

Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2011

IGCSE

IGCSE History (4HI0)

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Section A

A1

(a) *Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)*

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	Cavour becomes Prime Minister of Piedmont, Treaty of Villafranca, Victor Emmanuel crowned king, Venetia, Rome. 2 in correct sequence 1 mark 3 in correct sequence 2 marks 4/5 in correct sequence 3 marks	3

(b) *Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)*

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of consequence The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. Italy gained Venice. Getting Rome meant Italy had a capital.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of consequence The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g. The acquisition of Venetia came after the Austro-Prussian War. Italy now gained important port of Venice. Acquisition of Rome when Italian troops entered during Franco-Prussian War. Completed unification and Italy had its capital.</i>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. It was because Garibaldi was popular.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. One reason was Garibaldi raising a volunteer army known as the 'thousand'.....</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As level 2..Link appeal of Garibaldi to unpopularity of ruler of Naples. Could include unpopularity of ruler of two Sicilies and support of local people, British warships, lack of foreign intervention.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Napoleon III signed an agreement to help Piedmont</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Orsini assassination attempt led Napoleon to support Piedmont and sign the Pact of Plombières</i></p> <p>4-5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more.</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Explanation of terms of Pact. Pact led to French involvement in war with Austria, especially Magenta and Solferino, and link to Treaty of Villafranca.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A2

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	<p>Bismarck becomes Minister-President of Prussia, Blood and Iron speech, Convention of Gastein, Treaty of Prague, Ems Telegram</p> <p>2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1 mark 2 marks 3 marks</p>	3

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of consequence</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g Blood and Iron meant war. Treaty of Prague ended Austro-Prussian War</i></p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of consequence</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. The Blood and Iron speech led to the use of force by Prussia including three wars to achieve unification. The Treaty of Prague removed Austria from German unification and led to the North German Confederation.</i></p>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because Prussia had a better army.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. One reason was the discipline and organisation of the Prussian armed forces.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. <i>(One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</i></p> <p><i>e.g. As level 2 with explanation tactics, needle gun. Link to weaknesses French armed forces and Bismarck's diplomacy to isolate France.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge.</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. The Frankfurt Assembly failed.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Details of the Frankfurt Assembly, lack of popular support, attitudes of Austria and Prussia, refusal of Frederick William to become emperor.</i></p> <p>4-5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more.</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - show link between attitude of Austria and actions of Frederick William.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A3

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	<p>The Dawes Plan, The Young Plan, Nuremberg Laws, <i>Kristallnacht</i>, ghettos,</p> <p>2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1 mark 2 marks 3 marks</p>	3

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of consequence</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. The Dawes Plan reduced reparations. The Young Plan gave longer to pay.</i></p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of consequence</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. The Dawes Plan allowed Germany to increase payments over a longer period of time. The Young Plan extended the payments to a period of 59 years... ..</i></p>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because he got rid of opposition.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. One reason was the Reichstag Fire which meant he could ban the Communist Party. The Enabling Act gave him the powers of a dictator.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. <i>(One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</i></p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Link Reichstag Fire to Enabling Act. Could mention removal of political parties, Night of the Long Knives and death of Hindenburg.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. The Weimar Republic was blamed for the Treaty of Versailles.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Details of unpopularity of the Treaty of Versailles. Could include details of Spartacists, Kapp Putsch, hyperinflation.</i></p> <p>4-5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more.</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - links between Treaty of Versailles, French occupation of the Ruhr and hyperinflation.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A4

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	The Versailles Peace Settlement, The March on Rome, Battle of Birth Balilla, Lateran Treaty. 2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence	1 mark 2 marks 3 marks 3

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of consequence The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. This was when Mussolini took over. This was signed with the Pope.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of consequence The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g.. Showed popular support for Mussolini and to Fascist takeover. Improved relations with Pope by settling long term problems....</i>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because Italian people were unhappy.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Discontent with terms of Treaty of Versailles. Appeal of Mussolini and the Fascist Party.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Link discontent with terms of Treaty of Versailles. Appeal of Mussolini and the Fascist Party. Could include failings of parliamentary democracy and weak coalitions.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Some of his policies did not work.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Details of policies that did not work e.g. Battle of Lire and Wheat, impact of Depression, lack of understanding, shortage of raw materials.</i></p> <p>4-5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more.</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - could link lack of understanding to failures of Battle of Wheat and effects of Depression to Battle of Lira.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A5

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	Split in Social Democratic Party, Octobrists, first дума, assassination Stolypin, Lena Goldfield Strike 2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence	1 mark 2 marks 3 marks 3

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of consequence The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. Led to lots of deaths. It failed.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of consequence The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g. Violent reaction by authorities showed that Nicholas II still repressive and increased discontent. Short lived due to the attitude of Nicholas II. Meant dumas given little or no power.</i>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because his father was assassinated.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. The growth of opposition in the reign of Alexander II and his assassination. Influence of Pobedonostsev.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Link assassination with influence Pobedonostsev. Could include Russification.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. The peasants and workers were unhappy.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Peasant discontent due to harsh conditions. Town workers discontent due to poor living and working conditions. Refusal of Nicholas II to reform. Belief in autocracy.</i></p> <p>4-5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - link peasant and town workers' discontent to attitude of Nicholas II. Could include Russification, repression by Okhrana.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A6

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	Ending the NEP, The beginning of the Second Year Plan, murder of Ki Stakhanovites, German invasion 2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence	 1 mark 2 marks 3 marks

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of consequence The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. The Germans advanced into Russia. The Second FYP concentrated on making tractors.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of consequence The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g. At first defeat and retreat by Russian armies with rapid German advance into Russia. Second FYP improvements in transport and communications.</i>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because Stalin got rid of his rivals.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Weaknesses of Trotsky. Strengths of Stalin. Stalin's tactics to remove his rivals.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Could link Trotsky's mistakes and weaknesses to Stalin's strengths and tactics.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. It led to much opposition from the kulaks.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>N.B. The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Opposition from most peasants, especially kulaks, who resented giving up land, crops and livestock</i></p> <p>4/5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - link to Stalin's policy of deliberately provoking and targeting the kulaks in order to remove their influence and achieve greater political control.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A7

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	Roosevelt president first time, CCC, The beginning of the Second New Deal, US entry into Second World War, The beginning of the Double V. 2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence	 1 mark 2 marks 3 marks

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of consequence The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. Helped reduce unemployment. Allowed trade unions.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of consequence The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g. Gave legal recognition to trade unions which enabled them to negotiate for better pay and conditions. Brought immediate relief to unemployed young men for a period of six months. Around two and half million helped by scheme.</i>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because of panic selling.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Long term factors such as over production, over speculation. Immediate reasons panic selling, loss of confidence in banks.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Could link over-production and speculation to panic selling and loss of confidence.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. It led to many being out of work.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Very high unemployment with many families suffering. Problems in agricultural areas worsened by dust bowl.</i></p> <p>4-5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more.</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - link unemployment to other social effects - malnutrition, poor living conditions, poor diet etc.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A8

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	Freedom Riders, 'I have a dream' speech, Voting Rights Act, Kent State University, Watergate break-in 2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence	1 mark 2 marks 3 marks 3

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of consequence The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. Members of CREEP caught, blacks given the vote.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of consequence The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g. Arrest of burglars and link to CREEP and White House. It ended literacy tests and ensured a lot more blacks able to register for vote... .</i>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because women were second class citizens.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Influence of Betty Friedan and Feminine Mystique, Eleanor Roosevelt, changed expectations.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. <i>(One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</i></p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Could link Betty Friedan to changed expectations. Influence other protest movements, the pill and the climate of the 1960s.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because of Brown v Topeka and Little Rock.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2/3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Success of Supreme Court in Brown v Topeka, publicity given by Little Rock, success of bus boycott at Montgomery.</i></p> <p>4-5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more.</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - link successes of Brown v Topeka to Montgomery and Little Rock. Link Supreme Court in all three events. Influence of MLK.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A9

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	Corfu Incident, Kellogg-Briand, Rome-Berlin Axis, Munich Conference, Nazi-Soviet Pact 2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence	 1 mark 2 marks 3 marks

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of consequence The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. Britain and France gave way to Hitler. Signed between Hitler and Stalin.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of consequence The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g. Showed British and French weakness which encouraged further Nazi aggression. Secret terms in which partitioned Poland. Led to German invasion of Poland...</i>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because the Japanese invaded Manchuria.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Japanese desire for expansion. Failure of the League to act decisively.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. <i>(One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</i></p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Link Japanese aggression to weakness of the League. Could include attitude of Britain and France and the failings of the Lytton Commission.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. The Big Three had different aims.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. France had greatly suffered and wanted to weaken and punish Germany. USA not affected much by war and Wilson wanted self-determination and not punish Germany too much.</i></p> <p>4-5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - link effects of war on France and USA to their different aims. Include mixed aims of Lloyd George.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

A10

(a) Target: Recall of knowledge (A01)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	The Potsdam Conference, Truman Doctrine, Berlin Blockade, Korean War, Warsaw Pact 2 in correct sequence 3 in correct sequence 4/5 in correct sequence	1 mark 2 marks 3 marks 3

(b) Target: Consequence/recall of knowledge (A01)

(4)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of consequence The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. This said the USA would stop communism. Stalin blocked off road and rail routes into Berlin.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of consequence The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g. Committed the USA to containment, to a policy of stopping the spread of communism. Worsened relations between superpowers as Stalin had to back down.</i>	(3-4)

(c) Target: Causation/recall of knowledge (A01)

(8)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. To block off West from East Berlin</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.</p>	(1-2)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of causation</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Loss of skilled workers, contrasting lifestyle and economies of two parts, testing new president of USA, Kennedy.</i></p> <p>3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.</p>	(3-5)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of causation</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. Could link loss of skilled workers to contrasting lifestyles. Could mention failure of earlier negotiated settlements.</i></p> <p>6-7 marks for two or more explained factors. 8 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(6-8)

(d) Target: Recall of knowledge/comprehension of source (A01/A02)

(10)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements using the source supported by some own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Because Hungary wanted to stop communism.</i></p> <p>1 mark for one simple statement. 2-3 marks for two or more. Maximum 3 marks for only using the source.</p>	(1-3)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements using the source and relevant own knowledge</p> <p>The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. Reforms under Nagy, possibility leaving Warsaw Pact, Khrushchev and Eastern European bloc.</i></p> <p>4/5 marks for one developed statement. 6-7 marks for two or more.</p>	(4-7)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation using the source and precise own knowledge</p> <p>An explanation of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.)</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2 - could link Nagy's reforms and leaving Warsaw Pact to Khrushchev and security of Eastern Europe. Could mention Suez Crisis and preoccupation of USA, France and GB.</i></p> <p>8-9 marks for two or more explained factors. 10 marks for answers which show links between factors.</p>	(8-10)

Section B

B1

(a) Target: Source comprehension, inference and inference support (A02) (3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	One inference Two inferences Three inferences <i>e.g. Very bloodthirsty, wealthier people executed, radicals both male and female, wanting to remove all traditional institutions.</i>	1 mark 2 marks 3 marks 3

(b) Target: Corroboration by cross-referencing of sources (A02) (7)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple statements which identify support/differences at face value. 1 mark - summarises or paraphrases the sources. 2 marks for generalised comparisons. <i>e.g. The two sources disagree about Louis' execution.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements identifying support OR challenge based on source contents. <i>e.g. Differences in tone and content. Source B pleased about his execution and Source C remorseful. Source B mentions celebrations about his death and Source C regrets his death.</i>	(3-5)
Level 3	Developed statements identifying support AND challenge based on source contents and extent of support. <i>e.g. Level 2. Some support. Both mention disrespect shown after the execution. Overall very little support between sources.</i>	(6-7)

(c) Target: Making a judgement about an interpretation, relating analysis of sources to own knowledge (AO1, AO2 and AO3) (15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple statements, based on sources and/or own knowledge. Answers will often make generalised comments with little or no focus on the question.</p> <p>1-2 marks for answers which summarise or copy sources. <i>e.g. Source B says that his blood flows.</i></p> <p>3-4 marks for answers which attempt to answer the question using sources or own knowledge. <i>e.g. Source C shows that the king's death was the worst feature.</i></p>	1-4
Level 2	<p>Developed statements offering evidence for and/or against the view and is supported with details from the sources.</p> <p>5-6 marks for using sources/own knowledge only. 7-8 marks for using the sources and own knowledge. <i>e.g. Sources B and C suggest it was the execution of the King. Source B mentions the reaction of people to his death, for example the cries of joy. Source C mentions the great courage he showed.</i></p>	5-8
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation offering support for and/or against the view and is supported by precisely selected details from the sources.</p> <p>9-10 marks for using the sources/own knowledge only. 11-12 marks for using the sources and own knowledge. <i>e.g. As Level 2. However Source A suggests it was the mass executions that took place carried out by the radicals.</i></p>	9-12
Level 4	<p>Sustained argument, explicitly focused on the question, which reviews alternative views before giving a balanced judgement. The answer is supported by precisely selected details from sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>13-14 marks for explicit judgement on one factor. 15-16 marks for explicit judgement comparing the relative importance of a number of factors. <i>e.g. Although execution of the king was distasteful, as suggested in Sources B and C, Sources A and D suggests that it was the scale and manner of the Terror that was its worst feature. More details of executions and arbitrary nature, Robespierre and the Law of Suspects.</i></p>	13-15

B2

(a) Target: Source comprehension, inference and inference support (A02) (3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	One inference 1 mark Two inferences 2 marks Three inferences 3 marks <i>e.g. Overcrowded, basic, Turks in stronger position, improvised, weak defences, ramshackle</i>	3

(b) Target: Corroboration by cross-referencing of sources (A02) (7)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple statements which identify support/differences at face value. 1 mark - summarises or paraphrases the sources. 2 marks for generalised comparisons. <i>e.g. The two sources disagree about the Gallipoli landings.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements identifying support OR challenge based on source contents. <i>e.g. Differences. Source B suggests few able to reach beach due to strong Turkish defences and heavy casualties. Source C suggests landings easy due to lack of opposition.</i>	(3-5)
Level 3	Developed statements identifying support AND challenge based on source contents and extent of support. <i>e.g. Some support as both mention boats and landings. Overall very little support as B suggests landings were a disaster and C suggests they were successful.</i>	(6-7)

(c) Target: Making a judgement about an interpretation, relating analysis of sources to own knowledge (AO1, AO2 and AO3) (15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple statements, based on sources and/or own knowledge. Answers will often make generalised comments with little or no focus on the question.</p> <p>1-2 marks for answers which summarise or copy sources. <i>e.g. Source B says that the Turks were ready for them</i></p> <p>3-4 marks for answers which attempt to answer the question using sources or own knowledge. <i>e.g. Source D suggests it was due to lack of leadership at the top.</i></p>	1-4
Level 2	<p>Developed statements offering evidence for and/or against the view and is supported with details from the sources.</p> <p>5-6 marks for using sources/own knowledge only. 7-8 marks for using the sources and own knowledge. <i>e.g. Source B suggests that the landings were badly planned, resulting in heavy casualties due to strong Turkish defence.</i></p>	5-8
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation offering support for and/or against the view and is supported by precisely selected details from the sources.</p> <p>9-10 marks for using sources/own knowledge only. 11-12 marks for using the sources and own knowledge. <i>e.g. As Level 2. However Sources A, B and C suggest it was due to the strength of the Turkish opposition.</i></p>	9-12
Level 4	<p>Sustained argument, explicitly focused on the question, which reviews alternative views before giving a balanced judgement. The answer is supported by precisely selected details from sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>13-14 marks for explicit judgement on one factor. 15-16 marks for explicit judgement comparing the relative importance of a number of factors. <i>e.g. Inter-action of variety of factors including poor planning and preparation due to poor leadership, strength of Turkish defences and attitude of Turkish defenders.</i></p>	13-15

(c) Target: Making a judgement about an interpretation, relating analysis of sources to own knowledge (AO1, AO2 and AO3) (15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple statements, based on sources and/or own knowledge. Answers will often make generalised comments with little or no focus on the question.</p> <p>1-2 marks for answers which summarise or copy sources. <i>e.g. Source A shows lots of soldiers and officers.</i></p> <p>3-4 marks for answers which attempt to answer the question using sources or own knowledge. <i>e.g. Source C says the supply systems for food are completely disorganised.</i></p>	1-4
Level 2	<p>Developed statements offering evidence for and/or against the view and is supported with details from the sources.</p> <p>5-6 marks for using sources/own knowledge only 7-8 marks for using the sources and own knowledge.</p> <p><i>Source D suggests that food shortages played an important role. They led to inflation and rationing.</i></p>	5-8
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation offering support for and/or against the view and is supported by precisely selected details from the sources.</p> <p>9-10 marks for using sources/own knowledge only. 11-12 marks for using the sources and own knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. However, Source A suggests it was due to defeats in the First World War which led to discontent in the armed forces and mass desertions of officers and men.</i></p>	9-12
Level 4	<p>Sustained argument, explicitly focused on the question, which reviews alternative views before giving a balanced judgement. The answer is supported by precisely selected details from sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>13-14 marks for explicit judgement on one factor. 15-16 marks for explicit judgement comparing the relative importance of a number of factors.</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 3. Inter-action of variety of factors, including food shortages, Rasputin, military defeat, lack of effective government, the attitude of the Tsar and Tsarina.</i></p>	13-15

B4

(a) Target: Source comprehension, inference and inference support (A02) (3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	One inference 1 mark Two inferences 2 marks Three inferences 3 marks <i>e.g. It did not work, many ingenious methods to get alcohol, many broke the law, people go to any lengths to get alcohol</i>	3

(b) Target: Corroboration by cross-referencing of sources (A02) (7)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple statements which identify support/differences at face value. 1 mark - summarises or paraphrases the sources. 2 marks for generalised comparisons. <i>e.g. The two sources agree about the attitude of the police.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements identifying support OR challenge based on source contents. <i>e.g. The two sources support each other. They both suggest that the police were bribed, in Source B with \$50 dollar bill and in C a \$75 dollar bill.</i>	(3-5)
Level 3	Developed statements identifying support AND challenge based on source contents and extent of support. <i>e.g. Level 2. Some differences. Source B suggests cops keen to take bribes but in C he does it reluctantly. Overall strong support as both agree about the bribery of the police to turn a blind eye.</i>	(6-7)

(c) Target: Making a judgement about an interpretation, relating analysis of sources to own knowledge (AO1, AO2 and AO3) (15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple statements, based on sources and/or own knowledge. Answers will often make generalised comments with little or no focus on the question.</p> <p>1-2 marks for answers which summarise or copy sources. <i>e.g. Source B says that they had some arrangements with the cops.</i></p> <p>3-4 marks for answers which attempt to answer the question using sources or own knowledge. <i>e.g. Source C suggests that it was due to corrupt police.</i></p>	1-4
Level 2	<p>Developed statements offering evidence for and/or against the view and is supported with details from the sources.</p> <p>5-6 marks for using sources/own knowledge only 7-8 marks for using the sources and own knowledge.</p> <p><i>Sources B and C suggest that it was due to the corruption of the police who took bribes and turned a blind eye to speakeasies. Source D suggests it was due to the shortage of officials.</i></p>	5-8
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation offering support for and/or against the view and is supported by precisely selected details from the sources.</p> <p>9-10 marks for using sources/own knowledge only. 11-12 marks for using the sources and own knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 2. However Source A suggests that it was the willingness of many individuals to use any means, even illegal, to access alcohol</i></p>	9-12
Level 4	<p>Sustained argument, explicitly focused on the question, which reviews alternative views before giving a balanced judgement. The answer is supported by precisely selected details from sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>13-14 marks for explicit judgement on one factor. 15-16 marks for explicit judgement comparing the relative importance of a number of factors.</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 3. Interaction of variety of factors including corrupt officials, shortage agents, bootlegging and organised crime.</i></p>	13-15

(c) Target: Making a judgement about an interpretation, relating analysis of sources to own knowledge (AO1, AO2 and AO3) (15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple statements, based on sources and/or own knowledge. Answers will often make generalised comments with little or no focus on the question.</p> <p>1-2 marks for answers which summarise or copy sources. <i>e.g. Source C says that the crowd were unarmed.</i></p> <p>3-4 marks for answers which attempt to answer the question using sources or own knowledge. <i>e.g. Source C suggests that the shooting was unjustified.</i></p>	1-4
Level 2	<p>Developed statements offering evidence for and/or against the view and is supported with details from the sources.</p> <p>5-6 marks for using sources/own knowledge only. 7-8 marks for using the sources and own knowledge. <i>e.g. Sources B and C suggest it was due to the Massacre. Dyer has no regret whilst Churchill insists they fired on an unarmed crowd.</i></p>	5-8
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation offering support for and/or against the view and is supported by precisely selected details from the sources.</p> <p>9-10 marks for using sources/own knowledge only 11-12 marks for using the sources and own knowledge. <i>e.g. As Level 2. Source D suggests other reasons for opposition, including the Rowlatt and Government of India Acts and the support for Gandhi and the Congress Party.</i></p>	9-12
Level 4	<p>Sustained argument, explicitly focused on the question, which reviews alternative views before giving a balanced judgement. The answer is supported by precisely selected details from sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>13-14 marks for explicit judgement on one factor. 15-16 marks for explicit judgement comparing the relative importance of a number of factors. <i>e.g. As level 3. Inter-action of variety of factors including Rowlatt Acts, Government of India Act, activities of Gandhi, long term desire for independence and the Massacre.</i></p>	13-15

B6

(a) Target: Source comprehension, inference and inference support (A02) (3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	One inference 1 mark Two inferences 2 marks Three inferences 3 marks <i>e.g. Walesa was a key figure, there was popular support for Solidarity, many agreed with Walesa's views, crowds of workers listened enthusiastically to Walesa</i>	3

(b) Target: Corroboration by cross-referencing of sources (A02) (7)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple statements which identify support/differences at face value. 1 mark - summarises or paraphrases the sources. 2 marks for generalised comparisons. <i>e.g. The two sources do not agree about Walesa.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements identifying support OR challenge based on source contents. <i>e.g. The two sources do not support each other. The eyewitness in Source B was impressed with Walesa as a person whilst Source C suggests he was not suitable as a leader of the trade union.</i>	(3-5)
Level 3	Developed statements identifying support AND challenge based on source contents and extent of support. <i>e.g. Level 2. Some support as initially eyewitness in Source B afraid of reputation of Walesa and not impressed much like interview in Source C. However strong differences in attitude. Source B eventually very impressed unlike evidence of Source C.</i>	(6-7)

(c) Target: Making a judgement about an interpretation, relating analysis of sources to own knowledge (AO1, AO2 and AO3) (15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple statements, based on sources and/or own knowledge. Answers will often make generalised comments with little or no focus on the question.</p> <p>1-2 marks for answers which summarise or copy sources. <i>e.g. Source A shows Walesa talking to the workers.</i></p> <p>3-4 marks for answers which attempt to answer the question using sources or own knowledge. <i>e.g. Source A suggests that Walesa was a friendly leader.</i></p>	1-4
Level 2	<p>Developed statements offering evidence for and/or against the view and is supported with details from the sources.</p> <p>5-6 marks for using sources/own knowledge only 7-8 marks for using the sources and own knowledge. <i>e.g. Sources A and B suggest it was due to the leadership of Walesa. In A he is the central figure holding the attention of the workers. The eyewitness in B describes him as very impressive.</i></p>	5-8
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation offering support for and/or against the view and is supported by precisely selected details from the sources.</p> <p>9-10 marks for using sources/own knowledge only 11-12 marks for using the sources and own knowledge. <i>e.g. As Level 2. Source C suggests he was not an impressive leader. Source D provides other reasons for emergence of Solidarity, especially poor social and economic conditions.</i></p>	9-12
Level 4	<p>Sustained argument, explicitly focused on the question, which reviews alternative views before giving a balanced judgement. The answer is supported by precisely selected details from sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>13-14 marks for explicit judgement on one factor. 15-16 marks for explicit judgement comparing the relative importance of a number of factors. <i>e.g. As Level 3. Inter-action of variety factors. More long term discontent with Soviet control and communism, suppression of Catholic Church, poor economy, inflation and the leadership of Walesa.</i></p>	13-15

(c) Target: Analysis of change/recall of knowledge (A01)

(15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of change</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p>Low level 1 (1-2) Repetition of the provided stimulus material with no development. Higher Level (3-4) For unfocused description.</p> <p><i>e.g. There was a Greek rising against the Turks which began in 1822.</i></p>	(1-4)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of change</p> <p>Developed statements using the stimulus and/or additional material. Mostly relevant and accurate but with an implicit focus on the question.</p> <p>Low level 2 (5-6) Mainly narrative or one stimuli only</p> <p><i>e.g. The Great Powers had different aims in the Greek War of Independence. Russian support for Greeks - desire for greater influence and control of Straits. British desire to stop Russian expansion. Great Powers different aims in Belgium. British determined to stop growth of French influence.</i></p> <p>High level 2 (7-8) Develops two or more of stimuli or other relevant information.</p>	(5-8)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of change</p> <p>Developed explanation of more than one factor from stimulus and/or additional material and is able to make links between some factors. The answer mainly focuses on the question.</p> <p>Low level 3 (9-10). Considers a variety of factors but links implicit. High level 3 (11-12). Considers a variety of factors and links explicit.</p> <p><i>e.g. Level 2 but links Russian aims to British fears. Explains reasons for and effects of intervention of Mehemet Ali and British attitude to decision Louis-Philippe to withdraw candidate.</i></p>	(9-12)

Level 4	<p>A sustained argument</p> <p>This considers the inter-relationship between a range of factors from the stimulus and/or additional material and makes judgements on the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p>Low level 4 (13-14) Addresses inter-relationship between various factors. High level 4 (15) Addresses the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 3. Links Mehemet Ali to Great Power intervention and considers impact of Russo-Turkish War and Treaty of Adrianople on the course of the Greek War of Independence. Could address slow pace of change due to great power differences in early years of revolt. Judgement of extent Great Powers ensured success of Belgian revolt....</i></p>	(13-15)
---------	---	---------

(c) Target: Analysis of change/recall of knowledge (A01)

(15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of change</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p>Low level 1 (1-2) Repetition of the provided stimulus material with no development.</p> <p>Higher Level 1 (3-4) For unfocused description.</p> <p><i>e.g. In 1805 there was a battle between the British and French navies.</i></p>	(1-4)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of change</p> <p>Developed statements using the stimulus and/or additional material. Mostly relevant and accurate but with an implicit focus on the question.</p> <p>Low level 2 (5-6) Mainly narrative or one stimulus only <i>e.g. As Level 1. More details of battle.</i></p> <p>High level 2 (7-8) Develops two or more of stimuli or other relevant information.</p>	(5-8)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of change</p> <p>Developed explanation of more than one factor from stimulus and/or additional material and is able to make links between some factors. The answer mainly focuses on the question.</p> <p>Low level 3 (9-10). Considers a variety of factors but links implicit. High level 3 (11-12). Considers a variety of factors and links explicit.</p> <p><i>e.g. Level 2 but greater focus on changes brought about by the battle and links this with later developments in steam power and iron ships.</i></p>	(9-12)

Level 4	<p>A sustained argument</p> <p>This considers the inter-relationship between a range of factors from the stimulus and/or additional material and makes judgements on the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p>Low level 4 (13-14) Addresses inter-relationship between various factors. High level 4 (15) Addresses the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p><i>e.g. Links developments in steam power and iron ships to dreadnought. Could make judgements on extent of change 1803-1905. Lack of change or slow pace especially mid-nineteenth century.</i></p>	(13-15)
---------	--	---------

(c) Target: Analysis of change/recall of knowledge (A01)

(15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of change</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p>Low level 1 (1-2) Repetition of the provided stimulus material with no development.</p> <p>Higher Level 1 (3-4) For unfocused description.</p> <p><i>e.g. Describes Pasteur's experiments with flasks.</i></p>	(1-4)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of change</p> <p>Developed statements using the stimulus and/or additional material. Mostly relevant and accurate but with an implicit focus on the question.</p> <p>Low level 2 (5-6) Mainly narrative or one stimulus only <i>e.g. As Level 1. More details of Pasteur's experiments with flasks and link with germ theory and work of Koch.</i></p> <p>High level 2 (7-8) Develops two or more of stimuli or other relevant information.</p>	(5-8)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of change</p> <p>Developed explanation of more than one factor from stimulus and/or additional material and is able to make links between some factors. The answer mainly focuses on the question.</p> <p>Low level 3 (9-10). Considers a variety of factors but links implicit. High level 3 (11-12). Considers a variety of factors and links explicit.</p> <p><i>e.g. Level 2 but greater focus on changes brought about by Pasteur's and Koch's work and competition between two. Link work of these two to Ehrlich and the development of the Magic Bullet.</i></p>	(9-12)

Level 4	<p data-bbox="411 271 703 300">A sustained argument</p> <p data-bbox="411 338 1238 434">This considers the inter-relationship between a range of factors from the stimulus and/or additional material and makes judgements on the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p data-bbox="411 472 1246 533">Low level 4 (13-14) Addresses inter-relationship between various factors.</p> <p data-bbox="411 539 1278 568">High level 4 (15) Addresses the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p data-bbox="411 607 1198 663"><i>e.g. Could compare situation 1850 to 1950 but addresses shortcomings of work of Pasteur, Koch, Ehrlich and Fleming.</i></p>	(13-15)
---------	---	---------

(c) Target: Analysis of change/recall of knowledge (A01)

(15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of change</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p>Low level 1 (1-2) Repetition of the provided stimulus material with no development.</p> <p>Higher Level 1 (3-4) For unfocused description. <i>e.g. The League failed in Corfu. The UN was successful over the Suez Crisis.</i></p>	(1-4)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of change</p> <p>Developed statements using the stimulus and/or additional material. Mostly relevant and accurate but with an implicit focus on the question.</p> <p>Low level 2 (5-6) Mainly narrative or one stimulus only <i>e.g. As Level 1. More details of League's failure in Corfu and UN success over Suez Crisis.....</i></p> <p>High level 2 (7-8) Develops two or more of stimuli or other relevant information.</p>	(5-8)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of change</p> <p>Developed explanation of more than one factor from stimulus and/or additional material and is able to make links between some factors. The answer mainly focuses on the question.</p> <p>Low level 3 (9-10). Considers a variety of factors but links implicit. High level 3 (11-12). Considers a variety of factors and links explicit.</p> <p><i>e.g. Level 2 but links failures of League in Corfu and Manchuria or successes of UN in Korean and Suez Crisis.....</i></p>	(9-12)

Level 4	<p>A sustained argument</p> <p>This considers the inter-relationship between a range of factors from the stimulus and/or additional material and makes judgements on the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p>Low level 4 (13-14) Addresses inter-relationship between various factors. High level 4 (15) Addresses the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p><i>e.g. As L3 but judgement on extent success/failure of two organisations in their peacekeeping role.....</i></p>	(13-15)
---------	---	---------

(c) Target: Analysis of change/recall of knowledge (A01)

(15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of change</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p>Low level 1 (1-2) Repetition of the provided stimulus, material with no development.</p> <p>Higher Level 1 (3-4) For unfocused description</p> <p><i>e.g. The USA got involved in the Suez Crisis.</i></p>	(1-4)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of change</p> <p>Developed statements using the stimulus and/or additional material. Mostly relevant and accurate but with an implicit focus on the question.</p> <p>Low level 2 (5-6) Mainly narrative or one stimulus only.</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 1. More details of reasons for and effects of US involvement in Suez Crisis.</i></p> <p>High level 2 (7-8) Develops two or more of stimuli or other relevant information.</p>	(5-8)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of change</p> <p>Developed explanation of more than one factor from stimulus and/or additional material and is able to make links between some factors. The answer mainly focuses on the question.</p> <p>Low level 3 (9-10). Considers a variety of factors but links implicit. High level 3 (11-12). Considers a variety of factors and links explicit.</p> <p><i>e.g. Level 2 but greater focus on effects of US involvement in Suez Crisis. Links this with US aims in area and Cold War rivalry.</i></p>	(9-12)

Level 4	<p>A sustained argument</p> <p>This considers the inter-relationship between a range of factors from the stimulus and/or additional material and makes judgements on the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p>Low level 4 (13-14) Addresses inter-relationship between various factors. High level 4 (15) Addresses the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p><i>e.g. Massive influence of USA on course of events during Suez Crisis. Less influence on 1967, but Soviet intervention very important in 1973.</i></p>	(13-15)
---------	---	---------

(c) Target: Analysis of change/recall of knowledge (A01)

(15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of change</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p>Low level 1 (1-2) Repetition of the provided stimulus material with no development.</p> <p>Higher Level 1 (3-4) For unfocused description.</p> <p><i>e.g. There was much change in support.....</i></p>	(1-4)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of change</p> <p>Developed statements using the stimulus and/or additional material. Mostly relevant and accurate but with an implicit focus on the question.</p> <p>Low level 2 (5-6) Mainly narrative or one stimulus only.</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 1. More details of changes in support such as increase after Long March and Civil War</i></p> <p>High level 2 (7-8) Develops two or more of stimuli or other relevant information.</p>	(5-8)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of change</p> <p>Developed explanation of more than one factor from stimulus and/or additional material and is able to make links between some factors. The answer mainly focuses on the question.</p> <p>Low level 3 (9-10). Considers a variety of factors but links implicit. High level 3 (11-12). Considers a variety of factors and links explicit.</p> <p><i>e.g. Level 2 but links increase in support after Long March and during the Civil War, especially actions of Red Guards v peasants.</i></p>	(9-12)

Level 4	<p>A sustained argument</p> <p>This considers the inter-relationship between a range of factors from the stimulus and/or additional material and makes judgements on the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p>Low level 4 (13-14) Addresses inter-relationship between various factors. High level 4 (15) Addresses the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p><i>e.g. Level 3. Makes judgements on extent of change in years 1934-70</i></p>	(13-15)
---------	--	---------

C7 (a) : Target: Source comprehension (A02)

(3)

Question	Answer	Mark
(a)	One factor Two factors Three factors <i>e.g. Black South Africans had poor living conditions, they worked as servants, had poor clothing, no money, second class in everything</i>	1 mark 2 marks 3 marks

(b) Target: Key features/recall of knowledge (A01)

(7)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	Simple or generalised statements of key features The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations. <i>e.g. Botha gave blacks some rights. de Klerk got rid of apartheid.</i> 1 mark for one simple statement. 2 marks for two or more.	(1-2)
Level 2	Developed statements of key features The candidate supports their statement with relevant contextual knowledge. <i>e.g. More details of rights given to black South Africans, such as allowed to join trade unions and removal of Pass Laws. More details, e.g., removal of apartheid laws and release of Mandela under de Klerk.</i> 3 marks for one developed statement. 4-5 marks for two or more.	(3-5)
Level 3	Developed exposition of key features An exposition of more than one factor supported by selected knowledge. (One explained factor should be marked at the top of Level 2.) <i>e.g. As Level 2. Reactions and/or limitations of Botha's measures. More on transition to black majority rule or difficulties in talks with Mandela.</i> 6 marks for two or more factors. 7 marks for answers which show links between factors.	(6-7)

(c) Target: Analysis of change/recall of knowledge (A01)

(15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of change</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p>Low level 1 (1-2) Repetition of the provided stimulus material with no development.</p> <p>Higher Level 1 (3-4) For unfocused description <i>e.g. Kenyatta was the first president of Kenya.</i></p>	(1-4)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of change</p> <p>Developed statements using the stimulus and/or additional material. Mostly relevant and accurate but with an implicit focus on the question.</p> <p>Low level 2 (5-6) Mainly narrative or one stimulus only. <i>e.g. As Level 1. More details of achievements of individuals as leaders.</i></p> <p>High level 2 (7-8) Develops two or more of stimuli or other relevant information.</p>	(5-8)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of change</p> <p>Developed explanation of more than one factor from stimulus and/or additional material, and is able to make links between some factors. The answer mainly focuses on the question.</p> <p>Low level 3 (9-10). Considers a variety of factors but links implicit. High level 3 (11-12). Considers a variety of factors and links explicit. <i>e.g. Level 2 but greater links between independence movement and colonial period to the changes made by the individuals.</i></p>	(9-12)

Level 4	<p>A sustained argument</p> <p>This considers the inter-relationship between a range of factors from the stimulus and/or additional material and makes judgements on the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p>Low level 4 (13-14) Addresses inter-relationship between various factors. High level 4 (15) Addresses the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p><i>e.g. As level 3 but could make judgements on extent of change and continuity and whether changes brought about by leaders were for success/failure.</i></p>	(13-15)
---------	--	---------

(c) Target: Analysis of change/recall of knowledge (A01)

(15)

Level	Descriptor	Mark
Level 1	<p>Simple or generalised statements of change</p> <p>The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p>Low level 1 (1-2) Repetition of the provided stimulus material with no development.</p> <p>Higher Level 1 (3-4) For unfocused description. <i>e.g. Brief description of tactics of Blitzkrieg.</i></p>	(1-4)
Level 2	<p>Developed statements of change</p> <p>Developed statements using the stimulus and/or additional material. Mostly relevant and accurate but with an implicit focus on the question.</p> <p>Low level 2 (5-6) Mainly narrative or one stimulus only. <i>e.g. As Level 1. More details of tactics of Blitzkrieg with examples of its successes 1939-40.</i></p> <p>High level 2 (7-8) Develops two or more of stimuli or other relevant information.</p>	(5-8)
Level 3	<p>Developed explanation of change</p> <p>Developed explanation of more than one factor from stimulus and/or additional material and is able to make links between some factors. The answer mainly focuses on the question.</p> <p>Low level 3 (9-10). Considers a variety of factors but links implicit. High level 3 (11-12). Considers a variety of factors and links explicit. <i>e.g. As level 2. Could show links between Blitzkrieg 1939-43 and tactics of Israel 1967 or combined operations D-Day and first Gulf War.</i></p>	(9-12)

Level 4	<p>A sustained argument</p> <p>This considers the inter-relationship between a range of factors from the stimulus and/or additional material and makes judgements on the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p>Low level 4 (13-14) Addresses inter-relationship between various factors. High level 4 (15) Addresses the extent of change and/or continuity.</p> <p><i>e.g. Judgement on extent of change and continuity during and after Second World, more especially use of blitzkrieg and combined operations.</i></p>	(13-15)
---------	--	---------