

**GCSE (9–1) History A (Explaining the Modern World)**

**J410/01 International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001**

**Practice Paper - Set 2**

**MARK SCHEME**

**Duration: 1 hour**

**MAXIMUM MARK 65**

**This document consists of 18 pages**

**MARKING INSTRUCTIONS****PREPARATION FOR MARKING****RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: RM Assessor *Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK 10 PRACTICE AND 10 STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

**TRADITIONAL**

Before the Standardisation meeting you must mark at least 10 scripts from several centres. For this preliminary marking you should use **pencil** and follow the **mark scheme**. Bring these **marked scripts** to the meeting.

**MARKING**

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 50% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, email or via the RM Assessor messaging system.

5. Work crossed out:
  - a. where a candidate crosses out an answer and provides an alternative response, the crossed out response is not marked and gains no marks
  - b. if a candidate crosses out an answer to a whole question and makes no second attempt, and if the inclusion of the answer does not cause a rubric infringement, the assessor should attempt to mark the crossed out answer and award marks appropriately.
6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. There is a NR (No Response) option. Award NR (No Response)
  - if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
  - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g. 'can't do', 'don't know')
  - OR if there is a mark (e.g. a dash, a question mark) which isn't an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).
8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your Team Leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**  
If you have any questions or comments for your Team Leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.
9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.
10. For answers marked by levels of response:
  - a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
  - b. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

Please note that the Assessment Objectives being assessed are listed at the top of the mark scheme for each question, above the 'Additional guidance'. Where more than one Assessment Objective is being assessed, the more heavily weighted Assessment Objective will be listed first, and the maximum number of marks for each Assessment Objective will be given so that the relative weightings are clear. When marking, you must therefore give greater priority to the more heavily weighted Assessment Objective when determining in which level and within a level to place an answer.

## 11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning

## 12. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

### INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet **Instructions for Examiners**. If you are examining for the first time, please read carefully **Appendix 5 Introduction to Script Marking: Notes for New Examiners**.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

## USING THE MARK SCHEME

Please study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide 'correct' answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide 'best guesses' about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

The Examiners' Standardisation Meeting will ensure that the Mark Scheme covers the range of candidates' responses to the questions, and that all Examiners understand and apply the Mark Scheme in the same way. The Mark Scheme will be discussed and amended at the meeting, and administrative procedures will be confirmed. Co-ordination scripts will be issued at the meeting to exemplify aspects of candidates' responses and achievements; the co-ordination scripts then become part of this Mark Scheme.

Before the Standardisation Meeting, you should read and mark in pencil a number of scripts, in order to gain an impression of the range of responses and achievement that may be expected.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

**INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS**

- 1 The co-ordination scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the Team Leaders and will be discussed fully at the Examiners' Co-ordination Meeting.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

**International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001**

1. Outline the actions of Mikhail Gorbachev as Soviet leader in the years 1985–91.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples should also be credited.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically outline the general direction or motives of Gorbachev and then develop the answer with at least one supporting example e.g.</p> <p><i>In the period 1985-91 Gorbachev tried to reform the Soviet Union. The USSR's economy was in a very poor state and it was struggling with a costly war in Afghanistan. Gorbachev brought change. He ended the war in Afghanistan. He brought in new policies called Perestroika and Glasnost. These involved reforming the Soviet economy and making Soviet society more open.</i></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically outline one or more examples of Gorbachev's actions e.g.</p> <p><i>Gorbachev brought in new policies called Perestroika and Glasnost. These involved reforming the Soviet economy and making Soviet society more open. He also cut spending on arms and stopped trying to compete with the USA on spending on nuclear weapons. He also started disarmament talks with President Reagan.</i></p>	<b>2–3</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically outline one or more event with little or no reference to Gorbachev's actions e.g.</p> <p><i>In 1985 Gorbachev came to power. He was the youngest leader for many years and wanted to reform the USSR.</i></p>	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	No response or no response worthy of credit.	<b>0</b>

2. Explain why the USA clashed with the USSR over Berlin in 1961.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.  No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li><li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li></ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two reasons for the clash between the USA and USSR over Berlin and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p><i>He USA clashed with the USSR over Berlin for several reasons.</i></p> <p><i>One reason was that large numbers of East Germans were fleeing East Germany into West Berlin and then on to West Germany. Most of these refugees were disillusioned with life in the East which had a lower standard of living and less political freedom. The East German government and the USSR built a wall to stop these refugees in 1961 and the Americans were highly critical of this policy. In return the Soviets claimed they were building the wall to protect East Germany from American spies.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that the Soviet leader Khrushchev thought he could gain a propaganda victory over the USA, and possibly even take control of West Berlin. In 1961 the USA had a new leader, John F Kennedy. Khrushchev thought that he would be able to intimidate and humiliate Kennedy who was relatively young and inexperienced. Kennedy had suffered a disaster at the Bay of Pigs in 1961 and Khrushchev took the opportunity to press Kennedy to remove US troops from Berlin. Khrushchev thought that Kennedy would back down and give him control of Berlin. In fact, Kennedy resisted and sent more US troops to Berlin.</i></p>	<b>9–10</b>

<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify one reason why the USA and USSR clashed over Berlin and explain it fully e.g.</p> <p><i>The USA clashed with the USSR over Berlin for several reasons.</i></p> <p><i>One reason was that many refugees were fleeing East Germany. Most of these refugees were disillusioned with life in the East, which had a lower standard of living and less political freedom. The East German government and the USSR built a wall to stop these refugees in 1961.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that the Soviet leader Khrushchev thought he could gain a propaganda victory over the USA, and possibly even take control of West Berlin. In 1961 the USA had a new leader, John F Kennedy. Khrushchev thought that he would be able to intimidate and humiliate Kennedy who was relatively young and inexperienced. Kennedy had suffered a disaster at the Bay of Pigs in 1961 and Khrushchev took the opportunity to press Kennedy to remove US troops from Berlin. Khrushchev thought that Kennedy would back down and give him control of Berlin. In fact, Kennedy resisted and sent more US troops to Berlin.</i></p> <p>NOTE Answers at L4 will often identify and describe several reasons but only fully explain one of them.</p>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify at least one reason for the US clashing with the USSR over Berlin but description and explanation will be limited e.g.</p> <p><i>The USA and USSR clashed over Berlin because it was part of the Cold War. The Soviets were unhappy about defectors from East Germany as it made Communism look bad. The Americans wanted Berlin to be an example of capitalism and its successes.</i></p>	<b>5–6</b>
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to the clash over Berlin.</p> <p><i>In the summer of 1961 East German border guards started putting up barbed wire barriers to stop people travelling to and from East Berlin. The US President criticised the Soviet actions and there were demonstrations in West Berlin. In October Soviet and US tanks faced each other.</i></p>	<b>3–4</b>

<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li><li>• There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li></ul>	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g.  Berlin was a Cold War flashpoint.	<b>1–2</b>
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on Chamberlain and the policy of Appeasement? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of Appeasement to support your answer.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO4 (a and d): Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. [20] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full and thoroughly developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a convincing and substantiated judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically address the question through fully developed analysis and evaluation of specific aspects of Interpretation A, supported by relevant reference to other interpretations or the context of Interpretation A e.g.</p> <p><i>In Interpretation A Zara Steiner argues that Chamberlain simply did not understand Hitler. Chamberlain believed in international relations which was carried out according to strict rules. He failed to understand that Hitler did not care about these rules.</i></p> <p><i>In many respects this is a fair comment. In 1948 Winston Churchill wrote in his book 'The Gathering Storm' that Chamberlain had very pure motives but he made a series of mistakes and miscalculations about Hitler. This view was also expressed by post-revisionist historians in the 1990s. Counter-revisionists claimed that Chamberlain fooled himself into believing that he had a special influence over Hitler and this was clearly not the case.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand other historians would argue that this is not a fair comment. From the 1960s to the 1990s several revisionist historians argued that Chamberlain was not misled or fooled, but that he took the only sensible option which was appeasement. They argued that it was the most sensible policy for Britain which was weakened by the First World War and by economic problems in the 1930s.</i></p> <p>NOTE 1: Evaluation of interpretations can be through comparison with other historians or evaluation of the context in which the interpretation was written. NOTE 2: References to specific historians or schools of thought are not essential but will be given credit if they explain the arguments of those historians. Simply naming them is not sufficient. NOTE 3: Answers which are one-sided (i.e. wholly critical or supportive) can be rewarded at L5 if they are sufficiently developed and supported.</p>	<b>21–25</b>

<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a fully supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically address the question through analysis and evaluation of the general position of Interpretation A (ie critical of Chamberlain / Appeasement), supported by relevant reference to other interpretations or the context of Interpretation A e.g.</p> <p><i>In Interpretation A Zara Steiner argues that Chamberlain simply did not understand Hitler.</i></p> <p><i>In many respects this is a fair comment. In 1948 Winston Churchill wrote in his book the Gathering Storm that Chamberlain had very pure motives but he made a series of mistakes and miscalculations. Churchill thought he should have stood up to him.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand this is not a fair comment. Revisionist historians in the 1960s argued that Britain was weakened by the First World War and Chamberlain made the best choice which was appeasement.</i></p> <p>NOTE 1: Evaluation of interpretations can be through comparison with other historians or evaluation of the context in which the interpretation was written.</p>	<b>16–20</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied, and uses this to make a partially supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically address the question through some analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and support this with relevant factual knowledge to address the question e.g.</p> <p><i>The comment is fair because it's true that Chamberlain did not understand what Hitler was like. When Chamberlain chose not to help the Czechs defend the Sudetenland he believed Hitler's promises that he would not cause any more crises or try to take any more land. Chamberlain thought he had avoided war with his famous 'Piece of Paper'. But by the spring of 1939 Hitler invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia, showing that Chamberlain was wrong to believe Hitler.</i></p>	<b>11–15</b>
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and limited evaluation of other interpretations studied, and links this to a judgement of the given interpretation in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain some analysis of Interpretation A and support this with limited factual knowledge or consideration of the content of the interpretation e.g.</p> <p><i>Steiner says that Chamberlain did not understand Hitler. This seems like a fair comment because Chamberlain let him have what he wanted in the Munich Agreement but then Hitler started a war anyway.</i></p>	<b>6–10</b>

<b>Level 1</b>  The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in terms of the question. Other interpretations may be mentioned but there is no analysis or evaluation of them. The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points about Interpretation A accompanied by basic knowledge or a general statement about other interpretations e.g.  <i>The Interpretation is right. It says Chamberlain misunderstood Hitler. I agree.</i>  <i>This is harsh. Lots of other historians disagree and think he had no choice.</i>	1-5
<b>Level 0</b>  No response or no response worthy of credit.	.	0

4. Study Interpretation B. Explain why **not all** historians and commentators agree with this interpretation. Use other interpretations and your knowledge to support your answer.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO4 (a, b and c): Analyse individual interpretations and how and why interpretations differ. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p> <p>Credit could be awarded within any level for candidates who explain (with valid support such as the new sources under the Public Records Act) that some historians <b>have</b> agreed with the interpretation.</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically explain how and why historian(s) and commentator(s) from more than one period have disagreed with Interpretation B e.g.</p> <p><i>It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. In this interpretation Schlesinger is effectively arguing that the US never acted out of its own self-interest and only became involved in international conflict in order to do the right thing against aggressors.</i></p> <p><i>There would be many historians who would disagree with this view. To begin with, Soviet historians would not accept this view. They would have argued that actions like the Marshall Plan were ideological and self-interested because the Plan was designed to tie Europe to the USA politically and economically. Schlesinger is clearly patriotic and proud of his country but Soviet historians in the Cold War period were just as patriotic as US historians. In addition, Soviet historians would have faced pressures of censorship and control. If they were to criticise the USSR they might have lost their job or worse.</i></p> <p><i>Schlesinger was writing in the early 1960s but just a few years later he would have found that several US revisionist historians would have disagreed with his view. The revisionists were influenced by the horrors of the Vietnam War and the Cuban Missile Crisis and they did not believe America was acting for good. Many revisionists argued that the US was trying to promote and extend its own power and interests. Some said the main US policy from 1945-54 was a drive to expand American capitalism across the world.</i></p> <p>[Alternatively, candidates could balance their argument with reference to historians who might agree with Interpretation B such as Kennan, Gaddis or Feis. However, there must be at least one fully developed example of disagreement].</p>	<b>17–20</b> 

<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts some aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce an analysis of how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is a supported analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically explain how and why historian(s) and commentator(s) from one period have disagreed with Interpretation B e.g.</p> <p><i>It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. In this interpretation Schlesinger is effectively arguing that the US only became involved in the Cold War in order to do the right thing against aggressors.</i></p> <p><i>There would be many historians who would disagree with this view. To begin with, Soviet historians would not accept this view. They would have argued that actions like the Marshall Plan were ideological and self-interested because the Plan was designed to tie Europe to the USA politically and economically. In addition, Soviet historians would have faced pressures of censorship and control. If they were to criticise the USSR they might have lost their job or worse.</i></p> <p><i>Schlesinger was writing in the early 1960s but just a few years later he would have found that several US revisionist historians would have disagreed with his view. Revisionists argued that the US was trying to promote and extend its own power and interests. Some said the main US policy from 1945-54 was a drive to expand American capitalism across the world.</i></p> <p><i>[Alternatively, candidates could balance their argument with reference to historians who might agree with Interpretation B such as Kennan, Gaddis or Feis. However, there must be at least one example of how historians have disagreed. The reason for the disagreement (which is the threshold for L4) could be for the disagreement or (if relevant) the agreement].</i></p>	<b>13–16</b> 
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a partial analysis how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is some analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically explain how historian(s) and commentator(s) have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B e.g.</p> <p><i>It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B but actually many historians would agree. In the early stages of the Cold War orthodox historians would have agreed with what Schlesinger was saying. They definitely saw the USSR as an aggressor and they saw themselves as reacting to Soviet attempts to expand territory and spread communism. Post-revisionist historians blamed Stalin and claimed that Stalin's paranoia was the main cause of tensions between the two sides.</i></p>	<b>9–12</b> 

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>		
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of at least one other interpretation studied, to show how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is a basic explanation of why the given interpretation and the other interpretation(s) differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically focus on events which have led historian(s) to agree or disagree with Interpretation B e.g.</p> <p><i>Not all historians would agree with Interpretation B about America being innocent. For example they were trying to help Europe with Marshall Aid but at the same time the US insisted that countries who took Marshall Aid also adopted democracy and free market capitalism.</i></p>	<b>5–8</b> 
<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response compares the candidate's own knowledge and understanding to the interpretation, or uses knowledge and understanding of the time in which it was created, to analyse the given interpretation.</li> <li>There is no consideration or no relevant consideration of any other interpretations.</li> <li>The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions about Interpretation B or about views which support or oppose it e.g.</p> <p><i>Not all historians would disagree with Interpretation B because Russia was more to blame than the USA.</i></p>	<b>1–4</b> 
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG) mark scheme** 

<b>High performance</b> <b>4–5 marks</b>	<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>
<b>Intermediate performance</b> <b>2–3 marks</b>	<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>
<b>Threshold performance</b> <b>1 mark</b>	<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>
<b>No marks awarded</b> <b>0 marks</b>	<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>