



---

GCSE

# History B

91451 International Relations: Conflict and  
Peace in the 20th Century

Mark scheme

---

9145

June 2016

---

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 Assessment Writer.

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

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

## A Introduction

- **Consistency of Marking**

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a choice of specifications and a choice of options within them. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply this marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of all the other History specifications and options offered by AQA.

- **Subject Content**

The revised specification addresses subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages all students, but particularly the more able, to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

- **The Assessment Objectives (AOs)**

Assessment Objectives	
AO1	Recall, select and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history
AO2	Demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• key concepts: causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context</li><li>• key features and characteristics of the periods studied and the relationship between them</li></ul>
AO3	Understand, analyse and evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a range of source material as part of an historical enquiry</li><li>• how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways as part of an historical enquiry</li></ul>

- **Levels of Response Marking Schemes**

The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that students are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History. All students take a common examination paper – there is no tiering. Consequently, it is reasonable to expect to encounter the full range of attainment and this marking scheme has been designed to differentiate students' attainment by **outcome** and to reward **positively** what the students know, understand and can do.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall and in deciding on a mark within that particular level.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. This mark scheme provides the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in a subject like History, which in part relies upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content.

---

## B Question targets and Levels of response

- **Question targets**

The mark scheme for each question is prefaced by an assessment objective 'target'. This is an indication of the skill which it is expected students will use in answering the question and is directly based on the relevant assessment objectives. However, it does not mean that other answers which have merit will not be rewarded.

- **Identification of Levels of response**

There are several ways in which any question can be answered – in a simple way by less able students and in more sophisticated ways by students of greater ability. In the marking scheme different types of answers will be identified and will be arranged in a series of levels of response.

Levels of response have been identified on the basis that the full range of students entered for the GCSE examination will be able to respond positively. Each 'level' therefore represents a stage in the development of the candidate's **quality of thinking**, and, as such, recognition by the assistant examiner of the relative differences between each level descriptor is of paramount importance.

- **Placing an answer within a Level**

When marking each part of each question, examiners must first place the answer in a particular level and then, and only then, decide on the actual mark within the level, which should be recorded in the margin. **The level of response attained should also be indicated at the end of each answer.** In most cases, it will be helpful to annotate the answer by noting in the margin where a particular level has been reached, eg Level 1 may have been reached on line 1, L3 on line 5 and L1 again on line 7. When the whole answer has been read and annotated in this way, the highest of the Levels **clearly attained** and **sustained** should be awarded. Remember that it is often possible to reach the highest level **without** going through the lower levels. Marks are **not cumulative** for any question. There should be no 'totting up' of points made which are then converted into marks. Examiners should feel free to comment on part of any answer if it explains why a particular level has been awarded rather than one lower or higher. Such comments can be of assistance when the script is looked at later in the awarding process.

If an answer seems to fit into two or more levels, award the higher or highest level.

- **What is a sustained response?**

By a **sustained response**, we mean that the candidate has **applied** the appropriate level of thought to the **particular issues** in the sub-question.

A response does not necessarily have to be sustained throughout the whole answer, but an answer in which merely a few words seem to show a fleeting recognition of historical complexity is not sufficient to attain a higher level.

In some cases, as you read an answer to a sub-question, it will be clear that particular levels have been reached at certain points in the answer. If so, remember to identify them in the margin as you proceed. At the end of the sub-question, award the highest level that has been sustained.

In other cases you may reach the end of the sub-question without having been able to pinpoint a level. In such cases, simply record the level awarded at the end of the sub-question.

## C Deciding on marks within a level

A particular level of response may cover a range of marks. Therefore, in making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the **lower/lowest mark within the level**.

In giving more credit with the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid ‘bunching’ of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. At all times, therefore, examiners should be prepared to use **the full range of marks** available for a particular level and for a particular question. Remember – mark **positively** at all times.

Consider whether the answer is:

- precise in its use of supporting factual information
- appropriately detailed
- factually accurate
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others
- set in the historical context as appropriate to the question
- displaying appropriate **quality of written communication skills**

### • Note about indicative content

The mark scheme provides **examples of historical content** (indicative content) which students may deploy in support of an answer within a particular level. Do bear in mind that these are **only examples**; exhaustive lists of content are not provided so examiners might expect some students to deploy alternative information to support their answers.

This indicative content must **not** however determine the level into which an answer is placed; **the candidate’s level of critical thinking determines this**. Remember that the **number** of points made by a candidate may be taken into account only **after** a decision has been taken about the quality (level) of the response.

### • Some things to remember

Mark positively at all times.

Do **not** be afraid to award maximum marks within a level where it is possible to do so. Do not fail to give a maximum mark to an appropriate answer because you can think of something (or the marking scheme indicates something) that **might** be included but which is missing from the particular response.

Do **not** think in terms of a model answer to the question. Every question should be marked on its merits.

As a general rule, give credit for what is accurate, correct or valid.

Obviously, **errors can be given no credit** but, at the same time, the existence of an error should not prejudice you against the rest of what could be a perfectly valid answer.

It is important, therefore, to use the full range of marks where appropriate.

Do not use half marks.

## D Some practical points

- **Answers in note form**

Answers in note form to any question should be credited in so far as the candidate's meaning is communicated. You must not try to read things into what has been written.

- **Diagrams, etc**

Credit should be given for information provided by the students in diagrams, tables, maps etc, provided that it has not already been credited in another form.

- **Answers which run on to another sub-section**

If a candidate starts to answer the next sub-section in an earlier one, by simply running the answer on, give credit for that material in the appropriate sub-section.

- **Answers which do not fit the marking scheme**

Inevitably, some answers will not fit the marking scheme but may legitimately be seen as worthy of credit. Assess such answers in terms of the difficulty/sophistication of the thought involved. If it is believed that the 'thought level' equates with one of the levels in the marking scheme, award it a corresponding mark.

Make sure you identify such cases with an A (for alternative) in your sub-total, eg as B2A/3. Also write a brief comment to explain why this alternative has been awarded.

If in doubt, **always** telephone your Team Leader for advice.

**0 1** Describe the Bosnian Crisis of 1908–1909.

[4 marks]

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Basic description</b> ANY GENERAL RELEVANT COMMENT Eg it took place in the Balkans.	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Detailed description of limited aspects</b> Eg develops one of the following: Situation in the Balkans – decline of the Turkish Empire; Aims of A/H, Serbia and Russia in Balkans; Annexation of Bosnia by A/H; Response of Serbia and Russia; Attitude of Germany; Results of Crisis; Effect on future relations between the powers involved. One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks) TWO for 3 marks. ONE developed point for 3 marks. <b>OR</b> <b>Limited description of a wider range of aspects</b> Eg outline description of crisis with little accurate knowledge.	<b>2-3</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Detailed description of several aspects</b> Eg at least <b>two</b> developed points mentioned in the first part of level 2. Or <b>THREE</b> accurate ideas on any point(s).	<b>4</b>

**0 2** **Source A** is commenting on Germany's actions in Agadir in 1911.  
Do you agree that the main reason for Germany's actions in Agadir was to show her military power?  
Explain your answer using the source **and your knowledge**.

[6 marks]

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO1, AO2, AO3)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>General response relying on source or learned response</b>	<b>1</b>
	Eg describes source – shows Agadir being hit by a fist – there is a ship in the background etc. German so source is biased; cartoon so meant to amuse, not be accurate etc.	
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about.</b>	<b>2-3</b>
	Eg shows some understanding of the cartoon and/or the German policy at Agadir – makes inferences – recognises fist as representing Germany/Kaiser showing power; ship as representing the German Navy, Panther; Moroccan looks afraid etc. OR makes simple comments on the provenance of the source: German cartoon so showing the strength of Germany involving themselves in Agadir etc.	
	The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.	
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Agrees or disagrees either using source or own knowledge</b>	<b>4-5</b>
	Eg <b>EITHER</b> Evaluation of provenance of source: eg explaining the motive/purpose/audience such as: German cartoon directed at the German people showing the strength of German foreign policy, her army and navy and how Germany can influence world affairs; or German cartoonist could be mocking the Kaiser by exaggerating his good arm so does not think that the crisis is a serious one, just Germany protecting its citizens in Morocco, no army was involved, it was just a demonstration of interest etc. <b>OR</b> Uses specific knowledge of the Agadir Crisis: rebellion in Fez – French intervention – Germany and the 'Panther' protecting German interests – effect of this on other powers, especially GB – threat to naval supremacy, Mansion House Speech – strengthening of Entente with naval agreement; could explain other reasons for	



German policy over Agadir by reference to Kaiser's aims of a place in the sun; hatred of France; fear of encirclement; challenging Entente etc.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion**

**6**

Both parts of level 3.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**0 3** Which of these two causes was more responsible for Great Britain entering the First World War:

- the Entente Cordiale
- the neutrality of Belgium

You must refer to **both causes** when explaining your answer.

**[10 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO1, AO2)</b>	<b>0</b>
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason</b> Eg the Entente Cordiale was between GB and France; France was invaded by Germany so GB went to aid them. Germany invaded Belgium. German invasion of Belgium meant that GB entered the war to defend Belgium and France etc. <b>MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Develops one cause</b> <b>This starts with description at the bottom off the level, then explanation and assessment which focuses on the question</b> Eg describes the terms/development of the Entente Cordiale. Explanations could cover the nature of the Entente – colonial agreement etc; GB’s commitment to France under the Entente – an agreement not an alliance but effect of extension by military conversations in 1907 and the agreement to defend the north coast of France in 1912 etc. Assesses how it led to the outbreak of war: would GB have gone to war to defend France? GB’s fear of a strong country dominating the continent and the North coast of France opposite GB fuelled by the German Navy, nature of commitment to France etc.	<b>3-6</b>
	Describes the meaning of Belgian neutrality and how the Schlieffen Plan violated it, Terms of the Treaty of London. Explanations could cover why Germany invaded Belgium (war on two fronts etc) – the importance of the Treaty of London 1839 and the sanctity of treaties – the importance of the position of Belgium to GB etc. Assesses how the violation of Belgian neutrality united GB in supporting the war – unity of the Cabinet – got rid of opposition of many who would not support a war against Germany before the invasion of Belgium, reason given to the public etc.	

**OR**

**Covers both with some development or explanation**

**This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.**

Description of both for 4 marks; standard explanation of both for 5 marks; good explanation of one and standard explanation of other for 6.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

**Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument** **7-9**

Eg an answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Assesses the part played by the Entente in bringing GB into the war and explains the role of Belgium's neutrality – 8 marks.

Assesses both and relates them to GB's entry into the war – 9.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Balanced, well-argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question** **10**

Eg assesses both in depth and reaches a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**0 4** Describe the military terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

**[4 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Basic description</b> ANY GENERAL RELEVANT COMMENT Eg Germany's army was reduced etc.	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Detailed description of limited aspects</b> Eg develops one of the following: Army limited to 100,000; No tanks, no aircraft; Conscription not allowed; Navy limited to 15,000 men, 6 battleships and no submarines; Rhineland demilitarised; Allied troops to occupy the Rhineland for 15 years etc. One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks) TWO for 3 marks. ONE developed point for 3 marks.	<b>2-3</b>
	<b>OR</b> <b>Limited description of a wider range of aspects</b> Eg outline description of military restrictions with little accurate knowledge.	
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Detailed description of several aspects</b> Eg at least <b>two</b> developed points mentioned in the first part of level 2. Or <b>THREE</b> accurate ideas on any point(s).	<b>4</b>

**0 5**

**Source B** is commenting on the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

Do you agree with Wilson's view that the main result of the Treaty of Versailles was that it allowed people to choose their own governments?

Explain your answer using the source **and your knowledge**.

**[6 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO1, AO2, AO3)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>General response relying on source or learned response</b> Eg describes source – Wilson thought that there were no territorial gains; people chose who was to rule them etc. Wilson was at the peace conference so he should know etc.	<b>1</b>
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about.</b> Eg shows some understanding of the terms of the treaty in general – based on idea of self-determination – Belgium remained free; Alsace-Lorraine restored to France, result was to punish Germany, or to set up the League of Nations etc. OR makes simple comments on the provenance of the source: Wilson trying to defend/justify the Treaty because he was partly responsible for it etc.	<b>2-3</b>
	The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.	
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Agrees or disagrees either using source or own knowledge</b> Eg <b>EITHER</b> Evaluation of provenance of source: eg explaining the motive/purpose/audience such as: Wilson speaking in the USA trying to win over opponents before the debate on the Treaty, so he is referring to matters which the American people value in order to win over those who opposed the Treaty; etc. <b>OR</b> Uses specific knowledge of the territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles to agree or disagree with the source – most likely to disagree by referring to the German speaking people who found themselves in the Polish Corridor; Austria; the Sudetenland; the Saar; Memel etc. Could also disagree by reference to the fate of Germany's colonies or by explaining how Germany was punished e.g by specific knowledge on reparations or by claiming the main result was the League of Nations with explanation of why etc. Agreement could come from reference to the plebiscites held in North Schleswig; Eupen and Malmedy; Upper Silesia etc.	<b>4-5</b>

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion**

**6**

Both parts of Level 3.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**0 6** Which country was more responsible for the failure of the League of Nations:

- Great Britain
- the USA?

You must refer to **both countries** when explaining your answer.

**[10 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO1, AO2)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason</b> Eg Britain was too weak to support the League; USA did not join etc.	<b>1-2</b>
	<b>MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.</b>	
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Develops one cause</b> <b>This starts with description at the bottom off the level, then explanation and assessment which focuses on the question</b> Eg describes GB's part in the League. Explanations could cover why GB was too weak to support the League after the war and in the 1930s – reasons for GB's action during the Manchurian and Abyssinian Crises the ineffectiveness of Britain's action – why they did not fully support the League etc. Assesses by relating GB's policies directly to the failure of the League – failure to act in Manchuria led to Abyssinia which led to the League falling into disrepute, especially after the Hoare Laval Pact and the failure to prevent the re-militarisation of the Rhineland. Chamberlain using appeasement as a replacement for the League and ignoring the League.	<b>3-6</b>
	Describes USA's role in the League – e.g. simple reason for not joining such as isolationism not explained.	
	Explanations could cover why the USA did not join, why the absence of the USA weakened the League – their inability to enforce economic sanctions because of the USA, the lack of military power in the League without USA etc. Assesses by relating the absence of the USA directly to the failure of the League – would economic sanctions have been effective against Japan and Italy if the USA had been in the League? Would oil have been sanctioned during the Abyssinian Crisis and brought the invasion to an end and thus prevented the failure of the League etc?	

**OR**

**Covers both with some development or explanation**

**This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.**

Description of both for 4 marks; standard explanation of both for 5 marks; good explanation of one and standard explanation of other for 6.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

**Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument. 7-9**

Eg an answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Assesses the role of GB and explains the part played by the USA – 8 marks.

Assesses both relating the contribution of both countries to the failure of the League – 9.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Balanced, well-argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question. 10**

Eg assesses both in depth and reaches a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.



0 7

Describe the events after the collapse of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 which led to the outbreak of the Second World War.

[4 marks]

**Target: Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)**

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

**Level 1: Basic description**

ANY GENERAL RELEVANT COMMENT

Eg Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia and war broke out etc.

**1**

**Level 2: EITHER**

**Detailed description of limited aspects**

Eg develops one of the following:

||

Ended appeasement;

Britain and France were to protect Czechoslovakia after Munich but took no action to prevent Hitler taking over;

British and French guarantee to Poland, Romania and Greece;

Memel restored to Germany by Lithuania;

Mussolini's conquest of Albania;

Pact of Steel;

End of Germany's Non-Aggression Treaty with Poland and Anglo-German Naval Agreement;

GB and French negotiations with the USSR;

Nazi-Soviet Pact;

Invasion of Poland etc.

**2-3**

One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks).

TWO for 3 marks.

ONE developed point for 3 marks.

**OR**

||

**Limited description of a wider range of aspects**

Eg outline description of events with little accurate knowledge.

**Level 3: Detailed description of several aspects**

Eg at least **two** developed points mentioned in the first part of level 2.

Or **THREE** accurate ideas on any point(s).

**4**

**0 8** **Source C** shows Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, opposing Mars the God of War. Do you agree that the main reason for Chamberlain’s policy of appeasement was to prevent war?

Explain your answer using the source **and your knowledge**.

**[6 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO1, AO2, AO3)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>General response relying on source or learned response</b>	<b>1</b>
	Eg describes source – cartoon shows Chamberlain standing up to the God of War etc. British so source is biased; cartoon so meant to amuse, not be accurate etc.	
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the interpretation/gives simple explanation of how the interpretation came about</b>	<b>2-3</b>
	Eg shows some understanding of Chamberlain’s policy of appeasement and how he believed that he could negotiate with Hitler to prevent war – makes inferences about showing the bravery and strength of Chamberlain; relates date to Munich etc. OR makes simple comments on the provenance of the source: British cartoon so showing the courage and success of Chamberlain etc.	
	The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.	
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Agrees or disagrees either using source or own knowledge</b>	<b>4-5</b>
	Eg <b>EITHER</b> Evaluation of provenance of source: eg explaining the motive/purpose/audience such as: British cartoon meant to gain support for Chamberlain, appeasement and the Munich Settlement etc. <b>OR</b> Uses specific knowledge of why Chamberlain wanted peace – death of son and brother in WW1; popular opinion in GB; losses of WW1; fears of aerial bombardment in war after Guernica; GB close to war after Chamberlain’s second meeting with Hitler at Godesberg, digging trenches etc; effect of depression in 1930s etc. Or other reasons – failure of the League of Nations; fear of communist USSR so Hitler seen as a barrier against the expansion of the USSR; buying time to re-arm etc.	

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion**

**6**

Both parts of level 3.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**0 9** Which of these events was the greater success for Hitler:

- the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, 1936
- Anschluss with Austria, 1938?

You must refer **both events** when explaining your answer.

**[10 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO1, AO2)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason</b> Eg Hitler sent troops into the Rhineland. Won a plebiscite in Austria. Neither was opposed so equally successful etc. <b>MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Develops one cause</b> <b>This starts with description at the bottom off the level, then explanation and assessment which focuses on the question</b> Eg describes the remilitarisation. Explanations could cover why GB and France did not oppose – Abyssinian Crisis; ‘his own back garden’; Versailles too harsh; French elections etc; why it was regarded as a success – military achievement; reversing Treaty of Versailles; controlling his own frontier and securing it against France etc. Assesses the success of Hitler (not relating the event to the outbreak of war) – he gambled and won by reference to his orders to the troops re withdrawal; he ignored the advice of the military leaders and his economic advisers and was successful so he strengthened his position in Germany and felt confident enough to continue his foreign policy re Anschluss, Czechoslovakia etc.	<b>3-6</b>
	Describes Anschluss. Explanations could cover why Hitler was successful – his manipulation of Schuschnigg; his use of the Nazi party in Austria; how he gained plebiscite result; friendship of Mussolini; why GB and France did not oppose; why it was regarded as a success – reversed Treaty of Versailles; uniting German speaking people etc. Assesses Hitler’s success: (not by relating it to the outbreak of war) - his preparations and method got rid of likely opposition from Mussolini, GB and France; stronger militarily in 1938 – does this lessen his success here compared to the Rhineland? It was an extension of territory and power and achieved one of Hitler’s aims.	

**OR**

**Covers both with some development or explanation**

**This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question.**

Description of both for 4 marks; standard explanation of both for 5 marks; good explanation of one and standard explanation of other for 6

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

**Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument. 7-9**

Eg an answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Assesses Hitler's success in the Rhineland and explains his success in Austria – 8 marks.

Assesses both by judging Hitler's success, not by relating them to the outbreak of war – 9

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Balanced, well-argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question. 10**

Eg assesses both in depth and reaches a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**1 0** Describe the Marshall Plan.

**[4 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Basic description</b> <b>Any general relevant comment</b>	<b>1</b>
	Eg gave money to Europe; other half of Truman Doctrine.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Detailed description of limited aspects</b>	<b>2-3</b>
	Eg develops one of the following: Truman Doctrine in action; \$17 billion dollars of help to 16 European countries; Used to help recover from war; Helped industry and agriculture; Why US introduced it – fear of communism etc.; Named countries which accepted aid and those which did not; Attitude of Stalin to Plan; Effect of the plan on those who accepted aid. One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks) TWO for 3 marks. ONE developed point for 3 marks.	
	<b>OR</b> <b>Limited description of a wider range of aspects</b> Eg outline description of Plan with little accurate knowledge.	
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Detailed description of several aspects</b>	<b>4</b>
	Eg at least <b>two</b> developed points mentioned in the first part of Level 2. Or THREE accurate ideas on any point(s).	

**1 1** **Source D** suggests one reason why there were problems between the wartime allies in the years 1945 and 1947.  
Do you agree that Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe was the main reason for these problems?  
Explain your answer using the source **and your knowledge**.

**[6 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO1 2 marks, AO2 2 marks and AO3 2 marks)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>General response relying on source or learned response</b> Eg describes source – leaders did not trust each other. British so source is biased; cartoon so meant to amuse, not to be accurate etc.  The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the source/ gives simple evaluation of the source</b> Eg shows some awareness of Soviet influence and/or Western suspicions of Soviet intentions; makes inferences from the cartoon – reference to behind the Iron Curtain, secrecy of Soviet takeover etc OR makes simple comments on the provenance of the source: British cartoon blaming USSR for the changing relationship etc.  The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.	<b>2-3</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge</b> <b>EITHER</b> Evaluation of provenance of source: eg explaining the motive/purpose/audience such as: expresses British commitment to democracy, their fears in light of events in Eastern Europe since Potsdam; to show GB's determination to stand with USA in resisting spread of Soviet influence etc. <b>OR</b> Uses specific knowledge of events after Potsdam to agree eg: deterioration of relations between East and West due to Soviets ignoring the promises made at Yalta/Potsdam, Stalin intent on creating his buffer zone by leaving troops in 'liberated states' and refusing to allow free elections as agreed at Potsdam. Challenges view by reference to other reasons, eg the effect of contrasting ideologies after defeat of Germany; effects of the USA using the atom bomb; attitude of Truman to Stalin and the USSR – Truman Doctrine etc.  The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.	<b>4-5</b>

**Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion**

**6**

Both parts of Level 3.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.



**1 2** Which of these did more to increase Cold War tensions in the 1950s:

- the United Nations' intervention in the Korean War, 1950–1953
- the Soviet Union's reaction to the Hungarian Rising in 1956?

You must refer to **both bullet points** when explaining your answer.

**[10 marks]**

**Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO1, 4 marks and AO2, 6 marks)**

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

**Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason 1-2**

Eg Korean War involved fighting between USA and Communists. Soviets sent troops into Hungary etc.

**MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.**

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

**Level 2: EITHER 3-6**

**Develops one bullet**

**This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question**

Eg describes the Korean War:

Explanation could cover why the UN and USA became involved in Korea; US fears of Domino effect after China became communist in 1949; success of N Korean invasion; Soviet absence from the UN; the involvement of China, indirect fighting – proxy war explained etc.

Assesses the impact on Cold War: significance of the involvement of China, the broadening of the Cold War; role of USSR only indirect; MacArthur's proposal to use atom bomb and his subsequent dismissal, drawing conclusions re Cold War, containment and attitudes of USA and USSR to it etc.

Describes the Hungarian Rising.

Explanations could give reasons for the Rising/Soviet invasion – Soviet policy towards the satellites, Khrushchev and destalinisation; events in Poland; Nagy's reforms; Khrushchev and the 'buffer zone'; ferocity of Soviet reaction and Hungarian resistance – deaths and refugees etc.

Assesses the impact on the Cold War – proximity of Hungary to Western Europe; effect on the Thaw and peaceful co-existence and the continuing arms race; NATO and the Warsaw Pact; attitude of Western powers towards the Soviet sphere of influence; strengthening of Soviet position in Eastern Europe; stalemate in Cold War etc.

**OR**

**Covers both with some development or explanation**

**This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question**

Description of both for 4 marks; standard explanation of both for 5 marks; good explanation of one and standard explanation of other for 6.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

**Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument** **7-9**

Eg an answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Assesses the threat caused by the Korean War and explains the effect of the Hungarian Rising – 8 marks

Assesses both and relates them to the development of the Cold War – 9 marks.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Balanced, well-argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question** **10**

Eg assesses both in depth and reaches a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/ complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**1 3** Describe the Helsinki Agreement of 1975.

**[4 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Basic description</b> Any general relevant comment Eg signed by many powers including USA and USSR.	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Detailed description of limited aspects</b> Eg develops one of the following: Signed by 35 countries – part of Détente; Agreement on borders in Europe; Soviet control/ sphere of influence over Eastern Europe was accepted by West; Existing borders of Germany recognised and West Germany gave up its claim to be the only true German state; Human rights agreement – USSR agreed to allow inspection of its record; Exchange of cultural, technical and trade links – oil and grain etc. Comments on success/failure etc.  <b>OR</b> <b>Limited description of a wider range of aspects</b> Eg outline description of Agreement with little accurate knowledge.  One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks) TWO for 3 marks. ONE developed point for 3 marks.	<b>2-3</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Detailed description of several aspects</b> Eg at least <b>two</b> developed points mentioned in the first part of Level 2. <b>Or</b> THREE accurate ideas on any point(s).	<b>4</b>

1 4

**Source E** suggests that the Cuban Missile Crisis ended in victory for the USA.  
Do you agree that the main result of the Cuban Missile Crisis was a victory for the USA?  
Explain your answer using the source **and your knowledge**.

[6 marks]

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO1 2 marks, AO2 2 marks, AO3 2 marks)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>General response relying on source or learned response</b> Eg describes source – American newspaper reporting on the US victory etc. American source so is biased; newspaper headlines are often wrong etc.	<b>1</b>
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the source/gives simple evaluation of the source</b> Eg shows some understanding of the outcome of the crisis – Soviets withdrew the missiles from Cuba etc. <b>OR</b> Makes simple comments on the provenance of the source; American newspaper showing that Kennedy had stood up to Khrushchev.	<b>2-3</b>
	The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.	
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge</b> For example: <b>EITHER</b> Evaluation of provenance of the source: eg explaining the motive/purpose/audience such as: published by Americans to show America/the World that the USA had stood up to communism; to persuade the American public that Kennedy was strong in the context of young President and Bay of Pigs fiasco etc. <b>OR</b> Uses specific knowledge of Crisis to explain its outcome – American victory on surface – success of Blockade etc. Challenges source by reference to agreement made over missiles in Turkey and the gaining of Cuba as a communist country; other results which were more important – hot line, Test Ban Treaty etc.	<b>4-5</b>
	The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.	

**Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion**

**6**

Both parts of Level 3.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**1 5** Which of these was the greater threat to the Soviet Union:

- events in Czechoslovakia in 1968
- events in Afghanistan 1978–1980?

You must refer to **both threats** when explaining your answer.

**[10 marks]**

**Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO1, 4 marks and AO2, 6 marks)**

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

**Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason 1-2**

Eg USSR sent tanks to Prague  
There was a Communist revolution in Afghanistan

**MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.**

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

**Level 2: EITHER 3-6**

**Develops one bullet**

**This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question**

Eg Describes the Prague Spring and the Soviet response, treatment of Dubcek, etc.

Explanation could cover why Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia, nature of 'Prague Spring' and Dubcek's reforms, threat to 'buffer'; reaction of the Czechs to the invasion, why there was no physical resistance etc.

Assesses the threat to Soviet Union arising from actions in Czechoslovakia – attitude of Warsaw Pact countries who felt their own position threatened, and the Brezhnev Doctrine – some weakening of Soviet position – Chinese criticism – attitude of West: how this could have been a threat but in fact it was condemned but no intervention – no real effect on relations with West – Détente of 1970s.

Describes events in Afghanistan in 1978/80 – Communist revolution and growth of Soviet influence – Extreme Muslim attacks on Communist government – Soviet invasion at very end of 1979 etc.

Explains Soviet Union's fears of growth of Muslim influence in Afghanistan – nature of fighting, religious nature of opposition made it more difficult to win, linked to effect; weakness of pro-Soviet government in Afghanistan in dealing with Muslim threat – danger to USSR because of Muslim groups in Soviet Union – Amin's developing relationship with USA, China, etc.

Assesses threat to Soviet Union arising from developments in Afghanistan – condemned by both USA and China and led to opposition so greater threat than Czechoslovakia; revived US fears of Communist expansion, especially in area of American interest due to oil – Carter’s reaction, failure of SALT II/Détente, renewal of Cold War, arms race, reduction of trade (grain); boycott of Moscow Olympics; help to Mujahidin; Soviet standing in the World; effects of the early fighting; danger of internal threat because of increase in Muslim power etc.

**OR**

**Covers both with some development or explanation**

**This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question**

One developed explanation or two explanations of one bullet point **plus** standard explanation of other bullet point for top of level.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

**Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument** **7-9**

eg

An answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Assesses the threat to Soviet Union from events in Czechoslovakia and explains threat arising from events in Afghanistan – 8 marks.

Assesses both and relates them to the Soviet’s world situation at end of 1970s – 9 marks.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Balanced, well-argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question** **10**

Eg assesses both in depth and reaches a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/ complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**1 6** Describe the actions of the USA to support democracy across the world after the end of the Cold War.

[4 marks]

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Description of key features and characteristics (AO1)</b>  Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Basic description</b> <b>Any general relevant comment</b> Eg supported democratic movements in a number of countries,    world's police force.	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>EITHER</b> <b>Detailed description of limited aspects</b> Eg develops one of the following: Worked with European allies to promote democracy in former Soviet states – Transatlantic Declaration 1990; Intervened but failed to restore government in Somalia after rebels had taken over 1992–1993; Intervention in Haiti restoring the democratically elected President after a rebellion against him, 1994; Actions with NATO in Yugoslavia; Linked economic aid to democratic reforms; World Wide Web set up to promote democratic values etc. <b>OR</b> <b>Limited description of a wider range of aspects</b> Eg outline description of USA action with little accurate knowledge.  One accurate idea which goes beyond simple/general (2 marks) TWO for 3 marks. ONE developed point for 3 marks.	<b>2-3</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Detailed description of several aspects</b> Eg at least <b>two</b> developed points mentioned in the first part of level 2. Or <b>THREE</b> accurate ideas on any point(s).	<b>4</b>



**1 7** **Source F** suggests that Solidarity was successful because of the support of the Roman Catholic Church.

Do you agree that this was the main reason why Solidarity was successful in the 1980s?

Explain your answer using the source **and your knowledge**.

**[6 marks]**

<b>Target:</b>	<b>Use of knowledge and evaluation of source to reach a conclusion (AO1 2 marks, AO2 2 marks and AO3 2 marks)</b>	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>General response relying on source or learned response</b> Eg majority of Poles were Roman Catholic etc. Catholic source so source is biased etc.	<b>1</b>
	The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.	
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Uses general knowledge to agree/disagree with the source/ gives simple evaluation of the source</b> <b>Either</b> Eg shows some understanding of the reasons for Solidarity's popularity – Polish Pope supported Solidarity; popular because it was against communism and conditions in Poland were poor; Walesa and Nobel Peace Prize with no link etc. <b>OR</b> makes simple comments on the provenance of the source: Solidarity successful so Church is anxious to be associated with this success etc.	<b>2-3</b>
	The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.	
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Agrees/disagrees using either source or own knowledge</b> <b>EITHER</b> Evaluation of provenance of source: eg explaining the motive/purpose/audience such as: Catholic Church wanting to take the opportunity of the anniversary to remind the Polish people of the part it had played in overthrow of communism in order to encourage them to continue to support the Church etc. <b>OR</b> Shows specific knowledge of reasons for popularity of Solidarity in Poland – their deep attachment to the Catholic Church and effects of the Pope's visit and support for the movement in 1979; the murder of Fr J Popieluszko by secret police in 1984 etc.	<b>4-5</b>
	Could examine other reasons for success: conditions in Poland under communism, shortages etc and achievement of Solidarity as a Trade Union; Walesa's leadership; foreign support for Walesa - Nobel Peace Prize 1983, weakness of Soviet Union if explained etc.	
	The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of	

spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Uses source and knowledge to reach conclusion**

**6**

Both parts of Level 3.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.

**1 8** Which leader was more responsible for ending the Cold War:

- Ronald Reagan
- Mikhail Gorbachev?

You must refer to **both leaders** when explaining your answer.

**[10 marks]**

**Target: Analysis and explanation of events leading to causation (AO1, 4 marks and AO2, 6 marks)**

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

**Level 1: Simple descriptive comment and/or gives one reason 1-2**

Eg Reagan hated communism etc.  
Gorbachev wanted to modernise communism.  
**MUST COVER BOTH BULLET POINTS FOR TOP OF LEVEL.**

The answer demonstrates simple understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is generally coherent but basic in development.

**Level 2: EITHER 3-6**

**Develops one bullet**  
**This starts with description at the bottom of the level, then explanation and obtains top of level for assessment and focus on the question**

Eg describes Reagan’s anti-communist policies, spending on arms, support for anti-communists around the world and then meeting with Gorbachev and discussing arms control etc.  
Explanations could cover why Reagan saw communism as a threat – ‘Evil Empire’; why he increased spending on weapons; why he later changed his mind and started discussing arms reduction with Gorbachev etc.

Assesses the effects of Reagan’s policies on the USSR: economic pressures; internal challenges to communist regime; how this made changes necessary and led to collapse of the Soviet Empire and therefore end of USSR as superpower and therefore the end of Cold War by bringing USSR to negotiating table etc.

Describes Gorbachev’s policies – Glasnost, Perestroika, Afghanistan, Eastern Europe etc.  
Explanations could cover why Gorbachev saw reforms as necessary, economic problems as a result of the renewal of the Cold War, Afghan War etc; the challenges in Eastern Europe etc.  
Assesses the effect of Gorbachev’s reforms: how the greater openness led to the collapse of communism in the USSR which led to the collapse of USSR as a superpower. Gorbachev’s popularity in the West because of his changing policies led to greater acceptance and willingness to negotiate with him; his proposal for arms reduction at Reykjavik Summit in 1986, his visit to USA, the Washington Treaty 1987 which led to end of Cold War at the Malta Summit in 1989 etc.

**OR**

**Covers both with some development or explanation**

**This will involve description or explanation of both with no analysis or assessment and little focus on the question**

Description of both for 4 marks; standard explanation of both for 5 marks; good explanation of one and standard explanation of other for 6 marks.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is reasonably well organised and presented in a clear and effective manner.

**Level 3: A selective and structured account covering both bullet points, though one may be in greater depth, focused on the question or establishing some argument** **7-9**

Eg an answer which explains both and supports the explanations with good depth and command of knowledge can be placed at the bottom of level 3.

Assesses the contributions of Reagan and explains the effect of Gorbachev – 8 marks.

Assesses both and relates them to the end of the Cold War – 9 marks.

The answer demonstrates developed understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well organised with an appropriate form and style of writing. Some specialist vocabulary is used.

**Level 4: Balanced, well-argued answer linking both parts, focused on the question** **10**

Eg assesses both in depth and reaches a reasoned judgement.

The answer demonstrates highly developed/complex understanding of the rules of spelling, punctuation and grammar. It is well structured, with an appropriate form and style of writing. Specialist vocabulary is used effectively.