

# A Level History

Coursework Marking Training  
Module 2  
Applying the level-based  
mark scheme





# Aims and objectives

- Understanding how to apply the generic levels-based mark scheme.
- Work through two examples in order to assist understanding of the application of the mark scheme.

# What you will need to complete Module 2

- A copy of the generic levels-based mark scheme for A Level History Coursework (pages 125–27 of A Level History Specification (issue 2)).
- A copy of Script 1
- A copy of Script 2
- A copy of scripts A, B, C, D and E – which you will mark/assess, in your own time after the completion of this module, in preparation for Module 3.

These are all available for you to download.

# Applying the generic levels-based mark scheme



# General guidance

- In Module 1 it was suggested that a good way to mark a piece of A Level History coursework was to build up a 'profile' of the piece of work, as you assess it, based on the five bullet points that appear in each of the levels in the generic mark scheme.
- Here we have two pieces of centre assessed coursework:
- Script 1 (Level 5 – 40/40)
- Script 2 (Level 1 – 7/40).
- I am going to take you through each script, consider the bullet points one by one, and indicate where within the generic mark scheme each script 'best fits'.

# Script 1

# Script 1

**Question: Historians have disagreed about how far Cromwell was responsible for his limited success as Lord Protector.**

- The centre judged that this piece of work satisfied each of the five bullet point descriptors in Level 5 and, therefore, awarded a mark in the 'high-level range 38–40'. Their judgement was that the script gained 40 out of 40 marks.
- Before looking at the guidance that follows you may wish to have an initial read through of the script, annotating, in relation to the bullet points, where you think appropriate.
- Let's look at this script, bullet point by bullet point.

# Script 1: Bullet point 1

## **Bullet point 1: Identification of, selection from, and deployment of material relevant to an aspect of historical debate.**

- In Script 1 a range of material relevant to the enquiry is identified – in the introduction, and each of the following paragraphs there is relevant material about Cromwell and other factors.
- This material has been appropriately cited and deployed with precision to show understanding of the issues under debate – look at the start of each of the paragraphs to see evidence for this.
- The material deployed is about the relevant aspects of the debate in the question, which are discussed in a sustained evaluative argument – at no point does this piece of work drift from the issue raised in the question.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 1 in Level 5.

# Script 1: Bullet point 2

## **Bullet point 2: Ability to reach and sustain an overall judgement about a matter of historical debate in its historical context.**

- In Script 1 material is used with discrimination to sustain a considered overall judgment on the issue in the question.
- Contextual knowledge is taken from the chosen works and other reading and integrated into the discussion of the debate.
- Look at each paragraph and you will see evidence of this. Each paragraph is a discussion of an issue in the debate – Cromwell or other factors – and there are judgements made throughout.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 2 in Level 5.

# Script 1: Bullet point 3

## **Bullet point 3: Analysis and explanation of differences in historians' views**

- In Script 1 there is clear evidence of analysis of the differences between the chosen works that relate to the issues of interpretation raised by the question. There is also clear understanding of the basis of the arguments of the authors and the nature of the historical debate.
- This is demonstrated, for example, in the introductory paragraph, the paragraph that then follows on to page 2, the second paragraph on page 3, the start of the last paragraph on page 4, and the second paragraph on page 6.
- There is also the use to other works/reading to support or challenge the differences of view. This type of analysis and understanding is replete throughout this piece of work.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 3 in Level 5.

# Script 1: Bullet point 4

## **Bullet point 4: Evaluation of, and judgement on, historians' arguments.**

- In Script 1 valid criteria are established by which the arguments in the three chosen works can be judged and are applied in the decision-making process.
- Evidence of this, for example, can be found at the end of the first paragraph on page 3, at the beginning of the second paragraph on page 3, at the start of the third paragraph on page 4, at the start of the second paragraph on page 6, e.g. '...lies in their focus', at the start of the second paragraph on page 7, and at the start of the second paragraph on page 10.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 4 in Level 5.

# Script 1: Bullet point 5

**Bullet point 5: Demonstration of understanding of relevant concepts and organisation and communication of a concisely-formulated argument.**

- In Script 1 knowledge has been clearly deployed to demonstrate understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry – which is causation – the reasons for the limited success of Cromwell as Lord Protector.
- The answer is concise and clearly structured around the different views of the reasons for limited success. The argument is developed in a logical and coherent way.
- Evidence of this runs throughout the piece of work. Each paragraph has an analytical structure based around the methodology of ‘point, evidence, explain, link’.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 5 in Level 5.

# Script 1: Answer Profile

- An answer profile for Script 1 would look like this:

Script 1	
Bullet point 1	L5
Bullet point 2	L5
Bullet point 3	L5
Bullet point 4	L5
Bullet point 5	L5

- Therefore, the mark awarded should fall within Level 5, in the high-level band: 38–40 marks.
- There is no reason not to award the centre mark of 40/40. The piece of work satisfies each of the bullet point descriptors in Level 5, and also matches the overall descriptor for Level 5 – ‘Sustained analysis, explanation and evaluation of arguments’.

# Script 2

# Script 2

**Question: Historians have disagreed on to the extent to which Haig's failures are due to his leadership of the British army on the western front 1915–17, what is your view about Haig's leadership of the British Army on the Western front 1915–17?**

- The centre judged that this piece of work satisfied each of the five bullet point descriptors in Level 1 and, therefore, awarded a mark in the 'high-level range 6–8'. Their judgement was that the script gained 7 out of 40 marks.
- Before looking at the guidance that follows you may wish to have an initial read through of the script, annotating, in relation to the bullet points, where you think appropriate.
- Let's look at this script, bullet point by bullet point.

# Script 2: Bullet point 1

## **Bullet point 1: Identification of, selection from, and deployment of material relevant to an aspect of historical debate.**

- In Script 2 a range of material relevant to the enquiry is identified, but citation is weak.
- This material has been deployed to show understanding of the overall issue in the question – look at the start of each of the paragraphs to see evidence for this, which demonstrates that it does not fit the level 1 descriptor where understanding of the overall issue is limited.
- The material deployed is about the relevant aspects of the debate in the question.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 1 in Level 3 better than it does in Level 2 (therefore, noting that it is a weak L3).

## Script 2: Bullet point 2

### **Bullet point 2: Ability to reach and sustain an overall judgement about a matter of historical debate in its historical context.**

- In Script 2 there is some judgement on the question but with limited support.
- Evidence of this tends to come at the end of each paragraph where a judgement is stated, for example, the end of the second paragraph on page 1, the end of the third paragraph on page 2 and the end of the first paragraph on page 3.
- There is some contextual knowledge present and it expands on matters of detail rather than issues of interpretation.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 2 in Level 2.

# Script 2: Bullet point 3

## **Bullet point 3: Analysis and explanation of differences in historians' views**

- In Script 2 there is evidence of analysis of the differences between the chosen works that relate to some key points. There is also some understanding of the reasons for the differences. However, there is little attempt to consider the basis of the arguments in the three chosen works.
- This is demonstrated, for example, in paragraphs that relate to each chosen work. What each historian says is stated with little consideration of why.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 3 in Level 3.

# Script 2: Bullet point 4

## **Bullet point 4: Evaluation of, and judgement on, historians' arguments.**

- In Script 2 there is evidence of a recognition of an element of argument within the chosen works, but the criteria for judgment are mostly left implicit with limited substantiation.
- Evidence of this, for example, can be seen in the fourth paragraph, on page 5, that starts 'In conclusion...', and in the paragraph headed 'My Opinion' that starts on the bottom of page 5 and continues on page 6.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 4 in Level 2.

## Script 2: Bullet point 5

### **Bullet point 5: Demonstration of understanding of relevant concepts and organisation and communication of a concisely-formulated argument.**

- In Script 2 knowledge is accurate and relevant and there is some understanding of the conceptual focus – which is causation – the reasons for Haig’s failure, but the piece of work lacks range and depth.
- The answer is concise and shows some organisation, but parts of it lacks logic, coherence and precision. However, it does address aspects of the enquiry meaning it does not fit the Level 1 descriptor indicated by the centre.
- Evidence of this runs throughout the piece of work. Each paragraph lacks analytical organisation and coherence.
- Therefore, this piece of work satisfies the descriptor for bullet 5 in Level 3.

# Script 2: Answer Profile

- An answer profile for Script 2 would look like this:

Script 1	
Bullet point 1	L3 (weak)
Bullet point 2	L2
Bullet point 3	L3
Bullet point 4	L2
Bullet point 5	L3

- Therefore, the mark awarded should fall within Level 3, in the mid-level band: 19–21 marks. This is because Level 2 has been met and some elements of Level 3 are present.
- There is every reason to disagree with the centre awarded mark of Level 1 – 7 marks. There is sufficient evidence of satisfying some of the bullet points in Level 3 and a mark within Level 3 must be awarded.

# Next Steps

- You now need to prepare for Module 3 by downloading scripts A, B, C, D and E.
- You will see that each script has a centre mark.
- Look at each script, consider the centre marks in relation to the generic levels-based mark scheme, decide if you agree with the marks or not.
- In Module 3, we will review the scripts and indicate how they fit into the mark scheme.



Pearson