

INTERNATIONAL GCSE HISTORY

9245/1

Paper 1: International relations depth studies:
conflict and peace in the 20th century

Mark scheme

Additional Specimen

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 [oxfordaqaexams.org.uk](https://www.oxfordaqaexams.org.uk)

Copyright information

OxfordAQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for OxfordAQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: OxfordAQA 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 © 2026 OxfordAQA International Examinations 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.

Section A

Peace-making and the League of Nations, c1919-1939

Question	Answer	Total marks												
1.1	Source A supports the Treaty of Versailles. How do you know? Explain your answer using Source A and your own knowledge. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3-4</td><td>Demonstrates developed analysis of the source based on its content and/ or provenance. Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1-2</td><td>Demonstrates simple analysis of the source based on its content and/or provenance Identifies relevant features of the source. Reasoning may be implicit or show simple knowledge</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>0</td><td>No relevant content.</td></tr></table>	Level	Marks	Description	2	3-4	Demonstrates developed analysis of the source based on its content and/ or provenance. Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge.	1	1-2	Demonstrates simple analysis of the source based on its content and/or provenance Identifies relevant features of the source. Reasoning may be implicit or show simple knowledge		0	No relevant content.	4 AO3 = 4
	Level	Marks	Description											
	2	3-4	Demonstrates developed analysis of the source based on its content and/ or provenance. Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge.											
	1	1-2	Demonstrates simple analysis of the source based on its content and/or provenance Identifies relevant features of the source. Reasoning may be implicit or show simple knowledge											
		0	No relevant content.											
	Indicative content:													
	Content • Language supports the Treaty as a ‘great achievement’ – it stands for ‘civilisation’, an ‘end to German brutality’. • Tone suggests that there will be no war in the future because of the treaty.													
	Provenance • Experience as a war correspondent and witness to the peace discussions led the author to talk about German ‘brutality’ – uses the newspaper article to persuade readers that the Treaty is worth supporting because it will weaken Germany and end the threat of war.													
	Context • Date of Source A is the same month as the signing of the Treaty – the author will be aware of terms to weaken Germany such as disarmament. • Content reflects the view of the time - this was a ‘war to end all wars’, or the medal for fighting in the ‘Great War for Civilisation’.													
	Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.													

Question	Answer	Total marks															
1.2	How is Source A different to Source B about the Treaty of Versailles? Explain one difference using the content of Sources A and B and your own knowledge. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>5-6</td><td> Demonstrates a developed comparison of the sources based on content and relevant knowledge. An inference about a difference is drawn and supported with evidence from the sources and relevant contextual knowledge. </td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>3-4</td><td> Demonstrates a simple comparison of the sources based on content. A difference is identified and supported with evidence from the sources only. </td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>1-2</td><td> Demonstrates a basic comprehension of the sources. Identifies relevant features of the sources or the topic. </td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>0</td><td>No relevant content.</td></tr> </tbody> </table> Indicative content: Differences of content - A says the German danger is at an end, but B that the Germany could be a threat in the future; A that justice has been achieved, but B argues that the injustice of some terms such War Guilt was seen as an aggravation. - Inference that the author of A is optimistic that there might be an end to war itself as Germany has been weakened, while B claims that the future peace was uncertain as Germany was intact with the largest population in Europe. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	Level	Marks	Description	3	5-6	Demonstrates a developed comparison of the sources based on content and relevant knowledge. An inference about a difference is drawn and supported with evidence from the sources and relevant contextual knowledge.	2	3-4	Demonstrates a simple comparison of the sources based on content. A difference is identified and supported with evidence from the sources only.	1	1-2	Demonstrates a basic comprehension of the sources. Identifies relevant features of the sources or the topic.		0	No relevant content.	6 AO3 = 6
Level	Marks	Description															
3	5-6	Demonstrates a developed comparison of the sources based on content and relevant knowledge. An inference about a difference is drawn and supported with evidence from the sources and relevant contextual knowledge.															
2	3-4	Demonstrates a simple comparison of the sources based on content. A difference is identified and supported with evidence from the sources only.															
1	1-2	Demonstrates a basic comprehension of the sources. Identifies relevant features of the sources or the topic.															
	0	No relevant content.															

Question	Answer			Total marks
1.3	Why is Source C useful to a historian studying the Treaty of Versailles? Explain your answer using the content and provenance of Source H and your own knowledge.			8 AO3 = 8
	Level	Marks	Description	
	4	7-8	Demonstrates complex evaluation of the source based on content, provenance and relevant knowledge.	
			Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge.	
			Extends Level 3.	
	3	5-6	Demonstrates developed evaluation of the source based on content and relevant knowledge or provenance and relevant knowledge.	
			Shows some reasoning about utility which is directly linked to the issue in the question and supported with relevant contextual knowledge.	
	2	3-4	Demonstrates simple evaluation of the source based on content and/or provenance.	
			Shows some simple reasoning about utility which may be implicit to the issue in the question or shows simple knowledge.	
	1	1-2	Demonstrates basic analysis of the source based on content and/or provenance.	
		Identifies relevant features of the content and/or provenance, Reasoning, where attempted, is asserted.		
	0			
Indicative content: Content - It is useful as it shows how France, represented by Clemenceau as the vampire, aimed to suck the life out of Germany – by inference, destroying it. - Lloyd George and Wilson are shown as bats in the image and therefore share the blame for the terms. Provenance - The cartoonist is critical of France and the Treaty which aims to deliberately weaken Germany. The image was published in Germany with the intent of provoking more anger and resentment amongst readers against the treaty and those responsible for it. A source of value as it reflects German popular sentiments about the Treaty.				

	Context - Valid examples from the terms to support France's aims – such as disarmament, War Guilt, territorial changes. 'Blank cheque' for reparations (sum not yet decided) - Draws on the aims of Clemenceau expressed during the discussions at Versailles. There may be a comparison with the aims of Lloyd George and Wilson. - References the date - July 1919 - the terms had been published in June and widely publicised in Germany. The cartoon fits in with the angry reaction to the treaty inside Germany at the time. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	
--	--	--

Question	Answer			Total marks
1.4	According to the sources, did Germany have good reason to complain about the Treaty of Versailles? Explain your answer using the content of Sources A-E and your own knowledge.			12 AO3 = 12
	Level	Marks	Description	
	4	10-12	Demonstrates complex analysis and evaluation of the sources. Uses well-selected evidence drawn from the content of a range of sources and relevant and specific contextual knowledge and understanding to support a convincing line of argument The response addresses more than one reason or argument, explaining links between the sources. Extends Level 3.	
	3	7-9	Demonstrates developed analysis and evaluation of the sources. Uses evidence drawn from the content of a range of sources and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support a line of reasoning. The response addresses more than one reason or argument.	
	2	4-6	Demonstrates simple analysis and evaluation of the sources. Uses evidence drawn from the content of at least two sources and/or own knowledge to support a simple line of reasoning. The response addresses one or more reason(s)/argument(s). Reasoning may be implicitly linked to the issue in the question.	
	1	1-3	Demonstrates basic analysis of the source(s). Identifies relevant features of at least one source, showing basic comprehension of the source(s) and/or understanding of the topic The response addresses one or more reason(s)/argument(s). Reasoning - where present - is general in nature or asserted.	

	0	No relevant content.	
	Indicative content: Use of content explained • A - no - the Treaty has ended German brutality and hunger for conquest. • B - no - suggests that Germany had no reason to complain about the territorial clauses yes - some terms were not justified, such as War Guilt, and that the attitude was harsh • C - yes - suggests a deliberate and savage effort to weaken Germany. • D - yes and no - Germany deserved to be punished and made to sign; Germany used this as a basis for complaint • E - yes - shows that the Big Three aimed to punish the German people not their rulers: the Allies seemed disinterested in helping recovery Links between sources explained • A and B suggest that the Treaty was a 'great achievement – it had been fair and just (A), reflecting the 'goodwill' of the Allies notwithstanding the fact that the terms could have been much worse if France had had its way (B). And while some of the terms were to be expected, eg military restrictions (B), Germany as an empire had survived. • B, C and E in contrast, offer the view that there had been little 'goodwill' or justice (A); the peacemakers pursued different selfish aims and cared little for reconstruction (E), deliberately weakening Germany (C) and some punitive attitudes left a legacy of resentment, eg Poland and War Guilt (B). Arguments of B convincing as supported by specific examples from the Treaty, with its ideas shared by C and E. Link to D which suggests a punitive attitude (like B), the Treaty was the 'finishing touch' following defeat. Contextual knowledge • Valid examples from the terms to support the argument – such as disarmament, War Guilt, territorial changes. 'Blank cheque' for reparations (sum not yet decided) • Draws on the aims of Clemenceau expressed during the discussions at Versailles. There may be a comparison with the aims of Lloyd George and Wilson. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.		

Crises of the Cold War, 1960 – 1975

Question	Answer	Total marks												
2.1	Source F is critical of the Soviet Union. How do you know? Explain your answer using Source F and your own knowledge. <table border="1" data-bbox="260 555 1273 1077"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td><td>3-4</td><td>Demonstrates developed analysis of the source based on its content and/ or provenance Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge.</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>1-2</td><td>Demonstrates simple analysis of the source based on its content and/or provenance Identifies relevant features of the source. Reasoning may be implicit or show simple knowledge</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>0</td><td>No relevant content.</td></tr> </tbody> </table> Indicative content: Content - Accuses USSR of issuing threats – ending West's legal rights, grim warnings, increase in military spending, danger to 2 million Berliners Provenance - Kennedy's attitude anti-Soviet and intends to reinforce the support of the US people behind his policy to defend West Berlin/freedom Context - Cold war rivalry – Khrushchev bluster to remove Western Allies from Berlin and increase the USSR's hold on Warsaw Pact satellite states; Khrushchev thought Kennedy was young and inexperienced – seeking to exploit US weakness and its fear of nuclear war. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	Level	Marks	Description	2	3-4	Demonstrates developed analysis of the source based on its content and/ or provenance Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge.	1	1-2	Demonstrates simple analysis of the source based on its content and/or provenance Identifies relevant features of the source. Reasoning may be implicit or show simple knowledge		0	No relevant content.	4 AO3 = 4
Level	Marks	Description												
2	3-4	Demonstrates developed analysis of the source based on its content and/ or provenance Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge.												
1	1-2	Demonstrates simple analysis of the source based on its content and/or provenance Identifies relevant features of the source. Reasoning may be implicit or show simple knowledge												
	0	No relevant content.												

Question	Answer	Total marks															
2.2	How is Source F different to Source G about the crisis over Berlin? Explain one difference using the content of Sources F and G and your own knowledge.	6 AO3 = 6															
	<table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>5-6</td><td>Demonstrates a developed comparison of the sources based on content and relevant knowledge. An inference about a difference is drawn and supported with evidence from the sources and relevant contextual knowledge.</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3-4</td><td>Demonstrates a simple comparison of the sources based on content. A difference is identified and supported with evidence from the sources only.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1-2</td><td>Demonstrates a basic comprehension of the sources. Identifies relevant features of the sources or the topic.</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>0</td><td>No relevant content.</td></tr></table>		Level	Marks	Description	3	5-6	Demonstrates a developed comparison of the sources based on content and relevant knowledge. An inference about a difference is drawn and supported with evidence from the sources and relevant contextual knowledge.	2	3-4	Demonstrates a simple comparison of the sources based on content. A difference is identified and supported with evidence from the sources only.	1	1-2	Demonstrates a basic comprehension of the sources. Identifies relevant features of the sources or the topic.		0	No relevant content.
	Level		Marks	Description													
	3		5-6	Demonstrates a developed comparison of the sources based on content and relevant knowledge. An inference about a difference is drawn and supported with evidence from the sources and relevant contextual knowledge.													
	2		3-4	Demonstrates a simple comparison of the sources based on content. A difference is identified and supported with evidence from the sources only.													
	1		1-2	Demonstrates a basic comprehension of the sources. Identifies relevant features of the sources or the topic.													
			0	No relevant content.													
Indicative content: - G says the East is peace loving and has broken with its aggressive past, while F says there has been an increase in Communist military spending and a threat to NATO; Kennedy talks about an attack on West Berlin being an attack on NATO. - Inference is that in F Kennedy is defending legal rights, the people of Berlin, 'freedom and peace' from the Communist threat, but in G the Soviet Union's attitude is openly hostile to the West which is accused of 'violating' agreements and engaging in 'subversive activity' such as spying, as West Berlin was behind the Iron Curtain.																	
Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.																	

Question	Answer	Total marks																		
2.3	Why is Source H useful to a historian studying the crisis over Berlin? Explain your answer using the content and provenance of Source H and your own knowledge. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td><td>7-8</td><td> Demonstrates complex evaluation of the source based on content, provenance and relevant knowledge. Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge, showing a substantiated judgement about utility. Extends Level 3. </td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>5-6</td><td> Demonstrates developed evaluation of the source based on content and relevant knowledge or provenance and relevant knowledge. Shows some reasoning about utility which is directly linked to the issue in the question and supported with relevant contextual knowledge. </td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>3-4</td><td> Demonstrates simple evaluation of the source based on content and/or provenance. Shows some simple reasoning about utility which may be implicit to the issue in the question or shows simple knowledge. </td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>1-2</td><td> Demonstrates basic analysis of the source based on content and/or provenance. Identifies relevant features of the content and/or provenance, Reasoning, where attempted, is asserted. </td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>0</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table> Indicative content: Content - It is useful as it shows the USSR, represented by a wolverine/wild animal trying to take Berlin - Kennedy is saying 'no further' so it tells the historian that he intends to stop Soviet efforts to take Berlin Provenance - The image was published in Germany to convince readers of US support for West Berliners against the Communists and perhaps boost their morale. A source of value as it reflects West German/Berliners need for reassurance.	Level	Marks	Description	4	7-8	Demonstrates complex evaluation of the source based on content, provenance and relevant knowledge. Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge, showing a substantiated judgement about utility. Extends Level 3.	3	5-6	Demonstrates developed evaluation of the source based on content and relevant knowledge or provenance and relevant knowledge. Shows some reasoning about utility which is directly linked to the issue in the question and supported with relevant contextual knowledge.	2	3-4	Demonstrates simple evaluation of the source based on content and/or provenance. Shows some simple reasoning about utility which may be implicit to the issue in the question or shows simple knowledge.	1	1-2	Demonstrates basic analysis of the source based on content and/or provenance. Identifies relevant features of the content and/or provenance, Reasoning, where attempted, is asserted.		0		8 AO3 = 8
Level	Marks	Description																		
4	7-8	Demonstrates complex evaluation of the source based on content, provenance and relevant knowledge. Reasoning is directly linked to the issue in the question and is supported with relevant contextual knowledge, showing a substantiated judgement about utility. Extends Level 3.																		
3	5-6	Demonstrates developed evaluation of the source based on content and relevant knowledge or provenance and relevant knowledge. Shows some reasoning about utility which is directly linked to the issue in the question and supported with relevant contextual knowledge.																		
2	3-4	Demonstrates simple evaluation of the source based on content and/or provenance. Shows some simple reasoning about utility which may be implicit to the issue in the question or shows simple knowledge.																		
1	1-2	Demonstrates basic analysis of the source based on content and/or provenance. Identifies relevant features of the content and/or provenance, Reasoning, where attempted, is asserted.																		
	0																			

	Context • Draws on the background by confirming the context and usefulness of the source – post war agreements which placed West Berlin behind the Iron Curtain surrounded by communist East Germany; Soviet aims to stop Germans from the east using Berlin as an escape route to a more prosperous West; to stop the West spying in the East; Khrushchev bullying Kennedy who he thought to be an inexperienced and weak leader. • References the date – August 1961 – the height of the crisis and the month when the Wall was built. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	
--	--	--

Question	Answer			Total marks
2.4	According to the sources, was Khrushchev more successful than Kennedy during the crisis over Berlin?			12 AO3 = 12
	Explain your answer use the content of Sources F-J and your own knowledge.			
	Level	Marks	Description	
	4	10-12	Demonstrates complex analysis and evaluation of the sources. Uses well-selected evidence drawn from the content of a range of sources and relevant and specific contextual knowledge and understanding to support a line of reasoning. The response addresses more than one reason or argument, explaining links between the sources. Extends Level 3.	
	3	7-9	Demonstrates developed analysis and evaluation of the sources. Uses evidence drawn from the content of a range of sources and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support a line of reasoning. The response addresses more than one reason or argument.	
	2	4-6	Demonstrates simple analysis and evaluation of the sources. Uses evidence drawn from the content of at least two sources and/or own knowledge to support a simple line of reasoning. The response addresses one or more reason(s)/argument(s). Reasoning may be implicitly linked to the issue in the question.	
	1	1-3	Demonstrates basic analysis of the source(s). Identifies relevant features of at least one source, showing basic comprehension of the source(s) and/or understanding of the topic. The response addresses one or more reason(s)/argument(s). Reasoning - where present - is general in nature or asserted.	
	0	No relevant content.		

	Indicative content: Use of content explained • F - no - Kennedy shows determination to stand firm and not surrender • H - no - 'No further' boosts the morale of the West Germans/Berliners • J - no - Khrushchev failed to remove the Western Allies from Berlin • J - no - Johnson and Clay stood firm • G - USSR led by Khrushchev at that time appeared to have taken the upper hand by threatening the West – shows Khrushchev's intent but pre dates Kennedy's Presidency. • I - yes - Khrushchev looks pleased that he has taken the initiative and closed off East Berlin to stop the flow of refugees from the east; Kennedy looks unsure and is being told by Khrushchev what is negotiable. • J - yes - Khrushchev was 'cunning and effective' - found Kennedy's weak spot, ie concern about war and willing to negotiate to avoid it; Soviet intimidating tactics, increasing military spending; West's reaction to the Wall 'not drastic' and looks weak. Links between sources explained • J, F and H support each other - suggest that Kennedy stood firm (F with J) and stopped Khrushchev's aim to take all Berlin; Johnson and Clay increased the US battalion (J); Kennedy would justify himself (F) but West German cartoonist (H) reflects satisfaction that Kennedy had done what was needed • However, it could be said that G, I and J in contrast, offer the view that Khrushchev had taken advantage of Kennedy. J takes a neutral position – Khrushchev was cunning, he pressured the US and took the initiative in making demands, as suggested by G. In I Khrushchev appears self-satisfied, even though it is an American source, Kennedy is just looking on. There is more support from J that the Soviets felt they had succeeded beyond expectation. The US reaction was merely one of disapproval. On balance there seems to be more convincing evidence of Khrushchev's success. Contextual knowledge • Valid examples from Vienna summit and Khrushchev's attitude to Kennedy, the refugee problem, Kennedy's actions to defend West Berlin Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	
--	---	--

Section B**The Origins of the First World War, c1890-1915**

Question	Answer	Total marks
3.1	Identify three features of the Entente Cordiale, 1904. Award one mark for each relevant feature identified, up to a maximum of three marks. Indicative content: • It was signed between Britain and France as they both faced threats from Germany. • It settled areas of dispute between Britain and France over colonies in Africa. • Morocco became a French sphere of influence and Britain had freedom of action in Egypt. • It was a friendly agreement rather than a military alliance. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	3 AO1 = 3

Question	Answer			Total marks
3.2	Explain one way in which the Ottoman Empire responded to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914.			6 AO1 = 3 AO2 = 3
	Level	Marks	Description	
	3	5-6	Demonstrates a developed explanation of cause/ consequence. This is directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.	
	2	3-4	Demonstrates a simple explanation of cause/consequence. This may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.	
	1	1-2	Demonstrates a basic explanation of cause/consequence. This may be general in nature or asserted. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.	
		0	No relevant content.	
Indicative content:				
- Initial reluctance - Turkey was undecided about which side would give it more chance to recover lost lands and influence – both Britain (helping to improve Turkey’s army) and Germany (helping improve its navy) were trying to win Turkey over. There was a secret agreement with Germany signed in August 1914, but Turkey stayed neutral and resisted commitment for three months. - Turkey thought that Germany could help it to take lands from Russia in eastern Europe and regain its lost reputation – Germany seemed stronger after victories against Russian armies. - Turkey was angered by the seizure of Dreadnoughts being built in British shipyards. They saw this as a betrayal. - The Goeben, a German battleship, sailed to the Dardanelles and was handed over to Turkey with its crew. As a result, Turkey joined Germany and declared war on the Allies in November.				
Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.				

Question	Answer		Total marks	
3.3	Why did Britain declare war on Germany in 1914? Explain two reasons.		9 AO1 = 5 AO2 = 4	
	Level	Marks		Description
	3	7-9		Demonstrates a developed response relating to causes/ consequences. Explains two reasons, which are directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations.
	2	4-6		Demonstrates a simple response relating to cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains one or more reasons, which may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations. Note: award Level 2 if response shows a combination of developed and simple explanations OR a single developed explanation only.
	1	1-3		Demonstrates a basic response relating to cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains one or more reasons, which may be general in nature or asserted Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.
	0	No relevant content.		
Indicative content: - Germany had invaded Belgium as part of the Schlieffen Plan and refused to remove its troops from Belgium. - According to the Treaty of London 1839, Britain guaranteed Belgian neutrality; British public opinion said that Belgian should not fight on its own. - There had been an arms race between Britain and Germany, and this had increased tensions; Britain had been having talks with France about guarding the Channel, which was now being threatened by Germany. Britain therefore could not remain neutral. This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.				

Question	Answer			Total marks
3.4	‘Disagreements about Morocco were the main cause of increased tensions between the powers before 1914.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer with reference to disagreements about Morocco and at least one other cause.			12 AO1 = 4 AO2 = 8
	Level	Marks	Description	
	4	10-12	Demonstrates complex analysis of causes/ consequences. Explains the stated cause and at least one other cause, which are directly related to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations in a substantiated line of reasoning. Evaluates the relative importance of the stated factor and other factor(s), leading to a reasoned judgement. Extends Level 3.	
	3	7-9	Demonstrates developed analysis of causes/consequences. Explains the stated cause and at least one other cause. These may be related to the issue in the question. Uses relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations in a line of reasoning. Evaluation and judgement may show some simple reasoning. Note: award level 3 if response shows a combination of developed and simple explanations	
	2	4-6	Demonstrates simple analysis of cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains the stated cause and/or other cause(s). These may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanation(s) in a simple line of reasoning. Evaluation and judgement may be asserted. Note: award level 2 if response shows a single developed explanation only	

1	1-3	Demonstrates basic analysis of cause/ consequence. Explains the stated cause and/or other cause(s) in a general or asserted way. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge that is relevant to the issue in the question, showing basic explanation(s) and reasoning
	0	No relevant content.
Indicative content: - The Entente Cordiale agreed that France should have a free hand in Morocco, when the Kaiser interfered – in 1905, he visited Morocco and supported the independence of the Sultan; in 1911 the Kaiser sent a gunboat to Agadir - The Kaiser 'Weltpolitik'; testing the Entente between Britain and France; on both occasions the Kaiser had to back down, increasing international tensions - consideration of the relative impact of other factors, eg the arms race, the alliance system, tensions in the Balkans between Austria and Serbia which caused problems between their allies, Germany and Russia, the 1908 Balkan crisis and start of the Balkan Wars, the impact of aggressive nationalism - Evaluation and judgement could consider the relative impact and importance of different factors, eg after 1911 disputes over Morocco lessened, but aggressive nationalism in the Balkan proved to be the more dangerous problem and was unresolved in 1913. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.		

Hitler's Foreign Policy and the origins of the Second World War, 1933-1941

Question	Answer	Total marks
4.1	Identify three features of Germany's attack on the USSR in 1941. Award one mark for each relevant feature identified, up to a maximum of three marks. Indicative content: • Operation Barbarossa; opened up the eastern front, roughly 3000kms long. • Aimed to conquer western Soviet Union for German repopulation and to undermine communism; it ended the Nazi-Soviet Pact. • Initial successes: by August, German troops had reached Leningrad; millions of POWs had been taken. Hitler thought there would be a quick victory. • Winter of 1941 saw harsh conditions, fierce resistance and supply problems – halting the German advance. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	3 AO1 = 3

Question	Answer			Total marks
4.2	Explain one way in which Hitler’s aim of lebensraum increased the risk of war in Europe.			6 AO1 = 3 AO2 = 3
	Level	Marks	Description	
	3	5-6	Demonstrates a developed explanation of cause/ consequence. This is directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.	
	2	3-4	Demonstrates a simple explanation of cause/consequence. This may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.	
	1	1-2	Demonstrates a basic explanation of cause/consequence. This may be general in nature or asserted. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.	
Indicative content:				
- Lebensraum involved expanding the frontiers of Germany to give Germans more living space. This would create a ‘Greater Germany’. A rearmed more powerful and aggressive Germany was a threat to peace. - It meant expansion to the East into Poland and USSR. Neither would give up land without conflict, so war was likely.				
Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.				

Question	Answer			Total marks
4.3	Why did Stalin sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939? Explain two reasons.			9 AO1 = 5 AO2 = 4
	Level	Marks	Description	
	3	7-9	Demonstrates a developed response relating to causes/ consequences. Explains two reasons, which are directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations.	
	2	4-6	Demonstrates a simple response relating to cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains one or more reasons, which may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations. Note: award Level 2 if response shows a combination of developed and simple explanations OR a single developed explanation only.	
	1	1-3	Demonstrates a basic response relating to cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains one or more reasons, which may be general in nature or asserted Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.	
		0	No relevant content.	
Indicative content: - Stalin needed to avoid war in 1939 because the USSR was unprepared; the armed forces had been badly weakened by the Purges and the loss of a large proportion of officers. - Stalin gained time to rearm and relocate his heavy industries east of the Urals to prevent the loss of armaments. - In the short term, Stalin would gain half of Poland and Soviet trade with Germany would continue. - Stalin lost faith in the west. The 1935 Treaty of Mutual Assistance with France promised little support; appeasement convinced Stalin that Britain and France could not be trusted; both were opposed to Communism so Stalin's non-aggression pact with Hitler assured him peace at least for a time. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.				

Question	Answer			Total marks
4.4	‘The remilitarisation of Rhineland was the main cause of increased tension in Europe before 1939.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer with reference to the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and at least one other cause.			12 AO1 = 4 AO2 = 8
	Level	Marks	Description	
	4	10-12	Demonstrates complex analysis of causes/ consequences. Explains the stated cause and at least one other cause, which are directly related to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations in a substantiated line of reasoning. Evaluates the relative importance of the stated factor and other factor(s), leading to a reasoned judgement. Extends Level 3.	
	3	7-9	Demonstrates developed analysis of causes/consequences. Explains the stated cause and at least one other cause. These may be related to the issue in the question. Uses relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations in a line of reasoning. Evaluation and judgement may show some simple reasoning. Note: award level 3 if response shows a combination of developed and simple explanations	
	2	4-6	Demonstrates simple analysis causes/ consequences. Explains the stated cause and/or other cause(s). These may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanation(s) in a simple line of reasoning. Evaluation and judgement may be asserted. Note: award level 2 if response shows a single developed explanation only	

1	1-3	Demonstrates basic analysis of cause/ consequence. Explains the stated cause and/or other cause(s) in a general or asserted way. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge that is relevant to the issue in the question, showing basic explanation(s) and reasoning
	0	No relevant content.
Indicative content: - Limited increased tension: some took the view that all Hitler was doing was sending troops into another part of Germany, and Germany had the right to do this. - Although the remilitarization clearly broke the Treaty of Versailles, many terms had already been broken by 1936 e.g. rearmament and conscription had not been opposed, and Britain had signed the Anglo-German Naval Agreement - Hitler promised that he had no aggressive objectives and that all he wanted was to defend Germany. - Remilitarisation seemed to confirm that neither the British nor French were willing to fight to uphold the Treaty of Versailles, thereby encouraging Hitler to push for more; because the western border of Germany was now more secure, Hitler could pursue more aggressive aims to destroy the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and lebensraum in the east. - consideration of the relative impact of other factors which increased tension; aggressive nationalism and threats against Versailles; agreements with other militaristic states – Japan and Italy; anti-Bolshevik attitudes; military tactics used in the Spanish Civil War; Anschluss, the Sudetenland issue, large scale rearmament. - Evaluation and judgement could consider the relative impact and importance of different factors, eg the reoccupation of the Rhineland might have reflected a more aggressive approach, the threats against Austria and Czechoslovakia brought a more immediate reaction from Britain and France, eg appeasement, indicating that these events were more serious. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.		

The Origins and development of the Cold War, 1945-1960

Question	Answer	Total marks
5.1	Identify three features of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). Award one mark for each relevant feature identified, up to a maximum of three marks. Indicative content: • It was a response to Soviet control of Eastern Europe, which threatened Western Europe; set up following the Berlin Blockade. • Its member states agreed by Article 5 to defend each other if one of them was attacked; it aimed to defend Western Europe from Communism. • 12 nations joined in 1949, with Greece and Turkey joining in 1952, the FRG in 1955 • Article 3 said each member state had to maintain sufficient military power to resist aggression Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	3 AO1 = 3

Question	Answer	Total marks															
5.2	Explain one way in which the meeting between the Allies at Yalta was important for the future of Poland after the Second World War. <table border="1" data-bbox="260 483 1272 1290"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>5-6</td><td> Demonstrates a developed explanation of cause/consequence. This is directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation. </td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>3-4</td><td> Demonstrates a simple explanation of cause/consequence. This may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation. </td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>1-2</td><td> Demonstrates a basic explanation of cause/consequence. This may be general in nature or asserted. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question. </td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>0</td><td>No relevant content.</td></tr> </tbody> </table> Indicative content: - Poland would hold free elections but would remain part of the Soviet sphere of influence so the USSR would have indirect control. - Poland would have a provisional government made up of Lublin Poles (supporters of Stalin) and London Poles who had fled to Britain at the beginning of the war. - The Soviet border with Poland would move westwards (Curzon Line) and Poland's western border would also move westwards, taking over some German land. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	Level	Marks	Description	3	5-6	Demonstrates a developed explanation of cause/consequence. This is directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.	2	3-4	Demonstrates a simple explanation of cause/consequence. This may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.	1	1-2	Demonstrates a basic explanation of cause/consequence. This may be general in nature or asserted. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.		0	No relevant content.	6 AO1 = 3 AO2 = 3
Level	Marks	Description															
3	5-6	Demonstrates a developed explanation of cause/consequence. This is directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.															
2	3-4	Demonstrates a simple explanation of cause/consequence. This may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.															
1	1-2	Demonstrates a basic explanation of cause/consequence. This may be general in nature or asserted. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.															
	0	No relevant content.															

Question	Answer			Total marks
5.3	Why was the Marshall Plan important to Europe and the United States? Explain two reasons.			9 AO1 = 5 AO2 = 4
	Level	Marks	Description	
	3	7-9	Demonstrates a developed response relating to causes/ consequences. Explains two reasons, which are directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations.	
	2	4-6	Demonstrates a simple response relating to cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains one or more reasons, which may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations. Note: award Level 2 if response shows a combination of developed and simple explanations OR a single developed explanation only.	
	1	1-3	Demonstrates a basic response relating to cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains one or more reasons, which may be general in nature or asserted Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.	
	0	No relevant content.		
Indicative content: - During the severe weather of 1947, Europeans were experiencing disease, lack of food and decent homes, and desperate poverty. Without industrial machinery and power, Europe’s recovery from the Second World War would be slow and difficult. The Plan helped Europe recover from the War. - To prevent the spread of communism which controlled eastern Europe and threatened France and Italy; Marshall said that Communism would spread when people faced poverty. - US industries and farmers would supply Europe; as recovery took hold, trade between the two would increase boosting the profits of American companies. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.				

Question	Answer		Total marks	
5.4	‘The main result of the Korean War was that North Korean forces had failed to establish a united, communist country.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer with reference to the failure of North Korean forces and at least one other reason.		12 AO1 = 4 AO2 = 8	
	Level	Marks		Description
	4	10-12		Demonstrates complex analysis of causes/ consequences. Explains the stated cause and at least one other cause, which are directly related to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations in a substantiated line of reasoning. Evaluates the relative importance of the stated factor and other factor(s), leading to a reasoned judgement. Extends Level 3.
	3	7-9		Demonstrates developed analysis of causes/consequences. Explains the stated cause and at least one other cause. These may be related to the issue in the question. Uses relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations in a line of reasoning. Evaluation and judgement may show some simple reasoning. Note: award level 3 if response shows a combination of developed and simple explanations
2	4-6	Demonstrates simple analysis causes/ consequences. Explains the stated cause and/or other cause(s). These may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanation(s) in a simple line of reasoning. Evaluation and judgement may be asserted. Note: award level 2 if response shows a single developed explanation only		

1	1-3	Demonstrates basic analysis of cause/ consequence. Explains the stated cause and/or other cause(s) in a general or asserted way. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge that is relevant to the issue in the question, showing basic explanation(s) and reasoning
	0	No relevant content.
Indicative content: • Korea remained divided - North Korea's aim was to unite Korea under communism, and it failed to achieve this; North Korea invaded South Korea, but in the end had to retreat; it had relied on Chinese 'volunteers' for its survival in forcing UN forces back to the 38th Parallel. • consideration of the relative impact of other factors, eg the UN had also failed to unite Korea under a democratic government - the survival of North Korea as a communist country; devastation to Seoul, farms and factories plus large numbers of civilian casualties; the Truman Doctrine had been extended to Asia and the US policy of brinkmanship worsened relations between the superpowers; UN had played a significant role in resisting aggression – both the UN, US and other western forces sustained large numbers of casualties; China suffered losses of manpower but proved capable of fighting the UN forces and its status grew as a result – it was credited with saving North Korea from takeover. • Evaluation and judgement could consider the relative impact and importance of different factors, eg while North Korea remained divided and the North had failed to extend Communism, the main result was that it reflected a widening conflict between the US and communists - threats which extended to other parts of Asia such as Vietnam and lasted for decades to come. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate. Relevant technical terminology is used appropriately.		

Détente and the Collapse of Communism, 1969-1991

Question	Answer	Total marks
6.1	Identify three aims of Solidarity in Poland, 1980-1981. Award one mark for each relevant feature identified, up to a maximum of three marks. Indicative content: • Demands for pay increases, the right to strike and improved working conditions. • Liberation from state, communist control and authoritarian rule. • Free speech and fundamental human rights. • Social change and improved food supplies. Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.	3 AO1 = 3

Question	Answer	Total marks															
6.2	Explain one way in which Eastern European countries were threatening Soviet control in the late 1980s. [6 marks]	6 AO1 = 3 AO2 = 3															
	<table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>5-6</td><td>Demonstrates a developed explanation of cause/ consequence. This is directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3-4</td><td>Demonstrates a simple explanation of cause/consequence. This may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1-2</td><td>Demonstrates a basic explanation of cause/consequence. This may be general in nature or asserted. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>0</td><td>No relevant content.</td></tr></table>		Level	Marks	Description	3	5-6	Demonstrates a developed explanation of cause/ consequence. This is directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.	2	3-4	Demonstrates a simple explanation of cause/consequence. This may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.	1	1-2	Demonstrates a basic explanation of cause/consequence. This may be general in nature or asserted. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.		0	No relevant content.
	Level		Marks	Description													
	3		5-6	Demonstrates a developed explanation of cause/ consequence. This is directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.													
	2		3-4	Demonstrates a simple explanation of cause/consequence. This may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support the explanation.													
	1		1-2	Demonstrates a basic explanation of cause/consequence. This may be general in nature or asserted. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.													
	0	No relevant content.															
Indicative content: - Discontent throughout the Soviet bloc because of low living standards, repression and the success of protest following Solidarity’s example - Soviet power undermined by economic policies, Gorbachev’s openness policies and the abandonment of intervention by Red Army in Soviet bloc countries - Poland held free elections which Solidarity won; leading to the appointment of a Prime Minister and president representing Solidarity; independence from the USSR - East Germany mass demonstrations, dismantling of the Berlin Wall and the restart of free movement across the divided city - Hungary opened the border between itself and Austria, thousands flee to the West and free elections held - Czechoslovakia’s Velvet Revolution and the overthrow of the Communist government																	
Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.																	

Question	Answer			Total marks
6.3	Why was there a renewal of the Cold War during the early years of Reagan's presidency? Explain two reasons.			9 AO1 = 5 AO2 = 4
	Level	Marks	Description	
	3	7-9	Demonstrates a developed response relating to causes/ consequences. Explains two reasons, which are directly linked to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations.	
	2	4-6	Demonstrates a simple response relating to cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains one or more reasons, which may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations. Note: award Level 2 if response shows a combination of developed and simple explanations OR a single developed explanation only.	
	1	1-3	Demonstrates a basic response relating to cause(s)/ consequence(s). Explains one or more reasons, which may be general in nature or asserted Identifies some basic contextual knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the issue in the question.	
	0	No relevant content.		
Indicative content: • Under Reagan, US economic power fuelled the arms race; USSR economic weakness exposed as it tried to keep up. • Reagan and the renewal of the Cold War against a background of Soviet involvement in Afghanistan and continued repression in Eastern Europe; 'evil empire' speech. • Development of new weapons; the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI); deployment of Soviet and US missiles in Europe. • Antagonism between Reagan and Soviet leaders Andropov and Chernenko; Reagan's attacks on Soviet human rights record.				
Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.				

Question	Answer			Total marks
6.4	‘The main reason for détente in the years 1969 to 1975 was because of the Brezhnev-Nixon Summits.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer with reference to the Brezhnev-Nixon summits and at least one other reason.			12 AO1 = 4 AO2 = 8
	Level	Marks	Description	
	4	10-12	Demonstrates complex analysis of causes/ consequences. Explains the stated reason and at least one other reason, which are directly related to the issue in the question. Uses specific and relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations in a substantiated line of reasoning. Evaluates the relative importance of the stated factor and other factor(s), leading to a reasoned judgement. Extends Level 3.	
	3	7-9	Demonstrates developed analysis of causes/consequences. Explains the stated reason and at least one other reason. These may be related to the issue in the question. Uses relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanations in a line of reasoning. Evaluation and judgement may show some simple reasoning. Note: award level 3 if response shows a combination of developed and simple explanations	
	2	4-6	Demonstrates simple analysis causes/ consequences. Explains the stated reason and/or other reason(s). These may be descriptive or implicitly linked to the issue in the question. Uses some relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to support explanation(s) in a simple line of reasoning. Evaluation and judgement may be asserted. Note: award level 2 if response shows a single developed explanation only	

1	1-3	Demonstrates basic analysis of cause/ consequence. Explains the stated reason and/or other reason(s) in a general or asserted way. Identifies some basic contextual knowledge that is relevant to the issue in the question, showing basic explanation(s) and reasoning
	0	No relevant content.

Indicative content:

- Brezhnev-Nixon summits; laid the foundation for arms reduction and dramatic reduction in levels of threat thereby creating detente: SALT 1; Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty; Test Ban treaty
- Summits initiated a new atmosphere of peaceful coexistence, frameworks for dialogue, co-operation in space and reduction of risk
- Personal relationship between leaderships supported détente.
- Consideration of the relative impact of other factors eg the motives of the USSR, USA, China and West Germany; fear of nuclear arms race, proliferation and costs; impact of Vietnam war on US economy and ambitions for domestic reform; weakness of Soviet economy; China's emergence internationally and concerns about the Sino-Soviet split; the Helsinki Accords, 1975.
- Evaluation and judgement could consider the relative impact and importance of different factors, eg the Summits were important to confirm agreements which were part of detente. However, events at the time suggest that it suited both the US and USSR to change policy and build better understandings – in the 1970s both Nixon and Brezhnev were able to build a more positive personal relationship.

Note:
This indicative content is not exhaustive, other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.