

GCSE **History**

8145/1B/B- Paper 1 Section B/B Conflict and tension, the inter war years,
1918–1939

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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

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 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. It gives 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 is critical of the Versailles Treaty. 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 sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**

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 caption and the faces of the characters suggest that they don't care about the consequences for the future of the peace treaty. The cartoon is criticising the peacemakers for being harsh on Germany and caring more about getting what they wanted from the peace settlement; it made Germany want revenge.

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 child represents Germany; the child is crying because the Treaty has taken so much away from 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 causes of the Second World War?

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

[12 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 in studying the causes of the Second World War because they attribute blame to both Britain and Germany respectively. Source B blames appeasement for bringing war closer by misjudging Nazi Germany and also neglecting self-defence. Whereas Source C takes a more patriotic view and focuses on the aggression of the Nazi Soviet pact as a trigger for the Second World War. Furthermore, students may make a link between the sources by arguing that the exclusion of the USSR from the 1938 Munich Conference was a trigger for Stalin to seek some self-defence and hence he signed the Nazi Soviet Pact with Hitler in 1939.

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, they may explain how Source B is useful for showing contemporary criticism of Chamberlain's policy of negotiation because in the long term the Munich agreement over the Sudetenland was a failure. There may be comment on the value of the provenance in terms of Churchill being an important political figure but also that his view was not widely shared and most people supported Chamberlain's policy of appeasement.

There may be comment that Source C is British and discussion of the limitations this presents in studying the context of the Nazi Soviet Pact.

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, Source B is useful because it shows how the policy of appeasement brought the Second World War closer. Although Britain had tried to be friends with Germany, this policy did not work and it put Britain in danger. Source C is useful because it comments on the false friendship between Nazi Germany and USSR which gave Hitler the confidence to invade Poland.

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, Source B says that the Nazi government is dangerous and threatening. Source C shows Hitler and Stalin became allies and invaded Poland.

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

0 3

Write an account of how the remilitarisation of the Rhineland increased international tension.

[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 remilitarisation of the Rhineland increased international tension because it prompted France to seek more reassurance that they could rely on Britain as an ally in the event of German invasion. Furthermore, it led to the signing of the Rome-Berlin Axis which strengthened and emboldened the fascist dictatorships in Germany and Italy.

**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.

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.

For example, Hitler took a gamble when he remilitarised the Rhineland because his army was not big enough to fight if France challenged him. When neither Britain nor France took any action to uphold the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler grew more confident that he could do as he pleased. France was not willing to act alone against Hitler and many in Britain felt that Germany had a right to protect its own border.

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

Students 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 remilitarisation of the Rhineland meant that Germany had broken the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. This increased international tension because it made France more nervous.

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

Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the remilitarisation of the Rhineland put German troops on the border with France.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question **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 main reason why the League of Nations could not stop aggression in the 1930s was because the USA was not a member.'

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 the reasons for failure interacted over time throughout the 1930s. The original political weakness of the League caused by the absence of the USA was later exacerbated by the self-preserving actions of the leading members (Britain and France) who in turn were influenced by the wider factors of worldwide depression and the rise of Hitler. These factors influenced Britain and France to avoid war and try to retain Mussolini as an ally rather than prioritise the League of Nations.

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 absence of the USA made the League of Nations ineffective against aggression because without the wealth of the USA, the League could not afford to send armed troops to defend injured countries such as Manchuria. Since the League could not enforce the judgement of the Lytton report and its condemnation of Japan's invasion, it was limited to issuing moral condemnation which Japan ignored; thereby undermining the League's authority.

Students may additionally argue that another weakness of the League of Nations was that Britain and France were more concerned with protecting themselves than the covenant of the League; the Hoare Laval Pact was completed in secret to their advantage but at the expense of Abyssinia. The publication of the pact proved that the peace keeping role of the League was a sham as neither Britain nor France were prepared to seek justice for Abyssinia or censure Italy's aggression.

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, the main reason the League of Nations could not stop aggression by Italy and Japan was because it could only use economic sanctions against them. This had little effect against Italy in 1935 because it did not include banning trade in the key raw materials that Mussolini needed to wage 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, the League of Nations did not have any power or strength behind it because the USA was not a member.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, the League of Nations failed because it was slow to act in a crisis.

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