



---

# GCSE HISTORY 8145/1B/A

Paper 1 Section B/A:

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

---

Mark scheme

Version: 1.0 Final



G 4 0 0 6 8 1 4 5 / 1 B / A / M S

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

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

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

#### Copyright information

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

Copyright © G4006 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## Level of response marking instructions

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

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

### Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

### Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

### Step 3 Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG)

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

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

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

0	1
---	---

**Source A** supports the Franco–Russian Alliance. 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, Russia and France had made an alliance agreeing to help each other if either was attacked by Germany. France wanted protection after the Franco-Prussian war.

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

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

For example, the leaders are side by side, looking like close friends admiring the troops and warships.

**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 Ludendorff's German Spring Offensive?

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 how the progress of the Ludendorff Spring Offensive changed so rapidly during 1918. Source B refers to the early success, but Source C shows how German fortunes changed.

**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 is a German account from after the war. Despite the initial success, the Ludendorff Offensive failed and so there was no point in the author exaggerating his account because the truth was widely known. Therefore, an historian can be confident that this is an accurate account. The reason for the German success was the use of elite stormtroopers who were fast moving because they were only lightly equipped. Source C is laughing at the Germans who had advanced a long way into France during the Spring Offensive but then slowed down. It was too difficult to keep the German army supply lines of food and weapons operating once they were so far into France.

For example, Source C is useful to show how a British newspaper was making fun of Germany by showing them as a skinny little dog that can't get what it wants. It shows an historian that by June 1918 people in Britain were feeling

more confident of a victory over Germany. This was because the Allies came under a sole commander and American troops had arrived to help with a counter-attack against the rapid German advance described in Source B.

**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 says that the Germans had some success at the start of 1918 as they got past the British front line. Thousands of British soldiers were killed, wounded, or taken prisoner in the Ludendorff Spring Offensive.

For example, Source C is laughing at the Germans who had advanced a long way into France during the Spring Offensive but then slowed down. It was too difficult to keep the German army supply lines of food and weapons operating once they were so far into France.

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

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

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example,

Source B says the German army thought they would achieve victory in 1918.

Source C shows that the German dog cannot reach Paris.

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

0 3

Write an account of how the war at sea affected the First World War.

**[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 inconclusive result of the Battle of Jutland affected the First World War because it damaged the German navy they did not leave their ports again for the rest of the war. This had the effect of leaving the British blockade in place and it continued to weaken Germany's war efforts until the end of the war. It also meant that Germany developed the use of its U-boat fleet rather than its surface fleet.

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

Extends Level 2.

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

For example, the First World War was affected when British ships cut off the supply route of the North Sea in an attempt to force Germany into surrender. This affected German industry and agriculture because it prevented the importing of coal, oil and fertilisers.



---

<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Simple analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b>	<b>3–4</b>
	<p>Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For example, Germany used U-boats to sink all ships sailing in British waters. This included American ships and led to demands in America to declare war on Germany. The U-boat campaign was so successful that by April 1917, Britain's food supply was critically low.</p>	
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Basic analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b>	<b>1–2</b>
	<p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as Germany used unrestricted submarine warfare in the war at sea.</p>	
	<b>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

---

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 failure of the Schlieffen Plan was the main reason why the fighting on the Western Front lasted so long.'

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.

<b>Target</b>	<b>Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)</b> <b>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)</b>	
<b>Level 4:</b>	<p><b>Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement</b></p> <p><b>Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Extends Level 3.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For example, the failure of the Schlieffen Plan was the early reason the fighting lasted so long. However, the main reason for continued stalemate on the Western Front was that both sides had the technology to defend their front line but lacked the technology to break through their enemy's trenches. Therefore, the outcome of subsequent key battles was the reason fighting lasted until 1918.</p>	<b>13–16</b>

---

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

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

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

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

For example, the failure of the Schlieffen Plan meant that the fighting went on for so long because the Germans were not able to knock France quickly out of the war within 6 weeks and found themselves in a two-front war. Russia mobilised more quickly than the Germans had expected and so soldiers had to leave the Western Front and go to the Eastern Front. With fewer soldiers, the German advance into France was slowed down. When the German army dug trenches to defend the territory they had gained, the war of movement was over, and a stalemate began.

For example, another reason why the fighting lasted so long was because new tactics and technology in the First World War made trenches easier to defend than to breach. Large guns were used to fire shells at the enemy trenches before an assault. The objective was to make holes in the barbed wire so that attackers could run through. However, the shellfire just made the wire more tangled and slowed the attackers down which made a breakthrough less likely. Key battles such as the Somme were planned to coordinate a British and French attack to but did not achieve a decisive breakthrough.

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

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

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

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

For example, the fighting lasted so long because of the race to the sea in 1914. Both sides tried to get around the enemy trenches by heading north towards the sea. The armies dug trenches as they advanced towards the English Channel. Neither side could move forwards.

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

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

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

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as the Schlieffen Plan went wrong because the German army was slowed down by Belgium and did not capture Paris as planned.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, both sides dug trenches to defend themselves and their positions did not change throughout the whole war.

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

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar**

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