**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section A (20)** | **Section B (20)** | **Section C (20)** | **Total (60)** | **%** | **Grade** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Strengths: **The areas in which you have shown success:****A:****B:****C:**  |
| Targets: **In order to progress your next steps are:****A:****B:****C:**  |
| **Improvement Tasks:****A:****B:****C:**  |
| **Student Reflection:**MC900383600[1] **How much effort did you put into this assessment?** **0% 50% 100%****Areas I am confident with in this assessment:****Areas I found difficult in this assessment:** |

**Section A&B Mark Scheme (AO1)**

1. How far do you agree that, in the years 1945–80, the main reason for changes in the leisure activities of ordinary Americans was their growing affluence?
2. How far do you agree that there was a considerable similarity between the campaigns for black civil rights (1955–80) and minority civil rights (1960–80)?

**Each level descriptor has 4 strands:**

* Exploration and analysis of key issues
* Deployment of accurate and relevant information (knowledge)
* Reaching a judgement overall
* Organisation and Communication

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| **1** | **1-3** | * Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.
* Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.
* The overall judgement is missing or asserted.
* There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
 |
| **2** | **4-7** | * There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.
* Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.
* An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.
* The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
 |
| **3** | **8-12** | * There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.
* Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.
* Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.
* The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
 |
| **4** | **13-16** | * Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.
* Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.
* Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.
* The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision
 |
| **5** | **17-20** | * Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.
* Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.
* Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.
* The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.
 |

**Section A&B Mark Scheme (AO1)**

1. How far do you agree that, in the years 1945–80, the main reason for changes in the leisure activities of ordinary Americans was their growing affluence?
2. How far do you agree that there was a considerable similarity between the campaigns for black civil rights (1955–80) and minority civil rights (1960–80)?

**Each level descriptor has 4 strands:**

* Exploration and analysis of key issues
* Deployment of accurate and relevant information (knowledge)
* Reaching a judgement overall
* Organisation and Communication

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| **1** | **1-3** | * Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.
* Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.
* The overall judgement is missing or asserted.
* There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
 |
| **2** | **4-7** | * There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.
* Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.
* An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.
* The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
 |
| **3** | **8-12** | * There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.
* Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.
* Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.
* The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
 |
| **4** | **13-16** | * Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.
* Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.
* Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.
* The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision
 |
| **5** | **17-20** | * Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.
* Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.
* Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.
* The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.
 |

**Section A and B (AO1) Level 5 criteria explained**

1. **Exploration and analysis of key issues - Conceptual focus (the shape of your essay)**
* Have you analysed the key features of the period (specified or suggested) in relation to the focus of the question consistently throughout the essay?
* Have you addressed a range of relevant factors?
* Are you sticking to the topic focus; i.e. are your points relevant and valid? Are you consistent?
* Is your understanding of the topic holistic; i.e. have you made links?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **17–20** | * **Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.**
* **Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.**
* **Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.**
* **The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.**
 |

1. **Organisation and Communication** - **Formed to fit and support an argument**
* **Is your argument clearly organised addressing one factor / point per paragraph?**
* **Is your argument logically organised to support your argument?**
* **Is your argument coherent? (i.e. Have you full explained your argument in the introduction then consistently applied and referred to in each paragraph)?**
* **Have you communicated your argument precisely and with clarity using specific language and key words?**
1. **Reaching a judgement overall** - **Judgement (established and evaluated)**
* Have you thoroughly substantiated your evaluation and made a judgement based on consistently and thoroughly applied ‘**valid criteria’**, such as:
* Factors (causes, consequences, etc.) that were superficial vs deep and underlying?
* Short-term vs long term vs trigger factors?
* Factors that had wide vs narrow impact / significance/effect?
1. **Deployment of accurate and relevant information (knowledge)** - **Detail**
* Have you selected and deployed knowledge with accuracy?
* Have you selected and deployed relevant knowledge?
* Is the knowledge you have selected and deployed in depth?
* Have you selected and deployed a range of points and detail? (i.e. more than one factor/event and selected from across the chronology demanded by the question?
1. **Organisation and Communication** - **Formed to fit and support an argument**
* **Is your argument clearly organised addressing one factor / point per paragraph?**
* **Is your argument logically organised to support your argument?**
* **Is your argument coherent? (i.e. Have you full explained your argument in the introduction then consistently applied and referred to in each paragraph)?**
* **Have you communicated your argument precisely and with clarity using specific language and key words?**

**What are the top tips for success in Section A and B essays (AO1)?**

1. **RESPOND TO THE PRECISE WORDING OF THE QUESTION**

In order to help you understand what the question is asking you to do, the first thing you should do is read the question and look for these 3 foci:

* **Topic focus** (the topic of the question)
* **Conceptual focus** (the 2nd order historical concept of the question)
* **Chronological focus** (the time period of the question)
* **Adjectival/adverbial qualifier:** these are specific words in the question and they expect you to respond to and challenge. i.e. if they use the word ‘transformed’ or ask about **‘fundamental features**’ of an era (rather than ‘features’), address the precise meaning of this word in your introduction, challenge it based on what you know and come up with a better word instead that fits your judgement.
1. **PLAN YOUR JUDGEMENT CAREFULLY AND STATE THIS IN YOUR INTRODUCTION**

Writing an introduction should be the HARDEST part of writing an essay. If it’s not, you haven’t planned properly or have regurgitated a previous essay. You should always:

1. Address the question, including any specific language used.
2. State the 3-**4 factors** you will address
3. State and explain your judgement of most important precisely and explicitly in 1-2 sentences.

**3. STATE YOUR ‘VALID CRITERIA’ EXPLICITLY IN YOUR INTRO, LINKS AND CONCLUSION**

* Valid criteria = How have you made your decision? Valid criteria consider the relative importance of factors and the weight applied to these in reaching a judgement.
* You must be specific in your language when explaining how you have weighed up the relative importance of factors (e.g. underpinning cause, trigger, fatal combination etc). For example:

**‘I chose this pair of trousers. It was the best.’**

= Level 2 - A judgement given, with justification asserted.

**‘I chose this pair of trousers because it suited me best.’**

= Level 3 - A judgement with some justification, but without the evidence of valid criteria being applied.

**‘I chose this pair of trousers because, although others were a better fit or better price [+ comparative details], this pair was the best combination of a good fit round the waist and the right length at a price of which I could afford.’**

= Level 4 and 5 - Exemplifies the use of criteria for overall judgement and with justification.

* The selection of the criteria used will be dependent upon the nature of the question being asked. For example, a ‘main consequence’ factor question would probably require criteria that weigh up the relative importance of effects, and a ‘significance’ question would need a discussion of criteria related to impact.

**4. EVIDENCE NEEDS TO BE DETAILED, SPECIFIC AND COVER THE FULL RANGE OF THE QUESTION.**

If you asked about 1865-90, for example, you should aim to include examples from across the period, rather than just 1865-75.

**5. EXPLAIN THE IMPACT AND RESULTS OF YOUR EXAMPLES – HOW AND WHY?**

It is not enough to say ‘therefore this led to problems for race relations, if you don’t say HOW AND WHY - from whom, for whom, when, how, why, in what form, what was being challenged precisely? A good way to do this is to think about the sequence of events that followed as a result – *This led to….. As a result….*

6. **REFER BACK** TO YOUR JUDGEMENT AND THE QUESTION AND **LINK** BETWEEN YOUR FACTORS (PEAR / PEEL). This is a must for Level 3 (D-C grade). E.g. *However, the factor of….would not have caused a threat hand it not been for …..* *Without the factor of….* I*f* ……….*Had it not been for….*

**7. STRUCTURE YOUR ANSWER ACCORDING TO THE QUESTION TYPE – see below!!**

* Cause, Consequence or significance = compare the importance of 4 factors and give a most important that links the other 3 / by weighing up.
* Change and continuity OR similarity and difference = compare *within* 4 factors (=8 mini PEARs) to support your balanced judgement

**Section C Mark Scheme (AO1)**

Q5) In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Reagan presidency failed to live up to its own claims to reduce ‘big government’? To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

**Each level descriptor has 3 strands:**

* **Analysis and comparison of interpretations**

*Are you treating it as a repository of information analysing the subtleties of the interpretation? Analysis should break extract into parts.*

* **Deployment of knowledge of issues related to the debate**

*This is the knowledge you bring to the exam – do you know the debate and detail? Note the difference between lower and higher levels – at L5 knowledge is ‘integrated’ not just ‘linked’ mechanically and formulaically.*

* **Evaluation of and judgement about the interpretations.**

*Are you using valid criteria and reaching a judgement? Is the substantiated judgement followed through?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Mark** | **Descriptor** |
| **1** | **1-3** | * Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.
* Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.
* Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
 |
| **2** | **4-7** | * Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.
* Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.
* A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
 |
| **3** | **8-12** | * Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.
* Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.
* A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
 |
| **4** | **13-16** | * Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them.
* Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.
* Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.
 |
| **5** | **17-20** | * Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.
* Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.
* Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.
 |

**How do I approach and structure my answer in Section C?**

1. **What is the question asking**? Identify the two sides of the precise debate in the question. *On the one hand…. On the other hand….*

**2. Annotate and analyse the extracts carefully** - what does each suggest? What evidence have they used? Aim to summarise the arguments of each extract in a sentence each.

3. **Apply your knowledge of the debate to the extracts** - What evidence would you provide to support or challenge certain aspects of each extract? You should aim for two examples for each, as these will form your two points for and against in the essay!

4. **Plan and write your introduction carefully, to introduce the debate and your judgement.**

* Introduce the debate (wider debate, not simply the extracts alone)

*The two extracts contain ……… points of view / interpretations / perspectives on…..*

* Outline the main arguments in the extracts

*Extract 1 supports this view that….. “quote to support” whilst extract 2 challenges this view “quote to support”.*

* Overall judgement in response to the question

*It is argued that the view expressed in extract ….. has some strengths, but it is not the most convincing interpretation of the controversy. On balance, the most convincing interpretation is……which is supported by extract...*

**5. Write the essay! Suggested structure:**

* The response can consist of two large paragraphs for and against rather than 4.
* Integrate awareness of debate, contextual knowledge and extract analysis continually.

**Para 1 and 2 – FOR the statement in the question.**

**P: Point that relates to the question**

*Some might argue that …….. to some extent because…*

**EE: Is there any evidence from the extracts and your own knowledge to support this?**

*Extract ….. argues that… Extract ….also agrees to an extent because………which is true / and indeed there is truth in this argument……*

*There is validity in the argument that….suggested by extract …..*

*This view can be further supported by…..*

*Those who support this view include….*

*In order to place….. argument that…..into context, it is important to consider….*

*The extract also states that….*

*It is typical of the ….. view that….*

**E: Explain, analyse and evaluate your argument and provide counter-points**

*This is important because…*

*However, this may not be the complete case because…*

*This is partially supported by …….which shows….*

*So and So too says that….*

*However this view is also challenged by extract…. that suggests….*

*…whereas extract …. leans towards….. suggesting that….*

**L: Link back to the question, your line of argument, summarise and state how convincing the argument for/against is.**

*Therefore,……..to a large extent because…*

*Clearly this view plays an important role in understanding the controversy ………*

*Clearly this view is the most convincing in ….., but that is not to dismiss the other contributory interpretations which also make a significant contribution to this controversy….*

**Para 3 and 4 – COUNTER OR MODIFY the argument in the question**

*However this view has some major limitations in terms of the evidence…*

*Despite the fact that both sources show that……., there is some evidence to suggest that ……*

**Repeat the above PEEL structure for both paragraphs.**

**Conclusion** - Display an understanding of the basis of the differing arguments (for example, what criteria are being used on which to base a claim or judgement) and why you find one more convincing than the other. Make sure you justify this fully!

*In conclusion, the most convincing…. / the balance of the argument appears to favour….*

**Q1) June 2018 -** How far do you agree that, in the years 1945–80, the main reason for changes in the leisure activities of ordinary Americans was their growing affluence?

1. Use the ‘indicative content’ to identify four factors that you could have addressed in this question. Write them in the boxes below.
2. Then use the examiner report feedback to identify links that you could have made between factors. Draw and annotate arrows to make these.
3. Read the example introduction and identify three strengths that make it a ‘level 5’ introduction.

Second factor:

Factor in the Q: **Growing affluence**

Third Factor:

Fourth Factor (if time):

**Q2 June 2018 -** How far do you agree that there was a considerable similarity between the campaigns for black civil rights (1955–80) and minority civil rights (1960–80)?

1. Complete the Venn diagram on the next page. Again, use the ‘indicative content’ to help you identify factors for similarity and difference that you could have addressed in this question.
2. Then identify 2 similarities and differences overall and write them in the boxes below.
3. Read the examiner report feedback. How does it suggest that the best answers are structured?
4. Read the introduction and at least one paragraph of the example essay. Comment on the range and depth of the examples and the comparisons made.

Similarity 2: Turns to militant tactics – youth impatience

BCR e.g. BPP; Stokely Carmichael SNCC

MCR e.g. Red and Brown Power

Similarity 1: Non Violent Direct Action (Tactic)

BCR e.g. Greensboro sit ins 1960

MCR e.g. Alcatraz – occupation; Chavez

Difference 1: Aims

BCR e.g. Segregation and discrimination

MCR e.g. stigma; economic; self-determination; sexuality not race

Difference 2: Successes

BCR e.g. Political

MCR e.g. GR limited success (time period dependent) – invisible

**Q3 - SAMs -** How far do you agree that the news media was the most significant influence on the decline in confidence in the American presidency in the years 1968–80?

1. Use the indicative content and the hand out pages 84-87 to complete:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Factor  | How can you make the wording of this actor more specific to focus on the Q? | Give additional examples of…. |
| News media | How the media **portrayed** the Presidency  | The impact of PBS:The impact of political satire: ‘Laugh in’ …. Broadcast news during the 1960s: |
| Vietnam War | How the military defeat and US behaviour in Vietnam was portrayed | Specific incidents and which new centre broadcast it: |
| Actions of the Presidents  | Sensationalisation of incompetence  | Exactly how much of the Watergate scandal was televised and how it was portrayed:Examples of Jimmy Carter’s scandals and media portrayals, including the Iranian hostage crisis: |

1. identify one other factor you could have addressed using the indicative content.

**Q4 – Pearson textbook -** How far do you agree that the position of American women had changed significantly for the better between the years 1917 and 1980? (20)

1. Identify 3 ways in which ‘positions’ can improve (3 factors) in the boxes below
2. Give examples for each factor using the example essay / own knowledge
3. Read the example conclusion – what criteria are used?
4. How would you improve this essay?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Factor  | Examples from across the breadth of the time period (chronologically) |
| Political | e.g. 1: Perkins ‘hysterical’ – representation e.g. 2: Eleanor Roosevelt – role after FDR – UN after 1945 (but as a result of husband)e.g. 3: Congresswomen : |
| Economic | e.g. 1: 1920s non-existent; limited job opportunities e.g. 2: WW2 – opportunities – 1950s legislation; labour saving devices e.g. 3: still paid less; EPA |
| Social attitudes | e.g. 1: flapper minority – short lived - WASPse.g. 2: WW2 – social attitudes – latch key children – patronising e.g. 3: legislation; abortion rights; conservatism  |