

GCSE
HISTORY
8145/1B/B

Paper 1 Section B/B:

Conflict and tension, the inter-war years
1918–1939

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version:1.0 Final



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

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Step 3 Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG)

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in question 04.

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

Question 04 is an extended response question. They give students the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	1
---	---

Source A supports the Locarno Treaties. How do you know?

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

[4 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

Level 2: Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 3–4

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

For example, the cartoon was produced in the same year as the Locarno Treaties were signed. The title seems to celebrate that France and Germany have agreed not to go to war in the future. At Locarno, Germany accepted the western borders created by the Treaty of Versailles.

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

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

For example, the cartoon shows European countries working together.

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

0 2

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** to an historian studying the League of Nations?

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

[12 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target

Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)
Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)

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

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

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

For example, taken together the sources are useful because they illustrate how the reality of the League's capability in 1931 contrasts with the idealistic hopes that existed before it was created. Source B shows the belief in 1919 that the organisation would maintain peace. However, by 1931, the Covenant had been tested and proved to be of limited use in an international crisis. The artist that created Source C was trying to criticise the League for being ineffective and ignored.

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

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

For example, Source B is useful for giving information about the wider role of the League of Nations. The League did a lot more than try to resolve international disputes. An International Labour Organisation was created that enforced the setting of a minimum wage in many countries, a Health Committee worked to stop the spread of disease such as malaria and the Opium Board tried to stop illegal drug trading. Source C was published in America. It gives an American view that in 1931 the League needed the USA to do their work for them and solve the fight between China and Japan over Manchuria.

For example, Source C is useful for showing the opinion that the League was ineffective because the USA was not a member. The purpose of the cartoon was to encourage America to do more to solve the problem of Manchuria. The League did not have enough military or economic power to stop the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. Source B shows that the creators of the League of Nations wanted to help improve peoples' everyday lives. They wanted to do more than prevent war breaking out. For example, they helped refugees after the war.

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

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

For example, Source B shows that the creators of the League of Nations wanted to help improve peoples' everyday lives. They wanted to do more than prevent war breaking out. For example, they helped refugees after the war.

Source C was published in America. It gives an American view that in 1931 the League wanted the USA to do their work for them and solve the fight between China and Japan over Manchuria.

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

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

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Source B says that the League of Nations should keep peace.

Source C shows that China was fighting Japan.

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

0	3
---	---

Write an account of the problems facing the peacemakers in 1919.

[8 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target **Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)**
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)

Level 4: **Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question** **7–8**

Extends Level 3.

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

For example, the peacemakers wanted different sorts of treaties and they had to compromise. America was more idealistic than France and Britain. Wilson wanted to apply the principle of self-determination so that countries could rule themselves. Although self-determination was used to justify reducing the size of Germany and its empire, the same principle was not applied to the empires of France or Britain.

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 problem facing the peacemakers was France wanted to get revenge on Germany for the damage that had been caused by the fighting during the First World War and they wanted the peace treaty to be extremely harsh. Although the British people also wanted revenge for the lives lost in the war, Lloyd George was worried that if the treaty was excessively harsh it may cause Germany to start another war in the future.

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, France wanted Germany to pay large reparations. Britain wanted Germany to be a trading partner once again. The Big 3 were under time pressure to make decisions quickly.</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 Big 3 did not agree about how Germany should be treated by the peace treaty.</p>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

Question 04 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	4
---	---

'German rearmament was the main cause of increased tension in Europe before the Second World War.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

[16 marks]
[SPaG 4 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target **Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)**
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)

Level 4: **Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement** **13–16**
Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.

Extends Level 3.

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

For example, it was Hitler's wider foreign policy rather than rearmament that was the main cause of tension in Europe before the Second World War. Although the 'Freedom to Rearm Rally' created the problem of how Britain should uphold the treaty of Versailles, it was not until the invasion of Czechoslovakia that Chamberlain had to accept appeasement had failed. The imminent invasion of Poland was the highest point of tension before war broke out.

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

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

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

For example, German rearmament increased tension in Europe before the Second World War because it showed Hitler intended to make Germany strong again by using military action if necessary. He held a 'Freedom to Rearm Rally' in 1935 to show off his new troops and weapons. He began to conscript soldiers into his army and he made an agreement with Britain that he could start to build warships and submarines. He was breaking the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and no one stopped him.

Britain's policy of appeasement was also a reason for the increase of tension before the Second World War. Britain did not want to have the expense of war in 1936 and so they took no action when Hitler remilitarised the Rhineland. This made Hitler more confident that he could do as he pleased and it worried France.

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, Hitler's alliances with other countries also increased the tension before the Second World War. He made an agreement with the USSR that they could both take over Poland and divide it between their two countries. This made the invasion of Poland more likely.

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 Hitler built weapons, created an air force and increased his army.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, Hitler invaded other countries such as Czechoslovakia.

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