

---

# GCSE HISTORY 8145/1C

Paper 1 Understanding the modern world  
1C Russia, 1894–1945: Tsardom and communism  
with wider world depth studies

---

Mark scheme

Specimen for 2018

---

1.0

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

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

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

## 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 questions 10, 14, 18, 22 and 26 in Section B.

	<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

Questions 10, 14, 18, 22 and 26 in Section B are also extended responses. 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.

**Section A**

- 01** How does **Interpretation B** differ from **Interpretation A** about collectivisation? **4**

Explain your answer using **Interpretations A** and **B**.

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.

<b>Target</b>	<b>Analyse individual interpretations (AO4a)</b> <b>Analyse how interpretations of a key feature of a period differ (AO4b)</b>	
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Developed analysis of interpretations to explain differences based on their content</b>	<b>3-4</b>
	Candidates may progress from a simple analysis of interpretations with extended reasoning to explain the differences. For example, Kopelev (B) emphasises that despite the appalling effects of the famine, collectivisation was justified because the ends would mean prosperity for all. By comparison candidates might explain the report (A) supports idea that collectivisation was a hate campaign that was going to be impossible to achieve.	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Simple analysis of interpretation(s) to identify differences based on their content</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	Candidates are likely to identify relevant features in each interpretation(s). For example, collectivisation, according to the special report (A), focused entirely on the desperate plight of people facing famine, whereas Kopelev (B) claims that collectivisation was justified.	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

- 02** Why might the authors of **Interpretations A** and **B** have a different interpretation about collectivisation? **4**

Explain your answer using the **Interpretations A** and **B** and your contextual knowledge.

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 why interpretations differ (AO4c)**

**Level 2** **Developed answer analyses provenance of interpretation to explain reasons for differences** **3-4**

Candidates may progress from identification to explanation of the reasons for differences in the interpretations with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge or understanding related to, for example, differences in provenance, context of their time of writing, place, previous experience, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, and access to information, purpose and audience.

For example, candidates argue that Interpretations A and B were based on different circumstances, beliefs and purposes; the then newly independent Ukrainian Parliament (Interpretation A) was marking the famine as an Anniversary and its anti-Soviet report exposed the cruelties of the country's old rulers. Kopelev (Interpretation B) was a keen young Communist ('True Believer') who was swept along by idealism in the Communist system at that time and so he tries to justify the idea that forced collectivisation was all for the best in the long run for the future of the Soviet State.

**Level 1** **Simple answers analyse provenance to identify reasons for difference(s)** **1-2**

Candidates are likely to identify relevant reasons for the differences in each interpretation(s). For example, Interpretation A was based on eye witness accounts of the famine; people who hated the Soviets. Interpretation B was by a young Communist believer, so he supported collectivisation enthusiastically.

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

**03** Which interpretation do you find more convincing about collectivisation? **8**

Explain your answer using the **Interpretations A** and **B** and your contextual knowledge.

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)**  
**Evaluate interpretations and make substantiated judgements in the context of historical events studied (AO4d)**

**Level 4** **Complex evaluation of interpretations with sustained judgement based on contextual knowledge/understanding.** **7-8**

Extends Level 3.

Candidates may progress from a developed evaluation of interpretations by analysis of the relationship between the interpretations supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example...the judgement that although both Interpretation A and B agree that collectivisation brought about significant hardship, Interpretation B is more convincing because it talks about the ideals and motivations behind the people who implemented the policy. By contrast Interpretation A seems to attribute the hardship to deliberate cruelty without consideration of the historical context that Russia needed to modernise its economy.

**Level 3** **Developed evaluation of both interpretations based on contextual knowledge/understanding.** **5-6**

Extends Level 2.

Answers may assert one interpretation is more/less convincing.

Candidates may progress from a simple evaluation of the interpretations by extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example...supporting Interpretation B because of references to 1930s propaganda/communist ideology and/or the rationale for 'de-Kulakisation'.

**Level 2** **Simple evaluation of one interpretation based on contextual knowledge/understanding** **3-4**

There may be undeveloped comment about the other interpretation

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of interpretations by supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, developing an argument supporting Interpretation A by reference to the numbers of people who died as a result of famine/the cruelties of collectivisation and/or the deliberate use of unrealistic quotas by Moscow to justify the seizures of grain.

<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Basic analysis of interpretation(s) based on contextual knowledge/understanding</b>	<b>1-2</b>
----------------	--	------------

Answers show understanding/support for one/both interpretation(s), but the case is made by assertion/recognition of agreement.

For example, Interpretation A is convincing as forced collectivisation led to the millions of deaths from famine; Interpretation B is not convincing as young Communists had been brainwashed by Stalin's ideas.

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



- 04** Describe two problems faced by Tsar Nicholas II's government in ruling Russia up to 1905. **4**

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** **Demonstrate knowledge of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied (AO1a)**  
**Demonstrate understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. (AO1b)**

**Level 2** **Answers demonstrate knowledge and understanding.** **3-4**

Candidates may progress from a simple demonstration of knowledge about the issues identified with extended reasoning supported by understanding of, for example, the ways in which events were problematic.

These might include:

One problem was that ruling Russia was difficult as the belief of some revolutionary groups in violent struggle created problems so the Tsar had to rely on the use of secret police to suppress them.  
 Another problem was the size of Russia and the huge extent of its problems, such as ancient farming practices and land holdings made modernisation difficult.

**Level 1** **Answers demonstrate knowledge** **1-2**

Candidates demonstrate relevant knowledge about the issue(s) identified which might be related to, for example, revolutionary groups were growing in numbers; people wanted better living and working conditions.

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

- 05** In what ways were the lives of people in Russia affected by the policies of the Provisional Government during 1917? **8**

Explain your answer.

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)**  
**Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)**

**Level 4: Complex explanation of changes. 7-8**  
**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Extends Level 3.

Candidates may progress from a developed explanation of changes by explanation of the complexities of change arising from differences, such as time, group, social and/or economic impact, supported with knowledge and understanding.

For example...the policies of the Provisional Government affected the urban and rural people differently. People living in urban areas starved because supply chains did not improve whereas the people living in rural areas decided to take matters into their own hands and seize the land themselves.

**Level 3: Developed explanation of changes. 5-6**  
**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Extends Level 2.

Candidates may progress from a simple explanation by developed reasoning considering **two or more** of the identified consequences, supporting them by factual knowledge and understanding.

In addition to a Level 2 response, candidates make additional developed point(s).

For example...the peasants were disappointed by the absence of land reforms, so they had to take matters into their own hands and seize land in order to redistribute holdings and boost food production.

For example...workers had hoped for the right to go on strike to improve working conditions, but the Provisional Government allowed factory owners the right to dismiss anyone who went on strike.

**Level 2 Simple explanation of change. 3-4**  
**Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Candidates may progress from a basic explanation of change by using simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to **one** of the identified changes.

For example, the food shortages in the cities got worse because the Provisional Government failed to take measures to improve the food supply chains.

<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Basic explanation of change(s). Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b>	<b>1-2</b>
----------------	--	------------

Candidates identify change(s), which are relevant to the question.  
Explanation at this level is likely to be implicit or by assertion.

For example, under the Provisional Government there were more food shortages.

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

- 06** Which of the following was the more important reason why Lenin was able to strengthen his rule over Russia: **12**

- the Red Army
- economic policies?

Explain your answer with reference to both bullet points.

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 (AO2:6)**  
**Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:6)**

Examiners are reminded that AO1 and AO2 are regarded as interdependent and when deciding on a level should be considered together. When establishing a mark within a level, examiners should reward three marks for strong performance in both assessment objectives; two marks may be achieved by strong performance in either AO1 or AO2 and one mark should be rewarded for weak performance within the level in both assessment objectives.

**Level 4 Complex explanation of both bullets leading to a sustained judgement** **10-12**  
**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Extends Level 3.

Candidates may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by factual knowledge and understanding and arriving at a sustained judgement.

For example... candidates may conclude that the Red Army played a vital role in stabilising the country during a period of violence and without this control Lenin would have been unable to implement his economic policies, or that despite the success of the Red Army in defeating its enemies, its own supporters were turning against it by 1921, so without reform of the economy the Bolsheviks would have struggled to keep control.

**Level 3 Developed explanation of both bullets** **7-9**  
**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Extends Level 2

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

For example...Lenin was able establish power over Russia was because of the impact the Red Army had in defeating the enemies of the Bolsheviks by winning the Civil War. Also its ability to suppress dissent such as the Kronstadt Rising. Economic policies in the form of the New Economic Policy also established control as they helped the economy to recover by stimulating production and thereby stabilising the country after the dislocation of the war, the Civil War and War Communism.

**Level 2    Simple explanation of bullet(s)    4-6**  
**Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

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

For example, Lenin's power in Russia was strengthened by the work of the Red Army as they defeated the Whites and foreign armies in the Russian Civil War. The New Economic Policy was important in securing popular support for Lenin as production had slumped and there were shortages.

**Level 1    Basic explanation of bullet(s)    1-3**  
**Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.**

Candidates recognise and provide a basic explanation of one/both bullets.

For example, Lenin's rule was stronger because the Red Army won the Civil War; his economic policies would help to reduce the food shortages.

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

**Section B**  
**Conflict and tension, 1894–1918**

**07 Study Source A. 4**

Source A opposes Kaiser Wilhelm II. How do you know?

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

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**

Candidates 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, how the impression was created by referencing the militarism and love of war implied by the Kaiser's helmet. Aggression is inferred as he reaches out for the whole of Europe. The date would suggest this is just after the unprovoked attacks on Belgium, France and in the east, so it's going to be critical of Germany.

**Level 1 Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 1-2**

Candidates identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding,

For example, in the cartoon the Kaiser is trying to seize Europe; it's poking fun because he's in the bath tub; it is British wartime propaganda so it's bound to be anti-German.

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

**08 Study Sources B and C.****12**

How useful are Sources B and C to a historian studying opinions in Austria about Serbia?

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

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, candidates 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**

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

For example...this may relate to the way that taken together the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes in very different parts of Austrian society related to the need/opportunity to crush Serbian nationalism, but they also have limitations arising from their provenance. Both were from the immediate aftermath of the assassination when emotions were highly charged. In assessing utility candidates may observe that Source C has particular value because it provides additional insight into the motivations of government that Source B lacks.

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

Candidates 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 they might reflect popular contemporary Austrian anti-Serbian attitudes.

For example...Serbs were widely regarded as terrorists and that Austria could easily crush the threat (Source B). Or that in government circles the Serbs were seen as a threat to the very survival of the Austrian Empire and also that the government was not optimistic that it could meet this challenge (Source C).

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

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

For example the postcard (Source B) is useful because it suggests that Austrians perceived Serbians to be terrorists.

Hotzendorf (Source C) is useful because he is a key decision maker and sees the assassination of Franz Ferdinand as the last chance to defeat Serbia.

**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.

Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Hotzendorf is suggesting that this is Austria-Hungary's last chance to act; the message of the cartoon that Serbia had to be crushed

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



- 09** Write an account of how events in Morocco became an international crisis in 1905 and 1906. **8**

**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)

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.

- 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

Candidates 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 Kaiser's speech which promised support for the Sultan of Morocco. This was seen as a deliberate challenge to France's plan to control Morocco, which had been agreed by Britain according to the terms of the Entente Cordiale. The crisis escalated as the powers reacted to events – France and Britain were angry at the Kaiser's interference, and, in 1906 challenged him at the Algeiras Conference. At the conference the Kaiser was forced to back down. He felt humiliated, isolated and bitter because of a perceived threat from the strengthening Entente Cordiale.

- 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

Candidates 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...one consequence of the Kaiser's speech, which promised support for the Sultan of Morocco, was the crisis which it precipitated. It provoked an angry reaction from Britain and France because it was seen as a deliberate attempt to interfere with France's influence in Morocco. As it had been agreed under the terms of the Entente Cordiale that Morocco should be

in France's sphere of influence, Britain and France decided to challenge the Kaiser's provocative behaviour and force him to back down at an international conference.

<b>Level 2</b>	<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>	<b>3-4</b>
	<p>Candidates 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 Kaiser was behind the crisis after making a speech which promised to support the Sultan of Morocco. This German interference in Moroccan affairs angered France.</p>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<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>	<b>1-2</b>
	<p>Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the Kaiser interfered in Morocco so this angered other countries in Europe.</p>	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

Question 10 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.

- 10** 'The war at sea was the main reason for Germany's defeat in the First World War.'  
How far do you agree with this statement?  
Explain your answer.
- 16**  
**4 [SPaG]**

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**  
**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question** **13-16**

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.

Candidates 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 the convoys defeated U-boats which made the Germans sufficiently desperate to sink US ships, provoking the US entry into the war and ensuring an eventual Allied victory whilst the Allied blockade led to shortages in Germany and the collapse of morale.

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

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.

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

This might be related, for example, to the part played by the war at sea, in defeating the U-boat menace while the blockade denied vital war supplies to the Germans.

Candidates may additionally explain the importance of America's entry into the war, in providing decisive material and manpower support for the Allies and suggest that this was more important.

**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.

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

For example, the main reason was that the German Spring Offensive of 1918 failed because of such reasons as the impact of attritional warfare in 1916 and 1917, the arrival of US troops, more effective Allied military strategy and leadership and resource shortages.

**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.

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

Candidates may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as, the war at sea was the reason why Germany lost the war because Britain placed a naval blockade on Germany.

Candidates may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, Germany lost because the USA joined the war, making the allies more powerful.

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

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar**

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

**Conflict and tension, 1918–1939**

**11** Study **Source D**. **4**

Source D opposes Germany. How do you know?

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

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**

Candidates 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**

Candidates 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.

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

**12 Study Sources E and F.****12**

How useful are Sources E and F to a historian studying opinions about the Treaty of Versailles?

Explain your answer using **Sources E and F** and your contextual knowledge.

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, candidates 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**

Extends Level 3

Candidates 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 candidates may observe (eg) that Source F 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**

Extends Level 2

Candidates 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 E, 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 F 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 the content and/or provenance 4-6**

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of the source to simple evaluation of the content and/or provenance.

For example, candidates may explain that Source E 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 F) 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

Candidates 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.

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



- 13** Write an account of how events in Manchuria became an international crisis in the years 1931–1933. **8**

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.

Candidates 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** **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.

Candidates 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...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.

- |                |  |            |
|----------------|--|------------|
| <b>Level 2</b> | <b>Simple analysis of causation/consequence</b><br><b>Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b> | <b>3-4</b> |
|----------------|--|------------|

Candidates 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, 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.

- |                |   |            |
|----------------|---|------------|
| <b>Level 1</b> | <b>Basic analysis of causation/consequence</b><br><b>Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b> | <b>1-2</b> |
|----------------|---|------------|

Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the event such as when Japan invaded Manchuria which meant it had broken the rules of the League.

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

Question 14 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.

- 14** 'The Nazi-Soviet Pact was the main reason for the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939.'
- 16**  
**4 [SPaG]**

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

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.

Candidates 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 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.

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

For example... 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.

Candidates 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.

<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s) Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b>	<b>5-8</b>
----------------	---	------------

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.

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

For example, candidates 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.

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

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

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

For example, candidates 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.

Candidates may offer basic explanation of other factors, for example, the Second World War broke out because the League of Nations did not stop aggression during the 1930s.

**Candidates 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"> <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

**Conflict and tension between East and West, 1945–1972**

**15** Study **Source G**. **4**

**Source G** supports the Soviet Union. How do you know?

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

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**

Candidates 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 which projects a progressive and heroic image by seeing the Soviets as ‘pioneers’ of space; the Soviet spaceman is depicted in triumphant pose and holds aloft the hammer and sickle emblems; the four sputnik flights are represented as stars lighting up the sky; the date of the poster can be linked to the Soviet Union’s triumph in the space race.

**Level 1**     **Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance** **1-2**

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

For example, the legend (‘Glory to the Soviet people’) was very pro-Soviet Union; it was painted by a Soviet artist so it would be propaganda.

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

**16 Study Sources H and J.****12**

How useful are Sources H and J to a historian studying opinions about the Marshall Plan?

Explain your answer using **Sources H** and **J** and your contextual knowledge.

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, candidates 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**

Extends Level 3

Candidates 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 towards the Marshall Plan emphasising its benefits. Equally candidates may discern a different emphasis arising from authorship or the passage of time. Candidates may recognise the limitations of the sources, in that their western provenance may only offer a partial view.

**Level 3 Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance**

**7-9**

Extends Level 2

Candidates 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 they might reflect opinions towards the Marshall Plan, such as how it stressed co-operation in Europe and that there was evidently a desire/need to promote this in 1950 (Source H) and the way the support for freedom was linked to its American originator's initial anti-Communist emphasis (Source J).

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

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of the sources with simple reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, the poster (Source H) is useful because it shows how the Marshall Plan was presented as bringing the countries of Europe together. Marshall's speech (Source J) may be used by historians to shed light on how the Marshall Plan was viewed by its founder as a means to remove poverty and to preserve freedom.

**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.

Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point. For example, the message of the poster that there was unity because the flags of Europe are together. Source J says that the Marshall plan was meant to stop poverty.

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



- 17 Write an account of how events in Hungary became an international crisis during 1956. 8

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 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

Candidates 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 different consequences of Soviet actions meant that Cold War attitudes hardened at each stage, with evidence presented in the West of the Soviet's ruthless crushing of the revolt and the murder of its leaders, and the scale of Soviet military intervention against Hungarian citizens. It undermined the idea of 'peaceful co-existence' in a post-Stalinist era and the crisis escalated when Khrushchev carried his provocative veto in the UN in the face of Western protests. It was widely thought that US President Eisenhower supported the Hungarian Rising. East/West tensions arising from Hungary persisted against a background of the arms race and hard line Soviet attitudes.

**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.

Candidates 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...one consequence of the Soviet's response to Nagy's reforms was that it gave more evidence to the international community of the Communists' ruthless attitude towards anything which threatened the USSR and the Warsaw Pact. Hungarians demanded independence and the

withdrawal of Soviet troops. Condemnation grew when the Soviets sent in tanks and soldiers and the death toll mounted – probably over 11000 lost their lives. The scale of the repression against tens of thousands of Hungarian people shocked the West and provoked protests.

<b>Level 2</b>	<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>	<b>3-4</b>
	<p>Candidates may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge or understanding.</p> <p>For example, the Soviet Union was behind the crisis because it crushed the Hungarian people's demands for independence and withdrawal of all of Soviet troops. The Soviets' violent military reaction against the revolt upset the West and led to international protests.</p>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>Basic analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	<p>Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events, such as Nagy made reforms, which made Russia send troops into Hungary again.</p>	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

Question 18 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.

- 18** 'The main reason for the tension between East and West in Europe in the 1960s was the actions of the Soviet Union.'
- 16**  
**4 [SPaG]**

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

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.

Candidates 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...the way reasons interacted, such as the Soviet Union was mainly to blame because of their actions in Berlin and Prague. Although the arms race between the USA and the USSR might be seen as a bigger source of tension, America was only spending money on expensive weapons systems to deter further Soviet aggression.

**Level 3** **Developed explanation of 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.

Answers may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

For example... that Soviet aggression was evident (eg) in the building of the Berlin Wall and in the suppression of the Prague Spring which the West saw as an attack on freedom.

Candidates may additionally argue that America was responsible for the tension in the 1960s. Their expenditure on weapons increased Soviet anxieties, whilst the spying on Russia during the Geneva talks broke down trust. America's investment in West Germany so soon after the Second World War was viewed with hostility and suspicion in the USSR.

<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s) Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b>	<b>5-8</b>
----------------	---	------------

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.

Candidates may progress from a basic explanation of causation by simple reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, arguing that America was responsible for the tension in the 1960s because of such reasons as their expenditure on weapons and spying on Russia during the Geneva talks which broke down trust. America's investment in West Germany so soon after the Second World War was viewed with hostility and suspicion in the USSR.

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

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

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

Candidates may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, for example, the Soviets caused tension because they built the Berlin Wall. Candidates may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example the West didn't help relations because it was hostile towards communism.

<b>Candidates 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

**Conflict and tension in Asia, 1950–1975**

**19** Study **Source K**. **4**

Source K supports China. How do you know?

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

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**

Candidates 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 artist's depiction of China stopping the ignition of a bomb by US implying their intent to protect (contrasted with the US attempt to destroy); caption presents Chinese favourably as supporting their neighbours; the date of the poster may be linked to Chinese intervention to stop MacArthur's advance.

**Level 1**     **Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance** **1-2**

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

For example, the Chinese volunteers have been made to appear to be strong; it was produced by the Chinese to praise their actions.

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

**20 Study Sources L and M.****12**

How useful are Sources L and M to a historian studying opinions in the United States about the Vietnam War?

Explain your answer using your contextual knowledge and **Sources L and M**.

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, candidates 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**

Extends Level 3.

Candidates 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 the spectrum of different perspectives towards the Vietnam War, at different stages and from different vantage points (a newspaper and the President) but also recognise their limitations arising from their respective provenance. In assessing utility, through directly addressing the concerns of the American people, Nixon's speech may be seen as offering added value.

**Level 3 Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance**

**7-9**

Extends Level 2.

Candidates 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 they might reflect (different) contemporary American opinions. The destructive impact of Vietnam on successive administrations is highlighted satirically by the newspaper (Source L), whereas the ideals for which America has ostensibly fought are stressed by Nixon in a public speech (Source M).

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

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of the sources with simple reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example the cartoon is useful because it shows that the press were depicting the war as destructive.

Nixon's speech may be used by historians to show how he presented Vietnam to the American people as a just war.

**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.

Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point.

For example, the war was about achieving peace with honour; the war was destructive as shown in the cartoon.

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



- 21** Write an account of how events in Korea became an international crisis in 1950. **8**

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

Candidates 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 different consequences of Communist North Korea's attack which was seen as a blatant act of aggression. This escalated as the UN committed itself to the use of force. As a result, the Soviet Union was angry with this decision because it was temporarily absent from the UN at the time. UN troops liberated the South and, despite Mao's warnings, the UN forces led by a US Commander instigated a campaign of conquest into the Communist North. As UN and US troops approached the border with China, this was seen as dangerously provocative – hence Chinese military intervention and direct fighting with US forces.

**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.

Candidates 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...one consequence was that the escalation of tension was clear when the UN forces, having dealt with the invasion, went further and advanced into Communist North Korea. This was a significant crisis as UN forces, which included US soldiers and led by a US Commander, approached the border with China, provoking Chinese intervention and direct fighting between the USA and Chinese at Unsan.

<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>Candidates 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 UN campaign and advance into North Korea directly led to the dangerous intervention of Chinese troops with Soviet supplies against UN troops.</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>Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events, such as the North Koreans attacked the South so the UN decided to take action.</p>	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

Question 22 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.

- 22** 'The main reason for the military success of the Vietcong was the support of the Vietnamese people.'
- 16**  
**4 [SPaG]**

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

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)**  
**Demonstrates 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.

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

For example...the way reasons interacted such as the idea that American high-tech tactics, eg napalm, carpet bombing, Agent Orange et cetera were often inappropriate to the environment in Vietnam where their opponents' low-tech solutions were more effective. Also the Vietcong were prepared to accept losses that would have been unacceptable to their American enemy. But then the Vietnam War was ultimately a battle for hearts and minds and the Vietcong were better at winning the support of the Vietnamese people.

**Level 3** **Developed explanation of 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.

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

For example...candidates may explain that the Vietcong enjoyed military success because of their ideology as Communists and more determined than the Americans who were often from an urban environment and could not relate to the guerrilla fighting in the jungle. They were seen as liberators by the South Vietnamese people who helped them. The Vietcong were disciplined and they respected the peasants and helped them with farming and education; this contrasted with the South Vietnamese government as the Vietcong were on their side against the landlords and the corrupt Diem government.

Candidates may additionally argue that the Americans could not defeat the Vietcong because the environment was perfect for guerrilla warfare. The Americans suffered heavy losses and could not locate their enemy due to their tunnels and merging with the peasantry.

<b>Level 2</b>	<b>Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s)</b> <b>Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</b>	<b>5-8</b>
----------------	--	------------

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.

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

For example, explaining that the Vietcong were seen as liberators because of such reasons as they respected the people and helped the villagers with farming and education so the people hid their weapons and gave the Vietcong valuable information about the Americans.

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

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

Candidates identify basic factual and general statements which are valid about the period related to the event. For example, the Vietcong gained more support because they helped Vietnamese peasants. Candidates may offer basic explanations of other factor(s) eg the Vietcong's use of guerrilla tactics meant they couldn't be found or defeated easily.

Candidates 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"> <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

**Conflict and tension, 1990–2009**

**23** Study **Source N**. **4**

Source N supports Saddam Hussein. How do you know?

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

**Target** Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

**Level 2** Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance **3-4**

Candidates 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, candidates may refer to details of the image which project Saddam is a positive light, eg as a leader/powerful/ courageous warrior, facing forward, defending children, protecting order and stability; a wall painting in Baghdad at this time would inevitably have been pro-Saddam due to power of Ba'ath Party.

**Level 1** Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance **1-2**

Candidates identify relevant features in the source and support them with basic factual knowledge and understanding

For example, Saddam has been made to appear heroic; it was propaganda designed to flatter Saddam.

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

**24 Study Sources O and P.****12**

How useful are Sources O and P to a historian studying American opinions about the invasion of Iraq in 2003?

Explain your answer using **Sources O** and **P** and your contextual knowledge.

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, candidates 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**

Extends Level 3.

Candidates may progress from a developed explanation 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 they reflect how polarised American views were about Iraq. Candidates may also recognise limitations arising from provenance and particular significance may be attached to (eg) the passage of time and purpose of the two sources. In assessing utility the small readership of the newspaper (Source O) may lead to this source being seen as unrepresentative, particularly in view of Bush's victory in the presidential elections in 2004.

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

Extends Level 2.

Candidates 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 they might reflect opinions towards the invasion of Iraq.

For example...the cynicism and hostility of the cartoon (Source O) might

reflect contemporary (liberal) American opinions following the war. The speech by President Bush (Source P) at the beginning of the war might be in step with popular attitudes/concerns/perceptions at the time as well as the government's stated line.

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

Candidates may progress from a basic analysis of the sources with simple reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, candidates may explain that the cartoon (Source O) is useful because it shows that some Americans did not believe that the government had good reasons for going to war with Iraq

The Bush speech (Source P) may be used by historians to shed light on the official grounds for the invasion of Iraq and may highlight the President's emphasis on idealism.

**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.

Candidates identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Bush is suggesting that this is a war for freedom; the cartoon suggests the reasons for going to war were made up.

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



- 25** Write an account of how Saddam Hussein's occupation of Kuwait became an international crisis in 1991. **8**

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

Candidates 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 different consequences of the occupation of Kuwait... Bush and Thatcher refused to accept Saddam's blatant aggression and the tension escalated following initial sanctions. Neither side would back down; Saddam's bluff about the 'mother of all wars' was challenged by the next stage which was the creation of a sizeable international force. Operation Desert Storm was launched after deadlines for withdrawal were missed. While the military operation was a success, the international crisis within the coalition was complicated by missile attacks on Israel and Saudi Arabia as well as the critical issue of how to deal with Iraq's retreating forces. Bush's Arab allies were cautious about taking further offensive action to remove Saddam in case the coalition fractured. So a ceasefire was ordered with Kuwait liberated.

**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.

Candidates 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 to, for example, to an analysis of how / why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example...one consequence of how the occupation of Kuwait and the actions of Saddam Hussein gave rise to UN sanctions; neither side would back down. Saddam proved himself to be a provocative opponent and after

deadlines for withdrawal were missed, the crisis led to US Operation Desert Shield, which saw the creation of a large and varied coalition force to launch a counter attack on Iraqi forces, thereby escalating the conflict.

<b>Level 2</b>	<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>	<b>3-4</b>
	<p>Candidates may progress from a <b>basic</b> narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For example, Iraq's aggression and occupation of Kuwait led to UN sanctions and direct military action.</p>	
<b>Level 1</b>	<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>	<b>1-2</b>
	<p>Candidates identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the event, such as Iraq invaded Kuwait so a multi-national force was formed to deal with this.</p>	
	<b>Candidates either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

Question 26 enables students to produce an extended response. Students have the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

- 26** 'The main reason for Al-Qaeda's terror campaign was to destroy the state of Israel.'  
How far do you agree with this statement?  
Explain your answer.
- 16**  
**4 [SPaG]**

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

**13-16**

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.

Candidates 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, the way reasons interacted such as, the central thread running through Al-Qaeda's policies towards Israel, Saudi Arabia and Afghanistan was hostile towards the United States and its interference in the Muslim world.

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

**9-12**

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.

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

For example, Al-Qaeda's support for Palestine and actions against the USA were designed to put pressure on the USA to cease their support for Israel. Hence the direct attacks on New York, 9/11 against a background of the Intifada.

Candidates may additionally explain alternative factors, such as the intention to turn Osama bin Laden's homeland Saudi Arabia into an Islamic state which would also mean removing US military bases, returning the country to Islamic ways.

**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

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

For example, candidates may focus on Al-Qaeda's support for Palestine and explain the reasons for doing so, such as actions against the USA were designed to put pressure on the USA to cease their support for Israel.

**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.

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

Candidates may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as Al-Qaeda's campaign was to show support for Palestine.

Candidates may offer basic explanations of other factor(s) eg a reason for the terror campaign was because they did not like America's foreign policy and influence in the world.

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

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar**

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

