



---

# GCSE HISTORY 8145/1B/B

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

---

Mark scheme

June 2025

---

Version: 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 Examiner.

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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

#### **Copyright information**

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.

Copyright © 2025 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## 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.

	<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

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** is critical of Hitler. 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 cartoon is critical of Hitler because it shows him trying to go against the Treaty of Versailles and make Austria unite with Germany. Dollfuss did not want Anschluss and he banned the Nazi Party in Austria.

**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 cartoon shows Hitler making Austria unhappy.

**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 peacemaking in 1919?

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, the sources are useful for giving critical opinions from both sides of the war about why peacemaking in 1919 was not successful. The British provenance of Source B shows that even amongst the victorious Allies, there was a realisation that the peacemakers were not likely to work together effectively. The date of Source C shows how the problems that developed as a result of the Treaty of Versailles being so harsh were raised when it was first signed. The Big Three were given an opportunity to change the guilt clause. This was the part of the Treaty that German people hated the most.

**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, Source B is useful as it suggests Woodrow Wilson had a different priority from the other leaders at the peace conference. He is shown to be mainly interested in creating the League of Nations, whereas France is more concerned with reparations. The League was one of the fourteen points Wilson created as a basis for making sure there was fairness in the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. However, his ideals were not applied consistently during the conference, particularly over the issue of self-determination, and this led to resentment from Germany. Source C shows how Germany felt about the Treaty. It was a 'Diktat' and the Germans were not allowed to attend the

conference where the terms were discussed. German people thought this was unfair.

For example, Source C is useful because it shows that there were problems with the Treaty before it was even signed. The provenance illustrates how Germany's attitude towards the dictated terms was a European wide political problem because the German representatives openly criticised the peacemakers. This meant that the Treaty of Versailles was not highly regarded from the outset. Source B shows that in January 1919 the 'Big Three' had different attitudes towards peacemaking. France and Britain wanted to treat Germany like a criminal. France wanted to make Germany pay reparations for the damage caused by the fighting during the First World War.

**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 shows that in January 1919 the 'Big Three' had different attitudes towards peacemaking. France and Britain wanted to treat Germany like a criminal. France wanted to make Germany pay reparations for the damage caused by the fighting during the First World War.

For example, Source C shows how Germany felt about the Treaty. It was a 'Diktat' and the Germans were not allowed to attend the conference where the terms were discussed. German people thought this was unfair.

**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 shows that France wants Germany to pay the bill.

Source C says that Germany should not be the only ones to be blamed for starting the War.

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

**0 3**

Write an account of how the League of Nations failed to help Manchuria in 1931.

**[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:**      **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.

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.

For example, the League needed a unanimous vote from the Council for decisions to be made. It failed to solve the Manchurian Crisis because one of the permanent members of the Council had acted with aggression. Japan sabotaged the Covenant because it would not engage in mediation to discuss the invasion nor would it accept the moral condemnation.

**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.

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, the League failed to solve the Manchurian Crisis as its moral condemnation and the judgement of the Lytton Report were ignored by Japan. The League did not have its own troops to enforce its moral condemnation and Japan responded to the Lytton Report by leaving the League of Nations and continuing its invasion of the rest of China.



<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 League did not use trade sanctions against Japan because it would not have had any effect. Japan could continue to trade with America as America was not a member of the League of Nations.</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 League of Nations could not help because they did not have their own army.</p>	<b>1–2</b>
	<p><b>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b></p>	<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**

'Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was the main reason for the outbreak of the Second 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.

For example, Chamberlain's policy of appeasement during the Sudetenland Crisis became a cause of the Second World War because it had the unforeseen consequence of helping Hitler's broader aim of gaining 'lebensraum'. Despite his promises in the Munich Agreement and the Anglo-German declaration, Hitler had greater ambitions for the future of Germany. The exclusion of the USSR from the appeasement process also made war more likely because it led to the Nazi Soviet Pact and the invasion of Poland.

**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.

For example, the policy of appeasement was Chamberlain's plan to avoid war by giving into Hitler's demands for German speakers to be reunited with the rest of the German Reich. It contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War because once the Munich Agreement had been signed it was possible for Hitler to take control of the Sudetenland. However, Hitler did not honour the terms of the agreement and he went on to invade the rest of Czechoslovakia. Britain and France realised that appeasement had failed and announced they would declare war if Hitler expanded any further.

For example, Hitler's rearmament programme was a main cause of the Second World War because the Allied powers did not object, despite the fact that he was breaking the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler reintroduced conscription and built an air force, both of which allowed him to pursue his foreign policy aims of gaining land in the East.

**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, Anschluss with Austria contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War because it made Germany stronger. It was another example of how Hitler was not stopped from breaking the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The natural resources in Austria were used to support Hitler's rearmament programme.

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

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 appeasement meant that Hitler grew more confident that he could take over countries.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, the Nazi–Soviet Pact was a main cause of the Second World War because it meant that Hitler knew he would only have to fight on one front.

<b>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>
---	----------

### 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