



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

General Certificate of Secondary Education
June 2011

GCSE History
Specification B

**Unit 1 International Relations: Conflict and
Peace in the Twentieth Century**

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

HISTORY SPECIFICATION B

A: INTRODUCTION

- **Consistency of Marking**

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a choice of specifications and a choice of options within them. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply this marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of all the other History specifications and options offered by the AQA.

- **Subject Content**

The revised specification addresses subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages all candidates, but particularly the more able, to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

- **The Assessment Objectives (AOs)**

| Assessment Objectives | | % weighting |
|-----------------------|--|-------------|
| AO1 | Recall, select and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history | 32.5 |
| AO2 | Demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key concepts: causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context • key features and characteristics of the periods studied and the relationship between them | 32.5 |
| AO3 | Understand, analyse and evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of source material as part of an historical enquiry • how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways as part of an historical enquiry | 35 |

- **Levels of Response Marking Schemes**

The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History. All candidates take a common examination paper – there is no tiering. Consequently, it is reasonable to expect to encounter the full range of attainment and this marking scheme has been designed to differentiate candidates' attainment by **outcome** and to reward **positively** what the candidates know, understand and can do.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall and in deciding on a mark within that particular level.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. This mark scheme provides the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in a subject like History, which in part relies upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content.

B: QUESTION TARGETS & LEVELS OF RESPONSE

- **Question Targets**

The mark scheme for each question is prefaced by an assessment objective ‘target’. This is an indication of the skill which it is expected candidates will use in answering the question and is directly based on the relevant assessment objectives. However, it does not mean that other answers which have merit will not be rewarded.

- **Identification of Levels of Response**

There are several ways in which any question can be answered – in a simple way by less able candidates and in more sophisticated ways by candidates of greater ability. In the marking scheme different types of answers will be identified and will be arranged in a series of levels of response.

Levels of response have been identified on the basis that the full range of candidates entered for the GCSE examination will be able to respond positively. Each ‘level’ therefore represents a stage in the development of the candidate’s **quality of thinking**, and, as such, recognition by the assistant examiner of the relative differences between each level descriptor is of paramount importance.

- **Placing an answer within a Level**

When marking each part of each question, examiners must first place the answer in a particular level and then, and only then, decide on the actual mark within the level, which should be recorded. **The level of response attained should also be indicated at the end of each answer.** In most cases, it will be helpful to annotate the answer by noting in the margin where a particular level has been reached, e.g. Level 1 may have been reached on line 1, L3 on line 5 and L1 again on line 7. When the whole answer has been read and annotated in this way, the highest of the Levels **clearly attained** and **sustained** should be awarded. Remember that it is often possible to reach the highest level **without** going through the lower levels. Marks are **not cumulative** for any question. There should be no ‘totting up’ of points made which are then converted into marks. Examiners should feel free to comment on part of any answer if it explains why a particular level has been awarded rather than one lower or higher. Such comments can be of assistance when the script is looked at later in the awarding process.

If an answer seems to fit into two or more levels, award the higher or highest level.

- **What is a sustained response?**

By a **sustained response**, we mean that the candidate has **applied** the appropriate level of thought to the **particular issues** in the sub-question.

A response does not necessarily have to be sustained throughout the whole answer, but an answer in which merely a few words seem to show a fleeting recognition of historical complexity is not sufficient to attain a higher level.

In some cases, as you read an answer to a sub-question, it will be clear that particular levels have been reached at certain points in the answer. If so, remember

to identify them as you proceed. At the end of the sub-question, award the highest level that has been sustained.

In other cases you may reach the end of the sub-question without having been able to pinpoint a level. In such cases, simply record the level awarded at the end of the sub-question.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

A particular level of response may cover a range of marks. Therefore, in making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the **lower/lowest mark within the level**.

In giving more credit with the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. At all times, therefore, examiners should be prepared to use **the full range of marks** available for a particular level and for a particular question. Remember – mark **positively** at all times.

Consider whether the answer is:

- precise in its use of supporting factual information.
- appropriately detailed.
- factually accurate.
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others.
- set in the historical context as appropriate to the question.
- displaying appropriate **quality of written communication skills**.

Note about Indicative Content.

The mark scheme provides **examples of historical content** (indicative content) which candidates may deploy in support of an answer within a particular level. Do bear in mind that these are **only examples**; exhaustive lists of content are not provided so examiners might expect some candidates to deploy alternative information to support their answers.

This indicative content must **not** however determine the level into which an answer is placed; **the candidate’s level of critical thinking determines this**. Remember that the **number** of points made by a candidate may be taken into account only **after** a decision has been taken about the quality (level) of the response.

• Some things to remember

Mark positively at all times.

Do **not** be afraid to award maximum marks within a level where it is possible to do so. Do not fail to give a maximum mark to an appropriate answer because you can think of something (or the marking scheme indicates something) that **might** be included but which is missing from the particular response.

Do **not** think in terms of a model answer to the question. Every question should be marked on its merits.

As a general rule, give credit for what is accurate, correct or valid.

Obviously, **errors can be given no credit** but, at the same time, the existence of an error should not prejudice you against the rest of what could be a perfectly valid answer.

It is important, therefore, to use the full range of marks where appropriate.

Do not use half marks.

D: SOME PRACTICAL POINTS

- **Answers in note form**

Answers in note form to any question should be credited in so far as the candidate's meaning is communicated. You must not try to read things into what has been written.

- **Diagrams, etc**

Credit should be given for information provided by the candidates in diagrams, tables, maps etc., provided that it has not already been credited in another form.

- **Answers which run on to another sub-section**

If a candidate starts to answer the next sub-section in an earlier one, by simply running the answer on, give credit for that material in the appropriate sub-section.

- **Answers which do not fit the marking scheme**

Inevitably, some answers will not fit the marking scheme but may legitimately be seen as worthy of credit. Assess such answers in terms of the difficulty/sophistication of the thought involved. If it is believed that the "thought level" equates with one of the levels in the marking scheme, award it a corresponding mark.

Make sure you identify such cases and write a brief comment to explain why this alternative has been awarded.

If in doubt, **always** telephone your Team Leader for advice.

Paper 1: International Relations: Conflict and Peace in the Twentieth Century

- 0 1** In 1908 Austria-Hungary annexed the Slav state of Bosnia from Turkey. **4**
Describe the Bosnian Crisis, 1908-1909, which followed this annexation.
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 1 and 2)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. **0**
- MARK GENEROUSLY**
- Level 1: Basic description** **1**
Any general relevant comment.
e.g. it led to a crisis which involved: Serbia; Russia; Germany (gives any correct power with A/H or Turkey) etc.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-3**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. develops one of the following:
the annexation – end of Turkish Empire – why A/H carried it out;
relationship between Serbia and Russia – effect of annexation on them;
attitude of Germany and its effect;
answers may refer to crisis of 1914 – reward these if they are made relevant to 1908.
One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks)
Two for 3 marks.
- OR**
Limited description of a wider range of aspects
e.g. outline description of A/H and the Bosnian Crisis.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **4**
e.g. at least **two** of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.
OR three accurate ideas on any point(s)

| | | |
|------------|---|------------|
| 0 2 | Study Source A. | 6 |
| | <p>Source A suggests that Kaiser Wilhelm II's main aim in his foreign policy was to stay friendly with Britain.</p> <p>Do you agree that this was the Kaiser's main aim in his foreign policy?</p> <p>Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your knowledge.</p> | |
| | <p>Target: Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO 1,2 & 3)</p> <p>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Level 1: General response relying on source or learned response.</p> <p>e.g. Kaiser caused the First World War so he could not have wanted peace. Kaiser said it so it must be true – in a newspaper so it could be wrong. The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Level 2: Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/ gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about.</p> <p>e.g. shows awareness of Kaiser Wilhelm's policies at a simple level – he did not ally with GB – he built a navy – he went to war with GB in 1914 etc. OR simple comments on the provenance: an interview in a British newspaper therefore Kaiser may not have meant it or he may have been tricked by the interviewer etc.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.</p> | 2-3 |
| | <p>Level 3: Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge</p> <p>e.g.</p> <p>EITHER</p> <p>Evaluation of provenance of source: interview was in Britain so Kaiser was trying to give a good impression of himself, trying to explain his policies to the British people and prevent their hostility – could refer to date 1908 as one of the critical dates in the naval rivalry.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Shows some understanding of the Kaiser's character or policies by reference to German foreign policy – Morocco; naval rivalry; attack on Belgium etc. to agree or disagree with the interpretation.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.</p> | 4-5 |
| | <p>Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion</p> <p>Both parts of Level 3.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.</p> | 6 |

- 0 3** Which of these reasons was more responsible for the outbreak of the First World War in 1914: **10**
- the alliance systems that existed in 1914
 - the use of the Schlieffen Plan in 1914?

You must refer to both reasons when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 1 and 2)

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

Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason. 1-2

e.g. there were two rival alliances in 1914 which fought each other.

The Schlieffen Plan was the German plan for war in 1914.

MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

Level 2: EITHER 3-6

Develops one cause

This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.

e.g. explanations could cover why the alliances opposed each other; why they had been formed and developed.

Assesses the effect of the alliances on the outbreak of war – could be an assessment of the role of the alliances after the assassination – how they brought Europe to war.

Explains the importance of the Schlieffen Plan – why Germany used the plan in 1914, avoid 2 front war etc;

Assesses how it led to the extension of the war in Europe – why it brought GB into the war, sanctity of treaties, proximity to Great Britain, coastline etc .

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument. 7-9

e.g. assesses the part played by the alliances in the outbreak of war and explains the Schlieffen Plan.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question. 10

e.g. assesses both parts in depth with a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| 0 4 | <p>In January 1918 President Woodrow Wilson of the USA published the Fourteen Points which were his aims for peace. Describe the main features of the Fourteen Points.</p> | 4 |
| | <p>Target: Description of key features and characteristics Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> | 0 |
| | MARK GENEROUSLY | |
| | <p>Level 1: Basic description. Any general, relevant comment. e.g. they aimed to bring about a fair peace etc.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Level 2: EITHER Detailed description of limited aspects e.g. covers one of the following: develops any one of the Fourteen Points such as the League of Nations, self determination; the attitude of other countries (GB, Germany and France) to them etc. One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks) Two for 3 marks.</p> <p>OR Limited description of a wider range of aspects e.g. outline description of the Fourteen Points or their contents in general terms.</p> | 2-3 |
| | <p>Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects e.g. at least two of the points developed OR three accurate ideas on any point(s)</p> | 4 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 0 5 Study Source B | 6 |
| Source B suggests that the main result of the Treaty of Versailles was the destruction of Germany. | |
| Do you agree? | |
| Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your knowledge. | |
| Target: | 0 |
| Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion | |
| Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. | |
| Level 1: | 1 |
| General response relying on source or learned response. | |
| e.g. France did want to destroy Germany; Source German therefore biased. | |
| The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development. | |
| Level 2: | 2-3 |
| Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/ gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about. | |
| e.g. shows awareness of what happened to Germany in general terms – Germany was not destroyed, remained but with less land – was destroyed by reparations with no development etc. | |
| OR simple comments on the provenance: German cartoon, meant to be funny, not serious, biased because Germans hated Versailles etc. | |
| The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner. | |
| Level 3: | 4-5 |
| Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge | |
| e.g. | |
| EITHER | |
| Evaluation of provenance of source: German therefore trying to evoke sympathy after the treatment of Germany in the Treaty; reflecting German antipathy towards the French supported by cartoon (guillotine, Clemenceau etc.). | |
| OR | |
| Uses any specific knowledge of the peace settlement which is explained to support or reject the idea that Germany had been destroyed by it (Diktat; war guilt; reparations; military settlement; details of land lost etc.). Could comment on the role of Wilson and/or Lloyd George, relate to aims of Clemenceau, Wilson and Lloyd George. | |
| The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used. | |
| Level 4: | 6 |
| Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion | |
| Both parts of Level 3. | |
| The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively. | |

- 0 6** Which of the following reasons was more responsible for the failure of the League of Nations: **10**
- the absence of the USA from the League
 - the actions of Britain and France during the Abyssinian Crisis 1935-1936?

You must refer to both reasons when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 1 and 2)

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

Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason. **1-2**
 e.g. the USA never joined the League; USA was a strong country etc.;
 GB and France did not support the League in the crisis.
MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

Level 2: EITHER **3-6**
Develops one cause

This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.

e.g. explanations could cover why the USA did not join; why lack of the power of the USA weakened the League's sanctions etc.

Assesses the effect of the absence of the USA on the failure of the League – could not enforce its decisions because the only permanent members were GB and France and they were weakened by war and then Wall St Crash etc.

Explains how/why GB and France were reluctant to act against Mussolini.

Assesses how this failure to act over Abyssinia discredited the League and led to its failure – could use the hypocrisy of GB and France or their betrayal of the League and its policy of sanctions by the Hoare Laval Pact.

NB – both parts could overlap – must allow reward for both.

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument. 7-9

e.g. assesses the part played by the absence of the USA in the failure of the League and explains the actions of GB and France in the crisis.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question. 10

e.g. assesses both parts in depth with a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

- 0 7** In 1934 Hitler signed an agreement with Poland and in 1935 he signed a naval agreement with Britain. **4**
Describe the main features of these two agreements.

Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 1 and 2)

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

MARK GENEROUSLY

Level 1: Basic description. **1**

Any general, relevant comment.

e.g. Hitler recognised Poland or agreed to limit the size of his navy.

Both these examples would be L2 even though they are general.

Level 2: EITHER **2-3**

Detailed description of limited aspects

e.g. develops one of the following:

a non aggression treaty with Poland – Hitler accepted Polish Corridor – peaceful solution to eastern frontier of Germany etc.

Terms of naval treaty: 35% of British navy; no submarines etc.

Effects of the two agreements on Germany, GB and Poland e.g. Hitler believed GB had accepted re-armament of Germany etc.

One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks)

Two for 3 marks.

Allow as L2 ideas the following as separate points:

- 10 year pact
- Non aggression pact
- German fleet being limited compared to Great Britain's fleet
- 34% or 1/3

OR

Limited description of a wider range of aspects

e.g. outline description of both agreements.

Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects **4**

e.g. at least **two** of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.

Must refer to both agreements for this level.

OR **three** accurate ideas answering both points.

| | | |
|------------|---|------------|
| 0 8 | <p>Study Source C.</p> <p>Source C gives one reason why Britain did not oppose Hitler's remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936.</p> <p>Do you agree that this was the main reason?</p> <p>Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your knowledge.</p> | 6 |
| | <p>Target: Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO 1,2 & 3)</p> | |
| | <p>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Level 1: General response relying on source or learned response.</p> <p>e.g. Rhineland was German so Hitler was only marching into his own country; Source from a British politician so he will know the reason.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Level 2: Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/ gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about.</p> <p>e.g. shows awareness in general terms of why GB did not act by referring to such things as fear of war, injustice of Versailles etc but with little explanation. OR simple comments on the provenance: a British politician speaking at the time – explaining reality of situation etc.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.</p> | 2-3 |
| | <p>Level 3: Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge</p> <p>e.g.</p> <p>EITHER</p> <p>Evaluation of provenance of source: trying to excuse GB's failure to support Versailles, League of Nations etc.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Develops ideas of why Britain ignored the remilitarisation: distracted by Abyssinian Crisis; legitimacy of Hitler's action; why GB did not want a war etc. to agree or disagree with the interpretation.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.</p> | 4-5 |
| | <p>Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion</p> <p>Both parts of Level 3.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.</p> | 6 |

- 0 9** Which was more important as a cause of the Second World War: **10**
- Hitler's aims in foreign policy
 - Neville Chamberlain's policy of appeasement 1938-1939?

You must refer to both causes when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 1 and 2)

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

Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason. 1-2

e.g. Chamberlain gave in to Hitler to avoid war.

Hitler wanted lebensraum which was bound to lead to war.

MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

Level 2: EITHER 3-6

Develops one cause

This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.

e.g. explanations could cover why Hitler's aims could lead to war – nature of his aims and how they would cause opposition e.g. lebensraum.

Assesses how Hitler's aims caused the war – reference to March 1939 and September 1939 – flexibility of Hitler's aims – Nazi Soviet Pact etc.

Explains why Chamberlain followed a policy of appeasement etc.

Assesses the effect of appeasement on the outbreak of war – could be an assessment of the encouragement it gave to Hitler by not opposing Anschluss and at Munich – impression that Munich gave Hitler of Chamberlain etc.

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument. 7-9

e.g. assesses the part played by appeasement in the outbreak of war and explains Hitler's aims in foreign policy.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question. 10

e.g. assesses both parts in depth with a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

- 1 0** In February 1945, the leaders of the USA, the USSR and Britain met at Yalta to decide what to do with Germany when the Second World War was over. Describe what was decided about Germany at the Yalta Conference. **4**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 1 and 2)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. **0**
- MARK GENEROUSLY**
- Level 1: Basic description.** **1**
Any general, relevant comment.
e.g. Germany was divided up.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-3**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. develops one of the following:
the nature of the division of Germany and Berlin into 4 zones.
Decisions on war criminals and reparations etc.
Decisions re eastern Europe – free elections etc.
One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks)
Two for 3 marks.
- Accept the following as separate ideas:
- Germany split into 4 divisions/ zones/ sectors
 - Berlin split into 4 divisions/ zones/ sectors
 - Identity of occupying powers: USA/ USSR/ GB/ France
- OR**
Limited description of a wider range of aspects
e.g. outline description of the decisions made at Yalta.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **4**
e.g. at least **two** of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.
OR three accurate ideas on any point(s)

| | | |
|------------|---|------------|
| 1 1 | <p>Study Source D.</p> <p>Source D suggests that the USA was trying to take over North Korea during the Korean War.</p> <p>Do you agree that this was the main reason why the USA took part in the Korean War? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your knowledge.</p> | 6 |
| | <p>Target: Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO 1,2 & 3)</p> | |
| | <p>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Level 1: General response relying on source or learned response. e.g. The USA sent troops to Korea and invaded North Korea; a Soviet source therefore biased. The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Level 2: Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/ gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about. e.g. shows general knowledge of why the US sent forces to Korea – acting for UN – defending S Korea from an attack by N Korea, but little explanation. OR simple comments on the provenance: from a book published in Moscow by a Soviet therefore would be opposing the USA.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.</p> | 2-3 |
| | <p>Level 3: Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge e.g. EITHER Evaluation of provenance of source: disparaging the USA during the Cold War – nature of Soviet state, censorship etc. OR Uses knowledge of the US intervention to agree or disagree with source - reasons for intervention, role of UN; role of US troops; MacArthur’s advance into N Korea, Truman’s response etc.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.</p> | 4-5 |
| | <p>Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion Both parts of Level 3.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.</p> | 6 |

- 1 2** Which was more important in causing the Cold War: **10**
- the Soviet expansion in East Europe, 1945-1948
 - the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, 1947?

You must refer to both causes when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 1 and 2)

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

Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason. **1-2**

e.g. USSR took over many countries in East Europe and made them communist which annoyed the USA.

The Marshall Plan gave money to West Europe and not to East.

MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

Level 2: EITHER **3-6**

Develops one cause

This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.

e.g. explanations could cover the methods used by USSR to spread communism in East Europe and why this annoyed the USA; why Stalin wanted a communist barrier etc.

Assesses the effect of this on the start of the Cold War – betrayal of Potsdam - the fears of the USA – why they responded – how they responded etc.

Explains the nature and purpose of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan;

Assesses the effect of this on Stalin – his fear of ‘dollar imperialism’ – his response, Cominform, Berlin Blockade, start of Cold War?

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument. 7-9

e.g. assesses the part played by the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan in causing the Cold War and explaining the part played by Soviet expansion.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question. 10

e.g. assesses both parts in depth with a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

-
- 1 3** In 1968 Alexander Dubcek, the leader of the Czech Communist Party, introduced reforms, known as the Prague Spring, in Czechoslovakia. **4**
Describe how Brezhnev and the Soviet Union responded to the Prague Spring.
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 1 and 2)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. **0**
- MARK GENEROUSLY**
- Level 1: Basic description.** **1**
Any general, relevant comment.
e.g. USSR sent in tanks.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-3**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. develops one of the following:
nature of the Prague Spring and why Brezhnev opposed it – attempts to persuade Dubcek.
Invasion of Czechoslovakia and Czech response etc.
Results – fate of Dubcek, Brezhnev Doctrine etc.
One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks)
Two for 3 marks.
- OR**
Limited description of a wider range of aspects
e.g. outline description of the reforms/intervention.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **4**
e.g. at least **two** of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.
OR three accurate ideas on any point(s).
-

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| 1 4 | Study Source E. Source E claims that the launching of Sputnik 1 showed that communist USSR was more powerful than capitalist USA. Do you agree with this view of the importance of the launching of Sputnik 1? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your knowledge. | 6 |
| | Target: Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO 1,2 & 3) Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. | 0 |
| | Level 1: General response relying on source or learned response. e.g. Sputnik was the first, so they were ahead of the USA; Source Soviet therefore biased. The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development. | 1 |
| | Level 2: Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/ gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about. e.g. shows awareness of the importance of sputnik and how the USA had appeared to be ahead previously, or points out that that they were soon able to catch up. OR simple comments on the provenance: by the Soviet leader and reported in a Soviet newspaper to explain bias etc. The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner. | 2-3 |
| | Level 3: Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge e.g. EITHER Evaluation of provenance of source: trying to emphasise the achievements of the USSR and communism during the Cold War and boost Soviet morale; could it have been exaggerated by Khrushchev or Pravda – considers audience for source? OR Uses knowledge to show understanding of the place of the launching of sputnik in the arms race and space race etc. Could refer to events before or after 1957 to support or reject interpretation. The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used. | 4-5 |
| | Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion Both parts of Level 3. The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively. | 6 |

- 1 5 Which of the following was the greater threat to world peace: 10
- the U2 Crisis, 1960
 - the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962?

You must refer to both crises when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 1 and 2)

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

Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason. 1-2

e.g. the U2 crisis was a danger because the USSR shot down an American spy plane/ because the USA were proved to be spying on the USSR.

The Cuban Missile Crisis nearly led to nuclear war between USA and USSR.
MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

Level 2: EITHER 3-6

Develops one cause

This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.

e.g. explanations could cover American reaction to the shooting down of the U2, Khrushchev's demands and Eisenhower's refusal to apologise etc.

Assesses the effect of the crisis on peace – could explain how it ended the policy of peaceful co-existence; effect on Paris Summit etc.

Explains Khrushchev's reasons for putting the missiles on Cuba – explains the danger of these to the USA /or the American response.

Assesses the possibility of nuclear war and the possible results of the crisis.

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument. 7-9

e.g. assesses the threat to peace posed by the missile crisis and explains the U2 Crisis.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question. 10

e.g. assesses both parts in depth with a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

- 1 6** In 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev became the leader of the USSR. **4**
Describe the policies of Glasnost and Perestroika introduced by Gorbachev.
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO 1 and 2)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. **0**
- MARK GENEROUSLY**
- Level 1: Basic description.** **1**
Any general, relevant comment.
e.g. they were attempts to change communism in USSR.
- Level 2: EITHER** **2-3**
Detailed description of limited aspects
e.g. develops one of the following:
Glasnost – openness – changes introduced – and their effect - open debate – people made more aware of the past etc.;
Perestroika – restructuring – changes introduced and their effect etc.
Causes and aims of policy – stagnation of communism, increased corruption, Gorbachev trying to give people a share in government etc.
One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks)
Two for 3 marks
- OR**
Limited description of a wider range of aspects
e.g. outline description of glasnost and perestroika.
- Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects** **4**
e.g. at least **two** of the points mentioned in the first part of level 2.
OR three accurate ideas covering both glasnost and perestroika.

| | | |
|------------|--|------------|
| 1 7 | Study Source F. | 6 |
| | <p>Source F shows the people of Berlin celebrating the end of the Berlin Wall. The main reason for the ending of the Berlin Wall as a barrier between East and West Berlin was the opposition and actions of the people of Berlin. Do you agree? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your knowledge.</p> | |
| | <p>Target: Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO 1,2 & 3)</p> | |
| | <p>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> | 0 |
| | <p>Level 1: General response relying on source or learned response. e.g. the people of Berlin did march to the wall and tried to take it apart; Source western therefore biased. The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.</p> | 1 |
| | <p>Level 2: Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/ gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about. e.g. shows awareness of events in East Europe in 1989 in general terms with little explanation. OR simple comments on the provenance: a western photographer, general problems of photographs etc.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.</p> | 2-3 |
| | <p>Level 3: Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge e.g. EITHER Evaluation of provenance of source: a western photographer trying to show that the end of the Berlin Wall was a popular movement to indicate the unpopularity of communism, so could have been selective. OR Uses knowledge of the events of 1989 to agree or disagree with the interpretation – Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia; Gorbachev and the Red Army; weakness of Soviet economy; Honecker and East Germany etc.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.</p> | 4-5 |
| | <p>Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion Both parts of Level 3. The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.</p> | 6 |

- 1 8** Which was the greater threat to the USSR in the 1980s: **10**
- the Solidarity Movement in Poland
 - the policies of the United States President, Ronald Reagan?

You must refer to both threats when explaining your answer.

Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO 1 and 2)

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

Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason. **1-2**

e.g. Solidarity was a trade union which opposed Soviet communism in Poland.

Reagan opposed the USSR because he regarded them as evil.

MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

Level 2: EITHER **3-6**

Develops one cause

This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question.

e.g. explanations could cover why Solidarity was opposed by the Soviet Union and why it was supported by the West and became popular in Poland.

Assesses the effect of Solidarity on the Soviet Union – its survival and eventual success etc.

Explains the importance of Reagan's policies for the USSR – end of MAD – Soviet economy could not keep up etc.

Assesses how it led to the end of the Cold War and changes in the USSR which led to the collapse of the Soviet Union etc.

OR

Covers both with some development or explanation

This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.

N.B. An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument. 7-9

e.g. assesses the threat posed by Solidarity to the USSR and explains the part played by Reagan's policies.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

Level 4: Balanced, well argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question. 10

e.g. assesses both parts in depth with a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion