

---

# GCSE HISTORY 8145/1D

Paper 1 Understanding the modern world  
1D America, 1920–1973: Opportunity and inequality  
with wider world depth studies

---

Mark scheme

Specimen for 2018

---

1.0

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

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

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

## Level of response marking instructions

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

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

### Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

In many of our mark schemes we use the following terms to describe the qualities and levels of reasoning of an answer:

**Complex:** Answers build on the qualities of developed answers. Answers display reasoning that shows the links or connections between evidence or details that are explicitly relevant to the question. Answers may show originality or sophistication. Answers demonstrate substantiated judgement or an awareness of the provisional and problematic nature of historical issues, evidence and interpretations.

**Developed:** Answers that display more than one step of reasoning or detailed explanation that is explicitly relevant to the question. Answers will sustain an explanation of the differences or similarities in sources or interpretations.

**Simple:** Answers that describe evidence, features or material relevant to the question. Answers that display simple one step reasoning or brief explanation of a point or comment that is explicitly relevant to the question. Answers may recognise, describe and may explain, simple similarities or differences in sources or interpretations.

**Basic:** Answers that identify evidence, features or material relevant to the question. Explanation is likely to be implicit or by assertion. Answers take features of sources or interpretations at face value. Material discussed may have implicit relevance.

When a question tests AO1 and AO2 in conjunction, the AO2 element of the level descriptor always is the first statement in the descriptor and the AO1 element is the second statement in the descriptor.

It is also important to remember that the 'indicative' content', which accompanies the level descriptors, is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. Other historically accurate and valid answers should be credited.

### Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

### Step 3 Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG)

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in questions 10, 14, 18, 22 and 26 in Section B.

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

Questions 10, 14, 18, 22 and 26 in Section B are also extended responses. They give students the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

**Section A**

**01** How does **Interpretation B** differ from **Interpretation A** about President Roosevelt’s New Deal? **4**

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

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

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

**Level 2**     **Developed analysis of interpretations to explain differences based on their content** **3-4**

Candidates may progress from a simple analysis of interpretations with extended reasoning to explain the differences. For example, how Gates (Interpretation A) emphasises the idea that Roosevelt acted like a dictator as he forced the closure of the banks. He is writing about one aspect at the start of the New Deal which he saw as dictatorial. By comparison candidates might explain Tugwell’s (Interpretation B) support for Roosevelt’s use of regulation to help people and his protection of liberty.

**Level 1**     **Simple analysis of interpretation(s) to identify differences based on their content** **1-2**

Candidates are likely to identify relevant features in each interpretation(s). For example, the New Deal, according to Tugwell (B), helped the weakest in society so Americans were a lucky people; whereas Gates (A) claims that the New Deal did not offer much that was different from before.

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

**02** Why might the authors of **Interpretations A** and **B** have a different interpretation about President Roosevelt’s New Deal? **4**

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

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

**Target Analyse individual interpretations (AO4a)  
Analyse why interpretations differ (AO4c)**

**Level 2 Developed answer analyses provenance of interpretation to explain reasons for differences** **3-4**

Candidates may progress from identification to explanation of the reasons for differences in the interpretations with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to, for example: differences in provenance, context of their time of writing, place, previous experience, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, and access to information, purpose and audience.

Candidates argue that the interpretations from Gates and Tugwell were based on different circumstances, beliefs and purposes. For example, Gates, an outsider, was a communist and critic of capitalism and hence sought to justify his own opposition to the New Deal. Tugwell, an insider, was part of the government and was happy to commemorate his President’s achievements as well as his own role.

**Level 1 Simple answer analyses provenance to identify reasons for differences.** **1-2**

Candidates are likely to identify relevant reasons for the differences in each interpretation(s). Related to, for example, Interpretation A was by Gates who was a communist who hated the government and its New Deal. Interpretation B was by Tugwell who was an adviser to the government, so he supported the New Deal.

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

- 03** Which interpretation do you find more convincing about President Roosevelt's New Deal? **8**

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

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

**Target Analyse individual interpretations (AO4a)  
Evaluate interpretations and make substantiated judgements in the context of historical events studied (AO4d)**

- Level 4 Complex evaluation of interpretations with sustained judgement based on contextual knowledge/understanding. 7-8**

Extends Level 3.

Candidates may progress from a developed evaluation of interpretations by analysis of the relationship between the interpretations supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example... the judgement that Interpretation B is more convincing as it takes a more balanced view – while there was government regulation, the New Deal did help bring about recovery; so there was rather more to it than Interpretation A's wholly critical view based on the initial implementation of the New Deal.

- Level 3 Developed evaluation of both interpretation based on contextual knowledge/understanding. 5-6**

Extends Level 2.

Answers may assert one interpretation is more/less convincing.

Candidates may progress from a simple evaluation of the interpretations by extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example...to supporting Interpretation B by reference to the successes of the New Deal in improving the lives of different groups of people and/or in improving areas of the economy such as industry.

- Level 2 Simple evaluation of one interpretation based on contextual knowledge/understanding 3-4**

There may be undeveloped comment about the other interpretation.

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of interpretations by supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, candidates might develop an argument supporting



<b>04</b>	Describe two problems faced by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson in dealing with the Civil Rights protests during the 1960s.	<b>4</b>
	The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.	
	<p><b>Target</b>    <b>Demonstrates knowledge of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied (AO1a)</b>  <b>Demonstrates understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. (AO1b)</b></p>	
	<p><b>Level 2</b>    <b>Answers demonstrate knowledge and understanding.</b></p> <p>Candidates may progress from a demonstration of knowledge about the issues identified with extended reasoning supported by understanding of, for example, the ways in which events were problematic.</p> <p>These might include:  Protests were a real problem as the lack of Federal laws before 1964/1965 limited action to what pressure they could apply, such as Kennedy and Governor Wallace over releasing black protesters</p> <p>Another problem was that the scale of protest movements and their high visibility put pressure on the presidents to act decisively and quickly, but it was not easy to secure sufficient consensus in Congress.</p>	<b>3-4</b>
	<p><b>Level 1</b>    <b>Answers demonstrate knowledge</b></p> <p>Candidates demonstrate relevant knowledge about the issue(s) identified which might be related to, for example, many protests were televised/state governments often defied the presidents.</p> <p><b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b></p>	<b>1-2</b>   <b>0</b>

- 05** In what ways were the lives of women affected by the campaign for more equality in the USA during the 1960s and early 1970s? **8**

Explain your answer.

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

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

- Level 4: Complex explanation of changes. 7-8  
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Extends Level 3

Candidates may progress from a developed explanation of changes by explanation of the complexities of change arising from differences, such as time, group, social and/or economic impact supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example...the way that the impact of the campaign changed over time; such as, despite the victory of the Equal Pay Act in 1963, its implementation was patchy and it still needed the work of the National Organisation for Women (NOW) and a Supreme Court ruling in 1972 to consolidate equality of rights between men and women.

- Level 3: Developed explanation of changes. 5-6  
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Extends Level 2.

Candidates may progress from a simple explanation by developed reasoning considering **two or more** of the identified changes, supporting them by factual knowledge and understanding.

In addition to a Level 2 response, candidates make additional developed point(s).

For example...women's lives were also affected by the change in the abortion laws which meant they had the power to choose what happened to their bodies.

For example...sex and race discrimination were banned under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which meant it was illegal to discriminate against women in the workplace because of their gender and/or race.

**Level 2 Simple explanation of change** **3-4**  
**Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Candidates may progress from a basic explanation of change by using simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to **one** of the identified changes.

For example, women had greater equality in the workplace as a result of the Equal Pay Act of 1963.

**Level 1 Basic explanation of change(s)** **1-2**  
**Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Candidates identify change(s), which are relevant to the question. Explanation at this level is likely to be implicit or by assertion.

For example, women no longer expected to suffer discrimination at work.

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

- 06** Which of the following was the more important reason why there were more opportunities in America in the 1920s: **12**
- economic growth
  - social changes?

Explain your answer with reference to both reasons.

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

**Target Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2: 6)  
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:6)**

Examiners are reminded that AO1 and AO2 are regarded as interdependent and when deciding on a level should be considered together. When establishing a mark within a level, examiners should reward three marks for strong performance in both assessment objectives; two marks may be achieved by strong performance in either AO1 or AO2 and one mark should be rewarded for weak performance within the level in both assessment objectives.

**Level 4 Complex explanation of both bullets leading to a sustained judgement  
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.** **10-12**

Extends Level 3.

Candidates may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by factual knowledge and understanding and arriving at a sustained judgement.

For example...candidates may conclude that economic growth enabled many aspects of social change. People had the money to buy cars, go to the cinema and buy into the consumer lifestyle and if they didn't have the money then they would not have been able to have opportunities that were brought about by social change. Or that the social changes in America at this time, such as the greater freedom and opportunities for women, fuelled the economic boom by creating consumer demand and expanding its workforce.

**Level 3 Developed explanation of both bullets  
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question** **7-9**

Extends Level 2

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

For example...economic demand for consumer goods and the use of mass production meant employment opportunities and a rise in real wages of 11% More disposable income helped new industries like car manufacturing to develop and in the 1920s many Americans were able to enjoy a better standard of living. Also, social change meant that many people had more freedom, especially women. Advertising and the cinema made it acceptable for young women, 'the flappers', to enjoy new freedoms such as they were no longer restricted to what they could wear, they could go out dancing on their own and could work.

**Level 2 Simple explanation of bullet(s) 4-6**  
**Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Candidates may progress from a **basic** explanation of causation by using simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding

For example, economic growth meant that there was more opportunity in America because the use of mass production meant more employment opportunities, a rise in real wages and more disposable income; changing social attitudes fuelled by advertising and the cinema, meant that women had greater freedom.

**Level 1 Basic explanation of bullet(s) 1-3**  
**Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Candidates recognise and provide a basic explanation related to one/both bullet points.

For example, there were more opportunities because of rising wages and prosperity; women had more opportunities because they had more freedom.

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

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

**07** Study **Source A**. **4**

Source A opposes Kaiser Wilhelm II. How do you know?

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

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

**Target** Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

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

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

For example, how the impression was created by referencing the militarism and love of war implied by the Kaiser's helmet. Aggression is inferred as he reaches out for the whole of Europe. The date would suggest this is just after the unprovoked attacks on Belgium, France and in the east, so it's going to be critical of Germany.

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

Candidates identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding,

For example, in the cartoon the Kaiser is trying to seize Europe; it's poking fun because he's in the bath tub; it is British wartime propaganda so it's bound to be anti-German.

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

**08 Study Sources B and C.****12**

How useful are Sources B and C to a historian studying opinions in Austria about Serbia?

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

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

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

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

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

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

For example...this may relate to the way that taken together the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes in very different parts of Austrian society related to the need/opportunity to crush Serbian nationalism, but they also have limitations arising from their provenance. Both were from the immediate aftermath of the assassination when emotions were highly charged. In assessing utility candidates may observe that Source C has particular value because it provides additional insight into the motivations of government that Source B lacks.

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

Candidates may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how they might reflect popular contemporary Austrian anti-Serbian attitudes.

For example...Serbs were widely regarded as terrorists and that Austria could easily crush the threat (Source B). Or that in government circles the Serbs were seen as a threat to the very survival of the Austrian Empire and also that the government was not optimistic that it could meet this challenge (Source C).

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

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

For example the postcard (Source B) is useful because it suggests that Austrians perceived Serbians to be terrorists.

Hotzendorf (Source C) is useful because he is a key decision maker and sees the assassination of Franz Ferdinand as the last chance to defeat Serbia.

**Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1-3**

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

Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Hotzendorf is suggesting that this is Austria-Hungary's last chance to act; the message of the cartoon that Serbia had to be crushed

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

**09** Write an account of how events in Morocco became an international crisis in 1905 and 1906. **8**

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

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

**Level 4 Complex analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question** **7-8**

Extends Level 3

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

For example...analysis of the different consequences of the Kaiser's speech which promised support for the Sultan of Morocco. This was seen as a deliberate challenge to France's plan to control Morocco, which had been agreed by Britain according to the terms of the Entente Cordiale. The crisis escalated as the powers reacted to events – France and Britain were angry at the Kaiser's interference, and, in 1906 challenged him at the Algeiras Conference. At the conference the Kaiser was forced to back down. He felt humiliated, isolated and bitter because of a perceived threat from the strengthening Entente Cordiale.

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

Extends Level 2

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

For example...one consequence of the Kaiser's speech, which promised support for the Sultan of Morocco, was the crisis which it precipitated. It provoked an angry reaction from Britain and France because it was seen as a deliberate attempt to interfere with France's influence in Morocco. As it had been agreed under the terms of the Entente Cordiale that Morocco should be

in France's sphere of influence, Britain and France decided to challenge the Kaiser's provocative behaviour and force him to back down at an international conference.

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

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

For example, the Kaiser was behind the crisis after making a speech which promised to support the Sultan of Morocco. This German interference in Moroccan affairs angered France.

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

Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the Kaiser interfered in Morocco so this angered other countries in Europe.

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

Question 10 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

- 10** ‘The war at sea was the main reason for Germany’s defeat in the First World War.’ **16**  
 How far do you agree with this statement? **4 [SPaG]**

Explain your answer.

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

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

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

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

Extends Level 3.

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

This might be related, for example, to the way reasons interacted such as the convoys defeated U-boats which made the Germans sufficiently desperate to sink US ships, provoking the US entry into the war and ensuring an eventual Allied victory whilst the Allied blockade led to shortages in Germany and the collapse of morale.

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

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

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

This might be related, for example, to the part played by the war at sea, in defeating the U-boat menace while the blockade denied vital war supplies to the Germans.

Candidates may additionally explain the importance of America's entry into the war, in providing decisive material and manpower support for the Allies and suggest that this was more important.

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

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

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

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

For example, the main reason was that the German Spring Offensive of 1918 failed because of such reasons as the impact of attritional warfare in 1916 and 1917, the arrival of US troops, more effective Allied military strategy and leadership and resource shortages.

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

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

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

Candidates may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as, the war at sea was the reason why Germany lost the war because Britain placed a naval blockade on Germany.

Candidates may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, Germany lost because the USA joined the war, making the allies more powerful.

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

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar**

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

**Conflict and tension, 1918–1939**

**11** Study **Source D**. **4**

Source D opposes Germany. How do you know?

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

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

**Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**

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

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

For example: Germany was depicted as a criminal being arrested by Allied forces of law and order; Germany was untrustworthy as implied by the legend in the cartoon; the devastation in the background may be seen as linked to Germany's 'crimes'.

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

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

For example, the German looks evil; it was published by the British at the end of the war and therefore was bound to be anti-German.

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

**12 Study Sources E and F.****12**

How useful are Sources E and F to a historian studying opinions about the Treaty of Versailles?

Explain your answer using **Sources E and F** and your contextual knowledge.

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

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

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

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

Extends Level 3

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

For example...taken together the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes to the severity of Versailles, but also recognise their limitations arising from provenance as both were from acknowledged critics of Versailles and neither, for example, reflected on the legitimate needs of France for security and recovery from the devastation of war. In assessing utility candidates may observe (eg) that Source F has greater value due to the author's expertise and detached objectivity.

**Level 3 Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance**

**7-9**

Extends Level 2

Candidates may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how Source E, as part of the emotive popular press coverage, might reflect contemporary German attitudes in that it depicts the French as sucking the lifeblood out of the German people and that Germany was the innocent and defenceless victim. Source F revealed doubts towards the settlement, as an informed British view saw Germany's treatment as immoral, counter-productive and short-sighted.

**Level 2 Simple evaluation of source(s) based on the content and/or provenance 4-6**

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of the source to simple evaluation of the content and/or provenance.

For example, candidates may explain that Source E is useful because it shows how the Germans saw Clemenceau and the French as sucking their lifeblood away.

Keynes' accusation of the immorality of the terms (Source F) may be used by historians to shed light on the validity of German resentment in 1919.

**Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1-3**

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

Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Keynes is suggesting the terms were too harsh; the message of the cartoon that France was like a vampire.

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

- 13** Write an account of how events in Manchuria became an international crisis in the years 1931–1933. **8**
- The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.
- Target** **Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)**  
**Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)**
- Level 4** **Complex analysis of causation/consequence** **7-8**  
**Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**
- Extends Level 3.
- Candidates may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and /or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.
- For example... analysis of the different consequences of the Japanese invasion which was seen as blatant aggression by Britain and France and was made worse by Japan's status as a fellow permanent member, which meant that Japan was supposed to adhere to the Covenant. Following investigation of Japan's actions, the crisis deepened as Japan was insulted by the League's approval of the Lytton Report. The Lytton Report called for Japan's withdrawal from Manchuria. Britain and France then felt humiliated and powerless when Japan left the League and invaded Jehol. Failure to deal with obvious aggression merely deepened the sense of crisis about future prospects for peace.
- Level 3** **Developed analysis of causation/consequence** **5-6**  
**Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**
- Extends Level 2.
- Candidates may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how / why tension increased at one stage in the process.
- For example...one consequence was that tension grew in the Council when Japan, a permanent member, carried out blatant aggression by invading Manchuria; Japan was supposed to support the Covenant by keeping the peace. This angered Britain and France who felt the League had been undermined. But there was a real risk of damaging the League so Britain and

France delayed matters by setting up the Lytton Commission to investigate the crisis.

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

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

For example, Japan was behind the crisis as its invasion of Manchuria was seen as clear aggression, which angered the League, so it set up the Lytton Commission to investigate and report on what action should be taken to resolve the problem.

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

Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the event such as when Japan invaded Manchuria which meant it had broken the rules of the League.

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

Question 14 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

<b>14</b>	<p>‘The Nazi-Soviet Pact was the main reason for the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939.’</p> <p>How far do you agree with this statement?</p> <p>Explain your answer.</p> <p>The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.</p> <p><b>Target Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2: 8) Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)</b></p>	<b>16 4 [SPaG]</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p><b>Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b></p> <p>Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.</p> <p>Extends Level 3.</p> <p>Candidates may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a sustained judgement.</p> <p>This might be related, for example... to the way reasons interacted. Such as: although the Nazi-Soviet Pact was the trigger for war against Poland, the principal underlying cause was the aims of Hitler, such as lebensraum, which could not have been achieved without military conquest and which had already alienated Britain sufficiently to guarantee Polish independence.</p>	<b>13-16</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>Developed explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b></p> <p>Answer demonstrates a developed, sustained line of reasoning which has coherence and logical structure; it is well substantiated, and with sustained, explicit relevance.</p>	<b>9-12</b>

Extends Level 2

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

For example... the Nazi-Soviet Pact provided the opportunity to go to war, as Hitler knew he could attack Poland in safety as Stalin would remain 'neutral'. He could concentrate on Britain and France in the west as they had guaranteed to defend Poland if attacked, thereby starting the war.

Candidates may additionally argue for other reasons such as Hitler's aims to build a thousand year Reich and create lebensraum made conflict inevitable plus the appeasement policies of Britain and France which allowed Hitler to gain in strength also enabled Germany to cause conflict.

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

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

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

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

For example, candidates may argue that the Nazi-Soviet Pact provided the opportunity to go to war because of such reasons as Hitler knew he could attack Poland in safety as Stalin would remain 'neutral'. He could concentrate on Britain and France in the west as they had guaranteed to defend Poland if attacked, thereby starting the war.

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

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

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

For example, candidates may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as, signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact meant Hitler would only have to fight in the west on one front. This provided the opportunity for

war.

Candidates may offer basic explanation of other factors, for example, the Second World War broke out because the League of Nations did not stop aggression during the 1930s.

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

### Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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

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

**15** Study **Source G**. **4**

**Source G** supports the Soviet Union. How do you know?

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

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

**Target** Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

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

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

For example, the caption which projects a progressive and heroic image by seeing the Soviets as ‘pioneers’ of space; the Soviet spaceman is depicted in triumphant pose and holds aloft the hammer and sickle emblems; the four sputnik flights are represented as stars lighting up the sky; the date of the poster can be linked to the Soviet Union’s triumph in the space race.

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

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

For example, the legend (‘Glory to the Soviet people’) was very pro-Soviet Union; it was painted by a Soviet artist so it would be propaganda.

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

**16 Study Sources H and J.****12**

How useful are Sources H and J to a historian studying opinions about the Marshall Plan?

Explain your answer using **Sources H** and **J** and your contextual knowledge.

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

**Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**  
**Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)**  
 In analysing and evaluating sources, candidates will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

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

Extends Level 3

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

For example...taken together the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes towards the Marshall Plan emphasising its benefits. Equally candidates may discern a different emphasis arising from authorship or the passage of time. Candidates may recognise the limitations of the sources, in that their western provenance may only offer a partial view.

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

Extends Level 2

Candidates may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how they might reflect opinions towards the Marshall Plan, such as how it stressed co-operation in Europe and that there was evidently a desire/need to promote this in 1950 (Source H) and the way the support for freedom was linked to its American originator's initial anti-Communist emphasis (Source J).

<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple evaluation of source(s) based on content and/or provenance</b>	<b>4-6</b>
	<p>Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of the sources with simple reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.</p> <p>For example, the poster (Source H) is useful because it shows how the Marshall Plan was presented as bringing the countries of Europe together. Marshall's speech (Source J) may be used by historians to shed light on how the Marshall Plan was viewed by its founder as a means to remove poverty and to preserve freedom.</p>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Basic analysis of sources(s)</b>	<b>1-3</b>
	<p>Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.</p> <p>Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point. For example, the message of the poster that there was unity because the flags of Europe are together. Source J says that the Marshall plan was meant to stop poverty.</p>	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.</b>	<b>0</b>

- 17 Write an account of how events in Hungary became an international crisis during 1956. 8

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

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

**Level 4 Complex analysis of causation/consequence 7-8  
Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Extends Level 3

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

For example...analysis of different consequences of Soviet actions meant that Cold War attitudes hardened at each stage, with evidence presented in the West of the Soviet's ruthless crushing of the revolt and the murder of its leaders, and the scale of Soviet military intervention against Hungarian citizens. It undermined the idea of 'peaceful co-existence' in a post-Stalinist era and the crisis escalated when Khrushchev carried his provocative veto in the UN in the face of Western protests. It was widely thought that US President Eisenhower supported the Hungarian Rising. East/West tensions arising from Hungary persisted against a background of the arms race and hard line Soviet attitudes.

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

Extends Level 2.

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

For example...one consequence of the Soviet's response to Nagy's reforms was that it gave more evidence to the international community of the Communists' ruthless attitude towards anything which threatened the USSR and the Warsaw Pact. Hungarians demanded independence and the

withdrawal of Soviet troops. Condemnation grew when the Soviets sent in tanks and soldiers and the death toll mounted – probably over 11000 lost their lives. The scale of the repression against tens of thousands of Hungarian people shocked the West and provoked protests.

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

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

For example, the Soviet Union was behind the crisis because it crushed the Hungarian people's demands for independence and withdrawal of all of Soviet troops. The Soviets' violent military reaction against the revolt upset the West and led to international protests.

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

Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events, such as Nagy made reforms, which made Russia send troops into Hungary again.

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

Question 18 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

- 18** ‘The main reason for the tension between East and West in Europe in the 1960s was the actions of the Soviet Union.’ **16**  
**4 [SPaG]**

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

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

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

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

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

Extends Level 3.

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

For example...the way reasons interacted, such as the Soviet Union was mainly to blame because of their actions in Berlin and Prague. Although the arms race between the USA and the USSR might be seen as a bigger source of tension, America was only spending money on expensive weapons systems to deter further Soviet aggression.

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

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

Extends Level 2.



## Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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

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

<b>19</b>	Study <b>Source K</b> .	<b>4</b>
	Source K supports China. How do you know?	
	Explain your answer using <b>Source K</b> and your contextual knowledge.	
	The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.	
<b>Target</b>	<b>Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)</b>	
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance</b>	<b>3-4</b>
	Candidates may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source	
	For example, the artist's depiction of China stopping the ignition of a bomb by US implying their intent to protect (contrasted with the US attempt to destroy); caption presents Chinese favourably as supporting their neighbours; the date of the poster may be linked to Chinese intervention to stop MacArthur's advance.	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	Candidates identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge or understanding.	
	For example, the Chinese volunteers have been made to appear to be strong; it was produced by the Chinese to praise their actions.	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

**20 Study Sources L and M.****12**

How useful are Sources L and M to a historian studying opinions in the United States about the Vietnam War?

Explain your answer using your contextual knowledge and **Sources L and M**.

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

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

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

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

Extends Level 3.

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

For example...taken together the sources are useful because they reflect the spectrum of different perspectives towards the Vietnam War, at different stages and from different vantage points (a newspaper and the President) but also recognise their limitations arising from their respective provenance. In assessing utility, through directly addressing the concerns of the American people, Nixon's speech may be seen as offering added value.

**Level 3 Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance**

**7-9**

Extends Level 2.

Candidates may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how they might reflect (different) contemporary American opinions. The destructive impact of Vietnam on successive administrations is highlighted satirically by the newspaper (Source L), whereas the ideals for which America has ostensibly fought are stressed by Nixon in a public speech (Source M).

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

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of the sources with simple reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example the cartoon is useful because it shows that the press were depicting the war as destructive.

Nixon's speech may be used by historians to show how he presented Vietnam to the American people as a just war.

**Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1-3**

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

Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point.

For example, the war was about achieving peace with honour; the war was destructive as shown in the cartoon.

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

- 21 Write an account of how events in Korea became an international crisis in 1950. 8

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

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

**Level 4 Complex analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question** 7-8

Extends Level 3

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

For example...analysis of different consequences of Communist North Korea's attack which was seen as a blatant act of aggression. This escalated as the UN committed itself to the use of force. As a result, the Soviet Union was angry with this decision because it was temporarily absent from the UN at the time. UN troops liberated the South and, despite Mao's warnings, the UN forces led by a US Commander instigated a campaign of conquest into the Communist North. As UN and US troops approached the border with China, this was seen as dangerously provocative – hence Chinese military intervention and direct fighting with US forces.

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

Extends Level 2.

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

For example...one consequence was that the escalation of tension was clear when the UN forces, having dealt with the invasion, went further and advanced into Communist North Korea. This was a significant crisis as UN forces, which included US soldiers and led by a US Commander, approached the border with China, provoking Chinese intervention and direct fighting between the USA and Chinese at Unsan.

<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b>	<b>3-4</b>
	<p>Candidates may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For example... the UN campaign and advance into North Korea directly led to the dangerous intervention of Chinese troops with Soviet supplies against UN troops.</p>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Basic analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	<p>Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events, such as the North Koreans attacked the South so the UN decided to take action.</p>	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

Question 22 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

- 22** ‘The main reason for the military success of the Vietcong was the support of the Vietnamese people.’ **16**  
**4 [SPaG]**

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

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

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

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

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

Extends Level 3.

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

For example...the way reasons interacted such as the idea that American high-tech tactics, eg napalm, carpet bombing, Agent Orange et cetera were often inappropriate to the environment in Vietnam where their opponents' low-tech solutions were more effective. Also the Vietcong were prepared to accept losses that would have been unacceptable to their American enemy. But then the Vietnam War was ultimately a battle for hearts and minds and the Vietcong were better at winning the support of the Vietnamese people.

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

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

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

For example...candidates may explain that the Vietcong enjoyed military success because of their ideology as Communists and more determined than the Americans who were often from an urban environment and could not relate to the guerrilla fighting in the jungle. They were seen as liberators by the South Vietnamese people who helped them. The Vietcong were disciplined and they respected the peasants and helped them with farming and education; this contrasted with the South Vietnamese government as the Vietcong were on their side against the landlords and the corrupt Diem government.

Candidates may additionally argue that the Americans could not defeat the Vietcong because the environment was perfect for guerrilla warfare. The Americans suffered heavy losses and could not locate their enemy due to their tunnels and merging with the peasantry.

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

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

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

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

For example, explaining that the Vietcong were seen as liberators because of such reasons as they respected the people and helped the villagers with farming and education so the people hid their weapons and gave the Vietcong valuable information about the Americans.

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

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

Candidates identify basic factual and general statements which are valid about the period related to the event. For example, the Vietcong gained more support because they helped Vietnamese peasants. Candidates may offer basic explanations of other factor(s) eg the Vietcong's use of guerrilla tactics meant they couldn't be found or defeated easily.

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

**Conflict and tension, 1990–2009**

**23** Study **Source N**. **4**

Source N supports Saddam Hussein. How do you know?

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

**Target** Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

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

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

For example, candidates may refer to details of the image which project Saddam is a positive light, eg as a leader/powerful/ courageous warrior, facing forward, defending children, protecting order and stability; a wall painting in Baghdad at this time would inevitably have been pro-Saddam due to power of Ba'ath Party.

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

Candidates identify relevant features in the source and support them with basic factual knowledge and understanding

For example, Saddam has been made to appear heroic; it was propaganda designed to flatter Saddam.

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

**24 Study Sources O and P.****12**

How useful are Sources O and P to a historian studying American opinions about the invasion of Iraq in 2003?

Explain your answer using **Sources O** and **P** and your contextual knowledge.

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

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

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

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

Extends Level 3.

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

For example...taken together they reflect how polarised American views were about Iraq. Candidates may also recognise limitations arising from provenance and particular significance may be attached to (eg) the passage of time and purpose of the two sources. In assessing utility the small readership of the newspaper (Source O) may lead to this source being seen as unrepresentative, particularly in view of Bush's victory in the presidential elections in 2004.

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

Extends Level 2.

Candidates may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how they might reflect opinions towards the invasion of Iraq.

For example...the cynicism and hostility of the cartoon (Source O) might

reflect contemporary (liberal) American opinions following the war. The speech by President Bush (Source P) at the beginning of the war might be in step with popular attitudes/concerns/perceptions at the time as well as the government's stated line.

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

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of the sources with simple reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, candidates may explain that the cartoon (Source O) is useful because it shows that some Americans did not believe that the government had good reasons for going to war with Iraq

The Bush speech (Source P) may be used by historians to shed light on the official grounds for the invasion of Iraq and may highlight the President's emphasis on idealism.

**Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1-3**

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

Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Bush is suggesting that this is a war for freedom; the cartoon suggests the reasons for going to war were made up.

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

- 25 Write an account of how Saddam Hussein’s occupation of Kuwait became an international crisis in 1991. 8

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

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

**Level 4 Complex analysis of causation/consequence 7-8  
Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Extends Level 3

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

For example...analysis of different consequences of the occupation of Kuwait... Bush and Thatcher refused to accept Saddam’s blatant aggression and the tension escalated following initial sanctions. Neither side would back down; Saddam’s bluff about the ‘mother of all wars’ was challenged by the next stage which was the creation of a sizeable international force. Operation Desert Storm was launched after deadlines for withdrawal were missed. While the military operation was a success, the international crisis within the coalition was complicated by missile attacks on Israel and Saudi Arabia as well as the critical issue of how to deal with Iraq’s retreating forces. Bush’s Arab allies were cautious about taking further offensive action to remove Saddam in case the coalition fractured. So a ceasefire was ordered with Kuwait liberated.

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

Extends Level 2.

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

For example...one consequence of how the occupation of Kuwait and the actions of Saddam Hussein gave rise to UN sanctions; neither side would back down. Saddam proved himself to be a provocative opponent and after

deadlines for withdrawal were missed, the crisis led to US Operation Desert Shield, which saw the creation of a large and varied coalition force to launch a counter attack on Iraqi forces, thereby escalating the conflict.

<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>Simple analysis of causation/consequence</b>  <b>Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b></p> <p>Candidates may progress from a <b>basic</b> narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.                  For example, Iraq’s aggression and occupation of Kuwait led to UN sanctions and direct military action.</p>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>Basic analysis of causation/consequence</b>  <b>Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b>                  Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the event, such as Iraq invaded Kuwait so a multi-national force was formed to deal with this.</p>	<b>1-2</b>
	<p><b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b></p>	<b>0</b>

Question 26 enables students to produce an extended response. Students have the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

- 26** ‘The main reason for Al-Qaeda’s terror campaign was to destroy the state of Israel.’ **16**  
 How far do you agree with this statement? **4 [SPaG]**  
 Explain your answer.

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

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

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

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

Extends Level 3.

Candidates may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a sustained judgement. For example, the way reasons interacted such as, the central thread running through Al-Qaeda’s policies towards Israel, Saudi Arabia and Afghanistan was hostile towards the United States and its interference in the Muslim world.

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

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

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

For example, Al-Qaeda’s support for Palestine and actions against the USA were designed to put pressure on the USA to cease their support for Israel. Hence the direct attacks on New York, 9/11 against a background of the Intifada.

Candidates may additionally explain alternative factors, such as the intention to turn Osama bin Laden’s homeland Saudi Arabia into an Islamic state which would also mean removing US military bases, returning the country to Islamic ways.

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

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

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

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

For example, candidates may focus on Al-Qaeda’s support for Palestine and explain the reasons for doing so, such as actions against the USA were designed to put pressure on the USA to cease their support for Israel.

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

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

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

Candidates may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as Al-Qaeda’s campaign was to show support for Palestine.

Candidates may offer basic explanations of other factor(s) eg a reason for the terror campaign was because they did not like America’s foreign policy and influence in the world.

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

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar**

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

