



---

GCSE

**HISTORY**

**8145/1B/A**

Paper 1B/A: Conflict and tension, the First World War, 1894–1918

---

**Mark scheme**

Additional Specimen Material

Version E1

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

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

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

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

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

## Level of response marking instructions

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

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

### Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

### Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Performance descriptor	Marks awarded
High performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><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

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

0	1
---	---

**Source A** supports the United States joining the First World War. How do you know?

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

**[4 marks]**

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

**Target**

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

**Level 2:**

**Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance**

**3–4**

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

For example, the impression of the language and tone is that Germany was entirely to blame – for waging war on ‘innocent people’ and for making the world no longer safe for democracy. The date would suggest that the US is ready to declare war because 1917 was the year Germany provoked the US to declare war because U boats had been sinking US ships and taking American lives. The speech represents Wilson’s purpose to justify and gain support for the US joining the war.

**Level 1:**

**Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance**

**1–2**

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

For example, in the speech, the US President blames Germany for using submarine warfare as a war ‘against mankind’, so the US can’t stay neutral; given the date of 1917 this was when the US declared war on Germany.

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

**0**

**0 2**

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** to an historian studying the Battle of the Somme?

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

**[4 marks]**

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

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

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

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

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

For example, this may relate to the way that, taken together, the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes towards the need to show heroism in the army, but they also have limitations. Source B is propaganda and its purpose is to show heroism in action. Given the disaster of the first day of the Somme and news about the losses at home, the Illustrated London News would wish to show Tommies taking the fight to the enemy.

Source C is from an Inquiry into a military failure and you might expect it to deliberately cover up the truth, but it doesn't. In assessing utility students may observe that Source C has particular value because the evidence from the officers is supported by other battlefield reports of the failure of 7 days of shelling against barbed wire, the 20000 death toll on the first day, and the fact that German machine gunners survived to train their machine guns on gaps in impenetrable wire.

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

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

For example, it is useful because the newspaper would wish to portray their heroic actions in battle as pieces of propaganda to boost morale (Source B). Or that the officers were merely confirming that 7 days of bombardment across the whole front had failed to break German defences, as proven by the few significant advances, and casualty figures of around 60,000 men (Source C).

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

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

For example, the drawing (Source B) is useful because it suggests how a British newspaper wanted to portray a heroic advance by British troops across No Man’s Land.

The report (Source C) is useful because they were eye witnesses and saw the obstacles presented by the wire at first hand.

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

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

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, the officers in Source C were suggesting that an advance on the first day of the Somme was doomed to failure; the message was that the wire was an impassable barrier.

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

0	3
---	---

Write an account of how events following the Ludendorff Offensive became a crisis for both sides during the Spring of 1918.

**[8 marks]**

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

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

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

Extends Level 3.

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

For example, the Ludendorff Offensive threatened to break through the Western Front. The attacks were effective because the Allies faced well trained German ‘shock troops’ and they had to fall back to such an extent that even Paris came into range of German guns. The crisis for the Allies was how to regroup and they unified command under Foch.

However during May, German offensives made little progress. This was because their best troops had been killed, discipline was poor and they faced Allies who were well resourced and supported by inexhaustible reinforcements from the US. When the Allies counter attacked, the German resistance crumbled and they faced their own crisis, ie retreat and defeat.



<b>Level 3:</b>	<p><b>Developed analysis of causation/consequence</b>  <b>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</b></p> <p>Extends Level 2.</p> <p>Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.</p> <p>For example, the Ludendorff Offensive threatened to break through the Western Front. The attacks were effective because the Allies faced well trained German ‘shock troops’ and they had to fall back to such an extent that even Paris came into range of German guns. The crisis for the Allies was how to regroup and they unified their command under Foch. However, the Germans were exhausted by these attacks. The Allies counter attacked, and the German army found itself unable to do anything except retreat.</p>	<b>5–6</b>
<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>Students 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 Ludendorff Offensive meant that German troops made significant breakthroughs on the Western Front. At some points, they advanced 64 km easily taking the Allied front line trenches. Allied forces had to retreat and regroup and then Foch took over as overall Commander-in-Chief of the Allies. The German advance weakened and the Allies were able to counter attack. The German army was forced to retreat.</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></p> <p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the fact that the German forces made large advances into enemy held land.</p>	<b>1–2</b>
	<b>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

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

**0 4**

'The actions of Austria-Hungary were the main reason for the start of the First World War.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

**[16 marks]**  
**[SPaG 4 marks]**

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

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

**Level 4:**      **Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement**      **13–16**

**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

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

Extends Level 3.

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

This might be related, for example, to the way reasons interacted such as Austria's intention to crush Serbian nationalism coinciding with the assassination provided the opportunity, and Germany's unconditional support summed up by the Kaiser's statement, 'Whatever comes from Vienna, to me, is a command'. The actions were taken despite the suspicion that Russia would intervene and this would spark general war between the Alliance systems.

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

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

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

This might be related, for example, to the part played by Austria-Hungary in initiating war against Serbia, blaming it for the assassination of the heir to the Austrian throne and taking the opportunity to suppress Serbian nationalism. This action was taken despite the dangers from Russia who would declare war in defence of a fellow Slav nation. Austria therefore must take most responsibility for taking the initiative.

Students may additionally explain, for example, the importance of Germany's entry into the war, because the Kaiser leapt to the defence of its ally and offered it a 'blank cheque' to take whatever action it wished. This would also allow Germany to pursue its anti-French policies.

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

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

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

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

For example, Austria was not completely to blame, although it did declare war on Serbia following the result of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Other explanations must place initial blame on Russia for its support of another Slav nation and willingness to defend it against attack from Austria-Hungary. The alliance system meant that Triple Alliance and Triple Entente countries were dragged into conflict with each other.

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

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

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

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as, Austria blamed Serbia for the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand and declared war as a result.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, Germany gave Austria-Hungary complete support if it wished to settle its Serbian problem.

**Students 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