



General Certificate of Secondary Education

GCSE History 3042/7/3 *Specification B*

Paper 3

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 B2A/3. Also write a brief comment to explain why this alternative has been awarded.

If in doubt, **always** telephone your Team Leader for advice.

F: THE PRE-STANDARDISING AND STANDARDISING MEETING

- **The review of the mark scheme between the examination and standardising meeting**

After the examination but before the main Standardising Meeting, the Principal Examiner and the Team Leaders will have met to discuss the mark scheme in the light of candidates’ actual responses and re-draft where necessary. The re-draft of the mark scheme will be made available to Assistant Examiners at the Standardising Meeting. Through this *post-hoc review procedure* the marks will have been allocated in the expectation that candidates will achieve all the levels identified and no others. Adjustments will have been made to cater for candidates reaching higher levels than those provided for, to remove marks allocated to levels which candidates have not reached, or to enhance discrimination in cases where large numbers of candidates are bunched at the same level.

- **Prior Marking**

It is important that all examiners scrutinise at least 25 scripts before the main standardising meeting and note such things as: alternative interpretations of questions made by candidates; answers which do not fit into the mark scheme; levels which are not reached by the candidates; additional levels which have not been included in the mark scheme, etc. To familiarise themselves with a variety of responses, examiners should sample the range of questions, scripts from several centres and across the full range of ability in so far as practicable. Any preliminary marking **must** be completed in pencil and reviewed following the standardising meeting in the light of the revised mark scheme and advice given.

- **The Final Mark Scheme**

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

- **Post Standardising Meeting**

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

Paper 3: The changing role and status of women in Britain since 1900

Section A

Question 1

1(a) How reliable is **Source A** to an historian studying the violent protests of the Suffragettes? **(10)**

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

Level 1: EITHER

1-2

Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension)

OR

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

e.g. it is a report from the trial and so would be accurate.

She was a suffragette and suffragettes did this sort of thing

Level 2: EITHER

3-5

Combined both (simple) features of Level 1

OR

Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source

e.g. it was written by (explained provenance in simple terms)

Manchester Guardian is a broadsheet and therefore would report accurately.

General reference to women from the slums.

Level 3: EITHER

6-8

Evaluates the provenance of a source and applies provenance to the question set

OR

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

e.g. challenges reliability by reference to 'women from the slums' (using knowledge)

Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3

9-10

Top of level for use of knowledge to support both parts

In 1906 the Suffragist movement was using violence to get attention. The suffragist peaceful campaign was seen to be failing.

NB Level 3 (K) and Level 3 (P) = Level 4

1(b) Explain what **Source B** tells us about women in politics at the end of the twentieth Century. **(5)**

Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical Source (AO2)

Level 1: Answer that selects detail from the source **1**

Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding

e.g. only 19.5% of women are MPs

Level 2: Answer that contains a simple understanding drawing a basic inference from the source **2-3**

e.g. Compares one assembly/set of figures to another

Level 3: Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source **4-5**

e.g. sees the relationship between percentage figures

Scottish and Welsh assemblies are new and show greater involvement by women

Politics dominated by men in Northern Ireland due to the past history.

Westminster is the oldest and most traditional.

Refers to position of women at the beginning of the century.

Wales is only place statistically where equality can be claimed.

1(c) “Limited opportunity at work before the First World War was the main reason why women campaigned for the right to vote” Do you agree? Explain your answer **(15)**

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-3**

Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus on the question set e.g. refers to war work.

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/ consequence

e.g. tends to agree and explains inequality in work and /or the home to justify action

Level 2: EITHER **4-7**

Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. links to other factors such as non-violent campaign failing to get the vote sees the importance of the campaign in general terms

Level 3: EITHER **8-11**

Developed multi-causal answer

OR

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

e.g. Links the violent campaign to publicity but sees the pre war position as significant

Looks at political campaign and failure in Parliament to gain enough support

Looks at some improvements before WW1 to encourage action.

Refers to new opportunities when war began to show limits before the war

Considers the other organisations working for the vote

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

Comes to a balanced evaluation

Changing political attitudes

New types of employment

Educational opportunities opening up to women

Changing social attitudes

Traditional attitudes of most men

Traditional attitudes of MPs.

Laws which institutionalised second class citizenship.

1(d) “Women’s success in the work place and their role in television proves that the battle for equality had been won by the end of the twentieth century” Do you agree? Explain your answer. **(15)**

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-3**

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

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/ consequence

e.g. women can now earn equal pay with men but some do not
Lots more women reading the news, sports reporters, chat show hosts.

Level 2: EITHER **4-7**

Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. develops argument based on key elements-
Work/media- as presenters/experts
Mentions specific examples of successes- Thatcher/ Body Shop/ JK Rowling

Level 3: EITHER **8-11**

Developed multi-causal

e.g. Glass ceiling, equal pay, job opportunities, ‘eye candy’, men on TV.

OR

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

e.g. considers the impact of legislation and the reality in the workplace
Impact of popular culture and media uses famous women to support or challenge the statement.

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

e.g. Considers level 3 points and evaluates relative effectiveness of legislation over a significant period. Makes a final judgement which is balanced drawing on a knowledge of politics, family demands, glass ceiling, home

Makes reference to areas not specified- legislation, glass ceiling, world of work.

Challenges statement – equal pay, maternity, promotion ‘ Blair’s babes’.

Claims more success in world of work than in television.

Question 2

Britain and Ireland since 1916

- 2(a)** Explain what **Source C** tells us about the political inequality in Northern Ireland in the 1960s. **(5)**

Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2)

Level 1: Answer that selects detail from the source **1**
Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding

e.g. Catholic population = 76%

Level 2: Answer that contains simple understanding drawing a basic inference from the source **2-3**

e.g. numbers population and council don't match

e.g. links data from two or more columns

Level 3: Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source **4-5**

e.g. sees the link between key jobs, housing and quality of life

Emphasises the importance of housing committee membership (top level)

2(b) How reliable is **Source D** to an historian studying the Good Friday Agreement? **(10)**

Target: Evaluation of sources for utility/reliability (AO2)

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**

Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content

(comprehension)

OR

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

Accurate because it quotes the IRA

Inaccurate as it is a newspaper

Level 2: EITHER **3-5**

Combined both (simple) features of level 1

OR

Makes simple inference by using ascription and/or content of source

e.g. it was written by (explained provenance in simple terms)

it must have been accurate as it did.....

Level 3: EITHER **6-8**

Evaluates the provenance of the source and applies provenance to the question set

OR

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

e.g. uses knowledge of issue of decommissioning to show accuracy

Challenges the purpose of the newspaper 'Republican News'

Explains the significance of decommissioning of arms and its symbolic importance

Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3 **9-10**

Top level for use of knowledge to support both parts.

e.g. the Republican news supported Sinn Fein and the IRA and would therefore give this viewpoint.

Decommissioning of weapons was the last card the IRA would play in negotiations.

2(c) “The Easter Rising in 1916 was more important than the Civil war, 1919–1921 in leading to the partition of Ireland”. Do you agree? Explain your answer. **(15)**

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-3

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

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/ consequence

e.g. the Easter Rising was the start of it all
the Civil war led to a treaty with the Government

Level 2: EITHER 4-7

Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. the Easter Rising led to....more support for the cause....growth in IRA

Level 3: EITHER 8-11

Developed multi-causal answer

OR

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

Easter Rising

- Issues of Home rule highlighted
- Postponed move of Home rule until the end of the war
- IRB sees chance with outbreak of war
- Few British soldiers in Ireland
- Failed but showed determination of Nationalists
- Executions led to growth in national pride leading to civil war

Civil War

- Failure of home Rule Bill sparks Civil War
- IRA sparked war after killing two policemen
- Blacks and tans actions alleviated Irish people
- Failure of Government of Ireland Act
- Michael Collins accepts Anglo-Irish treaty

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

e.g. considers the list of points at L3, developing relative importance

2(d) “It was only the use of the British army in Northern Ireland in the 1960s and 1970s that made a peaceful solution to ‘the Troubles’ difficult”. Do you agree? Explain your answer. **(15)**

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-3

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

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/ consequence

Level 2: EITHER 4-7

Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development (see L3 list)

e.g. army seen as being on the side of the Protestants

Army failed to control civil unrest

IRA made it impossible for the army to win hearts and minds

Strength of nationalist unionists feelings at this time

Level 3: EITHER 8-11

Developed multi-causal answer

OR

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

e.g. considers the impact of;

Internment

Hunger strikes

Civil unrest

Attitudes of and for/against the army

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

e.g. considers level 3 points and evaluates relative impact

Increasing number of British troops on the streets

Media impact of Bloody Sunday

Impact of internment on IRA/UVF

Social inequality

Political inequality

Economic inequality

Question 3

Britain's changing role in the world since 1956.

3(a) How reliable is **Source E** to an historian studying the Falklands war? (10)

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

Level 1: EITHER

1-2

Accepts source as accurate information at face value, describing the content (comprehension)

OR

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

Accurate as it is Argentinean and describes events in Argentina

Inaccurate as it says nothing about British losses

Level 2: EITHER

3-5

Combined both (simple) features of level 1

OR

Makes simple inference using either ascription and/or content of source

e.g. twenty years later so they are forgetting about the war, trying to claim it back.

Level 3: EITHER

6-8

Evaluates the provenance of the source and applies provenance to the question set

OR

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

e.g. uses knowledge of Argentine feelings still existing for the Malvinas

Identifies comments on poor economy of the island

Level 4: Combination of both parts of level 3

9-10

Top of level for use of knowledge to support both parts

e.g. Argentina still continues with its historic claim to the islands although does not plan to go to war and this is reflected by the Argentinean newspaper.

Accurate description of Islands in 1982, but not of the Islands today.

3(b) Explain what **Source F** tells us about the Gulf war 1990–1991. **(5)**

Target: Comprehension and inference from an historical source (AO2)

Level 1: Answer that selects detail from the source **1**
Candidate tends to lift knowledge wholesale without understanding

e.g. numbers who fought and numbers who died.

Level 2: Answer that contains simple understanding, drawing basic inference from the source **2-3**
Place at the bottom of level the view that Britain's involvement was minor.

Level 3: Answer that develops an understanding based on a complex inference from the source. **4-5**

e.g. less than half the % losses as the USA

Women clearly not near the front line

Critical of US killing of British Troops or as proof that British troops were in danger at the front line.

Explained reference to 'friendly fire' as a complex inference.

3(c) “The actions of President Nasser of Egypt were the main reason for Britain’s invasion of Egypt in 1956”. Do you agree? **(15)**

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-3

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

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. describes what the canal was used for and infers importance to Britain
Dislike of Nasser

Level 2: EITHER 4-7

Developed mono-causal answer;

OR

Narrative implying causation/consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. describes Britain’s position within the world, link to Empire. Oil and trade with the Empire

Level 3: EITHER 8-11

Developed multi-causal answer

OR

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

e.g. Britain as a world power
Secret links with France
Importance of canal to India, economics
Attitude of British PM

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

e.g. considers the list of points at L3, developing relative importance
Range of immediate and longer term consequences
British government saw it as an opportunity to continue to influence events, still saw itself as a major power. It did not anticipate US/USSR reactions.

3(d) How did the reaction of the USA, Russia and the Arab Nations to the invasion of Suez effect Britain's standing in the world? (15)
Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-3

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

OR

Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. Britain losing Power

Britain listened to USA

Level 2: EITHER 4-7

Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation/ consequence

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. considers military impact- loss of status, UN, world powers now US/USSR

Level 3: EITHER 8-11

Developed multi-causal answer

OR

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

e.g. USSR threatening

USA angry

Loss or any remaining Arab support

Strengthened the position of Nasser

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

e.g. considers the list of points at L3, developing relative importance.

Sees loss of World status as most significant

Changes in World order confirmed with USA and USSR as the only real world powers.

QUESTION 4

Vietnam since 1939

4(a) How useful is **Source G** to an historian studying the role of the media in the Vietnam War? (8)

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2

Accepts the content of the source at face value

OR

Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source.

e.g. shows that soldiers were frightened, had a radio, uniforms

Level 2: EITHER 3-4

Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source or own simple knowledge

OR

Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance reliability or bias

e.g. tells us that the Australians were involved on the side of the USA.

Cartoons are unreliable because they only give the view of.....

Mocking the radio message (unexplained)

Technology of warfare.

Level 3: EITHER 5-6

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

OR

Source evaluation

e.g. cartoonist view explained

makes link to growing campaign worldwide against the war

Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness and limitations of the source using knowledge **AND** source evaluation 7-8

e.g. heavy Australian losses

Anti-war campaign growing in the USA and reaction abroad

Cartoon was published in 1966 just as the campaign to leave Vietnam was underway in Australia and beginning to develop – the USA.

4(b)	Did the Tet Offensive weaken the US military position in the Vietnam war?	(6)
	Target: Analysis and explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1)	
Level 1:	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus on the question set. OR Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence e.g. the VC got into Saigon People thought they were winning	1-2
Level 2:	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer OR Narrative implying causation/consequence OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development e.g. attacks on embassy and radio station Losses on US side Told they were winning the war	3-4
Level 3:	EITHER Developed multi-causal answer OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors clearly focused on the demands of the question e.g. may bring in reality that the NVA were weakened by this attack the US media portrayed it as a US defeat. US military realised the impact on the NVA. Explains in terms of successes and failures (6) Success and media reference (6)	5-6

4(c) Sources H and J give different views of Vietnam War veterans. Why do you think they are different? **(8)**
Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: Describes the content of the source(s) accepting the interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension) **1-2**

e.g. proud. Likes to talk about his experiences
Hated the war and treatment of veterans

Level 2: Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about: When the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality 1987 v 2006 **3-4**

e.g. one about the war and the other about the treatment of war veterans
One person v all organisations view.

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**

Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)

OR

Analysis of the content of the sources to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation

e.g. organisations view versus that of an individual (explained)

One had had a war with bravery valued and had not been wounded/hospitalised.

Refers to membership including serving troops (explained)

Level 4: As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context. **7-8**

Not all Veterans were anti-war. Many Americans were in favour of the war right up until it ended.

Anti-war organisations had more evidence to use once the effects of the war became better known e.g. effects of chemicals, posttraumatic stress etc.

- 4(d)** Why did the French leave Vietnam in 1954 and the USA become increasingly involved in Vietnam in the years 1954 to 1964? **(8)**
You should refer in your answer to:
French war 1946–1954
Government of Ngo Dinh Diem 1956–1963
Gulf of Tonkin, 1964.

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

- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**
Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than specific a focus of the question set
OR
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. the French had problems at home
the French were losing the war against the communists
the domino theory
Communism vs. capitalism
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer;
OR
Narrative implying causation
OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. description of the attack at Dien Bien Phu/Gulf of Tonkin
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed multi-causal answer
OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question

e.g. links events to increasing US involvement
- Level 4:** Well argued sustained multi causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement. **7-8**
Candidates may make clear references to the following areas to reach level 3&4
French war 1946–1954
Government of Ngo Dinh Diem 1956–1963
Gulf of Tonkin, 1964

4(e) Why did US military tactics fail in the Vietnam war? **(8)**
You should refer in your answer to;
Chemical weapons and bombing
Search and destroy tactics
Vietnamisation.

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus on the question set
OR
Simple generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. the VC kept fighting them
They did not know how to fight in the jungle

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer;
OR
Narrative implying causation
OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. chemical weapons and bombings did not work against tunnels
Lost the battle for hearts and minds
Anti war campaign
The draft (explained)

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**
Developed multi-causal answer
OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
Search and destroy linked to failure to win hearts and minds plus My Lai, lost support at home

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

e.g. balances the relative importance of key areas

Candidates may make clear reference to the following areas to reach levels 3&4

Chemical weapons and bombing
Search and destroy tactics and My Lai
Vietnamisation and US withdrawal

Question 5

The Arab Israeli conflict

- 5(a) Sources K and L** give different views on the outbreak of the Six Day War. (8)
Why do you think they are different? Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: Describes the content of the source(s), accepting interpretations or representations at face value (comprehension) **1-2**

e.g. they are from different sides
one is an Arab one is Jewish

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

e.g. when the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality.
e.g. both trying to justify getting involved

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**

Developed explanation of to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)
OR

Analysis of the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation

e.g. Arabs want to explain why they got involved in a failed war and the Israelis want to show the speed of their success.

Level 4: As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context. **7-8**

e.g. details of other successes, failure of command of the Arab armies.
Israel's military commanders knew the importance of attacking first.
The heavy defeat by Israel would need justification by Palestinians who were further away from a homeland

5(b) How useful is **Source M** to an historian studying the outbreak of the Yom Kippur War?

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

- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**
Accepts the content of the source at face value
OR
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source

e.g. Arab sneaking up on a boy
Cartoons only give one viewpoint.
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source or own simple knowledge
OR
Simple comments on the usefulness or limitations of the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias

e.g. cartoonist would want to show Israel as innocent (at prayer) and being bullied
- Level 3:** Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge or source evaluation **5-6**

e.g. trying to justify being caught by surprise by link to religious festival
- Level 4:** Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using knowledge **AND** source evaluation **7-8**
The Israeli's had not expected an attack on a public holiday. Their intelligence did not expect it.
Ignores pre-emptive attack used by Israelis in 1967.
Shows Israel 'small' attack but Israel had a well equipped army supported by the USA.

5(c) How close to peace did the Middle East get in the twentieth century?

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

- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**
Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus on the question set
OR
Simple, generalised statement of causation/consequence
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer;
OR
Narrative implying causation/consequence
OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed multi-causal
OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between causal factors clearly focused on the demands of the question
- e.g. details of White House Agreement, 1993
Details of Peace Accord, 1995
'Roadmap for Peace' (Allow use of this sort of terminology)

5(d)	<p>Why did Britain's relationship with the Jews fail in the years 1915 to 1947? You should refer in your answer to; McMahon letter, 1915 The Holocaust, 1939–1945 British Rule 1945–1947 Explain your answer.</p>	(6)
Target: Analysis and explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1)		
Level 1:	EITHER Simple, descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus on the question set. OR Simple, generalised statement of causation/consequence	1-2
Level 2:	EITHER Developed mono-causal answer OR Narrative implying causation/consequence OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development	3-4
Level 3:	EITHER Developed multi-causal answer OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question	5-6
Level 4:	Well argued, sustained multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement. Candidates may make clear references to the following areas; McMahon letter, 1915 The Holocaust, 1939–1945 British Rule 1945–1947	7-8

5(e) How effective were the following tactics used in the Arab Israeli Conflict in the 1970s? **(8)**
You should refer in your answer to;
Hijacking of aircraft, 1970–72
Munich Olympics, 1972
Oil Wars, 1973
Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER **1-2**

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

OR

Simple, generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. they stopped the Olympic Games

They blew up lots of planes

Level 2: EITHER **3-4**

Developed mono-causal answer

OR

Narrative implying causation

OR

Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. oil prices rose and showed the power of the Arab nations

Olympics/Hijacking put cause on the front page of newspapers

Level 3: EITHER **5-6**

Developed multi-causal answer

OR

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

e.g. discusses the relative successes of each method

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

e.g. balances the relative importance of tactics on the conflict

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

Hijacking of aircraft, 1970–72

Munich Olympics, 1972

Oil Wars, 1973

Question 6

Race relations in the USA Post 1945

6(a) Sources **N** and **O** give different views on The Supreme Court decision in the case **Brown v Topeka School Board**. (8)

Why do you think they are different? Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: Describes the content of the source(s), accepting the interpretations and representations at face value (comprehension) **1-2**

e.g. one was at the time and the other was years later

Level 2: Simple explanation and description of how the interpretation came about; **3-4**

e.g. when the source was written, known information at the time, selection of information or sources to arrive at a particular point of view, typicality

e.g. benefit of Hindsight, impact of the decision in reality.

Level 3: **EITHER** **5-6**

Developed explanation to evaluate the motives/purposes of the author(s)

OR

Analysis of the content of the source(s) to identify bias and evaluate the interpretation

e.g. seen as a success because it broke segregation laws

Failed as laws don't change attitudes

Level 4: As level 3, but uses knowledge to test the interpretation within its historical context **7-8**

- Seen as success in 1954. Little Rock High school shows a failure in attitudes with the federal government having to get involved.

- Attitudes at the end of the Century have improved, but less so in the Southern states than in the North.

6(b) How useful is **Source P** to an historian studying the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s? **(8)**

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Accepts the content of the source at face value
OR
Generalised or learned response which could apply to any source

e.g. shows that the buses were segregated
Shows that he would not get on certain buses.

Level 2: EITHER 3-4
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source or own simple knowledge
OR
Simple comments on the usefulness or the limitations of the source based on the information in the source in terms of provenance, reliability or bias

e.g. type of newspaper,
image of African-American very positive
Explanation of 'segregation' as the destination of the bus

Level 3: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using own knowledge or source evaluation 5-6

e.g. knowledge of the tactics working as bus company lost money
Other methods of getting to work, worked.
Considers other tactics (bottom of level)

Level 4: Develops an argument about the usefulness/limitations of the source using own knowledge AND source evaluation 7-8

Does not explain the eventual successful outcome
Does not show how African-Americans walked, arranged lifts
Cartoon positive yet many African-Americans were persecuted.

6(c) Did life for the African-Americans improve in the 1980s and 1990s? **(6)**
Explain your answer.

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

Level 1: EITHER 1-2
Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus on the question set
OR
Simple, generalised statement of causation/consequence

Level 2: EITHER 3-4
Developed mono-causal
OR
Narrative implying causation/consequence
OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development

e.g. suggests it did for some and not for others

Level 3: EITHER 5-6
Developed multi-causal answer
OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
Expect very clear balance for Level 3.
e.g. jobs in TV and the media
Greater involvement in local and national government
Middle class, black Americans very successful
Attitudes in the South might not have improved so much

6(d)	<p>Why did inequality exist in the USA in the first half of the century? You should refer in your answer to Segregation laws Voting rights Attitudes in the Southern States and the Ku Klux Klan</p>	(8)
Target: Analysis and explanation of events: Cause and consequence (AO1)		
Level 1:	<p>EITHER Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus on the question set OR Simple generalised statement of causation</p>	1-2
Level 2:	<p>EITHER Developed mono-causal answer OR Narrative implying causation/consequence OR Multi-causal explanation which lacks development</p>	3-4
Level 3:	<p>EITHER Developed multi-causal answer OR A selective and structured account establishing some links between factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question</p>	5-6
Level 4:	<p>Well argued, sustained, multi causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement. Candidates may make clear references to the following areas; Segregation Laws Voting Rights Attitudes in the Southern States and the Ku Klux Klan</p>	7-8

6(e) How important was the work of Martin Luther King in the fight for racial equality in the 1960s? **(8)**
You should refer in your answer to;
Freedom Marches, 1963
Nobel Peace Prize, 1964
Terms of Civil Rights Acts, 1964, 1968

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

- Level 1: EITHER** **1-2**
Simple descriptive narrative with general coverage of the topic rather than a specific focus on the question set
OR
Simple, generalised statement of causation/consequence

e.g. he became a national leader
The marches were attended by thousands
- Level 2: EITHER** **3-4**
Developed mono-causal answer
OR
Narrative implying causation/consequence
OR
Multi-causal explanation which lacks development
- Level 3: EITHER** **5-6**
Developed multi-causal answer
OR
A selective and structured account establishing some links between factors, clearly focused on the demands of the question
- Level 4: Well argued, sustained, multi-causal argument linked to the requirements of the question and arriving at a reasoned judgement. 7-8**
Candidates may make clear references to the following areas;
Freedom Marches, 1963
Nobel Peace Prize, 1964
Terms of Civil Rights Acts, 1964, 1968