



General Certificate of Secondary Education

GCSE History 3042/7/2 *Specification B*

Paper 2

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

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 L2A/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.

Section A**Question 1 - Stalin's USSR, 1924–1941**

- (a) Explain what you can learn from **Source A** about the reasons why Trotsky did not succeed Lenin. **5**

Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer that takes information from source **1-2**
e.g. Trotsky did not have many supporters. He did not attend Lenin's funeral.

Level 2: Answer contains basic understanding, and draws a simple inference **3-4**
e.g. Trotsky did not succeed Lenin because people were suspicious of Trotsky because of his background before he had joined the Bolsheviks. He didn't always agree with Lenin.

Level 3: Answer develops an understanding based on complex inference from the source **5**
e.g. Trotsky did not seem loyal to Lenin. He was not afraid to criticise Lenin, for example, over world revolution as opposed to NEP. His failure to attend Lenin's funeral seemed to emphasize his disloyalty to Lenin, and, by implication, Bolshevism.

(b) How does the content of **Sources B** and **C** differ? **6**

Target: Comparison of sources to detect similarities and differences (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer selects details from the sources to describe the content **1-2**

e.g. Source B says that the process of collectivisation was brutal. Source C says that the peasants worked in a mass movement to bring about the joining together of small farms.

OR

Answer focuses only on the provenance

e.g. Source B is probably from a modern book putting collectivisation in a harsh light. Source C is from a pro-Soviet source in the USSR, and therefore praises the achievements of collectivisation.

Level 2: Answer provides details from sources to make simple comparisons **3-5**

e.g. Source B says that collectivisation failed to increase production; Source C disagrees. Source B says that the peasants were forced to carry out the process, whereas Source C says that the peasants worked willingly.

Level 3: Answer provides comparison of the sources and explains how they differ **6**

e.g. in addition to Level 2, the sources are very different in tone. Source B is totally negative, and carries the accusation of Soviet propaganda in trying to hide the brutality involved, whereas Source C presents the process as the state helping the peasants to achieve the changes that they themselves wanted.

NB Answers which miss out the detailed comparison needed for Level 2, but combine the complex thinking of Level 3 with the “OR” of Level 1 should be given an alternative Level 2 mark – probably 4. i.e. L2A/4

- (c) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source C** about the success of Collectivisation? **10**
 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: Comprehension of the source, accepting the interpretation at face value** **1-2**
 e.g. yes, because the source says farm production increased, and peasants were given machinery and seed grain.
- Level 2: Simple explanation/description of how the interpretation came about based on the attribution or content** **3-5**
 e.g. no – because the source was published in the USSR during the period of Soviet rule. It will be biased in favour of communism.
- OR**
- Simple explanation based on own knowledge**
 e.g. no – because collectivisation involved a lot of suffering. Millions of people died. There was a big famine.
- Level 3: EITHER** **6-8**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author
 e.g. the source was published in the USSR during the Cold War. It would have been written to show that the Communist government had had a major success with Collectivisation, as part of the portrayal of the achievements of Communism since 1917. It was important to claim that the peasants supported the big change in the 1930s when, in the 1970s, Communism was still claiming that it had popular support within the USSR.
- OR**
- Analysis of the content of the source and using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation**
 e.g. no, the interpretation is very selective in its choice of evidence, and exaggerates the extent to which the people supported the process of collectivisation. Stalin used troops to enforce the process; many people starved to death, especially in the Ukraine; many kulaks were killed or sent to labour camps. Food production did not increase; by the end of the 1930s it was reaching its pre-1914 levels. Food exports were only possible at the expense of the living standards of the peasants.
- Level 4: Both strands above, one at Level 3, the other at Level 2 (4-5)** **9**
Both strands above at Level 3 **10**
N.B. If an answer is Level 2 on one strand and just Level 3 on the other, give Level 3A/ 6 or 7 marks.

(d)	How useful is Source D for studying the rule of Stalin in the 1930s? Use Source D and your own knowledge to explain your answer.	9
	Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)	
	Level 1: EITHER Accepts the content of the source at face value e.g. it is useful because it shows Stalin being a dictator.	1-2
	OR Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source e.g. it is a cartoon and therefore cannot be taken seriously.	
	Level 2: EITHER Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because it shows the way that Stalin dominated the government and only had supporters who agreed with him. (Explanation based solely on content).	3-5
	OR Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source in terms of provenance or reliability or bias e.g. the source is limited in use because it is a cartoon published in Paris by people who hated Stalin. They are trying to blacken his reputation. (Undeveloped explanation based on purpose). e.g. The source is not useful because it is not reliable (followed by own knowledge which shows the biased nature of the cartoon). (Explanation based on reliability).	
	Level 3: EITHER Developed explanation about the utility/limitations of the source using the source and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because (with extended explanation using own knowledge of the dictatorship in the USSR in the 1930s). (Detailed explanation based on own knowledge).	6-7
	OR Developed explanation about the utility/limitations of the source focusing on the provenance of the source in relation to the content and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because it shows how the cartoonist wanted to portray Stalin and alert people in western Europe to the way in which Stalin dominated all government departments. (Developed explanation based on purpose).	
	Level 4: Both strands above, one at Level 3, the other at Level 2 (4-5)	8
	Both strands above at Level 3	9
	N.B. If an answer is Level 2 on one strand and <u>just</u> Level 3 on the other, give Level 3A/ 6 or 7 marks.	

-
- (e) In the years 1928-1941 Stalin started a series of Five-Year Plans for industry. Use **your own knowledge** to explain how far these were successful. **15**
- Target: Analysis of extent of success (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
- Simple, descriptive narrative of part of the topic**
e.g. the USSR was very backward before Stalin, and under Stalin the amount of industry increased rapidly.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of extent of success**
e.g. Stalin's policy made the USSR a lot stronger industrially and made Stalin look successful.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**
- Narrative implying analysis of extent of success**
e.g. answer tells the story of what happened with a few details but no emphasis on extent of success.
- OR**
- Multi-factorial explanation which lacks development**
e.g. answer mentions successes in terms of some of the following: Industrial production, effects on people, effects on USSR's strength, effects on Stalin's reputation – but with few details.
- OR**
- Developed mono-factorial answer of extent of success**
e.g. developed answer on one aspect, such as effects on people of USSR.
- Level 3: EITHER 9-12**
- Developed multi-factorial answer of extent of success**
e.g. several points are developed from the list in Level 2.
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**
e.g. answer provides detailed narrative and description of events, but it does lead to some explanation in relation to the question.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical, multi-factorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**
- e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer argues in some depth that the rapid successes in industrialisation can be contrasted with the negative effects on many people's lives.
e.g. In addition to Level 3, the answer argues that the successes of industrialisation were more apparent in the later 1930s than they were during the period of construction in the earlier 1930s
-

Question 2 - The Weimar Republic

- (a) Explain what you can learn from **Source E** about the government of the Weimar Republic. **5**

Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer that takes information from source **1-2**
e.g. the Weimar Republic was very democratic. Both men and women could vote.

Level 2: Answer contains basic understanding, and draws a simple inference **3-4**
e.g. voting was by proportional representation, and this meant that all political parties had representatives in the Reichstag. Therefore, the political system was very democratic.

Level 3: Answer develops an understanding based on complex inference from the source **5**
e.g. although the Republic was very democratic with votes for all over 20 and proportional representation that ensured fairness for all political views, in fact the constitution contained elements which could destroy democracy. The President could rule by his own laws and ignore the democratically-elected Reichstag.

(b) How does the content of **Sources F** and **G** differ? **6**

Target: Comparison of sources to detect similarities and differences (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer selects details from the sources to describe the content **1-2**
e.g. Source F says that Germans greeted the treaty with shock and anger. Source G says that there should be a limit on weapons for all nations.

OR

Answer focuses only on the provenance

e.g. Source F is probably from a modern book, whereas Source G was written soon after the event. This British writing was showing bias.

Level 2: Answer provides details from sources to make simple comparisons **3-5**
e.g. Source F says that the treaty was greeted with horror, whereas Source G says that the treaty met the wishes of the various countries. Source F says that millions of Germans were living in other countries, whereas Source G says that most peoples were living under their own governments. Source F argues that it is unfair for Germany to disarm when other countries did not have to do so, whereas Source G says that other countries should now (in 1923) aim to do so.

Level 3: Answer provides comparison of the sources and explains how they differ **6**
e.g. in addition to Level 2, Source F is reflecting German anger at the time of the treaty, whereas Source G was written from a British perspective a few years after the Treaty was enforced on Germany, and it argues that the peace-makers did their best in difficult circumstances.

NB Answers which miss out the detailed comparison needed for Level 2, but combine the complex thinking of Level 3 with the “OR” of Level 1 should be given an alternative Level 2 mark – probably 4. i.e. L2A/4

- (c) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source G** about the Treaty of Versailles? **10**
 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: Comprehension of the source, accepting the interpretation at face value 1-2**
 e.g. yes, because the source says that Treaty of Versailles provided a fair solution given the complexity of the situation in Europe in 1919.
- Level 2: Simple explanation/description of how the interpretation came about based on the attribution or content 3-5**
 e.g. no – because the source was written by a British author who would sympathise with the allies and not with Germany. He would remember British suffering as a result of the First World War.
- OR**
- Simple explanation based on own knowledge**
 e.g. no – because Germany suffered greatly. A lot of Germans were living in other countries; Germany was blamed for the war; and Germans had to pay reparations.
- Level 3: EITHER 6-8**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author
 e.g. the source was published in 1923 by a British politician, Winston Churchill, who had been a government minister when the Treaty was signed. He would wish to defend the details of the Treaty and protect the reputation of his British colleagues. Therefore, he is very biased. However, he also wishes the world to move on, by joining Germany in disarmament – rather than accepting Germany's complaints.
- OR**
Analysis of the content of the source and using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation
 e.g. no, the interpretation is very selective in its choice of evidence. It implies that most Germans (and Europeans) were very happy with the treaty. It didn't even meet the wishes of the victorious countries in 1919. Clemenceau had wanted even more from Germany; many British people wanted to squeeze Germany until the pips squeak. By comparison, Wilson thought the treaty too vindictive because it did not fully follow the principles in the 14 Points.
- Level 4: Both strands above, one at Level 3, the other at Level 2 (4-5) 9**
Both strands above at Level 3 10
N.B. If an answer is Level 2 on one strand and just Level 3 on the other, give Level 3A/ 6 or 7 marks.

(d)	<p>How useful is Source H for learning about the activities of the Freikorps (Free Corps) in 1919-1920?</p> <p>Use Source H and your own knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)</p> <p>Level 1: EITHER</p> <p>Accepts the content of the source at face value e.g. it is useful because it shows that the Free Corps were violent.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source e.g. it is a cartoon and therefore cannot be taken seriously.</p> <p>Level 2: EITHER</p> <p>Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because it shows the methods of the Free Corps in trying to restore order and gain control. (Explanation based solely on content).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source in terms of provenance or reliability or bias e.g. the source is limited in use because it is a cartoon drawn by someone who hated the Free Corps. The bias is clearly seen in the way the Free Corps member is shown. (Undeveloped explanation based on purpose). e.g. The source is not useful because it is not reliable (followed by own knowledge which shows the biased nature of the cartoon). (Explanation based on reliability).</p> <p>Level 3: EITHER</p> <p>Developed explanation about the usefulness/limitations of the source using the content of the source and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because it shows their methods (with details about the violence, including the Kapp Putsch). (Detailed explanation based on own knowledge).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Developed explanation about the utility/limitations of the source focusing on the provenance of the source in relation to the content and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because it shows how the cartoonist wanted to portray the Free Corps and alert others to their lawless methods. (Developed explanation based on purpose).</p> <p>Level 4: Both strands above, one at Level 3, the other at Level 2</p> <p>Both strands above at Level 3</p>	<p>9</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>6-7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p>
-----	--	---

-
- (e) Use **your own knowledge** to explain how far the Weimar Republic recovered under Stresemann, 1924-1929. **15**
- Target: Analysis of extent of change (AO 6.1)**
NB In this question, foreign policy successes can be credited so long as they are made relevant to the recovery of the Weimar Republic. However, do not withhold marks if foreign developments are omitted.
- Level 1: EITHER** **1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative of part of the topic
 e.g. some outline on how Stresemann sorted out the currency.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of extent of success**
 e.g. Stresemann built up confidence in Germany following the loss of pride in the previous few years.
- Level 2: EITHER** **4-8**
Narrative implying analysis of extent of success
 e.g. answer describes in outline some of the changes concerning the currency, loans, industrial developments and the recovery of the economy, reflecting the development of a more confident and affluent society, as seen in the arts and entertainment.
- OR**
- Multi-factorial explanation which lacks development**
 e.g. answer mentions several areas in outline, suggesting substantial recovery.
- OR**
- Developed mono-factorial answer of extent of success**
 e.g. developed answer on one aspect, such as the currency – Rentenmark, Dawes Plan, Young Plan.
- Level 3: EITHER** **9-12**
Developed multi-factorial answer of extent of success
 e.g. several points are developed from the list in Level 2.
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**
 e.g. answer provides detailed narrative and description of events, but it does lead to some explanation of reasons for Stresemann's success.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical, multi-factorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question** **13-15**
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer clearly emphasizes the degree of recovery, probably explaining the extent to which continued affluence was dependent on US loans. This needs to contain more than a basic assertion for Level 4.
-

Question 3- The USA 1929–1941

- (a) Explain what you can learn from **Source J** about the importance of President Roosevelt's fireside chats. **5**

Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer that takes information from source **1-2**
e.g. Roosevelt's fireside chats were very popular. He had a reassuring voice.

Level 2: Answer contains basic understanding, and draws a simple inference **3-4**
e.g. many people looked forward to Roosevelt's broadcasts. He helped to convince people that their problems were being dealt with.

Level 3: Answer develops an understanding based on complex inference from the source **5**
e.g. Roosevelt in his radio broadcasts said what Americans wanted to hear and to believe in. He helped many Americans believe that the restoration of confidence would lead to recovery.

(b) How does the content of **Sources K** and **L** differ? **6**

Target: Comparison of sources to detect similarities and differences (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer selects details from the sources to describe the content **1-2**
e.g. Source K says that Hoover was unlucky. Source L says that Hoover believed in the idea of Americans helping themselves.

OR

Answer focuses only on the provenance

e.g. Source K tries to be fair to Hoover, but Source L is biased against Hoover.

Level 2: Answer provides details from sources to make simple comparisons **3-5**
e.g. Source K says Hoover was unlucky, whereas Source L argues that Hoover was unsuitable as President of the USA.
Source K argues that Hoover tried to act, including cutting his own salary, whereas Source L argues that Hoover clung to his beliefs in organised private charity and Americans helping themselves.

Level 3: Answer provides comparison of the sources and explains how they differ **6**
e.g. in addition to Level 2, the answer argues that Source K shows Hoover in a good light, trying to deal with the Depression, whereas Source L shows Hoover in a negative light, unwilling to take action.

NB Answers which miss out the detailed comparison needed for Level 2, but combine the complex thinking of Level 3 with the “OR” of Level 1 should be given an alternative Level 2 mark – probably 4. i.e. L2A/4

- (c) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source L** that President Hoover failed to act against the Depression? **10**
 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: Comprehension of the source, accepting the interpretation at face value** **1-2**
 e.g. yes, because the source says Hoover did nothing and was unfit to be President.
- Level 2: Simple explanation/description of how the interpretation came about based on the attribution or content** **3-5**
 e.g. no – because the source is clearly biased against Hoover. This is seen in the title of the chapter.
- OR**
Simple explanation based on own knowledge
 e.g. no – because Hoover did try to bring business leaders together. He did initiate projects such as the Hoover Dam.
- Level 3: EITHER** **6-8**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author
 e.g. the source was published in Britain in the 1980s. It is clearly biased. The author sees Hoover as being irresponsible and this confirmed in the last line of the source.
- OR**
Analysis of the content of the source and using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation
 e.g. no, the interpretation is very selective in its choice of evidence. Hoover is portrayed as totally stubborn in clinging to Republican views about Americans helping themselves. In fact, like all politicians, he was totally taken by surprise but then did try to act (e.g. Hoover Dam project). His attempts failed, but what he tried to do anticipated some of the principles of Roosevelt's New Deal.
- Level 4: Both strands above, one at Level 3, the other at Level 2 (4-5-)** **9**
Both strands above at Level 3 **10**
N.B. If an answer is Level 2 on one strand and just Level 3 on the other, give Level 3A/ 6 or 7 marks.

- (d) How useful is **Source M** for studying the attitudes of Americans to Roosevelt's New Deal? **9**
Use **Source M** and **your own knowledge** to explain your answer
- Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-2**
Accepts the content of the source at face value
e.g. it is useful because it shows lots of happy people around Roosevelt.
- OR**
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source
e.g. it is a cartoon and therefore cannot be taken seriously.
- Level 2: EITHER 3-5**
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source and/or own knowledge
e.g. the source is useful because it shows how Roosevelt tried to solve the problems of the Depression by setting up the Alphabet Agencies.(Explanation based solely on content).
- OR**
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source in terms of provenance or reliability or bias
e.g. the source is limited in use because it is election propaganda (Undeveloped explanation based on purpose).
e.g. The source is not useful because it is not reliable (followed by own knowledge which shows the biased nature of the cartoon). (Explanation based on reliability).
- Level 3: EITHER 6-7**
Developed explanation about the utility/limitations of the source using the content of the source and/or own knowledge
e.g. the source is useful because (with extended explanation of what Roosevelt had achieved by 1936); and/or the source is not useful (with extended explanation about the opposition to the New Deal). (Detailed explanation based on own knowledge).
- OR**
Developed explanation about the utility/limitations of the source focusing on the provenance of the source in relation to the content and/or own knowledge
e.g. the source is useful because it shows how the cartoonist wanted to portray Roosevelt. He had created happiness with his Alphabet Agencies. However, it is not totally useful as it only reflects the attitudes of Democrats. Republicans would disagree. (Developed explanation based on purpose).
- Level 4: Both strands above, one at Level 3, the other at Level 2 (4-5) 8**
Both strands above, at Level 3 9
- N.B. If an answer is Level 2 on one strand and just Level 3 on the other, give Level 3A/ 6 or 7 marks.**

-
- (e) Use **your own knowledge** to explain why the USA fell into depression in 1929. **15**
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER **1-3****
Simple, descriptive narrative of part of the topic
 e.g. some description of the Wall Street Crash.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of causation**
 e.g. over-production meant that so many goods were being produced that no-one needed to buy them.
- Level 2: EITHER **4-8****
Narrative implying analysis of causation
 e.g. description of the “boom” in the 1920s and how it ended.
- OR**
- Multi-causal explanation which lacks development**
 e.g. answer mentions reasons such as overproduction, pyramid buying of shares, limitations of foreign trade following restrictions, unequal distribution of wealth, etc.
- OR**
- Developed mono-causal answer**
 e.g. developed answer on one aspect, such as artificially high prices of stocks and shares that did not reflect real values.
- Level 3: EITHER **9-12****
Developed multi-causal answer
 e.g. several points are developed from the list in Level 2.
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**
 e.g. answer provides detailed narrative and description of events, but it does lead to some explanation of reasons for the onset of depression.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical, multi-causal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question **13-15****
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer argues that one reason was more important than the others; or the answer links reasons together.
 e.g. In addition to Level 3, answer argues that the Wall Street Crash led to a major depression because no-one was expecting this to happen and there was no precedent to follow.
-

Question 4 - Britain 1929–1951

- (a) Explain what you can learn from **Source N** about the reasons for building New Towns in the late 1940s. **5**

Target: Comprehensive and inference from a source (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer that takes information from source **1-2**
e.g. the new towns provided more houses and reduced overcrowding in the big cities.

Level 2: Answer contains basic understanding, and draws a simple inference **3-4**
e.g. the new towns were trying to do two things at once – solve overcrowding in the great cities as well as providing homes for the homeless.

Level 3: Answer develops an understanding based on complex inference from the source **5**
e.g. the concept of town planning before the start of any building work was intended to produce a much happier urban environment than the overcrowded cities prior to the Second World War.

(b) How does the content of **Source O** and **P** differ? **6**

Target: Comparison of sources to detect similarities and differences (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Answer selects details from the sources to describe the content **1-2**

e.g. Source O says the National Coal Board took over the coal mines, but there were problems. Source P says that electricity and gas were already in public ownership.

OR

Answer focuses only on the provenance

e.g. Source O is probably from a modern book, whereas Source P is from an autobiography by the Labour Prime Minister.

Level 2: Answer provides details from sources to make simple comparisons **3-5**

e.g. Source O says that the nationalisation of coal did not solve some problems. The miners were not happy as they had just exchanged bosses. Source P implies that nationalisation of coal would bring better management with a new start to solving the problems of the industry. There was little opposition.

Level 3: Answer provides comparison of the sources and explains how they differ **6**

e.g. in addition to Level 2, Source O is totally negative to the policy and to the attitude of the miners. Source P sees only benefits.

NB Answers which miss out the detailed comparison needed for Level 2, but combine the complex thinking of Level 3 with the “OR” of Level 1 should be given an alternative Level 2 mark – probably 4. i.e. L2A/4

- (c) Do you agree with the interpretation given in **Source P** about attitudes in the late 1940s towards the nationalisation of British industries? **10**
 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: Comprehension of the source, accepting the interpretation at face value** **1-2**
 e.g. yes, because the source says there was little opposition to nationalisation.
- Level 2: Simple explanation/description of how the interpretation came about based on the attribution or content** **3-5**
 e.g. no – because the source is biased. It was written by Attlee who had been Labour Prime Minister in the late 1940s.
- OR**
- Simple explanation based on own knowledge**
 e.g. no – because many people were opposed to nationalisation. Many of those who accepted the nationalisation of coal were opposed to the same policy for steel.
- Level 3: EITHER** **6-8**
Developed explanation to evaluate the motive/purpose of the author
 e.g. the source was published in Britain after Attlee had ceased to be Prime Minister and when the Conservatives were in office. He was seeking in his memoirs to explain and justify the policy of nationalisation in order to protect his reputation and that of his government.
- OR**
- Analysis of the content of the source and using own knowledge to evaluate the interpretation**
 e.g. no, the interpretation is very selective in its choice of evidence, and exaggerates the extent to which the people supported the process of nationalisation. Even in the coal industry, not all miners were happy. There were furious debates over the nationalisation of steel and this was postponed. Gas and electricity were only nationalised after furious debates in the House of Commons.
- Level 4: Both strands above, one at Level 3, the other at Level 2 (4-5)** **9**
Both strands above at Level 3 **10**
N.B. If an answer is Level 2 on one strand and just Level 3 on the other, give Level 3A/ 6 or 7 marks.

(d)	How useful is Source R for explaining the aims of the Labour Governments of 1945–1951 in changing society? Use Source R and your own knowledge to explain your answer.	9
	Target: Evaluation of a source for utility (AO 6.2) in context (AO 6.1)	
	Level 1: EITHER Accepts the content of the source at face value e.g. it is useful because it shows the five major social problems faced by Britain in the later 1940s. OR Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source e.g. it is a cartoon and therefore cannot be taken seriously.	1-2
	Level 2: EITHER Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on information in the source and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because it shows the five “giants” identified in the Beveridge Report published during the Second World War. (Explanation based solely on content). OR Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source in terms of provenance or reliability or bias e.g. the source is limited in use because it is a cartoon published in a British newspaper in 1942. Its purpose is to show the problems Britain was facing at this time. (Undeveloped explanation based on purpose). e.g. The source is useful because it is reliable (followed by own knowledge which shows an understanding of the content of the cartoon). (Explanation based on reliability).	3-5
	Level 3: EITHER Developed explanation about the utility/limitations of the source using the content of the source and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because it suggests that these social ills were going to be tackled by the new Labour Government in 1945. This is, indeed, true, as the government intended to avoid any return to the 1930s depression. (Detailed explanation based on own knowledge). OR Developed explanation about the utility/limitations of the source focusing on the provenance of the source in relation to the content and/or own knowledge e.g. the source is useful because it shows how the cartoonist wanted to portray the five “giants” as enemies to be slain by the “David” figure of Dr. Beveridge. This was an essential part of the political agenda of the Labour Party. (Developed explanation based on purpose).	6-7
	Level 4: Both strands above, one at Level 3, the other at Level 2 (4-5)	8
	Both strands above at Level 3	9
	N.B. If an answer is Level 2 on one strand and <u>just</u> Level 3 on the other, give Level 3A/ 6 or 7 marks.	

-
- (e) Use **your own knowledge** to explain how far Britain suffered an economic depression in 1930s. **15**
- Target: Analysis of key features (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative of part of the topic
 e.g. simple description of huge unemployment in parts of Britain.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of key features**
 e.g. many people in Britain were very poor, especially in the north, but not all.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**
Narrative implying analysis of key features
 e.g. description of some aspects of life in the 1930s, with falling exports, rising unemployment, and lower standards of living.
- OR**
- Multi-factorial explanation which lacks development**
 e.g. answer outlines a north-south divide, contrasting poverty in the north with comparative prosperity in some southern regions – but with little development.
- OR**
- Developed mono-factorial answer**
 e.g. developed argument based on analysis of employment patterns in the regions of Britain.
- Level 3: EITHER 9-12**
Developed multi-factorial answer
 e.g. several points are developed from the list in Level 2 and/or using government attempts to reduce the effects of the depression.
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**
 e.g. answer provides detailed description of life in Britain in the 1930s with some assessment as to the extent of the depression.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical, multi-factorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer judges the extent of depression from a wide variety of evidence, and reaches a reasoned conclusion.
-

Section B
Question 5 - Russia 1914–1921

- (a) What does **Source S** tell us about problems in Russian society just before the First World War? **3**

Target: Comprehensive and inference from a source (AO 6.2)

Mark on a penny-points system – up to a maximum of 3

e.g. most Russians were poor peasants; in bad winters they starved; increasing numbers worked in factories; long hours; low wages.

Count any explanation or inference as an extra points

e.g. there was a big gap between poor peasants and rich businessmen.

- (b) Using **Source T and your own knowledge**, explain how the First World War affected people in Russia. **7**

Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2)

Level 1: Use of source OR own knowledge to state basic reasons **1-2**

e.g. as shown in Source T, prices of basic goods rose a lot during the First World War.

e.g. Many people came to hate the Tsar for all the sufferings.

Level 2: Developed mono-consequential answer, using source and/or own knowledge **3-5**

e.g. explanation of growing problems in the cities with food and fuel shortages, price rises of essential goods, as shown in Source T; made worse by the breakdown of transport system; near starvation by time of exceptionally cold winter of 1916-1917.

OR

Multi-consequential answer that lacks development, using source and/or own knowledge

e.g. millions of deaths of soldiers; loss of morale following defeats and retreats; increasing suffering in cities and towns with food and fuel shortages; breakdown of transport; growing hostility to royal family and Rasputin.

Level 3: Developed multi-consequential answer, using source and own knowledge **6-7**

e.g. several points are developed from the list in Level 2, using source and own knowledge.

-
- (c) In March 1917 Tsar Nicholas II gave up his throne. Describe the events of 1917 which led to this abdication. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1**
e.g. Tsar Nicholas II did what the army commanders told him to do.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-4**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. Tsar Nicholas II tried to return to the capital, Petrograd, but his train was stopped and put in a siding at Pskov. Here he was told to abdicate. He tried to abdicate in favour of the Grand-Duke Michael but he refused. Therefore he abdicated unconditionally to protect his son, Alexis.
- OR**
- Limited description of wider range of aspects**
e.g. limited detail on the situation in Petrograd in early 1917 (strikes, demonstrations, food queues); on the Tsar's attempt to return to the capital; and on his abdication.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5**
e.g. detailed description of some aspects listed in Level 2.

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

- (d) Why were the Bolsheviks able to seize power in October/November 1917? **15**
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
- Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic**
e.g. the Bolsheviks stormed the Winter Palace and seized key places in Petrograd.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of causation**
e.g. many Russian people liked the Bolshevik promises of Bread, Peace and Land.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**
- Narrative implying analysis of causation**
e.g. answer tells story in fairly general terms about weaknesses of Provisional Government and growing popularity in Petrograd of Bolsheviks leading to them taking control.
- OR**
- Multi-causal answer which lacks development**
e.g. answer outlines reasons focusing on growing unpopularity of Provisional Government and decisive actions taken by Lenin and Trotsky.
- OR**
- Developed mono-causal answer**
e.g. detailed account of actual takeover in October/November 1917.
- Level 3: Developed multi-causal answer 9-12**
- e.g. items listed in Level 2 discussed in more detail..
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**
e.g. detailed narrative and description of the process and the reasons for Bolshevik success.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multi-causal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**
- e.g. in addition to Level 3, the answer provides exceptional levels of detail..

(e)	Why did the Bolsheviks win the Civil War, 1918-1921?	15
	Target: Causation (AO 6.1)	
	Level 1: EITHER	1-3
	Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic e.g. the Reds led by Trotsky defeated the Whites who had several different leaders.	
	OR	
	Simple, generalised statements of causation e.g. the Bolsheviks had the advantage of internal lines of communication whereas the Whites had problems in co-ordinating their attacks.	
	Level 2: EITHER	4-8
	Narrative implying analysis of causation e.g. description of what happened in the Civil War, without explicit statements of why the Bolsheviks won.	
	OR	
	Multi-causal answer which lacks development e.g. answer mentions leadership of Red Army under Trotsky; advantages of internal communications for Reds; internal divisions within Whites; death of Romanovs removing one motive of the Whites; ineffectiveness of foreign intervention; apparent patriotism of Reds; how War Communism helped to provide food for Reds.	
	OR	
	Developed mono-causal answer e.g. developed answer on one aspect, such as divisions among Whites.	
	Level 3: Developed multi-causal answer	9-12
	e.g. details on more than one aspect (as above).	
	OR	
	A selective and structured account establishing some arguments e.g. answer is mostly narrative/descriptive, but it does use the framework to develop analysis about why the Bolsheviks won.	
	Level 4: A sustained, analytical multi-causal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question	13-15
	e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer argues that one reason was more important than others; or the answer links reasons together; or the answer provides exceptional levels of factual detail to substantiate the arguments (e.g. about the White armies and their leaders).	

Question 6 – Germany 1929–1939

(a) What does **Source U** tell us about why the Gestapo organisation was feared? **3**

Target: Comprehension and inference from a source (AO 6.2) 3

Mark on a penny-points system – up to a maximum of 3

e.g. it had sweeping powers; citizens could be arrested on suspicion; they could be sent to concentration camps without trial; there were informers everywhere.

Count any explanation or inference as an extra point

e.g. the Gestapo was an important agent of Nazi totalitarian control.

(b) Describe how the Nazi Party gained support from 1929 onwards, leading to Hitler becoming Chancellor in January 1933. **5**

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

Level 1: Basic description 1

e.g. the Nazi Party became the largest political party

Level 2: EITHER 2-4

Detailed description of limited aspects

e.g. details on effects of Wall Street Crash leading to Depression and unemployment.

OR

Limited description of wider range of aspects

e.g. brief description of effects of Depression, Hitler’s promises, propaganda methods, use of SA, pressure on Hindenburg to appoint Hitler Chancellor.

Level 3: Developed description of several aspects 5

e.g. details on several items listed in Level 2.

-
- (c) Using **Sources V and your own knowledge**, explain how Hitler solved the problem of unemployment in Germany, 1933-1939. **7**
- Target: Use of source and knowledge to explain causation (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Use of source OR own knowledge to provide basic reasons** **1-2**
 e.g. using the source, unemployment fell rapidly after 1933.
 e.g. Using own knowledge, Hitler started a programme of rearmament which provided jobs.
- Level 2: Developed mono-causal answer, using source and/or own knowledge** **3-5**
 e.g. answer explains in detail Hitler's programme of rearmament plus expansion of the army, navy and air force.
- OR**
- Multi-causal answer that lacks development, using source and/or own knowledge**
 e.g. answer mentions, in outline, several factors, including rearmament, but also policy of autarky, Dr. Schacht, industrial expansion, building of autobahns, construction of Olympic stadium.
- Level 3: Developed multi-causal answer, using source and own knowledge** **6-7**
 e.g. several points are developed from list in Level 2, using source and own knowledge.

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

- (d) Explain why Germany changed from a democracy to a Nazi dictatorship between January 1933 and August 1934. **15**
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic
 e.g. the Reichstag Fire led to Hitler being able to abolish other parties.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of causation**
 e.g. Germans allowed Hitler to make political changes because they believed he was solving Germany's problems
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**
Narrative implying analysis of causation
 e.g. some outline description of the events in 1933, such as the Reichstag Fire, the March 1933 election, the Enabling Act, banning other political parties, etc.
- OR**
- Multi-causal answer which lacks development**
 e.g. answer mentions German support for Hitler as a result of the depression and Hitler's promises, and how he used violence and threats to change the constitution of Germany; the Night of the Long Knives; the death of Hindenburg.
- OR**
- Developed mono-causal answer**
 e.g. how he engineered the destruction of other political parties so that the Nazis were supreme.
- Level 3: Developed multi-causal answer 9-12**
 e.g. several items listed in Level 2 discussed in detail.
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some argument**
 e.g. answer is basically descriptive/narrative (as in Level 2) but with added analysis.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multi-causal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question. 13-15**
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer argues that Hitler was able to use the fears of many Germans – fear of the depression and unemployment, fears of Communism, fears of being second-class citizens in Europe.

-
- (e) Explain how the treatment of Jews changed in Nazi Germany in the years 1933 to 1939. **15**
- Target: Analysis of key features (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic
 e.g. some description of changes, such as Jews not marrying non-Jews; boycotting of Jewish shops.
- OR**
Simple, generalised statements of key features
 e.g. Hitler and the Nazis hated the Jews and increasingly made them suffer in Germany; the Nazi Master Race was superior.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**
Narrative implying analysis of key features
 e.g. basic outline of changes in laws, such as Nuremberg laws; Jews banned from the professions including law and medicine; Kristallnacht.
- OR**
Multi-factorial answer which lacks development
 e.g. how Jews were affected socially, economically and politically; how their religion was attacked via attacks on synagogues.
- OR**
Developed mono-factorial answer
 e.g. detailed on one aspect such as the Nuremberg Laws.
- Level 3: Developed multi-factorial answer 9-12**
 e.g. details on items listed in Level 2,.
- OR**
A selective and structured account establishing some arguments
 e.g. detailed description, leading to some conclusions about the fundamental changes to the status of the Jews between 1933 and 1939.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multi-factorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer clearly differentiates between 1933 and 1939, and explains the key stages in the fundamental changes.
-

Question 7- The USA 1919–1929

- (a) What does **Source W** tell us about flappers in the USA in the 1920s? **3**
- Target: Comprehension and inference from a source.(AO 6.2) 3**
- Mark on a penny-points system – up to a maximum of 3**
e.g. they shocked parents; they had short hair; smoked in public; short skirts.
- Count any explanation or inference as an extra point**
e.g. they were rebels against conventional attitudes
- (b) Using **Source X and your own knowledge**, explain the consequences of Prohibition in the USA in the 1920s. **7**
- Target: Use of source and knowledge to explain consequences (AO 6.1 and AO 6.2)**
- Level 1: Use of source OR own knowledge to state basic reasons 1-2**
e.g. as seen in Source X, there were many arrests, and the number increased during the decade.
- Level 2: Developed mono-consequential answer, using source and/or own knowledge 3-5**
e.g. detailed answer on crime and gangsters – Al Capone, Bugs Moran, St. Valentine’s Day Massacre, etc.
- OR**
- Multi-consequential answer that lacks development, using source and/or own knowledge**
e.g. brief details on lawbreaking activities – speakeasies, bootleggers, law enforcement agencies, corrupt police; realisation that law needed to be changed.
- Level 3: Developed multi-consequential answer, using source and own knowledge. 6-7**
e.g. several points are developed from list in Level 2, using source and own knowledge.

- (c) Describe how the Ku Klux Klan affected life in the USA in the 1920s. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1**
e.g. the KKK believed that the white race was the supreme race; they attacked blacks.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-4**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. detailed description of activities of the KKK – marches, hoods, race-hatred speeches, lynching's.
- OR**
- Limited description of wider range of aspects**
e.g. outline description of the beliefs of the KKK and how their actions affected the lives of blacks.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5**
e.g. detailed description of their beliefs and activities, especially in the southern USA.

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

- (d) Explain why the USA was able to achieve prosperity in the 1920s. **15**
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic
 e.g. some basic description of the growth of mass-production.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of causation**
 e.g. the stock market made many people rich until 1929.
- Level 2: EITHER** **4-8**
Narrative implying analysis of causation
 e.g. some description of the successes of the American economy in the 1920s – cars, mass production, share prices, hire purchase, symptoms of prosperity such as cinema-attendance..
- OR**
- Multi-causal answer which lacks development**
 e.g. answer mentions mass production methods, hire purchase, stocks and shares, restrictive tariff policy.
- OR**
- Developed mono-causal answer**
 e.g. detailed analysis of one aspect e.g. stock market.
- Level 3: Developed multi-causal answer** **9-12**
 e.g. developed answer on several aspects (as in Level 2).
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**
 e.g. more descriptive/narrative approach but with some arguments established about the causes of prosperity.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multi-causal answer clearly linked to demands of question** **13-15**
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, establishing an argument for the main reason for prosperity.

-
- (e) Explain how the policies of the US government in the early 1920s encouraged American isolation in world affairs. **15**
- Target: Causation (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER 1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic
 e.g. limited description of USA's isolationist policies, such as tariffs.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of causation**
 e.g. American policy was isolationist. USA avoided political alliances with European countries.
- Level 2: EITHER 4-8**
Narrative implying causation
 e.g. narrative/description of how the USA tried to keep isolationist in policies (didn't join the League of Nations) and restricted immigration.
- OR**
- Multi-causal answer which lacks development**
 e.g. several factors mentioned e.g. tariffs, political isolation from League of Nations and world politics, immigration restriction.
- OR**
- Developed mono-causal answer**
 e.g. detailed on one of the factors above.
- Level 3: Developed multi-causal answer 9-12**
 e.g. detailed argument based on some of the items listed in Level 2.
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**
 e.g. detailed narrative and description of US policies and attitudes in the early 1920s, with some analysis.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multi-causal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question 13-15**
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer differentiates between external and internal political motives.
-

Question 8 - Britain 1905–1926

(a) What does **Source Y** tell us about Lloyd George’s Budget of 1909? **3**

Target: Comprehension and inference from a source.(AO 6.2) 3

Mark on a penny-points system – up to a maximum of 3

e.g. he needed an extra £16m. He intended to raise income tax and double death duties. He intended to raise taxes on tobacco and alcohol.

Count any explanation or inference as an extra point

e.g. Lloyd George had plans to spend a lot more money than previously.

(b) Using **Source Z and your own knowledge**, explain how the crisis over Lloyd George’s Budget of 1909 led to the passing of the Parliament Act of 1911. **7**

Target: Use of source and knowledge to evaluate key features (AO 6.1 & AO 6.2)

Level 1: Use of source OR own knowledge to state basic features 1-2

e.g. there were two elections held in 1910 with the Liberals trying to get enough support for the Budget to be approved. (Referring to statistics in Source Z).

Level 2: Developed mono-factorial answer, using source and/or own knowledge 3-5

e.g. detailed answer on the Budget of 1909 and the elections of 1910, trying to get a mandate for the sweeping changes outlined in the budget, and probably making use of statistics in Source Z.

OR

Multi-factorial answer that lacks development, using source and/or own knowledge

e.g. outline answer on some of the following :- the rejection of the 1909 Budget by the House of Lords, the elections of 1910, the pressure on the House of Lords to give in, the threat to create new peers, the House of Lords losing much of its powers in the Parliament Act of 1911.

Level 3: Developed multi-factorial answer, using source and own knowledge 6-7

e.g. several points are developed from list in Level 2, using source and own knowledge.

- (c) Describe how the First World War helped women to get the right to vote in 1918. **5**
- Target: Description of key feature and characteristics (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1**
e.g. women did a lot of useful jobs.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-4**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. detailed description of jobs carried out by women during the war, and how that helped to change attitudes.
- OR**
- Limited description of wider range of aspects**
e.g. less detailed description on women's new roles during the war; the changing attitudes of male politicians, including Asquith; the support of Lloyd George; parallel changes of attitude in other countries.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **5**
e.g. detailed description of some of the items mentioned in Level 2.

Answer either part (d) or part (e)

- (d)** Explain the importance of the Liberal welfare reforms, 1906-1914. **15**
- Target: Analysis of key features (AO 6.1)**
- Level 1: EITHER** **1-3**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic
 e.g. limited description of school meals, or pensions.
- OR**
- Simple, generalised statements of key features**
 e.g. the Liberal governments were keen to push forward social reforms.
- Level 2: EITHER** **4-8**
Narrative implying analysis of key features
 e.g. limited description of some of the measures – school meals, pensions, insurance, Labour Exchanges.
- OR**
- Multi-factorial answer which lacks development**
 e.g. answer prioritizes importance of reforms, but limited detail or development.
- OR**
- Developed mono-factorial answer**
 e.g. detailed answer on one aspect, such as the Insurance Act of 1911.
- Level 3: Developed multi-factorial answer** **9-12**
 e.g. items listed in Level 2 discussed in detail.
- OR**
- A selective and structured account establishing some arguments**
 e.g. more descriptive/narrative approach towards the changes, but reaching relevant conclusions.
- Level 4: A sustained, analytical multi-factorial answer clearly linked to the demands of the question** **13-15**
 e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer specifically compares effects of changes on different social groups in Britain in the early 20th century.

(e)	Explain why the General Strike occurred in May 1926.	15
	Target: Causation (AO 6.1)	
Level 1:	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic e.g. limited description of events immediately before the strike. OR Simple, generalised statements of causation e.g. the miners and the mine-owners were arguing about miners' wages.	1-3
Level 2:	EITHER Narrative implying analysis of causation e.g. some description of events after the First World War in the coal industry, with only hints of causation. OR Multi-causal answer which lacks development e.g. answer mentions several reasons, but without detail e.g. on post-war problems with international trade, events in early 1920s, especially with the Triple Alliance and Red Friday, attitude of Conservative government under Baldwin, attitude of trade unions. OR Developed mono-causal answer e.g. detailed on one factor, such as the struggle over wages.	4-8
Level 3:	Developed multi-causal answer e.g. details on items listed in Level 2. OR A selective and structured account establishing some arguments e.g. more descriptive approach of events since 1918, but with some reasons established within a narrative framework.	9-12
Level 4:	A sustained, analytical multi-causal answer clearly linked to the demands of the question e.g. in addition to Level 3, answer highlights inter-relationships, or an understanding of the level of determination on both sides to have a show-down without fully appreciating the possible consequences.	13-15
