



Rewarding Learning

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
2014**

History

Unit 2: The Cold War 1945–1991

Foundation Tier

[GHY21]

FRIDAY 23 MAY, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

Mark schemes are published to assist teachers and students in their preparation for examinations. Through the mark schemes teachers and students will be able to see what examiners are looking for in response to questions and exactly where the marks have been awarded. The publishing of the mark schemes may help to show that examiners are not concerned about finding out what a student does not know but rather with rewarding students for what they do know.

The Purpose of Mark Schemes

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of students in schools and colleges.

The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

The questions and the mark schemes are developed in association with each other so that the issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed right from the start. Mark schemes, therefore, are regarded as part of an integral process which begins with the setting of questions and ends with the marking of the examination.

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all the markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements in so far as this is possible. Before marking begins a standardising meeting is held where all the markers are briefed using the mark scheme and samples of the students' work in the form of scripts. Consideration is also given at this stage to any comments on the operational papers received from teachers and their organisations. During this meeting, and up to and including the end of the marking, there is provision for amendments to be made to the mark scheme. What is published represents this final form of the mark scheme.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may well be other correct responses which are equally acceptable to those published: the mark scheme can only cover those responses which emerged in the examination. There may also be instances where certain judgements may have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute correct response – all teachers will be familiar with making such judgements.

GCSE History 2014

Foundation Tier

Mark Scheme

The detail given in the Mark Scheme is for **teacher guidance** and candidates are not expected to cover **every** point suggested.

Section A

Answer **all** of this section.

In **Question 1(d)** a maximum of **5 additional marks** is available for the use of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

1 This question is about the Cuban Missile Crisis.**(a) Study Source A**

Give **two** points from **Source A** to show how President Kennedy and Khrushchev each gained from the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Target AO3: Understand a range of source material as part of an historical enquiry.

No rewardable material [0]

Limited accurate reference to Source A [1]

Accurate reference to Source A [2]

Apply criteria for any **two** reasons:

Kennedy

- President Kennedy emerged with a greatly improved reputation in his own country and throughout the world
- President Kennedy had forced Khrushchev to back down

Khrushchev

- Khrushchev could claim a personal triumph as Cuba remained a useful ally for the USSR
- Khrushchev was regarded as a responsible peacemaker, willing to compromise

Any other valid point

[1] mark for each valid reason

[1] mark for development of each point

[4]

(b) Study Source B

Give **three** points from **Source B** to show President Kennedy's attitude when the Cuban Missile Crisis ended.

Target AO3: Understand a range of source material as part of an historical enquiry.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Identifies one valid point to show President Kennedy's attitude with contextual illustration from Source B.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Identifies two valid points to show President Kennedy's attitude with contextual illustration from Source B.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

Identifies three valid points to show President Kennedy's attitude with contextual illustration from Source B.

Apply criteria for any **three** points:

- President Kennedy did not want any credit for what had happened
- President Kennedy did not want to claim any kind of victory
- He respected Khrushchev for the role he had played
- He believed that it was a victory for the people of the entire world
- He believed that no-one would have to suffer the horrors of nuclear war.

Any other valid point

[6]

No rewardable material [0]

(c) Study Source C

How **reliable** is **Source C** to an historian studying Khrushchev's view of the Cuban Missile Crisis?

Target AO3: Understand, analyse and evaluate a range of source material as part of an historical enquiry.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

A limited response which may only focus on the content of Source C. Little attempt will be made to address the issue of the reliability of the source.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers will begin to discuss the reliability of Source C. Answers may comment on the author, Khrushchev, and the fact that he was the leader of the USSR at this time. Candidates may point out that it is a primary source and discuss the value of this. Candidates may begin to question the reasons why this source was produced, and how these affect the reliability of Source C. Candidates may show some awareness of bias in the account and comment on how this would affect the reliability of the source. They may refer to the content of the source to support their answers.

Level 3 ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will discuss the key issue of reliability of Source C in greater detail. Candidates will refer to the content of the source to support their answers.

They may refer to some of the following:

- The source is unreliable as it presents only one viewpoint, that of the USSR, about the Cuban Missile Crisis
- In this letter Khrushchev is trying to explain his actions to his ally Castro
- As a result he gives a very biased interpretation of the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis, presenting it as a great victory for the USSR, 'we see this as a great victory for Communism'
- Khrushchev is trying to convince Castro that Cuba has also benefited from the crisis as the USSR forced the USA to promise never to plan an attack on Cuba again. But he does not mention the concessions that he made to resolve the crisis, e.g. that the USSR would be withdrawing its 43 000 soldiers and nuclear missiles and missile sites.

Any other valid point

[8]

- (d) **Using Sources A, B and C and your own knowledge**, explain why the USA and the USSR had different views about the results of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Target AO2 and AO3: Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis within a historical context. Comprehend, analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how and why historical events, people, situations and changes have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

At this level responses may be limited and at the lower end may not address the question. Answers may describe the view given in one of the sources but show little awareness of interpretation. At the top end of this level candidates may describe the views given in two of the sources. Alternatively candidates may make little reference to the sources and use limited own knowledge to give a weak general response. Responses of this nature should be restricted to marks within the lower half of the level. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers at this level will show understanding of the different views given in at least two of the sources. At the upper end of this level they may display some awareness of the reasons why the USA and the USSR have different views about the results of the Cuban Missile Crisis. (AO3) Answers may use some outside knowledge to support their answer. (AO2) Responses of this nature can access the top end of this level. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level will show a clear understanding of the different viewpoints in all three sources and some awareness of the reasons for these. (AO3) Candidates at the top end of this level will make some use of their contextual knowledge to support their answers. (AO2) Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Some of the following points may be made:

Source A

- Source A provides an interpretation of a modern historian. This will be relatively objective and balanced as it was written more than thirty years after the crisis. The historian will not take either side but will provide his own viewpoint. His judgement is that *'Kennedy and Khrushchev both gained something from the Cuban Missile Crisis'* and he provides evidence to support this view
- In Source A the historian explains that President Kennedy benefited because the Cuban Missile Crisis *'greatly improved his reputation in his own country and throughout the world'*
- Source A also shows Khrushchev's view that the Crisis was *'a personal triumph'* and the fact that he had been forced to order the return of the USSR ships bound for Cuba *'was quickly forgotten'*
- Source A also tells us that the USSR benefited as Cuba *'remained a useful ally in the USA's 'backyard'*
- Source A states that as a result of his actions to end the Crisis, Khrushchev was recognised as *'a responsible peacemaker.'*

Source B

- Source B is an American viewpoint, that of Robert Kennedy, brother of the President. He was very close to the President and played an important role in the Cuban Missile Crisis. Robert Kennedy gives us a useful insight into American thinking
- Source B tells us that President Kennedy *'made no attempt to take credit for what happened'*
- We are told that President Kennedy *'respected Khrushchev for his actions'*
- It tells us that President Kennedy believed that avoiding nuclear war was the main achievement of the Cuban Missile Crisis
- This source was written six years after the crisis when there was a thaw in the Cold War and the beginning of détente. Robert Kennedy may have had this in mind in giving some credit to both sides. (*own knowledge*)

Source C

- Khrushchev, the USSR leader at the time of the Crisis, is the author of Source C
- He is writing to President Castro of Cuba a few days after the crisis had ended
- He believes that the USSR has gained most from the Cuban Missile Crisis *'the USA has been the loser here'*
- Khrushchev gives a very one-sided interpretation stating all the benefits that the USSR and Cuba had won, e.g. *'they (USA) made plans to attack Cuba but we stopped them'*; the Crisis was a *'great victory for Communism'*.

Outside Knowledge

Some evidence of outside knowledge will be expected in answers at the top of Level 3, for example some details may be given of the events of the relationship between Cuba and the USA/USSR at the time of the Crisis.

They may refer to some of the events of the thirteen Days-USA naval blockade, arrival/return of the USSR ships/telegrams between Kennedy and Khrushchev etc. These could be used to illustrate the USA and/or USSR view of events.

Any other valid point

[10]
and SPaG [5]

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

If the response does not address the question then no SPaG marks are available. However, if the candidate has attempted to answer the question but produced nothing of credit, SPaG marks may still be awarded.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 Threshold performance ([1] mark)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, candidates use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Level 2 Intermediate performance ([2]–[3] marks)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Level 3 High performance ([4]–[5] marks)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

[5]

28

SPaG

5

Section A

33

Section B

In **all** questions a maximum of **5 additional marks** is available for the use of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

2 This question is about the Korean War, 1950–1953.

Explain how the USA, the United Nations (UN) and China became involved in a war in Korea between 1950 and 1953.

Use the paragraph headings to help you with your answer.

- (a)** Role of the USA and the United Nations (UN) in helping South Korea in 1950
- (b)** Rollback and the actions of the USA and United Nations (UN) army, 1951–1953
- (c)** Actions of China in the Korean War, 1950–1953

Target AO1 and AO2: Recall, select and communicate knowledge and understanding of History and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of key concepts, key features and characteristics of the periods studied.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[3]) AO1 ([1]–[3]) AO2

Answers at this level may use only one of the paragraph headings and may fail to address the question, offering only a descriptive narrative which will contain inaccuracies. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[7]) AO1 ([4]–[7]) AO2

Answers will use at least two of the paragraph headings, perhaps missing out only one, and will offer a more informed explanation and analysis of the involvement of the USA, the United Nations and China in Korea between 1950 and 1953. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([8]–[11]) AO1 ([8]–[11]) AO2

Answers will use all of the paragraph headings and will provide a clear explanation and analysis of the involvement of the USA, the United Nations and China in Korea between 1950 and 1953. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

(a) Role of the USA and the United Nations (UN) in helping South Korea in 1950

- Korea became a very sensitive country in the Cold War as it bordered communist China and the USSR. The victory of the Communists led by Mao Ze Dong in the civil war in China confirmed the USA's worst fears that communism was about to overrun Asia. The belief that the loss of China was only the first stage in a communist take over of Asia underpinned the Domino Theory. The invasion of South Korea by

communist North Korea in June 1950 was viewed by many Americans as the first stage of the Domino Theory

- The South Korean army was pushed back to a small area called the Pusan Pocket. The USA became involved in order to save South Korea. The USA used the United Nations which was boycotted by the USSR. Fifteen countries contributed soldiers to the United Nations army but over 90% of the 300 000 soldiers sent to Korea were American. Almost all the weapons used were provided by the USA. The UN army was led by General Douglas MacArthur who was answerable to President Truman
- In September 1950 the UN/USA army successfully landed at Inchon behind North Korean lines and by October, the North Korean army was easily pushed back over the 38th Parallel.

(b) Rollback and the actions of the USA and United Nations (UN) army, 1951–1953

- The UN/USA army then went on the offensive and invaded North Korea. This was against its original orders. The USA was now pursuing a more ambitious policy of Rollback or reuniting Korea as a non-communist country
- The UN/USA army captured Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea and approached the Yalu River, the border between North Korea and China. General MacArthur and many American politicians wanted to continue the policy of Rollback and use the Korean War to remove Mao Ze Dong and put the Chinese Nationalists in control. The involvement of China changed the nature of the USA's involvement as the Chinese volunteer army pushed the USA/UN army out of North Korea.

(c) Actions of China in the Korean War, 1950–1953

- In October 1949 China, the most populated country in the world, had become communist. Mao Ze Dong, the Communist leader, was afraid that the involvement of the USA in Korea would provide the USA with an opportunity to invade and end communist rule. The USA/UN invasion of North Korea seemed to confirm these fears
- China did not want to risk war against the USA but was determined to resist a USA invasion. China saw its actions as self defence. On 25 October 1950, over 250 000 Chinese troops called 'volunteers' moved into North Korea and pushed the UN/USA army back into South Korea, even recapturing its capital Seoul in November 1950
- In early 1951 a number of costly offensives and counter attacks resulted in stalemate. China and the USSR signed a Treaty of Friendship in 1950 and Stalin gave China indirect help. The war after 1951 consisted mainly of aerial battles between the UN/USA Air Force and USSR planes with Chinese markings and Russian pilots dressed in Chinese uniforms
- Neither side openly admitted their involvement. Stalin was suspicious of growing Chinese influence in North Korea.

Some of the above detail may be included at Level 2.

Any other valid point.

[22]
and SPaG [5]

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

If the response does not address the question then no SPaG marks are available. However, if the candidate has attempted to answer the question but produced nothing of credit, SPaG marks may still be awarded.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 Threshold performance ([1] mark)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, candidates use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Level 2 Intermediate performance ([2]–[3] marks)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Level 3 High performance ([4]–[5] marks)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision. [5]

3 This question is about the involvement of the USA in Vietnam, 1954–1973.

Explain how the involvement of the USA in Vietnam changed between 1954 and 1973.

Use the paragraph headings to help you with your answer:

- (a)** The USA's involvement, 1954–1964
- (b)** The USA's military actions in Vietnam, 1965–1968
- (c)** Vietnamisation and the withdrawal of the USA from Vietnam, 1968–1973

Target AO1 and AO2: Recall, select and communicate knowledge and understanding of History and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of key concepts, key features and characteristics of the periods studied.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[3]) AO1 ([1]–[3]) AO2

Answers at this level may use only one of the paragraph headings and may fail to address the question, offering only a descriptive narrative which will contain inaccuracies. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar and with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[7]) AO1 ([4]–[7]) AO2

Answers may use both paragraph headings, perhaps leaving out only one, and

will offer a more informed explanation and analysis of how the involvement of the USA in Vietnam changed between 1954 and 1973. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([8]–[11]) AO1 ([8]–[11]) AO2

Answers will use all of the paragraph headings and will provide a clear explanation and analysis of how the involvement of the USA in Vietnam changed between 1954 and 1973. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

(a) The USA's involvement, 1954–1964

- After the defeat of France at the Battle of Dien Bien Phu in 1954, Vietnam was divided along Cold War lines into communist North Vietnam and non-communist South Vietnam. South Vietnam was seen as 'the cornerstone of the free world in South East Asia'
- Indirect help in the form of 16 000 military advisers and \$3 billion was given to the government of President Diem of South Vietnam to fight against the Viet Cong, a guerrilla group that wanted a united communist Vietnam
- The murder of President Diem in November 1963 and the attack on an American ship by North Vietnam in the Gulf of Tonkin in 1964 caused the USA to consider direct involvement in Vietnam. The USA Congress passed the Tonkin Resolution, which transformed the USA's role from indirect to direct involvement.

(b) The USA's military actions in Vietnam, 1965–1968

- The USA launched an intensive bombing campaign against North Vietnam called Operation Rolling Thunder. In 1965 USA soldiers were sent to South Vietnam to help the government against the Viet Cong and by 1968, over 540 000 USA troops were in Vietnam. The USA army was far superior in size and weapons and expected an easy victory
- The USA adopted the unpopular tactic of moving the South Vietnamese peasants out of their villages into strategic hamlets controlled by the Americans. About 40% of the population of South Vietnam was moved. This tactic was resented and only served to gain more recruits for the Viet Cong
- The USA wanted to destroy the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the vital Viet Cong supply route through the dense jungle of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. The Americans used chemical defoliants, e.g. Agent Orange to destroy trees and vegetation. They also used Napalm, a petrol-based liquid which cleared undergrowth but also caused terrible skin burns to civilians
- 'Search and Destroy' tactics led to the burning of villages and shooting of suspects. This resulted in a high civilian death rate. American frustration against this unseen enemy led to atrocities against civilians, especially the infamous My Lai massacre in March 1968, when over 300 civilians were killed.

(c) Vietnamisation and the withdrawal of the USA from Vietnam, 1968–1973

- Richard Nixon, who became President in January 1969, was determined to end USA involvement in the war in Vietnam by following a policy called Vietnamisation. This transferred responsibility to the

government and army of South Vietnam and allowed the USA to withdraw without losing face

- In 1970, Nixon expanded USA bombing into Cambodia and Laos to destroy the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the main Viet Cong supply route
- Peace talks in Paris between the USA and the Viet Cong dragged on until January 1973, when the USA withdrew from Vietnam and handed over responsibility for the conduct of the war to President Thieu and the government of South Vietnam.

Some of the above detail may be included at Level 2.

Any other valid point.

[22]
and SPaG [5]

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

If the response does not address the question then no SPaG marks are available. However, if the candidate has attempted to answer the question but produced nothing of credit, SPaG marks may still be awarded.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 Threshold performance ([1] mark)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, candidates use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Level 2 Intermediate performance ([2]–[3] marks)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Level 3 High performance ([4]–[5] marks)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

[5]

4 This question is about attempts by the USSR to keep control over Eastern Europe, 1985–1991.

Explain why the USSR lost control of Eastern Europe by 1991.

Use the paragraph headings to help you with your answer:

- (a) The policies of Gorbachev: Glasnost and Perestroika
- (b) Events in Eastern Europe, 1989–1991
- (c) The Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany

Targets AO1 and AO2: Recall, select and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history and demonstrate their understanding of the past through

explanation and analysis of key concepts, key features and characteristics of the period studied.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[3]) AO1 ([1]–[3]) AO2

Answers at this level may use only one of the paragraph headings and may fail to address the question, offering only a descriptive narrative which will contain inaccuracies. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[7]) AO1 ([4]–[7]) AO2

Answers may use both paragraph headings, perhaps leaving out only one, and will offer a more informed explanation and analysis of why the USSR lost control over Eastern Europe between 1985 and 1991. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([8]–[11]) AO1 ([8]–[11]) AO2

Answers will use all of the paragraph headings and will provide a clear explanation and analysis of why the USSR lost control over Eastern Europe between 1985 and 1991. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

(a) The policies of Gorbachev: Glasnost and Perestroika

- Mikhail Gorbachev, the new Russian leader in 1985, wanted to reform the economy and political system in the USSR. His two policies of Glasnost (openness) and Perestroika (economic reform) had a big impact on Russian control over Eastern Europe
- Gorbachev was eager for a reduction in the nuclear arms race which was a drain on the USSR's economy. Nuclear arms accounted for 25% of the national budget causing the standard of living to fall for many Russians. Gorbachev began to cut spending on defence and signed nuclear arms reduction treaties with Presidents Reagan and Bush by 1989 to remove most of their nuclear stockpiles from Europe
- Tension over Russian control over Eastern Europe was a major cause of superpower tension. Gorbachev believed that Eastern Europe was no longer needed as a buffer zone. Political freedom for Eastern Europe would remove one key cause of tension. This encouraged Gorbachev to abandon the Brezhnev Doctrine and allow the countries of Eastern Europe more freedom to decide their future. Gorbachev believed that each country should sort out its own problems and that opposition to the USSR's control would not be met with force
- In March 1985, he made it clear that communist governments in Eastern Europe would no longer be propped up by the Red Army which was withdrawn from Eastern Europe. Communist governments were now vulnerable as many people in Eastern Europe distrusted their Communist leaders but feared that open criticism would lead to a Warsaw Pact invasion.

(b) Events in Eastern Europe, 1989–1991

- The resentment at political repression and economic decline during the Cold War resulted in the sudden collapse of communist control in 1989,

the “year of miracles.” This led to the collapse of the Iron Curtain as the Communist Party lost control in almost all countries in Eastern Europe. The Polish government agreed to hold free elections and legalise Solidarity. In August 1989, Poland became the first country in Eastern Europe to have a non-Communist government. In 1990 Lech Walesa, the leader of Solidarity, was elected President of Poland

- Free elections in Hungary and Czechoslovakia led to non-communist governments. For a time East Germany, Romania and Bulgaria stayed loyal to the USSR and communism. In 1989 Ceausescu, the unpopular communist leader in Romania, was executed and the communist government in Bulgaria resigned.

(c) The Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany, 1989–1990

- In East Germany Eric Honecker, the communist leader, resisted Gorbachev’s reforms. During 1989 thousands of East Germans had fled to the West through Hungary. Then on 9 November 1989, thousands of demonstrators forced their way through the wall using pick axes and hammers to demolish large sections. The Berlin Wall, the starkest symbol of the East-West divide, was removed
- In October 1990, East and West Germany were reunited, with the new capital in Berlin, which had been such a symbol of Cold War divisions.

Some of this detail may be included at Level 2.

Any other valid point.

[22]

and SPaG [5]

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

If the response does not address the question then no SPaG marks are available. However, if the candidate has attempted to answer the question but produced nothing of credit, SPaG marks may still be awarded.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 Threshold performance ([1] mark)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, candidates use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Level 2 Intermediate performance ([2]–[3] marks)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Level 3 High performance ([4]–[5] marks)

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

[5]

SPaG

Section B

Total Paper Marks

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

22

5

27

60

