution e.g. a government artist therefore censored; title of painting indicates patriotism etc.
- Level 3: Develops an argument about the utility/limitations of the source using knowledge or source evaluation 5-6**  
**EITHER**  
develops the provenance of the source explaining its purpose e.g. shortage of workers therefore there is a need to attract more women so the work is shown as clean and idealised.  
**OR**  
Use of specific knowledge of women at work in the war to explain the utility of the source or to limit its value –either argument is valid for this level.  
Could explain the importance of the job – shell shortage, Lloyd George at the Ministry of Munitions, women having to do other named jobs such as fire-fighters, nurses, delivering post, Land Girls, WAAC formed 1917, bus drivers etc – jobs must be related to the needs of the war.  
Could explain the dangers of the job: ‘canary girls’, explosions, fires, length of the day etc.
- 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 O** is about the contribution made by General Haig to the defeat of Germany in the First World War. (8)

Do you agree with this interpretation of his contribution?

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 (AO6.3) in context (AO6.1)**

**Level 1: Describes the content of the source accepting it at face value (comprehension)** 1-2

e.g. Haig was the general who won victory for Britain in the FWW. It is biased, written with hindsight etc.

**Level 2: EITHER** 3-4

**Simple explanation of how the interpretation came about**

e.g. written by Haig's son therefore biased – use of language 'kindest' – only son would know.

**OR**

**Agrees/disagrees with the interpretation by using general knowledge of topic**

e.g. Haig was responsible for men going 'over the top' and getting killed. GB did win the war in 1918 and Haig was in charge when the Germans surrendered.

Lists other reasons why Germany surrendered: blockade; entry of USA etc

**Level 3: Agrees or disagrees with interpretation using knowledge and/or source** 5-6

Agrees: supported by the research of others; written on the anniversary of the armistice so is trying to correct the condemnation of Haig by others 'lions led by donkeys', 'butchers and bunglers' etc.

Agrees: using some knowledge of how the final victory on the Western Front Came under Haig's leadership: new weapons (tank); new tactics (creeping barrage); defence of attrition showing its effect on German army; defeat of Ludendorff's last offensive and attack on Germany.

Disagrees: written by son therefore the possible purpose is to defend the honour of his father and the family, pride he had in his father etc. – analyses and explains the language used (serious historians etc.)

Disagrees: using knowledge of Haig's contribution to victory: describes and explains the tactics he used – the artillery bombardments, going over the top etc. and how this led to the heavy losses at the Somme and Passchendaele.

Develops and explains other factors which contributed to victory – role of navy, effect of Blockade, specific contribution of American troops etc.

**N.B. 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.

**N.B.** 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 7**

- (a) What does **Source P** tell us about the methods used by Britain to defeat the U-Boats in the Second World War? (3)

**Target: Comprehension of source (AO6.2)**

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

e.g. convoys of merchant ships;

warships protected convoys;

sonic techniques (1) – explained (+1)

radar;

aircraft;

work of aircraft – spotting (1) destroying (1);

used depth charges;

Count any explanation or inference as one point.

- 
- (b) Why was the poster in **Source R** distributed in Britain during the Second World War? (6)  
Use **Source R and your own knowledge** to answer the question.
- Target: Explanation of reasons using source and own knowledge (AO6.1) (AO6.2)**
- Level 1: Simple, basic reasons drawing on source/own knowledge** 1-2  
e.g. it was propaganda; showing the bombing of London; children helping to clear up; boy should have been evacuated etc.
- 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:  
Details of Blitz on London: 7 September 1940-June 1941; 77 days almost non-stop etc.  
Details of evacuation: where the boy should be; reasons for this; why he might have returned home etc.
- (ii) explains the propaganda aspect/appeal of the poster – must focus on Source R, not on other similar sources.  
e.g. to encourage evacuation (published as part of the evacuation scheme) by showing the dangers of children staying in London; could be to illustrate the work of the ARP or to promote patriotism (flag in background still flying)
- OR**  
**Multi-causal answer which lacks development or explanation using source and/or own knowledge**  
e.g. lists the points above with no explanation.
- Level 3: Developed multi-causal answer using source and own knowledge** 5-6  
e.g. develops at least two of the reasons in the first part of level 2, but **must cover (i) context of poster using own knowledge and (ii) explain the propaganda aspects/appeal of the poster.**
-

- (c) How useful is **Source S** to an historian studying the work done by women in the Second World War? (8)  
Use **Source S and your own knowledge** to answer the question.
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO6.2) in context (AO6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**  
**accepts the content of the source at face value**  
e.g. it is useful because it shows us that women worked in factories making armaments.  
**OR**  
**generalised or learned response**  
e.g. it is a painting, so is not real therefore not useful.
- 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 factory and one type of job that women did.  
Use of general rather than specific knowledge to develop level 1 points and prove utility e.g. worked alongside men; had to work because the men were away fighting; doing skilled work with machinery; women did other jobs as well with one example.  
**OR**  
**Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias.**  
e.g. develops the attribution e.g. a government artist therefore censored; painted by a woman therefore biased to work of women who are shown in a good light.
- Level 3: Develops an argument about the utility/limitations of the source using knowledge or source evaluation 5-6**  
**EITHER**  
develops the provenance of the source explaining its purpose e.g. shortage of workers therefore there is a need to attract more women so the work is shown as clean, skilful and idealised. Could be showing women's worth in society and how they should have equal pay etc.  
**OR**  
Use of specific knowledge of women at work in the war to explain the utility of the source or to limit its value –either argument is valid for this level.  
Could explain the type of precision work that they did – welding; forging; aircraft and ship building etc., women having to do other named jobs such as ATS, WAAF, WRNS, WLA etc.  
Could explain the problems of the jobs – conscripted 1941 – directed to work so had to move etc – jobs must be related to the needs of the war.
- 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 T** is about the importance of the evacuation from Dunkirk in Britain's victory in the Second World War. (8)  
Do you agree with this interpretation of the importance of Dunkirk?  
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. Dunkirk was glorious and its memory has lived on. It is biased, written with hindsight etc.

**Level 2: EITHER** 3-4  
**Simple explanation of how the interpretation came about**

e.g. written by ex Prime Minister responsible for Dunkirk, therefore biased – use of language 'glory', 'will shine' etc. Written afterwards therefore will have been researched.

**OR**

**Agrees/disagrees with the interpretation by using general knowledge of topic**

e.g. BEF was in retreat in the face of the German Blitzkrieg – many escaped in boats – caused by Hitler's mistakes etc.

Final victory came much later – names other reasons: Battle of Britain; D Day, entry of USA etc.

**Level 3: Agrees or disagrees with interpretation using knowledge and/or source** 5-6

Agrees: written after the war, so no censorship, no reason to exaggerate, had time for research, will have been from point of view of wartime PM.

Agrees: using some knowledge of the situation at Dunkirk and how it was a victory – process of evacuation, small boats etc, numbers evacuated 338,000 including French – formed core of new army as they were experienced.

Disagrees: written by ex PM who had used it to build up the Dunkirk Spirit during the war – purpose could be to highlight this and glorify the event, making it more important than it was at the time etc.

Disagrees: development of 'defeat': left guns and vehicles behind on the beach for Germans – 68,000 killed, aircraft lost, had failed in their mission, Paris fell one month later.

Develops and explains, using knowledge, other factors which contributed to victory – role of navy, RAF, D Day, contribution of America etc.

**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.**