

GCSE
HISTORY
8145/1C

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

Mark scheme

Additional 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

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.

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

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 Lenin’s importance to the Bolshevik Revolution? **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.

Target **Analyse individual interpretations (AO4a)**
Analyse how interpretations of a key feature of a period differ (AO4b)

Level 2 **Developed analysis of interpretations to explain differences based on their content** **3–4**

Students may progress from a simple analysis of interpretations with extended reasoning to explain the differences. For example, Trotsky (B) emphasises Lenin’s role in the timing of the Bolshevik Revolution claiming it would have happened, but Lenin hastened the event. By comparison students might explain that Sukhanov (A) never considered Lenin to be a threat because of his manner, ‘dictatorial’ and because of his ideas which were so ‘lunatic’ that he lacked support and put people off. He couldn’t even command the support of his own Bolsheviks.

Level 1 **Simple analysis of interpretation(s) to identify differences based on their content** **1–2**

Students are likely to identify relevant features in each interpretation(s). For example, Lenin, according to Interpretation A, lacked support even amongst Bolsheviks – a man whose ideas were ‘unacceptable’, whereas Trotsky (Interpretation B) claims that he played the central role in the Revolution.

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

- 02** Why might the authors of **Interpretations A** and **B** have a different interpretation about Lenin's importance to the Bolshevik Revolution? **4**

Explain your answer using **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**

Students 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, students argue that Interpretations A and B were based on different circumstances, beliefs and purposes; Sukhanov was not a Bolshevik nor Lenin supporter. His ideas were influenced by his membership of the Social Revolutionary (ideologically opposed to the Bolsheviks) and by his support for the Provisional Government – which Lenin destroyed. Trotsky (Interpretation B) was a keen Bolshevik who worked alongside Lenin during 1917 and afterwards played his part in the Bolshevik victory; so he tries to justify the idea that Lenin deserved his reputation as clearly pivotal to the timing of the Revolution.

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

Students are likely to identify relevant reasons for the differences in each interpretation(s). Related to, for example, differences in provenance, context of their time of writing, place, previous experience, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience.

For example, Interpretation A was based on Sukhanov's Social Revolutionary background and his support for the Provisional Government, so he wasn't a Bolshevik supporter of Lenin.

Interpretation B was by one of Lenin's inner circle who worked with him during the Revolution, so he supported Lenin enthusiastically.

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

03 Which interpretation do you find more convincing about Lenin’s importance to the Bolshevik Revolution? **8**

Explain your answer using **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.

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

For example, Interpretation B is more convincing because it is supported by explanations which argue that Lenin’s oratory, ruthless organisational abilities and domination of the Bolsheviks were the keys to his success, and the Revolution would not have happened necessarily without him. By contrast, Interpretation A seems to claim that Lenin was on the sidelines; while there are questions about how much mass appeal Lenin and the Bolsheviks had, there was no doubting the success of their well-planned seizure of power in Oct/Nov1917.

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.

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

For example, there is convincing support for Interpretation A because of questions about the extent of Lenin and Bolshevik support in 1917 – it was still unclear how many people supported Lenin particularly in the countryside. His views did put some people off. The Bolsheviks only later portrayed themselves as part of a mass movement with Lenin at its head.

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

There may be undeveloped comment about the other interpretation.

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

For example, developing an argument supporting Interpretation B by reference to Lenin's remarkable qualities as an inspirational Bolshevik leader during the events of the Revolution.

Level 1 Basic analysis of interpretation(s) based on contextual knowledge/understanding 1–2

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 Lenin did not have mass support so might not appear dangerous; Interpretation B is not convincing as there was nothing in the events to suggest that the Bolsheviks were bound to win.

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

04 Describe two problems faced by Stalin in dealing with the Great Patriotic War up to 1945. **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**

Students 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 during the Great Patriotic War was difficult because factories had to be relocated to areas safe from invasion so as to guarantee tank and general munitions production.

Another problem was that challenges to Stalin’s leadership would not be tolerated, so victorious generals were sidelined and the NKVD imposed ruthless discipline on officers to overcome political distrust of the army.

Level 1 **Answers demonstrate knowledge** **1–2**

Students demonstrate relevant knowledge about the issue(s) identified which might be related to, for example, relocation of factories, stimulating industrial production, use of propaganda to strengthen unity and the cult of leadership, food rationing, boosting the size of families, political control of the army, suppression of ethnic minorities, rehabilitation of the Church.

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

- 05** In what ways did the lives of people in Russia change in the years between the 1905 Revolution and the start of the First World War? **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
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

7–8

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed 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...in one sense policies affected people differently. Change worked for some and not for others. Factory workers gained better pay and conditions because there were more factory inspectors and profits were increasing, as well as the fact that sickness and accident insurance schemes were introduced; whereas the people living in rural areas not only found that debts were cancelled but also many were able to buy their own land, and a new prosperous class of Kulaks emerged.

In another sense, these same changes were not universally beneficial. The wave of industrial strikes before the war proved that many grievances remained and improvements were taking place too slowly. While in rural areas, the rapidly increasing peasant population meant that not everyone could have their own land, therefore millions of peasants continued to rely on inefficient farming and poor food supplies.

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

5–6

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple 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, students make additional developed point(s).

For example...the lives of many revolutionaries were changed by repressive policies because, following the 1905 Revolution the Tsar wished to recover his power and authority. Stolypin strengthened the secret police and introduced measures which resulted in the execution of 4000 people over 3 years.

For example...workers became more prosperous and conditions improved because there were more factory inspectors and, in 1912, sickness and accident benefits were introduced.

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

Students 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, to gain support for the government, there were changes to the lives of peasants because their redemption payments for their freedom and land were cancelled and, instead, they were encouraged to buy their own land – about 2 million did so and became prosperous Kulaks.

Level 1 Basic explanation of change(s) **1–2**
Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

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

For example, there was: the cancellation of peasant's debts; the purchase of farms by peasants; suppression and executions.

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

06 Which of the following was the more important result of Stalin's industrialisation of the USSR: **12**

- economic modernisation
- social benefits?

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
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question** **10–12**

Extends Level 3.

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

For example...building on the previous arguments about why the economy was more modern and why social benefits were available, students may conclude that the results of Stalin's policies should be measured against their aims – to make the USSR militarily stronger and to put right the fact that the country was 50 or 100 years behind others. In which case, the economic miracle was more important, because the social benefits were won only through the advances in industrial production (which increased the standard of living) and because they would help USSR modernise even more, eg free education.

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

Extends Level 2.

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

For example, answers would explain why Stalin could justify claims that the USSR had become a more modern state. Production levels had increased massively in key areas, such as coal, oil, electricity and iron. Waste and inefficiency had been reduced through the building of modern plant. All this placed the USSR on a more equal footing with, say, Germany. Socially, there were benefits as, by the late 1930s, workers had improved their conditions – workers with high skills benefited from better housing and access to good medical care. There were crèches so women could work, and education and training were available for free.

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

Students may progress from a basic explanation of consequences by using simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, production massively increased – figures for heavy industries showed massive rises which made the USSR a more modern state which was less reliant on inefficient manufacturing or agriculture.

Socially, benefits included full employment and workers could take advantage of free education and medicine. Skilled jobs were better paid.

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

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

For example, Russia was modernised industrially, but there were social benefits such as no unemployment – jobs for all, including women.

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

Section B**Topic 1: Conflict and tension, 1894–1918**

07 Study **Source A**. **4**

Source A supports the United States joining the First World War. 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**

Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source.

For example, the impression of the language and tone is that Germany was entirely to blame – for waging war on ‘innocent people’ and for making the world no longer safe for democracy. The date would suggest that the US is ready to declare war because 1917 was the year Germany provoked the US to declare war because U boats had been sinking US ships and taking American lives. The speech represents Wilson’s purpose to justify and gain support for the US joining the war.

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

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

For example, in the speech, the US President blames Germany for using submarine warfare as a war ‘against mankind’, so the US can’t stay neutral; given the date of 1917 this was when the US declared war on Germany.

Students 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 the Battle of the Somme?

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, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4 Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance 10–12

Extends Level 3.

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

For example, this may relate to the way that, taken together, the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes towards the need to show heroism in the army, but they also have limitations. Source B is propaganda and its purpose is to show heroism in action. Given the disaster of the first day of the Somme and news about the losses at home, the Illustrated London News would wish to show Tommies taking the fight to the enemy.

Source C is from an Inquiry into a military failure and you might expect it to deliberately cover up the truth, but it doesn't. In assessing utility students may observe that Source C has particular value because the evidence from the officers is supported by other battlefield reports of the failure of 7 days of shelling against barbed wire, the 20000 death toll on the first day, and the fact that German machine gunners survived to train their machine guns on gaps in impenetrable wire.

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

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how they might reflect military attitudes.

For example, it is useful because the newspaper would wish to portray their heroic actions in battle as pieces of propaganda to boost morale (Source B).

Or that the officers were merely confirming that 7 days of bombardment across the whole front had failed to break German defences, as proven by the few significant advances, and casualty figures of around 60,000 men (Source C).

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

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

For example the drawing (Source B) is useful because it suggests how a British newspaper wanted to portray a heroic advance by British troops across No Man's Land.

The report (Source C) is useful because they were eye witnesses and saw the obstacles presented by the wire at first hand.

Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, the officers in Source C were suggesting that an advance on the first day of the Somme was doomed to failure; the message was that the wire was an impassable barrier.

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

- 09** Write an account of how events following the Ludendorff Offensive became a crisis for both sides during the Spring of 1918. **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.

Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and/or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.

For example, the Ludendorff Offensive threatened to break through the Western Front. The attacks were effective because the Allies faced well trained German ‘shock troops’ and they had to fall back to such an extent that even Paris came into range of German guns. The crisis for the Allies was how to regroup and they unified command under Foch.

However during May, German offensives made little progress. This was because their best troops had been killed, discipline was poor and they faced Allies who were well resourced and supported by inexhaustible reinforcements from the US. When the Allies counter attacked, the German resistance crumbled and they faced their own crisis, ie retreat and defeat.

Level 3 **Developed analysis of causation/consequence** **5–6**
Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example, the Ludendorff Offensive threatened to break through the Western Front. The attacks were effective because the Allies faced well trained German ‘shock troops’ and they had to fall back to such an extent that even Paris came into range of German guns. The crisis for the Allies was how to regroup and they unified their command under Foch.

However, the Germans were exhausted by these attacks. The Allies counter attacked, and the German army found itself unable to do anything except retreat.

Level 2 Simple analysis of causation/consequence **3–4**
Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the Ludendorff Offensive meant that German troops made significant breakthroughs on the Western Front. At some points, they advanced 64 km easily taking the Allied front line trenches. Allied forces had to retreat and regroup and then Foch took over as overall Commander-in-Chief of the Allies. The German advance weakened and the Allies were able to counter attack. The German army was forced to retreat.

Level 1 Basic analysis of causation/consequence **1–2**
Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the fact that the German forces made large advances into enemy held land.

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

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 actions of Austria-Hungary were the main reason for the start of the First World War.’ **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.

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

This might be related, for example, to the way reasons interacted such as Austria’s intention to crush Serbian nationalism coinciding with the assassination provided the opportunity, and Germany’s unconditional support summed up by the Kaiser’s statement, ‘Whatever comes from Vienna, to me, is a command’. The actions were taken despite the suspicion that Russia would intervene and this would spark general war between the Alliance systems.

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

Answer demonstrates a developed, sustained line of reasoning which has coherence and logical structure; it is well substantiated, and with sustained, explicit relevance.

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

This might be related, for example, to the part played by Austria-Hungary in initiating war against Serbia, blaming it for the assassination of the heir to the Austrian throne and taking the opportunity to suppress Serbian nationalism. This action was taken despite the dangers from Russia who would declare war in defence of a fellow Slav nation. Austria therefore must take most responsibility for taking the initiative.

Students may additionally explain, for example, the importance of Germany's entry into the war, because the Kaiser leapt to the defence of its ally and offered it a 'blank cheque' to take whatever action it wished. This would also allow Germany to pursue its anti-French policies.

Level 2 Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s) **5–8**
Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

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

For example, Austria was not completely to blame, although it did declare war on Serbia following the result of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Other explanations must place initial blame on Russia for its support of another Slav nation and willingness to defend it against attack from Austria-Hungary. The alliance system meant that Triple Alliance and Triple Entente countries were dragged into conflict with each other.

Level 1 Basic explanation of one or more factors **1–4**
Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

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

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

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as Austria blamed Serbia for the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand and declared war as a result.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example Germany gave Austria-Hungary complete support if it wished to settle its Serbian problem.

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

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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

Topic 2: Conflict and tension, 1918–1939

11	Study Source D .	4
	Source D is critical of the League of Nations. 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
	Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source. For example, the League was depicted as greedy capitalists exploiting the poor at their feet; the League was a club for capitalists as implied by the legend in the cartoon; as the Soviets were communist and had been left out of the League, it was the enemy of capitalism.	
	Level 1 Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance	1–2
	Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding. For example, the League is represented as Capitalists with figures of rich and greedy businessmen; it was published by the Soviets and therefore the cartoon was anti-League.	
	Students 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 the Abyssinian Crisis?

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, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4 Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance **10–12**

Extends Level 3.

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

For example, taken together, the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes to the League's inaction; but answers might also recognise limitations arising from provenance as Source F shows a politician making a speech, trying to justify not taking action against Italy at a time when they were planning to give part of Abyssinia away to Mussolini (the Hoare Laval Pact). In assessing utility students may observe (eg) that Source E has greater value as the authorship was British and it is making fun of Britain's weakness – their 'mild disapproval' was not 'awful' at all as the cartoonist knows. This is supported by the fact that all Britain and France were doing was to keep Mussolini as a potential ally against Germany.

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

7–9

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how Source E is useful because it was part of the popular press coverage before Mussolini invaded Abyssinia. It is making fun of how weak the French and British are as all they will do is issue a warning. It is sarcastic about how 'awful' this would be and suggests that little was being done to stop Mussolini taking military action. Source F revealed doubts that Britain could do very much and it appears that the British Foreign minister is trying to justify inaction.

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

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

For example, Source E is useful because it shows how the British saw the League as weak because all it promises to do is to protest against Mussolini if he went to war.

For example Hoare is apologising for the League's inaction and this may be used to shed light on how weak it had become by 1935.

Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example Hoare is suggesting that the League cannot do anything to help very much; the message of the cartoon is that all the League will do is issue a protest.

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

13	Write an account of how problems relating to the Sudetenland led to an international crisis in 1938.	8
	<p>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.</p>	
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
	<p>Extends Level 3.</p> <p>Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and/or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.</p> <p>For example, analysis of the different stages of the crisis which was initiated because Hitler gave support to the Sudeten Germans. This was dangerous because France’s alliance with Czechoslovakia might have meant war if Germany decided to annex the disputed land. France was even more worried by recent events such as the Anschluss. Chamberlain went to visit Hitler twice and each time his demands increased. At first Hitler agreed to a plebiscite then argued that he wanted the Sudetenland handing over. It caused panic in Europe with war preparations being undertaken.</p> <p>Much depended on whether or not Chamberlain could persuade France to agree in order to pursue appeasement and avoid war. The conference at Munich averted conflict when Britain persuaded France and Czechoslovakia to agree to the transfer of the Sudetenland to Germany.</p>	
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
	<p>Extends Level 2.</p> <p>Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.</p> <p>For example, when Hitler announced support for the Sudeten Germans, there was potential for war because France had an alliance with Czechoslovakia and might go to war if the Sudetenland was taken. Also, there were many concerns about the threat from Germany which already broken the Treaty of Versailles. War was avoided at the Munich conference where Britain and France agreed to hand over the Sudetenland to Hitler.</p>	

Level 2 Simple analysis of causation/consequence 3–4
Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, riots broke out in the Sudetenland as the Germans there wanted independence. Hitler said he would support them and he started to demand that the Sudetenland should join with Germany. Britain and France might not agree. To avoid war, Hitler gained the land he wanted at the Munich conference.

Level 1 Basic analysis of causation/consequence 1–2
Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the event such as the fact that Hitler was demanding the Sudetenland should be handed over to Germany and it looked as if there might be war.

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

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 main reason why Germany hated the Treaty of Versailles was because of its military terms.’ **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.

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

This might be related, for example, to the way reasons interacted and how the Germans measured the impact of terms after the war. Certainly the military terms were a source of resentment for a section of the German public such as nationalists. But the reparations terms had more impact on a wider population and their effects were longer lasting, hence prolonging the bitterness of the peace. This went beyond the ‘blank cheque’ idea and encompassed the humiliation of hyperinflation and the Ruhr invasion because of default on payments. Land losses were linked to this because they made it harder to pay off reparations – so are linked.

Overall, reparations might be seen as more damaging over a longer time period and were hated by a larger section of the population because of the poverty and starvation which accompanied them.

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.

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

For example, other factors were also hated not only for their severity but also because they caused lasting bitterness. Land losses included the splitting of Germany in two because of the Polish Corridor; this was seen as unfair. Some land losses included economically valuable land such as the Saar granted to France for mining its coal for 15 years. Germans were also denied self-determination – Anschluss was banned and many Germans found themselves living outside their homeland. Reparations were hated because not only was the final figure not decided when the Germans were forced to sign the Treaty but also because they were seen as impossible to pay and the product of Allied attempts to ruin the German people and reduce them to poverty.

Students may additionally argue for the stated factors and rehearse the view that Germany was deliberately rendered defenceless against well-armed neighbours. But they might add that German militarism had been a source of particular pride before the war, so this represented another ploy to humiliate Germany and reduce its status in the world.

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

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

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

For example, the military terms were hated because Germany was left weak and defenceless, surrounded by armed neighbours. This was made worse because Germany was denied modern weapons such as tanks and military aircraft as well as only having an army of 100,000 men.

Other terms were also hated because of the severity of the land losses and reparations payments.

Level 1 Basic explanation of one or more factors **1–4**
Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

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

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

For example, students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as, Germans hated having a small and weak army.

Students may offer basic explanation of other factors, for example, Germans hated many other terms of the Treaty such as losses of land and reparations.

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

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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

Topic 3: Conflict and tension between East and West, 1945–1972

15	Study Source G .	4
	Source G supports the USA taking part in the space race. 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
	Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source. For example, the USA was depicted as a person who needs to wake up – the alarm signifying that the Soviets are getting ahead as they have a satellite in space; the USA had been relaxing as implied by the legend ‘complacency’ in the cartoon and need to catch up in the Space race; 1957 was the year the Soviets launched Sputnik.	
	Level 1 Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance	1–2
	Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding. For example, the legend (‘Awake at Last?’) implies that the Americans have been sleeping while the Soviets have launched a satellite; it was painted by an American artist so it would be propaganda.	
	Students 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 the threat posed by Cuba?

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, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4 Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance **10–12**

Extends Level 3.

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

For example, taken together, the sources are useful because they reflect similar views that the Communist revolution was spreading. Equally students may discern a different emphasis arising from authorship or the passage of time. Students may recognise the limitations of the sources, in that their respective provenance may only offer a partial view. Source H was motivated by the need to stand firm against Cuban communism backed by Russia and China against a background of Cold War tensions caused by the arms race – the US did not want communism in its own backyard. Source J shows Castro feeling confident after defeating US backed invasion at the Bay of Pigs, galvanising his own support for a weak Cuba who showed it could stand up to a nuclear power and lead revolution in the region, which would pose a huge threat to the US.

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

7–9

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain that the sources are useful because they show different perspectives - one highlights the perceived need for the US to guard against the hostile influence of the USSR and Communist China in the Americas (Source H); and the other the way that support for communist revolution was being spread by Cuba, especially since Castro would feel much stronger after the failed attempt by the US in the Bay of Pigs to defeat him (Source J).

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

Students 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 (Source H) is useful because it shows how the Communist threat was portrayed by Americans as something sinister because Russia and China were behind it.

For example, Castro's speech (Source J) may be used by historians to shed light on how he saw Cuba – too small to be a threat but part of something bigger – as Communism was spreading through the region. After the Bay of Pigs Castro would want to rally his support.

Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point. For example, the message of the cartoon is that Castro was spreading Communism to South America with the blessing of Russia and China. Source J says that the US is frightened not of Cuba but of Communism spreading through Latin America.

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

17	Write an account of how the shooting down of a U2 spy plane in 1960 became an international crisis.	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.	
	Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and/or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.	
	For example with a dangerous nuclear arms race under way, it was hoped a US-USSR meeting in Paris might lead to peace. Instead a crisis occurred because a U2 spy plane was shot down by the Soviets when taking pictures of Russian military sites. Khrushchev was angered by the US which not only lied about it but refused to apologise. Matters deteriorated when the Americans just said they were doing this to protect itself, which Khrushchev condemned and then he stormed out of the Summit. It didn't end there because the US pilot was put on trial and an invitation to Eisenhower to visit Moscow was withdrawn. The Cold War was set to continue.	
Level 3	Developed analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	5–6
	Extends Level 2.	
	Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.	
	For example, at the time a meeting of the two Cold War leaders in Paris offered hope of a thaw in the nuclear arms race. During the Summit, the Soviets were angry because they had shot down a US U2 plane which had been sent to spy on their military sites. Khrushchev was even more annoyed because the Americans lied about it and refused to apologise. As a result the Summit collapsed with no improvement in Cold War relations.	

Level 2	Simple analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	3–4
	<p>Students 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, a U2 spy plane was shot down by the Soviet Union. Khrushchev protested but the Americans refused to apologise for spying on the Communists. The Paris peace talks broke down when Khrushchev stormed out of the Summit. It seemed that the Cold War would continue.</p>	
Level 1	Basic analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	1–2
	<p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events, such as the Soviets accused the Americans of spying on them and wanted the spy flights to stop.</p>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

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 development of the Cold War in the years 1945 to 1949 was the Truman Doctrine.’ **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.

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

For example, responses might include the ways the reasons interacted, such as the Soviet Union was mainly to blame because it created an Iron Curtain, a satellite state in Poland and confrontation during the Berlin Blockade. Although the USA might argue that the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan was only a response to USSR provocation. Similarly the USA’s possession of atomic weapons might be perceived as forcing the USSR into an arms race. Hence responsibility was shared.

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.

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

For example the whole intention behind the Truman Doctrine was to use the Marshall Plan to help European recovery and prevent Communism taking root and this was deliberately aimed at challenging the spread of Communism. This was apparent in Germany where Stalin took the strengthening of the western zones of Germany and sectors of Berlin as provocative.

Students may additionally argue that the USSR initiated tension because of Stalin's determination that the Red Army should occupy as much of eastern Europe as possible and set up Communist regimes, and then arm a secretive Iron Curtain; this was viewed with hostility and suspicion. Confirmation was provided when Poland was denied free elections by Stalin and by the Berlin Blockade which aimed to remove western influence from Berlin.

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

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

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

For example, arguing that the USSR was responsible for the start of the Cold War, because of such reasons as Stalin's determination that the Red Army should occupy as much of eastern Europe as possible and set up Communist regimes, and then arm a secretive Iron Curtain; this was viewed with hostility and suspicion.

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

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

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, for example, the Truman Doctrine was set up to stop Communism.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example the Soviet army built the Iron Curtain to keep the west out.

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

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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

Topic 4: Conflict and tension in Asia, 1950–1975

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

Source K supports ending the war in Vietnam. 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**

Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source.

For example, the artists' depiction of Nixon's exhaustion because of US efforts against 'Hanoi' – this was the punch-bag representing the North, which had not been beaten into submission. The legend infers that both sides needed peace and the Americans were too exhausted to win; this was 1973 and the cartoonist seems to be suggesting that the Paris talks must succeed and bring peace, as Nixon had promised.

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

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

For example, it was time for peace; the Americans were too weak and couldn't now win because they couldn't throw any more punches at the North Vietnamese punch-bag; it was a cartoon from the British side which was not fighting in Vietnam and so were neutral.

Students 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 anti-Vietnam War protests in the United States?

Explain your answer using **Sources L** and **M** 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, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4 Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance **10–12**

Extends Level 3.

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

For example, this may relate to the way that, taken together, the sources are useful because they reflect similar reactions and the need to expose what really happened. But they also have limitations. Source L is a photograph and exhibits the horrors faced by protestors, but it doesn't explain the National Guard's actions, responsibility for what happened or why it happened.

Source M is from an eye witness. In assessing utility students may observe that Source M has particular value because the evidence was from a respected professor and his testimony is confirmed by Source L, as well as our knowledge that the Guardsmen did use live ammunition because tear gas had run out and they over reacted when students followed them as they retreated.

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

7–9

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain that the sources are useful because, for example, the photojournalist showed how anti-war messages could be communicated in the media and / or how this particular outrage was exposed (Source L) – or that the Professor clearly had been alienated from the war by the National Guard shooting dead unarmed student protestors without warning (Source M).

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

Students 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 photograph (Source L) is useful because it suggests how an American photographer wanted to portray the horror of how protests against the war were dealt with by the government.

The report (Source M) is useful because he was eye witnesses and saw what happened at first hand.

Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

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

For example, the Professor in Source M is shocked because they expected that blank, instead of live bullets were being used; the message of the photo (L) supports this sense of shock and horror.

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

- 21** Write an account of how events at Dien Bien Phu created an international problem in 1954. **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.

Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and/or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.

For example there was an international conflict of interest as China backed the Viet Minh and the US backed a capitalist South. Once the French had been defeated, the vacuum of power caused the convening of the Geneva peace conference to decide Vietnam's future.

A temporary division of the country was decided while elections were held. This caused further problems as the US decided to prevent elections to stop the Communists winning. Their belief in Domino Theory caused the US to support the government of the South against the Chinese backed guerrillas leading to an extension of Cold war tensions

Level 3 **Developed analysis of causation/consequence** **5–6**
Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example, one consequence was that the French were the controlling power but its defeat by the Viet Minh caused a Geneva peace conference to be held as the future of Vietnam had to be decided. This was an international problem because the Chinese favoured a Communist Vietnam, while the US backed a Communist free South Vietnam. The conference decided on a division across the 17th parallel.

Level 2	Simple analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	3–4
	<p>Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For example, the French were defeated by the Viet Minh. An international peace conference had to be held to decide the future of Vietnam. This took place at Geneva in 1954. The US had difficulty in abiding by what was agreed and started to lend help to South Vietnam to stop the spread of Communism.</p>	
Level 1	Basic analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	1–2
	<p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events, such as the French were defeated so there was the problem of coming to a peace settlement.</p>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

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 result of the war in Korea, 1950–1953, was that Communist forces had been removed from South Korea.’ **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.

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

For example, the ways results linked because, when the campaign is measured against the purpose of the UN and its original aim of ‘punishing’ aggression, then North Korean forces were defeated and the border restored. But if the UN campaign is measured against the aims of the US’ containment policy, the moment the UN exceeded the initial aims by invading another country itself, it failed. Evidence might emphasise the dangers it provoked in provoking China, and that the war proved ‘unwinnable’ because it ended with an armistice and continuing armed stand-off across the 38th parallel. In the long term then, these were more important results.

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.

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

For example, the UN objectives had been achieved, North Korean forces were cut off, defeated and the original border at the 38th Parallel restored. But that was a limited success when set against other results.

Hence, students may argue that the UN forces had provoked a ‘Chinese’ invasion, when they had exceeded the UN brief and threatened the Yalu River border. Students might explain that MacArthur’s sacking had revealed the possibility of the use of atomic weapons and an escalation of the conflict. Alternative results might focus on the lengthy stalemate of the war 1951–3, the suffering of civilians and a death toll of around 1.4 million.

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

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

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

For example, the US led coalition had prosecuted its campaign with the initial objective of expelling invading North Korean forces. This had been successful because Communist forces had been cut off and defeated, and the border restored on the 38th parallel. The UN might argue that it had resisted aggression and restored South Korea’s territory.

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

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

Students identify basic factual and general statements which are valid about the period related to the event. For example the UN troops were sent to Korea and were too strong for the Communists, forcing them to surrender.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s). For example, the military stalemate, the human and financial costs, the dangers of China’s involvement.

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

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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

Topic 5: Conflict and tension, 1990–2009

23	Study Source N.	4
	Source N is critical of the Taliban. How do you know? Explain your answer using Source N 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
	Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source. For example, the writing uses language to put the Taliban in a bad light, eg suggesting cowardly fighters who hide amongst civilians; Kemp would inevitably suggest his antipathy towards the Taliban as he was a British Commander and part of the coalition fighting the Taliban.	
Level 1	Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance	1–2
	Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with basic factual knowledge and understanding. For example, Kemp was fighting the Taliban so would speak out against them; the Taliban are accused of hiding amongst innocent people.	
	Students 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 the start of the war in Afghanistan in 2001?

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, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4 Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance **10–12**

Extends Level 3.

Students 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 the sources are useful because they reflect the importance of the link between 9/11 and bin Laden with the intervention in Afghanistan. The purpose of the cartoon was to question the basis of military intervention, but is limited because it cannot reflect broader knowledge, eg that Afghanistan was a refuge and training ground for Islamic extremists. Source P may be regarded as more useful as it reflects this knowledge, although there is an element of Blair justifying his decision to take military action, so it has a clear purpose. This may be seen to endow this source with utility in different ways.

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

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how.

For example, Source O is useful because it might reflect British attitudes that Bush and Blair's intelligence about bin Laden was not proven and the purpose of the cartoon was to reflect reluctance about the wisdom of military action. Source P is useful as it confirms an attitude that Afghanistan was a rogue state and that the Taliban regime had to be dealt with because of its actions/policies and links to Islamic extremism.

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

Students 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, students may explain that the cartoon (Source O) is useful because it shows that there is some doubt that bin Laden was in Afghanistan but that wouldn't stop the Americans.

The Blair speech (Source P) may shed light on official grounds for the British military intervention in Afghanistan, highlighting Blair's belief that the Taliban were harbouring bin Laden.

Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example Blair suggests that this war is in retaliation for 9/11; the cartoon suggests that some thought that Blair and the Americans were wrong.

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

25	Write an account of how the difficulties faced by weapons inspectors in Iraq became an international crisis in 2002 and 2003.	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. Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and/or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis. For example, the crisis was played out partly in the UN because the US used Resolution 1441 at the end of 2002 as authority, to urge attacks on Iraq for allegedly delaying the work of weapons inspectors and having WMD. France wanted to give Saddam more time to comply and argued that it would veto another UN resolution. Russia and China were also opposed to war. Iraq agreed to weapons inspectors returning to Iraq. In Feb 2003 when weapons inspectors reported the Iraqis were cooperating and destroying some missiles, impatient US and UK leaders said that Saddam was still delaying disarmament. Other countries joined in the protest against the US/UK such as Germany, but their objections were brushed aside. No further UN resolution was passed – Bush went ahead amidst an international outcry against alleged US militarism.	
Level 3	Developed analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	5–6
	Extends Level 2. Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related to, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process. For example, the quarrel broke out in the UN because the US used Resolution 1441 as authority to urge attacks on Iraq for allegedly delaying the work of weapons inspectors. France wanted to give Saddam more time to comply and argued that he would veto another UN resolution. Russia and China were also opposed to war, but Bush and Blair ignored objections and authorised air strikes.	

Level 2	Simple analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	3–4
	<p>Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For example, the UN was divided about action to be taken against Saddam for allegedly ‘delaying’ the work of IAEA weapons inspectors. USA and UK wanted war which was opposed by France, China and Russia. The US and UK wanted to go ahead and gave Saddam a 48 hours ultimatum. Although France and others voiced opposition in the UN, US and UK air attacks began in March.</p>	
Level 1	Basic analysis of causation/consequence Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	1–2
	<p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the event, for example there were quarrels in the UN about how to deal with Saddam’s obstruction of weapons inspections. Some wanted action, others asked for more time.</p>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

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 result of the Gulf War, 1990–1991, was that Iraqi forces were removed from Kuwait.’ **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.

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

For example, students will make a judgment about the short term result, ie success in liberating Kuwait with the long term results of leaving Saddam in power. There may be a suggestion that a judgement depends on the point of view – did the coalition consider oil supplies more important than dealing with a dictator who inflicted further brutality on his own people. Or students might consider that in the long term Saddam still had to be dealt with and it led to another Iraqi war, so this was a more important result.

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.

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

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

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

