



GCSE HISTORY 8145/1B/A

Paper 1 Section B/A

Conflict and tension:
the First World War, 1894-1918

Mark scheme

June 2019

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

Copyright © 2019 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

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 is critical of the Bolsheviks during the First World War. 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 is British and the title refers to being betrayed by Russia who was one of their allies. The Bolshevik Revolution occurred in 1917 and Lenin made peace with Germany in 1918. This reduced the demands on the German army in the East and allowed them to concentrate all their forces against the Allies on the Western Front.

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 Bolshevik is dragging Russia towards Germany against her will; the cartoon was published in the year Russia withdrew from the First World War.

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 military technology and tactics in the First World War?

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, the sources show that military technology and tactics had to change over time in response to the difficulty of succeeding in trench warfare and breaking the stalemate on the Western Front. The date of Source B in particular shows an historian that in contrast to the earlier years of the war the public was given a much more realistic picture of battlefield tactics.

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 because it illustrates the development of new infantry tactics in the course of the First World War; 'over the top' attrition assaults on the enemy trenches were replaced with 'creeping barrage' which was the practice of providing sustained artillery cover to protect the advancing troops.

Source C is useful because the author is an experienced soldier. His account gives an accurate picture of the threat posed by Germany's successful advance in the Spring Offensive using storm troopers. The new design of British tank was one of the ways in which this threat was countered.

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 is useful because it was printed in the later years of the war and shows how the new technology of aircraft was being used as part of the attack on the enemy.

Source C is useful because it is a first-hand account of how the design of tanks developed during the war.

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

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

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Source B shows how heavy artillery as well as soldiers were used to attack trenches. Source C describes how tanks were used during the First World War.

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

0 3

Write an account of how the Schlieffen Plan led to problems in 1914.

[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 success of the Schlieffen Plan depended on the speed of its execution but the Germans failed to defeat France within the planned timescale of 6 weeks. The Germans underestimated the resolve and reaction times of its enemies. However, whilst the Germans were not successful in their primary objective, neither were they entirely defeated. When both sides sought to protect the territory gained by digging trenches, stalemate resulted.

**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, the German advance on Paris was weakened by the need to send troops east as Russia had mobilised more quickly than expected. The failure of the Schlieffen Plan led to a stalemate in the fighting on the Western Front because after the Battle of the Marne, both sides dug a line of trenches that stretched across France.

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 German advance through Belgium was slowed down by fighting Belgian and British troops. The French were able to push back the German front line but both sides needed to build trenches to protect themselves.

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 Schlieffen Plan did not happen as quickly as planned and so the German army had to dig trenches.

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

'The Alliance system was the main cause of the First 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 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, the Alliance system was one of the long term causes of the war in the wider context of European rivalry over empires. It did not in itself make war inevitable, but it created a framework for conflict. This was triggered in the short-term by the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia in 1914.	13–16
Level 3:	Developed explanation of the stated factor and other factor(s) Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question 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.	9–12

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

For example, explaining the motives and rivalries that led to the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. This system resulted in Europe being divided into opposing armed camps and resulted in Germany worrying about ‘encirclement’.

For example, the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand was also a cause of the First World War because the Austrian government wanted to crush the nationalist movement in Serbia. In retaliation for the assassination, Austria declared war against Serbia. When Russia began to mobilise with the intention of supporting Serbia, Germany declared war on Russia.

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

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 main reason a war broke out was the rivalry that had been developing between Britain and Germany over the size of their empires and their armed forces. Both countries felt threatened by the development of the other and wanted an opportunity to show their superiority by winning a war.

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

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, the Alliance system brought all the European powers into a war together. They had promised to support each other if a war broke out.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand caused Austria to declare war and this became a World War.

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