

---

GCSE  
HISTORY  
8145/1B

Paper 1 Understanding the modern world

1B Germany, 1890-1945: Democracy and dictatorship with wider world  
depth studies

---

Mark scheme

Specimen for 2018

---

0.1

Draft

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Draft

## Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

### Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

### Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

### Step 3 Spelling, punctuation, grammar and specialist terminology (SPGST)

Spelling, punctuation, grammar and specialist terminology will be assessed in question 06 in Section A.

	<b>Performance descriptor</b>	<b>Marks awarded</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<p><b>High performance:</b> In the context of the level of demand of the question, learners spell, punctuate and use grammar with consistent accuracy and also use specialist terminology with consistent accuracy.</p>	4 marks

<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Intermediate performance:</b> In the context of the level of demand of the question, learners spell, punctuate and use grammar with considerable accuracy and also use specialist terminology with considerable accuracy.	2–3 marks
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Threshold performance:</b> In the context of the level of demand of the question, learners spell, punctuate and use grammar with reasonable accuracy and also use specialist terminology with reasonable accuracy; any errors do not hinder meaning in the response.	1 mark

Where a candidate writes nothing or fails to meet threshold performance they should receive 0 marks.

Draft

---

**Section A**

<b>01</b>	What does <b>Interpretation A</b> suggest about why people supported Hitler?  Explain your answer using <b>Interpretation A</b> .	<b>2</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Analyse an individual interpretation of a key feature using contextual knowledge of the period. (AO4a)</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that make inferences</b>  eg Interpretation A shows that Hitler’s speeches had the effect of making people want to follow him.	<b>2</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Selects or paraphrases relevant points in Source A</b>  eg Interpretation A says Hitler spoke persuasively.	<b>1</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

**02** How does **Interpretation B** differ from **Interpretation A** about why people supported Hitler? **4**

Explain your answer using **Interpretations A** and **B** and your contextual knowledge.

**Target Analyse how interpretations of a key feature of a period differ (AO4b)**

**Level 2 Analysis that explains complex inferences about both interpretations** **3-4**  
Answers make (a) comparison(s) by explained and supported inference. Differences are supported and explained. Analyses must be drawn from and relate to the content of each Interpretation.

eg Candidates might explain how Schiff uses the despair of different groups to support his view. By comparison candidates might explain Speer's support for Hitler made sense to him, based on what Hitler said and how he said it.

**Level 1 Analysis that identifies/describes simple inferences about differences from Interpretations A and B.** **1-2**

Answers make a comparison by inference which is identified rather than explained:

eg

- Hitler's appeal, according to Schiff, was based on the desperate plight of people ruined by the Depression
- Speer claims that it was Hitler's hypnotic oratory.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question** **0**

<b>03</b>	Why might the authors of <b>Interpretation A</b> and <b>B</b> have a different interpretation about why people supported Hitler?  Explain your answer using <b>Interpretation A</b> and <b>B</b> and your contextual knowledge.  <b>Target</b> <b>Analyse why interpretations of a key feature of a period differ. (AO4c)</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Answers that provide full analysis</b> Developed arguments based on the differences in the context of their time of writing, place, previous experience, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, and access to information <b>AND</b> purpose or audience.  eg Both parts of Level 2.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that provide partial analysis</b>  <b>Either:</b>  <b>Responses based on the differences in the context of their time of writing, place, previous experience, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, and access to information</b>  eg Candidates might argue that Speer and Schiff differed because of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• beliefs (one had been a Nazi, the other was a Socialist)</li><li>• circumstances (Speer was in jail, Schiff writing during the period of reconstruction after the war)</li><li>• knowledge (Speer was basing his analysis on first-hand knowledge / emotional experiences, Schiff was more objective).</li></ul> <b>Or:</b>  <b>Responses based on the differences in purpose or audience</b>  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Candidates argue that Speer and Schiff had a different purpose – Speer justifying his own actions/support for the Nazis, Schiff blaming Hitler's rise on the Depression (and, by inference, capitalism) from a socialist point of view.</li></ul>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Answers which provide general comments relating to the authors</b> eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interpretation A was by Speer who became Nazi Armaments Minister</li><li>• Interpretation B was by Schiff who was a socialist – they hated the Nazis.</li></ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>04</b>	Which interpretation do you find more convincing about why people supported Hitler? Explain your answer using <b>Interpretations A</b> and <b>B</b> and your contextual knowledge.	<b>6</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Evaluates and makes substantiated judgements in respect of different interpretations of a key feature of a period (AO4d)</b>	
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Answers that argue and evaluate a detailed case for and appreciate both interpretations, arriving at a substantiated judgement</b> Evaluates both interpretations.  eg Candidates might conclude that Interpretation B is more convincing than A, as B explains the conditions which were needed before Hitler’s oratory could have had such an impact.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain the case for either Interpretation A or B</b> Answers show a detailed understanding and support for one interpretation. Answers may explain a preference for one interpretation with only simple development of the other.  <b>Either:</b>  eg Candidates might develop argument supporting Interpretation A by, for example, reference to Hitler’s oratory/use of propaganda/rallies, or scapegoating of Jews/Communists contextual knowledge.  <b>Or:</b>  eg Candidates might support Interpretation B by reference to growth in Nazi electoral support as Depression worsened or Hitler’s support amongst key groups.	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Simple argument for either/both interpretation(s) based on valid identified points</b> Answers show an understanding and support for one/both interpretation(s), but the case is made by assertion/simple inference.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speer was a Nazi so his views are not to be trusted</li> <li>• Hitler was known to be a master of propaganda.</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>



---

<b>05</b>	Describe the problems faced by Kaiser Wilhelm II's governments in ruling Germany up to 1914.	<b>6</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Demonstrate knowledge of the key features and characteristics of the period studies (AO1)</b>	
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Developed knowledge, based on understanding</b> eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Germany's rapid industrial expansion created social problems in the towns and the growth of militant Trade Unions and extremist groups.</li><li>• The growing power of the socialists made it difficult to secure a majority for the government in the Reichstag. The Kaiser feared that anarchists and socialists threatened the lives of his family, so anti-Socialist laws were needed.</li><li>• Government needed to raise money to pay for the cost of Germany's defence/naval building programme but taxation was unpopular.</li></ul>	<b>4-6</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Simple knowledge statements</b> eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Germany was industrialising very quickly</li><li>• The socialists were becoming more powerful</li><li>• Government needed to raise taxes.</li></ul>	<b>1-3</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

**06** Which of the following groups of people were more affected by Nazi social policy in the years 1933 to 1945: **16**

- women
- young people?

Explain your answer with reference to both groups.

**Target A comparative analysis of consequences, differences and similarities (AO1:8, AO2:8)**

**Level 4 Answers that show balanced, well-argued answer linking both bullet points and arriving at a balanced judgement 13-16**  
Extends Level 3.

eg Candidates may explain that the Nazis had a similar impact on both groups through common exposure to propaganda and special groups and behavioural expectations.

**Or:**

eg Differentiate between the impact that Nazi policies had – for example a short-term impact on women (in the light of reversal of Nazi policies towards them due to labour shortages), but more lasting impact on the young who were more impressionable due to school curriculum.

**Level 3 Answers that show a structured explanation and argument relating to both bullet points 9-12**

Candidates base their arguments on the development of both bullet points.

Candidates are able to argue that women were more affected by reference to eg

- their domestic role as wives and mothers
- their (changing) role in the labour market
- the cultural influence of Nazi women's organisations
- the pressure to increase the birth rate etc.

**Or**

Candidates could argue that young people were more affected through, eg:

- influence of Hitler Youth/BDM
- Nazi influence over the school curriculum
- suppression of non-Aryan culture
- brainwashing/pressures to conform.

<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that develop/explain one bullet point</b>	<b>5-8</b>
	Candidates are able to argue that women were more affected by reference to eg:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• their domestic role as wives and mothers</li> <li>• their (changing) role in the labour market</li> <li>• the cultural influence of Nazi women's organisations</li> <li>• the pressure to increase the birth rate etc.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Or</b>	
	<b>Answers that provide simple development of both bullet points</b>	
	Candidates identify/describe valid reasons without explaining them.	
	Candidates make valid assertions about eg	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the pressure on women to conform to their domestic role</li> <li>• the brainwashing of young people through the school curriculum</li> <li>• the influence of Nazi organisations on both groups.</li> </ul>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Answers that show basic description.</b>	<b>1-4</b>
	Candidates make simple factual statements or identify valid reasons related to one bullet point eg	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the young had to join the Hitler Youth</li> <li>• women got medals for having children.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>SPGST:</b>		
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>High performance:</b>	<b>4</b>
	In the context of the level of demand of the question, learners spell, punctuate and use grammar with consistent accuracy and also use specialist terminology with consistent accuracy.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Intermediate performance:</b>	<b>2-3</b>
	In the context of the level of demand of the question, learners spell, punctuate and use grammar with considerable accuracy and also use specialist terminology with considerable accuracy.	
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Threshold performance:</b>	<b>1</b>
	In the context of the level of demand of the question, learners spell, punctuate and use grammar with reasonable accuracy and also use specialist terminology with reasonable accuracy; any errors do not hinder meaning in the response.	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

**Section B****Conflict and tension, 1894–1918**

<b>07</b>	Study <b>Source A</b> .	<b>6</b>
	What are the strengths and weaknesses of <b>Source A</b> in understanding Anglo-German rivalry before the First World War?	
	Explain your answer using <b>Source A</b> and your contextual knowledge.	
<b>Target</b>	<b>Evaluate, question and make substantiated judgements about a source (AO3b)</b>	
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Answers evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the source</b> Candidates will discuss the strengths and weaknesses in detail. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own knowledge in context or provenance.  eg Candidates may use contextual knowledge of Anglo-German Naval rivalry to corroborate the source and see this as a strength; a perceived weakness might be Churchill's reasons (as First Lord of the Admiralty) at that time for deliberately highlighting the dangers of the situation.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that explain the strengths or weaknesses of the source</b> Candidates will consider either strengths or weaknesses. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own knowledge in context or provenance.  eg Candidates may suggest that a weakness of the source might relate to the role of Churchill (as First Lord of the Admiralty) and his reasons at that time for deliberately highlighting the dangers of the situation.	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Answers that describe the source and details from the source</b> Answers that provide simple statements in support of the source, describe single aspects or factual details. Answers may suggest generic, undeveloped strengths and/or weaknesses for the lower part of the level.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the source is just Churchill's point of view</li> <li>• Britain did have a big navy.</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>08</b>	Study <b>Sources B</b> and <b>C</b> .	<b>10</b>
	Which source is more useful for understanding Austria's reaction to the assassination of Franz Ferdinand?	
	Explain your answer using <b>Sources B</b> and <b>C</b> and your contextual knowledge.	
	<b>Target Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)</b>	
<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Answers that argue a detailed case for both sources using contextual knowledge and provenance, arriving at a substantiated judgement</b> Developed explanations of both sources based on provenance and contextual knowledge. Answers making a substantiated judgement about the relative merits of each source will gain 10 marks.  eg Candidates produce a balanced argument based on a detailed understanding of both sources and may explain that they are both useful because they reflect similar Austrian attitudes related to the need/opportunity to crush Serbian nationalism.	<b>9-10</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain a developed case, using contextual knowledge and provenance, for one source.</b> Answers explain a preference for one source based on provenance and contextual knowledge. There may be reference to the other source.  eg Candidates may focus on one source and explain why its provenance might reflect contemporary Austrian anti-Serbian attitudes and supports or tests this against knowledge of the perceived threat posed by Serbian nationalism.	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain the case for either/both sources, based on either provenance or contextual knowledge</b>  eg Candidates will focus on one source and may explain how the provenance of the cartoon or the Hotzendorf source may be used by historians to shed light on anti-Serbian attitudes in 1914.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that assert the case for either/both sources(s) based on valid identified points but give no explanation</b> Answers show an understanding of and support for one/both source(s), but the case is made by assertion/simple inference; no explanation is given.  eg Candidates may state identified points which rely on inference about what Hotzendorf is suggesting such as that this is Austria-Hungary's last chance and/or the message of the cartoon, such as Serbia had to be crushed to stop the terrorist threat.	<b>3-4</b>

**Level 1**    **Answers that describe or paraphrase the source(s) and details from the source(s)**    **1-2**

Answers provide simple statements in support of one source, describe single aspects or factual details.

eg Candidates may simply describe details of the image from the cartoon or paraphrase parts of the written source.

eg

- Serbia was a threat
- Austria-Hungary had to act now.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.**    **0**

Draft

---

<b>09</b>	Explain the consequences of the Moroccan Crisis of 1905.	<b>8</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Knowledge, understanding and explanation of the consequence(s) of a key feature of the period (AO1:4, AO2:4)</b>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that develop out of Level 3 and provide links between the consequence(s) of the event and the wider context of the period</b>  Extends Level 3.  eg: ...these suspicions caused by the First Moroccan Crisis gave rise to naval talks between Britain and France and so this helped consolidate the ties between the Entente powers and further divided Europe into two armed camps...	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Developed answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b>  eg British suspicions of German naval ambitions and the threat they posed to the Empire were heightened as Morocco was strategically important to the Mediterranean...	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple answer about the consequence(s) of the event)</b>  Answers identify consequence(s) or result(s) of the event.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• increased British suspicions of Germany</li><li>• brought Britain and France closer together</li><li>• a conference was held to resolve crisis at Algeciras (1906)</li><li>• Germany had to promise to stay out of Morocco.</li></ul>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Identifies and describes aspect(s) of the event.</b>  Answers provide detail of the event.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• there was an international crisis</li><li>• France and Germany threatened to go to war.</li></ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

---

- 10** ‘The war at sea was the main reason for Germany’s defeat in the First World War.’ **16**
- How far do you agree with this statement?
- Explain your answer.
- Target** **Demonstrate knowledge and understanding to explain and analyse historical events using second order concepts (AO1:8, AO2:8)**
- Level 4** **Answers that develop out of Level 3 and evaluate the relative merits of judgement in the ‘Statement’** **13-16**
- The answer demonstrates a balanced, integrated summary assessment or judgement about the merits of the issue posed in the question, supported by sustained reasoning and evidence.
- eg Candidates may arrive at the judgment that the war at sea was linked to alternative factors, eg convoys defeated U-boats which made the Germans sufficiently desperate to sink US ships provoking the US entry into the war ensuring an eventual Allied victory.
- Level 3** **Answers that argue a detailed case for the ‘Statement’ given and an alternative judgement(s)** **9-12**
- Answers may suggest that one assessment has greater merit.
- eg An explanation of the part played by the war at sea for example in defeating the U-boat menace while the blockade denied vital war supplies to the Germans.
- Candidates may explain the importance of America’s entry into the war, in providing decisive material and manpower support for the Allies and suggest that this was more important.
- Level 2** **Answers that argue the case for the ‘Statement’ or another judgement that shows detailed understanding and support** **5-8**
- Answers stating a preference for one judgement but with only simple development of another view will be marked at this level.
- eg Candidates may develop the argument that the German Spring Offensive of 1918 failed because of such factors as the impact of attritional warfare in 1916 and 1917, of the arrival of US troops, of more effective Allied military strategy and leadership and of resource shortages.
- Or**



**Answers that argue simply for several points of view about the ‘Statement’**

Answers demonstrate a simple understanding.

eg Candidates may identify several points:

- the failure of the U-boat campaign
- unrestricted U-boat warfare led to the USA’s entry into the war
- the naval blockade caused shortages in Germany
- Jutland proved inconclusive.

**Level 1 Answers that describe the ‘Statement’ using basic knowledge**

**1-4**

Answers that provide simple points or knowledge/statements in support of the assessment or another view, describe single aspects or factual details in relation to the statement.

eg

- Britain placed a naval blockade on Germany
- The spring offensive failed.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.**

**0**

Draft

**Conflict and tension, 1918 – 1939**

<b>11</b>	<b>Study Source D.</b>	<b>6</b>
	<p>What are the strengths and weaknesses of <b>Source D</b> in understanding British aims at the Paris Peace Conference?</p> <p>Explain your answer using <b>Source D</b> and your contextual knowledge.</p>	
	<b>Target Evaluate, question and make substantiated judgements about a source (AO3b)</b>	
	<p><b>Level 3 Answers evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the source</b></p> <p>Candidates will discuss the strengths and weaknesses in detail. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own contextual knowledge or the source's provenance.</p> <p>eg Contextual knowledge of Lloyd George's actions in pressing for reparations at Versailles supports the source; a perceived weakness would be that the source does not reveal true aims as Lloyd George's was electioneering and appealing to the British public.</p>	<b>5-6</b>
	<p><b>Level 2 Answers that explain the strengths or weaknesses of the source</b></p> <p>Candidates will consider either strengths or weaknesses. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own knowledge in context or provenance.</p> <p>eg Candidates may suggest that a weakness of the source might relate to the context – Lloyd George's election rhetoric does not reflect his true aims.</p>	<b>3-4</b>
	<p><b>Level 1 Answers that describe the source and details from the source</b></p> <p>Answers that provide simple statements in support of the source, describe single aspects or factual details. Answers may suggest generic, undeveloped strengths and/or weaknesses for the lower part of the level.</p> <p>eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it says Germany should pay for the war</li> <li>• this is just Lloyd George's view.</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>12</b>	Study <b>Sources E</b> and <b>F</b> .	<b>10</b>
	Which source is more useful for understanding Germany's reaction to the Treaty of Versailles?	
	Explain your answer using <b>Sources E</b> and <b>F</b> and your contextual knowledge.	
	<b>Target</b>	<b>Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Answers that argue a detailed case for and appreciate both sources using contextual knowledge and provenance, arriving at a substantiated judgement</b> Developed explanations of both sources based on provenance and contextual knowledge.  eg Candidates produce a balanced argument based on a detailed understanding of both sources and may explain that they are both useful because they reflect similar German attitudes ie resentment, Source F on the basis of reparations/loss of the Saar; Source E based on the Fourteen Points.	<b>9-10</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain a developed case using contextual knowledge and provenance for one source</b> Answers explain a preference for one source based on provenance and contextual knowledge. There may be reference to the other source.  eg Candidates may focus on one source and explain how its provenance might reflect contemporary German attitudes and support or test this against knowledge.	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain the case for either/both sources, based on either provenance or contextual knowledge</b>  eg Candidates will focus on one source and may explain how the anti-French provenance of the cartoon or Ebert's accusation of broken promises may be used by historians to shed light on German resentment in 1919.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that assert the case for either/both sources(s) based on valid identified points but give no explanation</b> Answers show an understanding and support for one/both source(s), but the case is made by assertion/simple inference; no explanation is given.  eg Candidates may state identified points which rely on inference about what Ebert is suggesting and/or the message of the cartoon but offer no explanation.	<b>3-4</b>

**Level 1**    **Answers that describe or paraphrase the source(s) and details from the source(s).**    **1-2**

Answers provide simple statements in support of one source, describe single aspects or factual details.

eg Candidates may simply describe details of the image from the cartoon or paraphrase parts of the written source.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question**    **0**

Draft

---

<b>13</b>	Explain the consequences of the Locarno treaties signed in 1925.	<b>8</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Knowledge, understanding and explanation of the consequence(s) of a key feature of the period (AO1:4, AO2:4)</b>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that develop out of Level 3 and provide links between the consequence(s) of the event and the wider context of the period</b>	<b>7-8</b>
	Extends Level 3.  eg the Locarno treaties signalled a new era of hope as Stresemann decided to co-operate with the Allied powers and it resulted in improved international relations as the following year Germany joined the League. However, the failure to confirm the borders in the east represented a critical stage in the weakening of the peace settlement...	
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Developed answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b>	<b>5-6</b>
	eg the Locarno treaties signalled a new era of hope as Stresemann decided to co-operate with the Allied powers and it resulted in improved international relations as the following year Germany joined the League...	
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b> Answers identify consequence(s) or result(s).	<b>3-4</b>
	eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Germany accepted their western borders</li><li>• Locarno helped build trust in Europe</li><li>• The eastern European settlement was undermined</li><li>• Germany was able to join the League of Nations.</li></ul>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Identifies and describes aspect(s) of the event</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	Answers provide detail of the event.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It improved international relations</li><li>• Germany agreed to keep the peace.</li></ul>	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</b>	<b>0</b>

---

- 14** ‘The main reason for conflict in the 1930s was the weakness of the League of Nations.’ **16**
- How far do you agree with this statement?
- Explain your answer.
- Target** **Demonstrate knowledge and understanding to explain and analyse historical events using second order concepts (AO1:8, AO2:8)**
- Level 4** **Answers that develop out of level 3 and evaluate the relative merits of judgement in the ‘Statement’** **13-16**
- The answer demonstrates a balanced, integrated summary assessment or judgement about the merits of the issue posed in the question, supported by sustained reasoning and evidence.
- eg Candidates may arrive at the judgement that the weakness of League was important as this was the body set up to avoid future wars, but they did not do so... However it was the actions of the dictators that brought about conflict. On balance it was the weakness of the League that encouraged dictators.
- Level 3** **Answers that argue a detailed case for the ‘Statement’ given and alternative judgement(s)** **9-12**
- Answers may suggest that one assessment has greater merit.
- eg Candidates may explain that the League was slow to react to Manchurian Crisis and so aggression was not deterred. The Abyssinian War also due to weaknesses of the League because a permanent member of the League’s Council had committed an act of aggression and sanctions were ineffective...
- Candidates may argue that the appeasement policies of Britain and France allowed the dictators to gain in strength by not opposing Hitler’s remilitarisation of the Rhineland or the Anschluss they allowed Germany to become strong enough to cause conflict.
- Level 2** **Answers that argue the case for the ‘Statement’ or another judgement that shows detailed understanding and support** **5-8**
- Answers stating a preference for one judgement but with only simple development of another view will be marked at this level.
- eg Candidates may explain that the League was slow to react to Manchurian Crisis and so aggression was not deterred. The Abyssinian War also due to weaknesses of the League because a permanent member of the League’s Council had committed an act of aggression and sanctions were ineffective...
- eg Candidates may develop the argument that the actions of the dictators were most important as Mussolini invaded Abyssinia and Hitler invaded Poland...
- Or**

**Answers that argue simply for several points of view about the ‘Statement’**

Answers demonstrate a simple understanding.

eg

- Manchuria showed slow decision making of the League
- Sanctions did not work
- America not a member
- Britain and France’s unwillingness to take action etc.

**Level 1 Answers that describe the ‘Statement’ using basic knowledge 1-4**

Answers that provide simple points or knowledge/statements in support of the assessment or another view, describe single aspects or factual details in relation to the statement.

eg

- The League did not stop the Manchurian War
- Hitler attacked Poland.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**

Draft

**Conflict and tension between East and West, 1945–1972**

<b>15</b>	<b>Study Source G.</b>	<b>6</b>
	<p>What are the strengths and weaknesses of <b>Source G</b> in understanding the breakdown of relations between East and West?</p> <p>Explain your answer using <b>Source G</b> and your contextual knowledge.</p>	
	<b>Target Evaluate, question and make substantiated judgements about a source (AO3b)</b>	
	<p><b>Level 3 Answers evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the source</b></p> <p>Candidates will discuss the strengths and weaknesses in detail. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own contextual knowledge or the source's provenance.</p> <p>eg Candidates may explain that contextual knowledge corroborates the source because of Soviet policies in eastern Europe; a perceived weakness might be Churchill's suspicions of Communists and Stalin might lead him to deliberately highlight the dangers of the situation.</p>	<b>5-6</b>
	<p><b>Level 2 Answers that explain the strengths or weaknesses of the source.</b></p> <p>Candidates may consider mainly either strengths or weaknesses. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own knowledge in context.</p> <p>eg Candidates may suggest that a weakness of the source might relate to the context ie the role of Churchill and his suspicions of Stalin led him to deliberately highlight the dangers of the situation (explained)</p>	<b>3-4</b>
	<p><b>Level 1 Answers that describe the source and details from the source</b></p> <p>Answers that provide simple statements in support of the source, describe single aspects or factual details. Answers may suggest generic, undeveloped strengths and/or weaknesses for the lower part of the level.</p> <p>eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only reveals Churchill's point of view</li> <li>• The USSR's leaders were opposed to freedom.</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>



<b>16</b>	Study <b>Sources H</b> and <b>J</b> .	<b>10</b>
	Which source is more useful for understanding the Marshall Plan?	
	Explain your answer using <b>Sources H</b> and <b>J</b> and your contextual knowledge.	
	<b>Target</b>	<b>Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)</b>
	<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Answers that argue a detailed case for both sources using contextual knowledge and provenance, arriving at a substantiated judgement</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>9-10</b></span>
	Developed explanations of both sources based on provenance and contextual knowledge. Answers making a substantiated judgement about the relative merits of each source will gain 10 marks.	
	eg Candidates produce a balanced argument based on a detailed understanding of both sources and may explain that they are both useful because they reflect attitudes related to the need to promote European recovery; Source H based on anti-Communism, Source J based on cooperative enterprise.	
	<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain a developed case for using contextual knowledge and provenance for one source.</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>7-8</b></span>
	Answers explain a preference for one source based on provenance and contextual knowledge. There may be reference to the other source.	
	eg Candidates may focus on one source and explain how its provenance might reflect contemporary attitudes and supports or tests this against knowledge of the state of post war Europe/the Communist threat.	
	<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain the case for either/both sources, based on either provenance or contextual knowledge</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>5-6</b></span>
	Answers show an understanding and support for one source.	
	eg Candidates will focus on one source and may explain how the provenance of the poster or the Marshall source may be used by historians to shed light on the state of post war Europe and the real motives behind the ERP.	
	<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that assert the case for either/both sources(s) based on valid identified points but give no explanation</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>3-4</b></span>
	Answers show an understanding and support for one/both source(s), but the case is made by assertion/simple inference; no explanation is given.	
	eg Candidates may state identified points which rely on inference about what Marshall is suggesting and/or the message of the poster.	

<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Answers that describe or paraphrase the source(s) and details from the source(s).</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	Answers provide simple statements in support of one source, describe single aspects or factual details.	
	eg Candidates may simply describe details of the image from the poster or paraphrase parts of the written source	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

Draft

---

<b>17</b>	<b>Explain the consequences of the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Knowledge, understanding and explanation of the consequence(s) of a key feature of the period (AO1:4, AO2:4)</b>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that develop out of Level 3 and provide links between the consequence(s) of the event and the wider context of the period</b>  Extends Level 3.  eg After Cuba both the USSR's and the USA's leaders realised that brinkmanship could result in nuclear war and so greater emphasis was given to dialogue and co-operation. Future crises would not be as serious.	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Developed answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b>  eg In the West Cuba was seen as a great victory for America as the USSR appeared to back down as a consequence of Kennedy's firm stance which weakened Khrushchev's position inside the Soviet Union.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b>  Answers identify consequence(s) or result(s) of the event eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• USSR withdrew nuclear weapons from Cuba</li><li>• USA withdrew missiles from Turkey</li><li>• There was a hotline</li><li>• Cuba remained Communist.</li></ul>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Identifies and describes aspect(s) of the event</b>  Answers provide detail of the event.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• USA and the USSR nearly went to war</li><li>• The USA blockaded Cuba</li></ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</b>	<b>0</b>

---

- 18** 'The main reason for the tension between East and West in Europe in the 1960s was the actions of the Soviet Union.' **16**
- How far do you agree with this statement?
- Explain your answer.
- Target** **Demonstrate knowledge and understanding to explain and analyse historical events using second order concepts (AO1:8, AO2:8)**
- Level 4** **Answers that develop out of Level 3 and evaluate the relative merits of judgement in the 'Statement'** **13-16**
- The answer demonstrates a balanced, integrated summary assessment or judgement about the merits of the issue posed in the question, supported by sustained reasoning and evidence.
- eg Candidates may arrive at the judgement that the Soviet Union was mainly to blame because of their actions in Berlin and Prague. Some say the arms race between the USA and the USSR was a bigger source of tension. However America was only spending money on expensive weapons systems to deter further Soviet aggression.
- Level 3** **Answers that argue a detailed case for the 'Statement' given and an alternative judgement(s)** **9-12**
- Answers may suggest that one assessment has greater merit.
- eg Soviet aggression was evident in the building of the Berlin Wall and in the suppression of the Prague Spring which the West saw as an attack on freedom.
- eg America was responsible for the tension in the 1960s. The spying on Russia during the Geneva talks broke down trust. America's investment in West Germany was viewed with hostility and suspicion in the USSR.
- Level 2** **Answers that argue the case for the 'Statement' or another judgement that shows detailed understanding and support** **5-8**
- Answers stating a preference for one judgement but with only simple development of another view will be marked at this level.
- eg America was responsible for the tension in the 1960s. The spying on Russia during the Geneva talks broke down trust. America's investment in West Germany was viewed with hostility and suspicion in the USSR.
- Or**

**Answers that argue simply for several points of view about the ‘Statement’**

Answers demonstrate a simple understanding.

eg

- The construction of the Berlin Wall was seen as a hostile act
- The Americans were putting missiles on Russia’s borders
- The Soviets had a bad record on human rights
- The Czechs were crushed etc.

**Level 1 Answers that describe the ‘Statement’ using basic knowledge 1-4**

Answers that provide simple points or knowledge / statements in support of the assessment or another view, describe single aspects or factual details in relation to the statement.

eg

- The Soviets built the Berlin Wall
- The West was frightened of communism.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**

Draft

**Conflict and tension in Asia, 1950–1975**

<b>19</b>	<b>Study Source K.</b>	<b>6</b>
	<p>What are the strengths and weaknesses of <b>Source K</b> in understanding the impact of Dien Bien Phu?</p> <p>Explain your answer using <b>Source K</b> and your contextual knowledge.</p>	
	<b>Target Evaluate, question and make substantiated judgements about a source (AO3b)</b>	
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>Answers evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the source</b></p> <p>Candidates will discuss the strengths and weaknesses in detail. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own contextual knowledge or the source's provenance.</p> <p>eg Candidates may explain that contextual knowledge corroborates the source as France's defeat at Dien Bien Phu was a shock; a perceived weakness may be Giap's triumphalist tone; his view was not necessarily representative of wider opinion.</p>	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>Answers that explain the strengths or weaknesses of the source</b></p> <p>Candidates may consider mainly either strengths or weaknesses. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own knowledge in context.</p> <p>eg Candidates may suggest that a weakness of the source might relate to Giap's deliberately exaggerating the importance of victory over the French, as he was taking a triumphalist tone, and he did not represent the whole Vietnamese nation.</p>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>Answers that describe the source and details from the source</b></p> <p>Answers that provide simple statements in support of the source, describe single aspects or factual details. Answers may suggest generic, undeveloped strengths and/or weaknesses for the lower part of the level.</p> <p>eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is just Giap's opinion</li> <li>• The French were defeated.</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>20</b>	<p><b>Study Sources L and M.</b></p> <p>Which source is more useful for understanding attitudes in the United States towards the Vietnam War?</p> <p>Explain your answer using your contextual knowledge and <b>Sources L and M.</b></p>	<b>10</b>
<b>Target Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)</b>		
<b>Level 5</b>	<p><b>Answers that argue a detailed case for and appreciate both sources using contextual knowledge and provenance, arriving at a substantiated judgment</b></p> <p>Developed explanations of both sources based on provenance and contextual knowledge. Answers making a substantiated judgement about the relative merits of each source will gain 10 marks.</p> <p>eg Candidates produce a balanced argument based on a detailed understanding of both sources and may explain that they are both useful because they reflect different perspectives towards the Vietnam War from a newspaper and the president. The dates may be seen as relevant.</p>	<b>9-10</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p><b>Answers that argue and explain a developed case using contextual knowledge and provenance for one source.</b></p> <p>Answers explain a preference for one source based on provenance and contextual knowledge. There may be reference to the other source.</p> <p>eg Candidates may focus on one source and explain how its provenance might reflect contemporary American attitudes and support or test this against knowledge.</p>	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>Answers that argue and explain the case for either/both sources, based on either provenance or contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>Answers show an understanding of and support for one source or both.</p> <p>eg Candidates will focus on one source and may explain how the provenance of the cartoon or Nixon’s speech may be used by historians to shed light on attitudes in America at the time.</p>	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>Answers that assert the case for either/both sources(s) based on valid identified points but give no explanation</b></p> <p>Answers show an understanding and support for one/both source(s), but the case is made by assertion/simple inference; no explanation is given.</p> <p>eg Candidates may state identified points which rely on what Nixon is suggesting about honour and/or the message of the cartoon.</p>	<b>3-4</b>

**Level 1**    **Answers that describe or paraphrase the source(s) and details from the source(s)**    **1-2**

Answers provide simple statements in support of one source, describe single aspects or factual details.

eg Candidates may simply describe details of the image from the cartoon or paraphrase parts of the written source.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question**    **0**

Draft



<b>21</b>	Explain the consequences of the UN's intervention in Korea in 1950.	<b>8</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Knowledge, understanding and explanation of the consequence(s) of a key feature of the period (AO1:4, AO2:4)</b>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that develop out of Level 3 and provide links between the consequence(s) of the event and the wider context of the period</b>  eg The UN had demonstrated that it could act decisively in defending South Korea and unlike its predecessor the League of Nations had stood up to aggression. However this only happened because Russia was boycotting the UN over its refusal to admit China and in the long run did not provide an effective mechanism for securing peace.	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Developed answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b>  eg The UN prevented the North Korean army from overrunning the South and succeeded in restoring the border around the 38 <sup>th</sup> parallel.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b>  Answers identify consequence(s) or result(s) of the event. eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the independence of South Korea was maintained</li><li>• China was threatened and entered the war</li><li>• The UN was seen as a puppet acting in America's interests.</li></ul>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Identifies and describes aspect(s) of the event</b>  Answers provide detail of the event. eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• America sent troops</li><li>• Seoul was recaptured.</li></ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>22</b>	<p>‘The main reason for the military success of the Vietcong was the support of the Vietnamese people.’</p> <p>How far do you agree with this statement?</p> <p>Explain your answer.</p>	<b>16</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding to explain and analyse historical events using second-order concepts (AO1:8, AO2:8)</b>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<p><b>Answers that develop out of Level 3 and evaluate the relative merits of judgement in the ‘Statement’</b></p> <p>The answer demonstrates a balanced, integrated summary assessment or judgement about the merits of the issue posed in the question, supported by sustained reasoning and evidence.</p> <p>eg Candidates may arrive at the judgement that the Vietnam War was ultimately a battle for hearts and minds, and the Vietcong were better at winning the support of the Vietnamese people, whereas the South and the Americans were good at alienating people...</p>	<b>13-16</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>Answers that argue a detailed case for the ‘Statement’ given and an alternative judgement(s)</b></p> <p>eg The Vietcong were seen as liberators by the South Vietnamese people who helped them. The Vietcong were disciplined and they respected the peasants and helped them with farming and education; they were on their side against the landlords and the corrupt Diem government.</p> <p>The Americans could not defeat the Vietcong because the environment was perfect for guerrilla warfare. The Americans suffered heavy losses and could not locate their enemy due to their tunnels and merging with the peasantry.</p>	<b>9-12</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>Answers that argue the case for the ‘Statement’ or another judgement that shows detailed understanding and support</b></p> <p>eg The Vietcong were seen as liberators by the Vietnamese people who helped them. The Vietcong were disciplined and they respected the peasants and helped them with farming and education; they were on their side against the landlords and the corrupt Diem government.</p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Answers that argue simply for several points of view about the ‘Statement’</b></p> <p>Answers demonstrate a simple understanding.</p>	<b>5-8</b>

eg

- The Vietcong were seen as liberators by the South Vietnamese peasants
- The South Vietnamese government was seen as corrupt by the peasants
- American tactics turned the Vietnamese people against them.

**Level 1 Answers that describe the 'Statement' using basic knowledge**

**1-4**

Answers that provide simple points or knowledge/statements in support of the assessment or another view, describe single aspects or factual details in relation to the statement.

eg

- The Vietcong used guerrilla warfare
- They were backed by China and Russia.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question**

**0**

Draft

**Conflict and tension, 1990–2009**

<b>23</b>	<b>Study Source N.</b>	<b>6</b>
	What are the strengths and weaknesses of <b>Source N</b> in understanding the reasons for war against the Taliban?	
	Explain your answer using <b>Source N</b> and your contextual knowledge	
	<b>Target Evaluate, question and make substantiated judgements about a source (AO3b)</b>	
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Answers evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the source</b> Candidates will discuss the strengths and weaknesses in detail. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own contextual knowledge or the source's provenance.  eg Candidates may explain that knowledge of the context supports the source – ie Taliban activities in Afghanistan; a weakness might be Karzai's personal and political motives in presenting his anti-Taliban sentiments in this way.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that explain the strengths or weaknesses of the source</b> Candidates may consider mainly either strengths or weaknesses. Candidates will evaluate, test and challenge the source using their own knowledge in context.  eg Candidates may suggest that a weakness of the source might relate to the context, the role of Karzai and his reasons at that time for deliberately highlighting his personal and political anti-Taliban sentiments.	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Answers that describe the source and details from the source</b> Answers that provide simple statements in support of the source, describe single aspects or factual details. Answers may suggest generic, undeveloped strengths and/or weaknesses for the lower part of the level.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is just Karzai's point of view</li> <li>• The Taliban were violent.</li> </ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>24</b>	Study <b>Sources O</b> and <b>P</b> .	<b>10</b>
	Which source is more useful for understanding American attitudes towards the invasion of Iraq in 2003?	
	Explain your answer using <b>Sources O</b> and <b>P</b> and your contextual knowledge.	
	<b>Target</b>	<b>Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<b>Answers that argue a detailed case for and appreciate both sources using contextual knowledge and provenance, arriving at a substantiated judgement</b> Developed explanations of both sources based on provenance and contextual knowledge.  eg Candidates produce a balanced argument based on a detailed understanding of both sources and may explain that they are both useful because they reflect both official and critical attitudes related to the reasons for the invasion in 2003.	<b>9-10</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain a developed case for using contextual knowledge and provenance for one source.</b> Answers explain a preference for one source based on provenance and contextual knowledge. There may be reference to the other source.  eg Candidates may focus on one source and explain how its provenance or tone (eg the irony and critical nature of the cartoon) might reflect contemporary American attitudes and supports or tests this against knowledge of opposition to Bush.	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Answers that argue and explain the case for either/both sources, based on either provenance or contextual knowledge</b> Answers show an understanding of and support for one source or both  eg Candidates will focus on one source and may explain how the provenance of the cartoon or the Bush source may be used by historians to shed light on support/opposition to invading Iraq in 2003.	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Answers that assert the case for either/both sources(s) based on valid identified points but give no explanation</b> Answers show an understanding and support for one/both source(s), but the case is made by assertion/simple inference; no explanation is given.  eg Candidates may state identified points which rely on inference about what Bush is suggesting and/or the message of the cartoon.	<b>3-4</b>

**Level 1**    **Answers that describe or paraphrase the source(s) and details from the source(s)**    **1-2**

Answers provide simple statements in support of one source, describe single aspects or factual details.

eg Candidates may simply describe details of the image from the cartoon or paraphrase parts of the written source.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question**    **0**

Draft

<b>25</b>	Explain the consequences of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990.	<b>8</b>
<b>Target</b>	<b>Knowledge, understanding and explanation of the consequence(s) of a key feature of the period (AO1:4, AO2:4)</b>	
<b>Level 4</b>	<b>Answers that develop out of level 3 and provide links between the consequence(s) of the event and the wider context of the period</b>  eg The biggest consequence was perception of Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi leadership in the west. Tensions between Iraq and America continued leading to the second Gulf war in 2003...	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Developed answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b>  eg Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait was unanimously condemned by all major world powers. The UN Security Council even passed Resolution 660 condemning the Iraqi invasion. The USA eventually led a coalition to liberate Kuwait...	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple answer about the consequence(s) of the event</b> Answers identify consequence(s) or result(s) of the event.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Kuwait was annexed by Iraq</li><li>• UN sanctions imposed on Iraq</li><li>• America launched Desert Storm to liberate Kuwait</li><li>• Saddam Hussein was seen as an aggressor.</li></ul>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Identifies and describes aspect(s) of the event</b> Answers provide detail of the event.  eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Saddam Hussein was blamed</li><li>• Iraq was attacked by America.</li></ul>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

- 26 ‘The main reason for opposition to the invasion of Iraq in 2003 was the absence of a UN mandate.’ **16**
- How far do you agree with this statement?
- Explain your answer.
- Target Demonstrate knowledge and understanding to explain and analyse historical events using second order concepts (AO1:8, AO2:8)**
- Level 4 Answers that develop out of level 3 and evaluate the relative merits of judgement in the ‘Statement’** **13-16**
- The answer demonstrates a balanced, integrated summary assessment or judgement about the merits of the issue posed in the question, supported by sustained reasoning and evidence.
- eg Candidates may arrive at the judgement that the readiness of the US/UK coalition to act without a UN resolution fuelled the impression that they were not looking for a peaceful resolution and trying to exaggerate the threat posed by Iraq for their own interests.
- Level 3 Answers that argue a detailed case for the ‘Statement’ given and an alternative judgement(s)** **9-12**
- Answers may suggest that one assessment has greater merit.
- eg The United Nations did not pass a specific resolution authorising the invasion. Kofi Annan later said the war was illegal and Robin Cook resigned from the British Government in protest.
- During the lead-up to the war and the aftermath of the invasion, many critics questioned the claims that Iraq had been developing weapons of mass destruction. Scott Ritter, a former UN weapons inspector argued that inspections had eliminated the nuclear and chemical weapons programs. The British Government was accused of creating a ‘dodgy dossier’ to justify intervention.
- Level 2 Answers that argue the case for the ‘Statement’ or another judgement that shows detailed understanding and support** **5-8**
- Answers stating a preference for one judgement but with only simple development of another view will be marked at this level.
- eg The United Nations did not pass a specific resolution authorising the invasion. Kofi Annan later said the war was illegal and Robin Cook resigned from the British government in protest...
- Or**



**Answers that argue simply for several points of view about the 'Statement'**

Answers demonstrate a simple understanding.

eg

- There was inconclusive evidence about Iraq's weapons
- Questions about the legality of the invasion
- Human casualties
- Financial costs.

**Level 1    Answers that describe the 'Statement' using basic knowledge    1-4**

Answers that provide simple points or knowledge/statements in support of the assessment or another view, describe single aspects or factual details in relation to the statement.

eg

- Iraq did not have WMD
- People were opposed to war.

**Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.    0**

Draft

Draft