



GCSE

HISTORY

8145/1B/B

Paper 1B/B: Conflict and tension, the inter-war years, 1918–1939

Mark scheme

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

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

Students 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.

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 opinions about the Treaty of Versailles?

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, 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 students may observe (eg) that Source C 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**

Students 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 B, 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 C 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 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, students may explain that Source B 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 C) 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.

Students 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.

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

0	3
---	---

Write an account of how events in Manchuria became an international crisis in the years 1931–1933.

[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, 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:	<p>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</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, 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.</p>	5–6
Level 2:	<p>Simple analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</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, 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.</p>	3–4
Level 1:	<p>Basic analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</p> <p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as as when Japan invaded Manchuria which meant it had broken the rules of the League.</p>	1–2
	<p>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</p>	0

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 Nazi-Soviet Pact was the main reason for the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939.'

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: 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.

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 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.

Students 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) **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, students 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 **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, signing the Nazi-Soviet Pact meant Hitler would only have to fight in the west on one front. This provided the opportunity for war.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, the Second World War broke out because the League of Nations did not stop aggression during the 1930s.

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

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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