



Level 1/2 Certificate

History

Paper 2 International Relations, 1905–2005
8045/2

Specimen

<i>Mark Scheme</i>

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 © 2012 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.

Level 1/2 Certificate in History

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. 	31.5
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. 	36

- **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 2:

Topic 1 The Origins of the First World War, 1905–1914

01 What does **Source A** tell us about the British Navy in 1911? **3**

Target: Comprehension of the source (AO3)

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

Any 3 simple observations – one mark each. 3

Additional mark (2) for inferences

e.g. it was painted therefore GB must have been proud of the Dreadnoughts; a show of power etc.

02 Describe the Moroccan Crisis of 1911 (the Agadir Crisis). **5**

Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)

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

Level 1: Basic description 1

e.g. Germany sent a gunboat to Morocco.

Level 2: Some detailed description 2-3

e.g. develops one of the following:
background to crisis showing understanding of its nature – rivalry between Germany and France in Morocco – rebellion in Fez and French response – what Germany hoped to gain etc.

Level 3: Detailed description of two or more aspects 4-5

e.g. any two or more of the above.

03	Explain why Britain was worried about the growth of the German Navy in the years up to 1914.	7
	Target: Causation and analysis of key features (AOs 1 and 2)	
	Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	0
	Level 1: Simple description/basic statements e.g. Germany was building more ships; they were catching up with Britain etc.	1
	Level 2: Identifies feature(s) e.g. Dreadnoughts; German fleet was a threat to GB; Germany had a strong army etc.	2-3
	Level 3: Explains one feature e.g. explains the vulnerability of GB as an island; importance of navy for trade and Empire – Germany a challenge; the effect of the Dreadnoughts; explained fears of German ambitions.	4-5
	Level 4: Explains more than one feature Any two or more of the above.	6-7

- 04** Study **Source B**. The source says that Princip believed that the First World War was not caused by the assassination of Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo in 1914. **10**
How far do you agree with Princip's view? Explain your answer.

Target: Explanation of a view (AOs 1, 2 and 3)

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

Level 1: Simple description based on source detail/paraphrasing 1
e.g. Princip assassinated Franz Ferdinand so he would say this; war did break out after the assassination etc.

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

Level 2: Identifies/describes relevant factors and/or general source evaluation 2-4
e.g. provenance, bias, tone, nature and/or timing of source
e.g. describes the assassination and the part played by Princip and how it led to war in general terms; general comment on provenance, bias, tone, nature and timing of source.
Supports the source by identifying other reasons that contributed to the War e.g. the alliances; the attitude of Germany to A/H in 1914; rivalry between the powers etc., with little analysis.

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: Explains one factor, agreeing or disagreeing 5-6
e.g. could concentrate on how the assassination led to war by analysing one event between it and the outbreak, such as the ultimatum from A/H and the Serb response, effect of the alliances in 1914, the Schlieffen Plan etc.
OR
Could explain another factor involved e.g. the nature of the rivalry between A/H and Serbia; reference to other crises and their effect on the alliances or individual powers' attitudes; criticism of the provenance of the source, why would Princip say this etc.?

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: Explains more than one factor, agreeing and disagreeing 7-8
e.g. factors from both parts of L3.

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.

Level 5: Balanced answer to arrive at a judgement

9-10

e.g. supports or rejects the view after considering the evidence in favour and against using source and knowledge.

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, and will be persuasive. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

Topic 2 Peacemaking 1919–1920 and the League of Nations, 1933–1939

05 What does **Source C** tell us about the Treaty of Versailles? **3**

Target: Comprehension of the source (AO3)

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

Any 3 simple observations – one mark each. 3

Additional mark (2) for inferences

Reward simple observations e.g. people wanted to see what was happening; some observers had uniforms; the room was crowded; it appears to be in a big house etc. One mark for each observation.

OR two marks for each inference (max. 3) e.g. it was recognised as a momentous occasion, an important moment in history etc.

06 Describe how the Treaty of Versailles reduced Germany's armed forces? **5**

Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)

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

Level 1: Basic description 1

e.g. Germany's army was reduced.

Level 2: Some detailed description 2-3

e.g. develops one of the following:

army restrictions: 100,000 men, no conscription, tanks etc.

naval limits: 15,000 men, 6 battleships, no U Boats.

Rhineland demilitarised – explained.

Level 3: Detailed description of two or more aspects 4-5

e.g. any two or more of the above.

07	Explain why the German people objected to the Treaty of Versailles.	7
Target: Causation and analysis of key features (AOs 1 and 2)		
	Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	0
Level 1:	Simple description/basic statements e.g. it punished them too much; they lost too much etc.	1
Level 2:	Identifies feature(s) e.g. they did not like the war guilt clause, it was a Diktat, their forces were reduced too much, they lost too much land etc.	2-3
Level 3:	Explains one feature e.g. explains why the German people hated reparations or any other aspect of the Treaty such as the territorial settlement, war, guilt, etc.	4-5
Level 4:	Explains more than one feature Any two or more of the reasons that Germans hated the treaty.	6-7

08	<p>Study Source D. The source says that the League of Nations ended as a peacekeeping body with the Abyssinian Crisis of 1935. How far do you agree with this? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Target: Explanation of a view (AOs 1, 2 and 3)</p> <p>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> <p>Level 1: Simple description based on source detail/paraphrasing e.g. the League did nothing about crises after Abyssinia; no-one took any notice of it etc.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.</p> <p>Level 2: Identifies/describes relevant factors and/or general source evaluation e.g. provenance, bias, tone, nature and/or timing of source e.g. describes Abyssinian Crisis with little focus on its contribution to the end of the League; general comment on provenance, bias, tone, nature and timing of source. Challenges source by identifying other reasons that contributed to the end of the League e.g. membership, Manchuria, no army 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> <p>Level 3: Explains one factor, agreeing or disagreeing e.g. could concentrate on Abyssinia by analysing the crisis and explaining one reason why the League failed such as the attitude of GB and France, the effect of the Hoare Laval Pact etc. OR Could explain other contributions to end of League e.g. was Abyssinia more important than Manchuria or absence of USA or an army; critical assessment of the provenance of the source, could any factors have influenced its view 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> <p>Level 4: Explains more than one factor, agreeing and disagreeing e.g. factors from both parts of L3.</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> <p>Level 5: Balanced answer to arrive at a judgement e.g. supports or rejects the view after considering the evidence in favour and against using source and knowledge.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2-4</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>7-8</p> <p>9-10</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, and will be persuasive. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

Topic 3 Hitler's foreign policy 1933–1939 and the origins of the Second World War

- 09** What does **Source E** tell us about the Anschluss, March 1938? **3**
- Target: Comprehension of the source (AO3)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**
- Any 3 simple observations – one mark each. 3**
Additional mark (2) for inferences
 e.g. people are cheering; it is a large crowd; Hitler in open top car; soldiers on crowd control etc. One mark for each observation.
 OR two marks for each inference (max. 3) e.g. shows the popularity of Hitler/Anschluss in Austria.
- 10** Describe how the Nazi-Soviet Pact of August 1939 led to the outbreak of the Second World War. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question . 0**
- Level 1: Basic description 1**
 e.g. Germany attacked Poland shortly afterwards.
- Level 2: Some detailed description 2-3**
 e.g. develops one of the following:
 nature and terms of pact – reasons for surprise;
 non-aggression pact; secret division of Poland etc.
 Hitler's gains – war on two fronts avoided;
 Stalin's reasons – re-armament, attitude of GB and France to USSR;
 attack on Poland and why GB went to war over it.
- Level 3: Detailed description of two or more aspects 4-5**
 e.g. any two or more of the above.

11	Explain why Neville Chamberlain used the policy of appeasement between 1937 and 1938.	7
	Target: Causation and analysis of key features (AOs 1 and 2)	
	Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	0
	Level 1: Simple description/basic statements e.g. did not want another war; thought it would keep peace etc.	1
	Level 2: Identifies feature(s) e.g. GB not recovered from effects of WW1; trusted Hitler; thought his claims were legitimate; not ready for war etc.	2-3
	Level 3: Explains one feature e.g. explains public opinion re war in GB in 30s; relates Hitler's claims to Versailles and comments on legitimacy; something had to replace the League after Abyssinia; need for re-armament in GB; fear of danger from Soviet Russia and communism..	4-5
	Level 4: Explains more than one feature Any two or more of the above.	6-7

- 12** Study **Source F**. The source says that the Remilitarisation of the Rhineland on 7 March 1936 was the last opportunity of stopping Hitler without a war. How far do you agree with this? Explain your answer. **10**

Target: Explanation of a view (AOs 1, 2 and 3)

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

Level 1: Simple description based on source detail/paraphrasing 1
e.g. Hitler occupied the Rhineland and was not opposed etc.

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

Level 2: Identifies/describes relevant factors and/or general source evaluation 2-4
e.g. provenance, bias, tone, nature and/or timing of source
e.g. describes the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, concentrating on Versailles and why it was not opposed with little focus on the last opportunity; general comment on provenance, bias, tone, nature and timing of source. Challenges source by identifying other occasions when Hitler could have been stopped e.g. Anschluss, Czechoslovakia, weaknesses of appeasement 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: Explains one factor, agreeing or disagreeing 5-6
e.g. could concentrate on the remilitarisation by analysing it and explaining why it was a lost opportunity by commenting on one factor such as the relative strength of German and French armies in 1936, the vulnerability of Germany to economic sanctions, advice of Hitler's generals and ministers etc.
OR
Could explain why it was not a lost opportunity by considering the action that could have been taken and questioning if it would have overthrown Hitler or strengthened his position in Germany; could comment on why other times were better opportunities to stop Hitler because they were based on firmer premise or stronger defence (Czechoslovakia?); a critical assessment of the provenance of the source, could any factors have influenced its view etc.?

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: Explains more than one factor, agreeing and disagreeing 7-8
e.g. factors from both parts of L3.

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.

Level 5: Balanced answer to arrive at a judgement

9-10

e.g. supports or rejects the view after considering the evidence in favour and against using source and knowledge.

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, and will be persuasive. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

Topic 4 The Origins of the Cold War, 1945–1955

- 13** What does **Source G** tell us about the Berlin Airlift, 1948–1949? **3**
- Target: Comprehension of the source (AO3)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**
- Any 3 simple observations – one mark each. 3**
Additional mark (2) for inferences
 e.g. it involved American planes; people waved at them; went to West Berlin etc. One mark for each observation.
 OR two marks for each inference (max. 3) e.g. the planes were popular because the people are giving a friendly wave etc.
- 14** Describe how Germany was weakened at the end of the Second World War. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**
- Level 1: Basic description 1**
 e.g. Germany was divided; lost territory; had to pay war debts etc.
- Level 2: Some detailed description 2-3**
 e.g. develops one of the following:
 division of Germany and Berlin into 4 occupied zones;
 punishment of war criminals;
 territories lost;
 reparations, how much and in what way.
- Level 3: Detailed description of two or more aspects 4-5**
 e.g. any two or more of the above.

15	Explain why the Soviet Union formed the Warsaw Pact in 1955.	7
Target: Causation and analysis of key features (AOs 1 and 2)		
	Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	0
Level 1:	Simple description/basic statements e.g. to get some allies etc.	1
Level 2:	Identifies feature(s) e.g. to oppose NATO; to defend communism; to control eastern Europe etc.	2-3
Level 3:	Explains one feature e.g. explains the nature of NATO and why USSR feared it; nature of Warsaw Pact and power of USSR in it; Soviet fears of recovery of Germany when they joined NATO in 1955; Soviet troops allowed in satellite states – effect on control.	4-5
Level 4:	Explains more than one feature Any two or more of the above.	6-7

16	Study Source H . The source says that the American forces in Korea were successful. How far do you agree with this? Explain your answer.	10
	Target: Explanation of a view (AOs 1, 2 and 3)	
	Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	0
	Level 1: Simple description based on source detail/paraphrasing e.g. US forces did stop the invasion of S Korea etc.	1
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
	Level 2: Identifies/describes relevant factors and/or general source evaluation e.g. provenance, bias, tone, nature and/or timing of source e.g. describes the events of the Korean War with little focus on American success or failure; general comment on provenance, bias, tone, nature and timing of source. Challenges source by identifying the failure of the American forces to hold on to their position in North Korea; the final settlement at 38 th parallel.	2-4
	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: Explains one factor, agreeing or disagreeing e.g. could concentrate on success of US army in Korea by analysing the war and commenting on such factors as the landings at Inchon and military success that followed; how the army achieved Truman's aim of containment of communism; the role of MacArthur and the support given to the UN etc.	5-6
	OR Could limit the success of US forces by explaining how it brought them into conflict with China and the eventual end of the fighting and conditions of the ceasefire; critical assessment of the provenance of the source, could any factors have influenced its view etc.?	
	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: Explains more than one factor, agreeing and disagreeing e.g. factors from both parts of L3.	7-8
	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.	
	Level 5: Balanced answer to arrive at a judgement e.g. supports or rejects the view after considering the evidence in favour and	9-10

against using source and knowledge.

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, and will be persuasive. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

Topic 5 Crises of the Cold War, 1955–1970

17 What does **Source I** tell us about the rising in Hungary in 1956? **3**

Target: Comprehension of the source (AO3)

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

Any 3 simple observations – one mark each. 3

Additional mark (2) for inferences

Reward simple observations e.g. Stalin's statue knocked down, bus/tram overturned etc.
One mark for each observation.

OR two marks for each inference (max. 3) e.g. it was against communist government etc.

18 Describe the U2 Crisis of 1960. **5**

Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)

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

Level 1: Basic description 1

e.g. An American spy plane was shot down.

Level 2: Some detailed description 2-3

e.g. develops one of the following:

background and events: peaceful co-existence – explanation of U2 – mission and fate of Powers etc.;

USA response – excuse – Khrushchev and apology – Eisenhower's refusal;

effect on Cold War: collapse of Paris Summit – end of peaceful co-existence – diplomatic victory for USSR – trial and fate of Powers.

Level 3: Detailed description of two or more aspects 4-5

e.g. any two or more of the above.

19	Explain why the Soviet Union sent tanks into Hungary in November 1956.	7
Target: Causation and analysis of key features (AOs 1 and 2)		
	Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	0
Level 1:	Simple description/basic statements e.g. to put down the rioting; to take control etc.	1
Level 2:	Identifies feature(s) Rioting for more freedom; wanted more democracy; wanted to leave the Warsaw Pact etc.	2-3
Level 3:	Explains one feature e.g. explains Nagy's reforms and movement away from communism; Withdrawal from Warsaw Pact and fears of USSR; Soviet claim to be restoring popular government.	4-5
Level 4:	Explains more than one feature Any two or more of the above.	6-7

20	<p>Study Source J. The source says that the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 ended in victory for the USSR.</p> <p>How far do you agree with this? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Target: Explanation of a view (AOs 1, 2 and 3)</p> <p>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> <p>Level 1: Simple description based on source detail/paraphrasing e.g. True, Kennedy did agree not to invade Cuba; no shots were fired.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.</p> <p>Level 2: Identifies/describes relevant factors and/or general source evaluation e.g. provenance, bias, tone, nature and/or timing of source e.g. describes the Cuban Missile Crisis with little focus on it being a 'victory for the USSR'; general comment on provenance, bias, tone, nature and timing of source. Challenges source by identifying other reasons why crisis was a defeat for USSR and a victory for USA – withdrawal of missiles from Cuba; prestige of Kennedy, later overthrow of Khrushchev 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> <p>Level 3: Explains one factor, agreeing or disagreeing e.g. could concentrate on Cuban Crisis, analysing it and arguing how Khrushchev's actions did protect Cuba and how the missiles from Turkey were removed etc. OR Could analyse and explain reasons it is also regarded as a victory for USA – circumstances leading to the withdrawal of missiles – exchange of letters etc.; a critical assessment of the provenance of the source – an autobiography, was Khrushchev trying to justify his actions 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> <p>Level 4: Explains more than one factor, agreeing and disagreeing e.g. factors from both parts of L3.</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> <p>Level 5: Balanced answer to arrive at a judgement e.g. supports or rejects the view after considering the evidence in favour and against using source and knowledge.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2-4</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>7-8</p> <p>9-10</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, and will be persuasive. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

Topic 6 Failure of Détente and the collapse of communism, 1970–1991

- 21** What does **Source K** tell us about Pope John Paul II's visit to Poland in 1979? **3**
- Target: Comprehension of the source (AO3)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**
- Any 3 simple observations – one mark each. 3**
Additional mark (2) for inferences
 Reward simple observations e.g. a lot of people attended; it was in the open air etc.
 One mark for each observation.
 OR two marks for each inference (max. 3) e.g. Pope/Roman Catholicism was popular in Poland.
- 22** Describe the work of Lech Walesa in Poland up to his imprisonment in 1982. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**
- Level 1: Basic description 1**
 e.g. he was the leader of a trade union in Poland, led strikes etc
- Level 2: Some detailed description 2-3**
 e.g. develops one of the following:
 strikes in the shipyard at Gdansk;
 formation of Solidarity and its growth;
 Walesa's status in the world;
 Jaruzelski, martial law, arrest.
- Level 3: Detailed description of two or more aspects 4-5**
 e.g. any two or more of the above.

23	Explain why the USSR invaded Afghanistan in 1979.	7
	Target: Causation and analysis of key features (AOs 1 and 2)	
	Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	0
	Level 1: Simple description/basic statements e.g. to take control; to conquer etc.	1
	Level 2: Identifies feature(s) e.g. to help the communist government; rebellion in Afghanistan etc.	2-3
	Level 3: Explains one feature e.g. explains Soviet fears of a Muslim revolt and effect it could have on USSR; importance of the oil supply route; afraid of growing western influence in Afghanistan and Asia.	4-5
	Level 4: Explains more than one feature Any two or more of the above.	6-7

24	<p>Study Source L. The source says that President Reagan of the USA was the main reason why the Cold War ended. How far do you agree with this? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Target: Explanation of a view (AOs 1, 2 and 3)</p> <p>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> <p>Level 1: Simple description based on source detail/paraphrasing e.g. Reagan did make peace with the Soviets and ended the Cold War etc.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.</p> <p>Level 2: Identifies/describes relevant factors and/or general source evaluation e.g. provenance, bias, tone, nature and/or timing of source e.g. describes Reagan's policies and how he improved relations with the USSR with little focus on it ending the Cold War; general comment on provenance, bias, tone, nature and timing of source. Challenges source by identifying other reasons why the Cold War ended, Soviet war in Afghanistan, Gorbachev 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> <p>Level 3: Explains one factor, agreeing or disagreeing e.g. could concentrate on Reagan's policies, analysing their effect on the USSR and arguing how they contributed to a different approach from the Soviets to arms limitation etc.</p> <p>OR Could analyse and explain other reasons for the end of the Cold War such as the policies of Gorbachev, weaknesses and problems of USSR, the collapse of communism etc.; a critical assessment of the provenance of the source – an obituary by a former ally – how would this affect the view 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> <p>Level 4: Explains more than one factor, agreeing and disagreeing e.g. factors from both parts of L3.</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>	<p>10</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2-4</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>7-8</p>
-----------	--	--

Level 5: Balanced answer to arrive at a judgement

9-10

e.g. supports or rejects the view after considering the evidence in favour and against using source and knowledge.

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, and will be persuasive. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

Topic 7 Post-Cold War relations, 1991–2005

- 25** What does **Source M** tell us about the war in Kosovo 1998-1999? **3**
- Target: Comprehension of the source (AO3)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**
- Any 3 simple observations – one mark each. 3**
Additional mark (2) for inferences
 e.g. there were a lot of refugees; the Red Cross helped them; there were temporary shelters etc. One mark for each observation.
 OR two marks for each inference (max. 3) e.g. international aid helped them etc.
- 26** Describe how the European Union has changed since the Maastricht Treaty of 1992/1993. **5**
- Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)**
- Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question. 0**
- Level 1: Basic description 1**
 e.g. more countries have joined it.
- Level 2: Some detailed description 2-3**
 e.g. develops one of the following:
 details any of the three main treaties – Maastricht; Amsterdam and Nice;
 The introduction of the euro 1999 and its effects;
 Naming of countries that have joined since 1993, probably concentrating on Eastern Europe.
- Level 3: Detailed description of two or more aspects 4-5**
 e.g. any two or more of the above.

27	Explain why the role of the USA in the world has changed since the end of the Cold War.	7
	Target: Causation and analysis of key features (AOs 1 and 2)	
	Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	0
	Level 1: Simple description/basic statements e.g. they are the strongest power; they had won the Cold War etc.	1
	Level 2: Identifies feature(s) e.g. it is the only superpower in the world; USSR had broken up etc.	2-3
	Level 3: Explains one feature e.g. explains the situation of USA after 1991 – most powerful state with no single danger so had to adopt to new role; US perceived role as any of the following with examples of US action to explain the role: protector of democracy; elimination of terrorism; arbiter of the world; protector of the environment etc.	4-5
	Level 4: Explains more than one feature Any two or more of the above.	6-7

28	<p>Study Source N. The source says that the United Nations has been successful in two thirds of its attempts to keep the peace. How far do you agree that the UN has been successful? Explain your answer. You can refer to the part played by the UN in the disputes and wars involving any ONE or BOTH of Kuwait and Iraq.</p> <p>Target: Explanation of a view (AOs 1, 2 and 3)</p> <p>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</p> <p>Level 1: Simple description based on source detail/paraphrasing e.g. Agree, UN freed Kuwait in 1991. Disagree, the UN has not stopped fighting from taking place.</p> <p>The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.</p> <p>Level 2: Identifies/describes relevant factors and/or general source evaluation e.g. provenance, bias, tone, nature and/or timing of source e.g. describes one or more of the disputes and wars named in question with little focus on it being a success or failure for the UN - general comment on provenance, bias, tone, nature and timing of source. Challenges source by identifying failures of the UN – failed to prevent the Iraq War of 2003 – failed to find a peaceful settlement – powerless with USA – effect of sanctions on North Korea.</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> <p>Level 3: Explains one factor, agreeing or disagreeing e.g. could concentrate on any one crisis or on more, analysing it/them and arguing about the success (Kuwait?) agreeing with the source that it was mostly successful etc. OR Could choose and analyse one or more of the interventions of the UN to contradict the source by explaining that it did not mostly succeed (Iraq); a critical assessment of the provenance of the source.</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> <p>Level 4: Explains more than one factor, agreeing and disagreeing e.g. factors from both parts of L3.</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>	<p>10</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2-4</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>7-8</p>
-----------	---	--

Level 5: Balanced answer to arrive at a judgement

9-10

e.g. supports or rejects the view after considering the evidence in favour and against using source and knowledge.

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, and will be persuasive. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.