



GCSE

HISTORY

8145/1B/B

Paper 1B/B: Conflict and tension: the inter-war years, 1918–1939

Mark scheme

Additional Specimen Material

Version E1

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

Copyright © 2018 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

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 and grammar (SPaG)

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in question 04.

	Performance descriptor	Marks awarded
High performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate 	4 marks
Intermediate performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate 	2–3 marks
Threshold performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate 	1 mark
No marks awarded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learner writes nothing • The learner’s response does not relate to the question • The learner’s achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning 	0 marks

Question 04 is an extended response question. They give students the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	1
---	---

Source A is critical of the League of Nations. How do you know?

Explain your answer using **Source A** and your contextual knowledge.

[4 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target

Analyse individual interpretations (AO4a)
Analyse how interpretations of a key feature of a period differ (AO4b)

Level 2: Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance **3–4**

Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source.

For example, the League was depicted as greedy capitalists exploiting the poor at their feet; the League was a club for capitalists as implied by the legend in the cartoon; as the Soviets were communist and had been left out of the League, it was the enemy of capitalism.

Level 1: Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance **1–2**

Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the League is represented as Capitalists with figures of rich and greedy businessmen; it was published by the Soviets and therefore the cartoon was anti-League.

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

0	2
---	---

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** to an historian studying the Abyssinian Crisis?

Explain your answer using **Sources B** and **C** and your contextual knowledge.

[4 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target **Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**
Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)

In analysing and evaluating sources, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4: **Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance** **10–12**

Students may progress from a developed evaluation of the sources by complex reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and provenance. They may evaluate the relationship between the sources based on analysis of provenance and contextual knowledge.

For example, taken together, the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes to the League's inaction; but answers might also recognise limitations arising from provenance as Source C shows a politician making a speech, trying to justify not taking action against Italy at a time when they were planning to give part of Abyssinia away to Mussolini (the Hoare Laval Pact). In assessing utility students may observe (eg) that Source B has greater value as the authorship was British and it is making fun of Britain's weakness – their 'mild disapproval' was not 'awful' at all as the cartoonist knows. This is supported by the fact that all Britain and France were doing was to keep Mussolini as a potential ally against Germany.

Level 3: **Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance** **7–9**

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, they may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how Source B is useful because it was part of the popular press coverage before Mussolini invaded Abyssinia. It is making fun of how weak the French and British are as all they will do is issue a warning. It is sarcastic about how 'awful' this would be and suggests that little was being done to stop Mussolini taking military action. Source C revealed doubts that Britain could do very much and it appears that the British Foreign minister is trying to justify inaction.

Level 2: Simple evaluation of source(s) based on content and/or provenance 4–6

Students may progress from a basic analysis of the source(s) to simple evaluation of the content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B is useful because it shows how the British saw the League as weak because all it promises to do is to protest against Mussolini if he went to war.

For example Hoare is apologising for the League's inaction and this may be used to shed light on how weak it had become by 1935.

Level 1: Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example Hoare is suggesting that the League cannot do anything to help very much; the message of the cartoon is that all the League will do is issue a protest.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

0	3
---	---

Write an account of how problems relating to the Sudetenland led to an international crisis in 1938.

[8 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target **Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)**
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)

Level 4: **Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question** **7–8**

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and /or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.

For example, analysis of the different stages of the crisis which was initiated because Hitler gave support to the Sudeten Germans. This was dangerous because France's alliance with Czechoslovakia might have meant war if Germany decided to annex the disputed land. France was even more worried by recent events such as the Anschluss. Chamberlain went to visit Hitler twice and each time his demands increased. At first Hitler agreed to a plebiscite then argued that he wanted the Sudetenland handing over. It caused panic in Europe with war preparations being undertaken.

Much depended on whether or not Chamberlain could persuade France to agree in order to pursue appeasement and avoid war. The conference at Munich averted conflict when Britain persuaded France and Czechoslovakia to agree to the transfer of the Sudetenland to Germany.

Level 3: Developed analysis of causation/consequence **5–6**
Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example, when Hitler announced support for the Sudeten Germans, there was potential for war because France had an alliance with Czechoslovakia and might go to war if the Sudetenland was taken. Also, there were many concerns about the threat from Germany which already broken the Treaty of Versailles. War was avoided at the Munich conference where Britain and France agreed to hand over the Sudetenland to Hitler.

Level 2: Simple analysis of causation/consequence **3–4**
Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, riots broke out in the Sudetenland as the Germans there wanted independence. Hitler said he would support them and he started to demand that the Sudetenland should join with Germany. Britain and France might not agree. To avoid war, Hitler gained the land he wanted at the Munich conference.

Level 1: Basic analysis of causation/consequence **1–2**
Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the fact that Hitler was demanding the Sudetenland should be handed over to Germany and it looked as if there might be war.

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

Question 04 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	4
---	---

'The main reason why Germany hated the Treaty of Versailles was because of its military terms.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

[16 marks]
[SPaG 4 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target **Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)**
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)

Level 4: **Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement** **13–16**
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a sustained judgement.

This might be related, for example, to the way reasons interacted and how the Germans measured the impact of terms after the war. Certainly the military terms were a source of resentment for a section of the German public such as nationalists. But the reparations terms had more impact on a wider population and their effects were longer lasting, hence prolonging the bitterness of the peace. This went beyond the 'blank cheque' idea and encompassed the humiliation of hyperinflation and the Ruhr invasion because of default on payments. Land losses were linked to this because they made it harder to pay off reparations – so are linked.

Overall, reparations might be seen as more damaging over a longer time period and were hated by a larger section of the population because of the poverty and starvation which accompanied them.

Level 3: Developed explanation of the stated factor and other factor(s) 9–12
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding
that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a developed, sustained line of reasoning which has coherence and logical structure; it is well substantiated, and with sustained, explicit relevance.

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

Students may progress from a simple explanation of causation with developed reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, other factors were also hated not only for their severity but also because they caused lasting bitterness. Land losses included the splitting of Germany in two because of the Polish Corridor; this was seen as unfair. Some land losses included economically valuable land such as the Saar granted to France for mining its coal for 15 years. Germans were also denied self-determination – Anschluss was banned and many Germans found themselves living outside their homeland. Reparations were hated because not only was the final figure not decided when the Germans were forced to sign the Treaty but also because they were seen as impossible to pay and the product of Allied attempts to ruin the German people and reduce them to poverty.

Students may additionally argue for the stated factors and rehearse the view that Germany was deliberately rendered defenceless against well-armed neighbours. But they might add that German militarism had been a source of particular pride before the war, so this represented another ploy to humiliate Germany and reduce its status in the world.

Level 2: Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s) 5–8
Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is
relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

Students may progress from a basic explanation of causation by simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the military terms were hated because Germany was left weak and defenceless, surrounded by armed neighbours. This was made worse because Germany was denied modern weapons such as tanks and military aircraft as well as only having an army of 100,000 men. Other terms were also hated because of the severity of the land losses and reparations payments.

Level 1: Basic explanation of one or more factors **1–4**
Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a basic line of reasoning, which is coherent, structured with some substantiation; the relevance might be implicit.

Students recognise and provide a basic explanation of one or more factors.

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as, Germans hated having a small and weak army.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, Germans hated many other terms of the Treaty such as losses of land and reparations.

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

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

Performance descriptor	Marks awarded
High performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate 	4 marks
Intermediate performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate 	2–3 marks
Threshold performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate 	1 mark
No marks awarded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learner writes nothing • The learner’s response does not relate to the question • The learner’s achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning 	0 marks