

**...day June 20XX – Morning/Afternoon**

**GCSE (9–1) History (A Explaining the Modern World)**

**J410/06 International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001 with The USA 1919–1948: The People and the State**

**SAMPLE MARK SCHEME**

**Duration:** 1 hour 45 minutes

**MAXIMUM MARK 105**

**This document consists of 32 pages**

**MARKING INSTRUCTIONS****PREPARATION FOR MARKING****SCORIS**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on–screen marking: *scoris assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log–in to scoris and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

YOU MUST MARK 10 PRACTICE AND 10 STANDARDISATION RESPONSES BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK LIVE SCRIPTS.

**TRADITIONAL**

Before the Standardisation meeting you must mark at least 10 scripts from several centres. For this preliminary marking you should use **pencil** and follow the **mark scheme**. Bring these **marked scripts** to the meeting.

**MARKING**

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the scoris 50% and 100% (traditional 50% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone, email or via the scoris messaging system.

5. Work crossed out:
- where a candidate crosses out an answer and provides an alternative response, the crossed out response is not marked and gains no marks
  - if a candidate crosses out an answer to a whole question and makes no second attempt, and if the inclusion of the answer does not cause a rubric infringement, the assessor should attempt to mark the crossed out answer and award marks appropriately.
6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. There is a NR (No Response) option. Award NR (No Response)
- if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
  - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g. 'can't do', 'don't know')
  - OR if there is a mark (e.g. a dash, a question mark) which isn't an attempt at the question.
- Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).
8. The scoris **comments box** is used by your Team Leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.** If you have any questions or comments for your Team Leader, use the phone, the scoris messaging system, or e-mail.
9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.
10. For answers marked by levels of response:
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
  - To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

Please note that the Assessment Objectives being assessed are listed at the top of the mark scheme for each question, above the 'Additional guidance'. Where more than one Assessment Objective is being assessed, the more heavily weighted Assessment Objective will be listed first, and the maximum number of marks for each Assessment Objective will be given so that the relative weightings are clear. When marking, you must therefore give greater priority to the more heavily weighted Assessment Objective when determining in which level and within a level to place an answer.

#### 11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning

## 12. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

### INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet **Instructions for Examiners**. If you are examining for the first time, please read carefully **Appendix 5 Introduction to Script Marking: Notes for New Examiners**.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

## USING THE MARK SCHEME

Please study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide 'correct' answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide 'best guesses' about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

The Examiners' Standardisation Meeting will ensure that the Mark Scheme covers the range of candidates' responses to the questions, and that all Examiners understand and apply the Mark Scheme in the same way. The Mark Scheme will be discussed and amended at the meeting, and administrative procedures will be confirmed. Co-ordination scripts will be issued at the meeting to exemplify aspects of candidates' responses and achievements; the co-ordination scripts then become part of this Mark Scheme.

Before the Standardisation Meeting, you should read and mark in pencil a number of scripts, in order to gain an impression of the range of responses and achievement that may be expected.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

**INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS**

- 1 The co-ordination scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the Team Leaders and will be discussed fully at the Examiners' Co-ordination Meeting.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

**International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001**

1. Outline the actions of the USSR in Eastern Europe from 1945 to 1948.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of the actions of the USSR in Eastern Europe in the period 1945–1948 should also be credited.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows a clear understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.</li> </ul>	<p><i>In the final stages of the Second World War Soviet forces drove German forces back across much of Eastern Europe. Once the war ended the Soviets kept their troops in countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia. Stalin wanted Eastern Europe to become a Soviet sphere of influence and he pushed for this at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences in 1945. At the same time the USSR helped Communist parties to take power in several Eastern European countries. To help keep this control Stalin established the Cominform in 1947, an organization based in the USSR which effectively controlled the Communist parties of the Eastern European states.</i></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows some understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.</li> </ul>	<p><i>In the final stages of the Second World War Soviet forces drove German forces back across much of Eastern Europe. Once the war ended the Soviets kept their troops in countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia because Stalin wanted Eastern Europe to become a Soviet sphere of influence.</i></p>	<b>2–3</b>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Soviet Union made a bloc of countries in Eastern Europe after the Second World War.</i></p>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

2. How successful were attempts at international co-operation in the 1920s? Explain your answer.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.  No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically cover different aspects of the argument, supported by a range of more detailed description and fuller explanation that is directly relevant to the question e.g.</p> <p><i>During the 1920s world leaders faced many problems still left over from the First World War. Because international rivalry had led to war they decided to try international co-operation.</i></p> <p><i>In many ways international co-operation was very successful. The most obvious example was the League of Nations. During the 1920s the League was able to sort out several disputes. For example in 1921 the League successfully resolved a dispute between Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. The League held a vote which divided the area between Poland and Germany and both states accepted this. The League also succeeded in stopping a dispute between Bulgaria and Greece in 1925. Greek troops invaded Bulgaria after some Greek soldiers were killed. The League ruled against Greece and ordered it to leave Bulgaria and Greece obeyed. The League also did really important work in other fields. For example the League's Refugee Committee succeeded in returning over 400,000 displaced persons to their homes after the First World War. Its Finance Committee helped to repair a financial disaster in Austria and Hungary. The Health Committee helped to pay for research into vaccines against deadly diseases like malaria.</i></p> <p><i>The League was not the only type of international co-operation in the 1920s. For example in 1925 Germany reached an agreement with Belgium and France called the Locarno Treaties in which Germany accepted its borders as set out in the Treaty</i></p>	<b>9–10</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

	<p><i>of Versailles, reducing tension with France greatly. And in 1928 65 nations, including the USA which was not in the League, signed the Kellogg Briand Pact agreeing to reject war as a means of achieving political aims.</i></p> <p><i>Of course there were also failures in the 1920s. In 1923 Italy attacked the Greek island of Corfu after a dispute involving some of its troops. At first the League of Nations ruled against Italy but the Italian leader Mussolini pressured Britain and France and they agreed to support Mussolini. The League was forced to change its mind and back down. The League also failed to achieve one of its main aims, international disarmament. There was one agreement about limiting naval forces in 1921 but apart from this no progress was made.</i></p> <p><i>So on balance the attempts at international co-operation in the 1920s and 1930s were mixed, with some successes and some failures.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically cover different aspects of the argument supported by description and explanation that is directly relevant to the question e.g.</p> <p><i>In many ways international co-operation was very successful. The most obvious example was the League of Nations. During the 1920s the League was able to sort out several disputes. For example in 1921 the League successfully resolved a dispute between Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. The League also succeeded in stopping a dispute between Bulgaria and Greece in 1925. The League also did really important work in other fields. For example, the League's Refugee Committee succeeded in returning over 400,000 displaced persons to their homes after the First World War.</i></p> <p><i>The League was not the only type of international co-operation in the 1920s. For example, in 1925 Germany reached an agreement with Belgium and France called the Locarno Treaties. And in 1928, 65 nations, including the USA which was not in the League, signed the Kellogg Briand Pact agreeing to reject war as a means of achieving political aims.</i></p> <p><i>Of course there were also failures in the 1920s. In 1923, Italy attacked the Greek island of Corfu after a dispute involving some of its troops. At first the League of Nations ruled against Italy but the Italian leader Mussolini forced the League back down. The League also failed to achieve one of its main aims, international</i></p>	<p><b>7–8</b></p>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

	<p><i>disarmament.</i></p> <p><i>So on balance the attempts at international co-operation in the 1920s and 1930s were mixed, with some successes and some failures.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically cover one aspect of the argument supported with description and explanation that is directly relevant to the issue in the question e.g.</p> <p><i>In many ways international co-operation was very successful. The most obvious example was the League of Nations. During the 1920s the League was able to sort out several disputes. For example, in 1921 the League successfully resolved a dispute between Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. The League also succeeded in stopping a dispute between Bulgaria and Greece in 1925. The League also did really important work in other fields. For example, the League's Refugee Committee succeeded in returning over 400,000 displaced persons to their homes after the First World War.</i></p>	<b>5–6</b>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events that is linked to the issue in the question e.g.</p> <p><i>The League of Nations was the most important attempt at international co-operation in the 1920s. It had an assembly and a council and these were used to discuss international disputes.</i></p>	<b>3–4</b>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>• There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g.</p> <p><i>The League of Nations was set up in 1919 and was based in Geneva.</i></p>	<b>1–2</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is a fair comment on the policies of Neville Chamberlain in the period 1937–1939? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of the events of 1937–1939 to support your answer.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO4 (a and d): Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. [20] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full and thoroughly developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a convincing and substantiated judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically contain fully developed analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and its context and support this with consideration of other interpretations to address the question e.g.</p> <p><i>The comment is fair about Chamberlain being sincere. He was trying to prevent another war. He was especially worried that a new war would involve civilians more than any previous war, through bombing. It is also fair to say that Chamberlain also made miscalculations. The most obvious one was that when he returned from his meeting with Hitler in 1938 he talked about the piece of paper in his hand which would bring peace in our time. Less than six months later Hitler broke his word and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia and then went on to invade Poland.</i></p> <p><i>Churchill's view is supported by many other historians. In the Second World War journalists and historians wrote accounts of Chamberlain and his supporters and accused them of being responsible for the war, calling them 'The Guilty Men'. In the 1960s, during the Cold War, American politicians often referred back to the policy of appeasement saying that England fell asleep and used it to justify aggressive actions towards the USSR.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand it could be argued that the comment is not fair. Many historians argue that Chamberlain did not miscalculate, he was playing for time. In 1938 intelligence reports suggested that Germany's air force was much larger and more advanced than Britain's. Historians have shown that this information was incorrect but they also argue that Chamberlain did not know it was incorrect so his policy made sense.</i></p> <p><i>Historians in the 1990s were able to use official government papers which were kept secret before then. These papers show that Britain was struggling financially. When Chamberlain was Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1936 he began planning for Britain's rearmament. So historians say Chamberlain did not miscalculate he just found himself in a difficult position and running out of time. Historians in the 1990s have also used government records to show that the government was very worried that the British people</i></p>	<b>21–25</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

	<p><i>simply did not support going to war in 1938. Neither did Britain's Empire. By contrast, the British people did support the decision for war in 1939.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, we have to be careful about accepting an account of events in the 1930s written by Winston Churchill. He was well known for glorifying his own role in history. He was also a marginalised and rejected figure in the 1930s and we can see his discontent in what he says about Chamberlain.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a fully supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically contain developed analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and its context and support this with consideration of other interpretations to address the question e.g.</p> <p><i>The comment is fair about Chamberlain being sincere. He was trying to prevent another war. He was especially worried that a new war would involve civilians more than any previous war, through bombing. It is also fair to say that Chamberlain also made miscalculations. The most obvious one was trusting Hitler's promise to leave Czechoslovakia and Poland in peace which he broke.</i></p> <p><i>Churchill's view is supported by other historians. In the Second World War journalists and historians described Chamberlain and his supporters as 'The Guilty Men'. In the 1960s, during the Cold War, American politicians often referred back to the policy of appeasement saying that England fell asleep.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand not all historians are critical of Chamberlain. Historians in the 1990s used government records to show that the government was very worried that the British people simply did not support going to war in 1938. Neither did Britain's Empire. By contrast, the British people did support the decision for war in 1939.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, we have to be careful about accepting an account of events in the 1930s written by Winston Churchill. He was well known for glorifying his own role in history and even said history would be kind to him because he would write it.</i></p>	<b>16–20</b>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied, and uses this to make a partially supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically contain some accurate analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and its context and support this with consideration of other interpretations to address the question e.g.</p> <p><i>The comment is fair because Chamberlain did make miscalculations. After Munich in 1938 he said he had gained peace in our time. Less than six months later Hitler broke his word and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia.</i></p>	<b>11–15</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

	<i>Also Churchill's comments might not be completely fair. Churchill was well known for emphasising his own achievements. By criticising Chamberlain, Churchill was emphasising his own qualities in leading Britain to victory in the Second World War. It is said that Churchill actually told US President Roosevelt that history would be kind because he would write the history.</i>	
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and limited evaluation of other interpretations studied, and links this to a judgement of the given interpretation in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain some analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and its context and link this to considerations of other interpretations to address the question e.g.</p> <p><i>The comment is fair because Chamberlain did make miscalculations. After Munich in 1938 he said he had gained peace in our time. Less than six months later Hitler broke his word and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Churchill's criticisms of Chamberlain are not fair. By criticising Chamberlain, Churchill was emphasising his own qualities in leading Britain to victory in the Second World War. It is said that Churchill actually told US President Roosevelt that history would be kind because he would write the history.</i></p>	<b>6–10</b>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in terms of the question. Other interpretations may be mentioned but there is no analysis or evaluation of them.</li> <li>The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points about Interpretation A accompanied by basic knowledge or a general statement about other interpretations e.g.</p> <p><i>The comment is fair because Chamberlain trusted Hitler in 1937–1939 and he should have stood up to him at Munich.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>We cannot really say this comment is fair because Churchill was writing after the war and during the war many people criticised appeasement because it led to war.</i></p>	<b>1–5</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

4. Study Interpretation B. Explain why not all historians and commentators have agreed with this interpretations. Use other interpretations and your knowledge to support your answer.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO4 (a, b and c): Analyse individual interpretations and how and why interpretations differ. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a range of aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a thorough, detailed analysis of how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is a fully supported and convincing analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically provide a full analysis of Interpretation B and compare this with other interpretations of the same events in different ways, with an analysis of why these interpretations differ, e.g.</p> <p><i>Gaddis argues that conflict between the USA and USSR was unavoidable at the end of the Second World War because the two sides simply could not see each other's' point of view although he also seems to say that the Western powers were innocent and that Stalin was to blame.</i></p> <p><i>Not all historians would agree with this interpretation of events. In the 1940s and 1950s Soviet historians effectively argued the exact opposite of what Gaddis was saying. They claimed that it was the USA which was the aggressive power. Many Soviet historians were Communists, and even if they were not, the tight control of universities and publications in the USSR would have ensured Soviet historians criticism of the USA's actions. For example they argued that that the development of the atomic bomb, and Truman's attempts to intimidate Stalin with the bomb at the Potsdam Conference, prove that it was the USA not the USSR which was the aggressor.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand historians in the USA in the late 1940s and 1950s would have taken a very different view. In the period after the Second World War, the USA was gripped by a Red Scare, a fear of Communism. In this climate US historians pointed to the way Stalin took control of Eastern Europe in the years 1945-1948 and claimed that he was planning to extend Soviet control into western Europe.</i></p> <p><i>However, by the 1960s some US historians were painting a slightly different picture of the Cold War which would have disagreed with what Gaddis says. By the later 1960s many American historians had become disillusioned about their own country as a</i></p>	<p><b>17–20</b></p> 

	<p><i>result of the Vietnam War. This made them look again at the actions of their own country in the early stages of the Cold War and argue that the USA was at least partly to blame, and even mainly to blame. According to this view, big business and military commanders joined together in aggressive policies because they gained from it through arms contracts and a well-supplied army.</i></p> <p><i>By the 1990s and 2000s the situation in Russia and the USA had changed with the ending of the Cold War. Many historians gained access to archive sources, especially in the USSR, and these revealed that the Cold War was, to a great extent, the result of misunderstanding and mistrust. Each side was fearful of the other and so over-reacted to actions by the other side. So this view is similar to the view of Interpretation A, although not as critical of Stalin.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts some aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce an analysis of how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>• There is a supported analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>• Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically provide an analysis of one aspect of Interpretation B and compare this with other interpretations of the same events in different ways, with an analysis of why these interpretations differ, e.g.</p> <p><i>Gaddis argues that conflict between the USA and USSR was unavoidable at the end of the Second World War and he also seems to say that the Western powers were innocent and that Stalin was to blame.</i></p> <p><i>Not all historians would agree with this interpretation of events. In the 1940s and 1950s Soviet historians effectively argued the exact opposite of what Gaddis was saying. They claimed that it was the USA which was the aggressive power. For example, they argued that the use of the atomic bomb on Japan was to intimidate the USSR. They also argued that the formation of NATO in 1949 was an aggressive act by the USA.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand historians in the USA in the late 1940s and 1950s would have taken a very different view. In the period after the Second World War the USA was gripped by a Red Scare, a fear of Communism. In this climate US historians pointed to the way Stalin took control of Eastern Europe even though people there generally did not support Communist parties.</i></p> <p><i>However, by the 1960s some US historians were painting a slightly different picture of the Cold War which would have disagreed with what Gaddis says. By the later 1960s many American historians, like many American people, had become disillusioned about their own country as a result of the Vietnam War. This made them look again at the actions of their own country and argue that the USA was at least partly to blame. For example, American historians argued that the network of US military bases around</i></p>	<p><b>13–16</b></p> 

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

	<i>the world, supposedly to counter the threat of Communism, were actually a form of American imperialism.</i>	
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a partial analysis how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is some analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically provide an analysis of more than one aspect of Interpretation B and compare this with other interpretations of the same events in different ways, with a partial analysis of why these interpretations differ, e.g.</p> <p><i>The Soviet historians who were writing in the late 1940s and early 1950s would certainly not have agreed with Interpretation B. They said the USSR was not responsible and was defending itself by supporting Communist regimes in Poland, Czechoslovakia and other states. They also said the USA caused the Cold War by actions like the Marshall Plan which they said was designed to give the USA dominance over Europe.</i></p> <p><i>However, some historians would agree with Interpretation B. George Kennan had been a US diplomat in the years after the Second World War and had been involved in drawing up the Marshall Plan. He later became a historian and his experiences led him to write books which criticised Soviet actions but he also criticised US leaders.</i></p>	<p><b>9–12</b></p> 
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of at least one other interpretation studied, to show how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is a basic explanation of why the given interpretation and the other interpretation(s) differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically provide an analysis of more than one aspect of Interpretation B and compare this with other interpretations of the same events in different ways, e.g.</p> <p><i>Soviet historians who were writing in the late 1940s and early 1950s would not have agreed with Interpretation B. Historians and all other writers were controlled by the state so they would have argued that the USA was to blame.</i></p> <p><i>However, some American historians at the same time would have agreed. In the late 1940s America was gripped by McCarthyism and saw the USA as a threat. They argued that the USSR was trying to take over Europe and the rest of the world.</i></p>	<p><b>5–8</b></p> 

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response compares the candidate's own knowledge and understanding to the interpretation, or uses knowledge and understanding of the time in which it was created, to analyse the given interpretation.</li> <li>• There is no consideration or no relevant consideration of any other interpretations.</li> <li>• Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>• There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically provide a comparison between contextual knowledge and Interpretation B argue the source was meant to provide information e.g.</p> <p><i>Soviet historians who were writing in the late 1940s and early 1950s would not have agreed with Interpretation B because they were controlled by the state. But others would agree because of how the USSR took over most of Eastern Europe after the war.</i></p>	<p><b>1–4</b></p> 
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

### The USA 1919–1948: The People and the State

5. Describe **one** action taken by the US government during the Second World War.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>First mark for identification of action + second mark for descriptive detail for each response.</p> <p>Note that a maximum of 1 mark can be given for correct identification of action, even if more than one action is identified.</p> <p>All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of actions taken by the US government in the Second World War should also be credited.</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
N/A  Points marking	<p>One important action the USA took during the Second World War was neutrality. When the war broke out in 1939 the US Congress passed the Neutrality Act.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>One action the USA took during the war was the Lend Lease programme. This allowed the US to effectively lend resources and equipment to the British to help them fight against Germany.</p>	<b>2</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

6. Explain why some industries prospered in the 1920s.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.  No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically contain a range of more detailed description and fuller explanation that is directly relevant to the question e.g.</p> <p><i>Industry prospered because the US had big reserves of raw materials, there was a demand for consumer goods, mass production allowed goods to be produced at affordable prices, advertisements encouraged Americans to spend. Production line for motor cars made them cheaper. As motor industry developed it engendered more industry with components being produced, roads constructed and petrol industry developed Government encouraged industry by tax benefits, tariffs and the idea that there should be little interference in business to let it prosper in its own way.</i></p>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically contain a range of description and explanation that is directly relevant to the question e.g.</p> <p><i>Industry prospered in America in the 1920s for a number of reasons. One such reason was the laissez-faire policy of the Republican government. They believed that the businessmen should not be interfered with and to be allowed to get on with his job of making money. Another reason was the use of tariffs to make importing foreign goods more expensive. This meant Americans bought American goods and their companies grew. Taxation was also kept low, which meant that all Americans, both rich and poor, could spend money on American goods.</i></p>	<b>7–8</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically contain description with explanation that is directly relevant to the issue in the question e.g.</p> <p><i>Some industries such as oil and steel prospered in America in the 1920s because of the use of trusts. These were super companies which were so huge that they dominated their sectors. The Republicans supported trusts because they believed it helped industry. For example, one major oil company was helpful because it meant that the quality of fuel was standard across the country (which was why Standard Oil got its name). Trusts were allowed to do what they wanted by the Government in the USA at the time so their costs were reduced, they could control workers and wages and they could eliminate potential competitors. The USA also reduced tax, increased tariffs and did not interfere in business.</i></p>	<p><b>5–6</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events that is linked to the issue in the question e.g.</p> <p><i>The American government tried not to interfere with business in the 1920s. They felt that it was the work of businessmen to do their job and create money.</i></p>	<p><b>3–4</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>• There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g.</p> <p><i>The American government did not interfere in business in the 1920s.</i></p>	<p><b>1–2</b></p>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

7a Study Source A. What is the message of this source?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>No marks must be awarded for demonstration of knowledge and/or understanding in isolation, knowledge and understanding can only be credited where it is clearly and intrinsically linked to analysis of the source.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the specific question about the source.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically make effective use of content, provenance or context to support inference about the main message of the source e.g.</p> <p><i>The message of this source is that Roosevelt needs to be stopped because he is planning to become a dictator. He is shown taking a series of steps which the cartoonist thinks will lead to dictatorship. The cartoon is saying that Roosevelt had a crafty plan to become a dictator by advancing slowly, a step at a time. Once he had reorganized the government he could deal with the Supreme Court and then there would be nothing to stop him being a dictator. The cartoon was published by Roosevelt's opponents, many of whom were owners of big businesses. They believed that government should stay out of business as far as possible and that Roosevelt was interfering too much in business and legal matters. They claimed he was becoming like the dictators who were running Germany and Italy.</i></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct an argument in answer to the question about the source.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically make valid inference(s) about the main message of the source e.g.</p> <p><i>The message of this source is that Roosevelt is taking a series of steps which the cartoonist thinks will lead to dictatorship. The cartoonist is an opponent and in 1937 Roosevelt was facing opposition from big business and some members of the Supreme Court.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>This source is telling the public the steps that Roosevelt has taken since he became President in 1933. He has taken a number of important measures in reorganizing the government (like his New Deals) and he is now planning to reform the Supreme Court.</i></p>	<b>2–3</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Response analyses the source in a basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance and using this to give a simple answer to the question about the source.</li></ul>	Level 1 answers will typically make a valid comment about the content/provenance of the source, e.g.  <i>The source is not useful because it was written during the 1930s.</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

SPECIMEN

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

7b Study Source B. Explain how this source is useful to a historian studying the New Deal

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>No marks must be awarded for demonstration of knowledge and/or understanding in isolation, knowledge and understanding can only be credited where it is clearly and intrinsically linked to analysis of the source.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the question about the source.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically make a valid inference from the source, developed with effective use of content, provenance or context to support the inference e.g.</p> <p><i>This source is useful as an example of why some Americans opposed Roosevelt and also as evidence of how his opponents tried to discredit him. Father Coughlin was a popular broadcaster with a very large audience estimated at 30 million. He basically felt that Roosevelt was not doing enough to help the poor and not enough to control banks and big business. We can see how strongly Coughlin feels where he calls Roosevelt a liar and betrayer. This is clearly a very biased source, which makes it useful as a source about the views and methods used by some of Roosevelt's opponents.</i></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct a supported argument in answer to the question about the source.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically argue the source is useful or not useful based on reliability or will make a valid but more generalised assertion about the value of the source.eg.</p> <p><i>This source is not useful because it was written by an opponent of Roosevelt. Coughlin set up the National Union for Social Justice which attacked Roosevelt and his policies. The source is very harsh and critical of him.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>This source is useful as it shows the critical attitude of some Americans to his New Deal. Father Coughlin argues that the impact of his New Deal on the poor in America has been devastating.</i></p>	<b>2–3</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Response analyses the source in a basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance and using this to give a simple answer to the question about the source.</li></ul>	Level 1 answers will typically select sections from the source and assert they are useful e.g.  <i>This source is useful because it says that American people were driven from their homes by the New Deal.</i>	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 0</b>  No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

SPECIMEN

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

8. “The people of the USA fully supported the Government in the Second World War.” How far do you agree?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [8]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>At Level 3, at least two distinct reasons should be considered.</p> <p>At Level 4, at least two distinct reasons should be developed. Level 4 and above should consider ‘how far’ (both sides of argument).</p> <p>At Level 5, responses should address how far the USA fully supported the government in the Second World War, based on a nuanced argument considering a range of possible reasons, with a conclusion.</p> <p>The ‘Indicative content’ is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.</p> <p>The ‘Indicative content’ shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p> <p>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.</p>

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full explanation and thorough analysis of historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is developed to reach a convincing, substantiated conclusion in response to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically construct a well-supported argument around more than one factor which reaches a valid conclusion e.g.</p> <p><i>As Level 4 but with conclusion</i></p> <p><i>Overall I agree with the statement. Far more Americans supported the war than opposed it. Perhaps the most striking example is the Japanese Americans. Despite their poor treatment by the government many Japanese Americans went on to serve with distinction in the armed forces, indicating how strong support was among the population as a whole.</i></p>	<b>15–18</b>
<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full explanation and analysis of the historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to develop a fully supported answer to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a well-supported argument around more than one factor e.g.</p> <p><i>The majority of Americans supported the war effort in the Second World War. To begin with, the majority of them supported going to war against Japan in particular after the attack on Pearl Harbor. This outraged Americans anyway and US propaganda made effective use of the attack. Germany declared war on USA soon afterwards and US propaganda found</i></p>	<b>11–14</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</li> </ul>	<p><i>it easy to convince Americans that Nazism was an evil which needed to be fought.</i></p> <p><i>Americans also gained a great deal from the war. More than half a million new businesses started up. The war ended unemployment which had been a massive problem in the 1930s. It brought opportunities for all workers, including women and African Americans as well.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, not all Americans supported the war. There was very high taxation which was unpopular and some opposed America getting involved in the war in Europe. For many African-Americans the war so little or no improvement in racial discrimination. Units in the Army and Navy were segregated along racial lines.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an analysis and explanation of the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to give a supported answer to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a supported argument e.g.</p> <p><i>The majority of Americans supported the war effort in World War 2. To begin with, the majority of them supported going to war against Japan in particular after the attack on Pearl Harbor. This outraged Americans anyway and US propaganda made effective use of the attack. Germany declared war on USA soon afterwards and US propaganda found it easy to convince Americans that Nazism was an evil which needed to be fought.</i></p>	7–10
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an explanation about the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and gives an answer to the question set.</li> <li>This is supported by some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify reason(s) why the American people supported the government in the Second World War e.g.</p> <p><i>On the whole the American people did support the war effort. The war brought greater job opportunities for men and women. Also most Americans though that the war was a just cause.</i></p>	4–6
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a basic explanation about the historical events/period in the question, though the specific question may be answered only partially or the answer may be in the form of assertion that is not supported by the preceding explanation. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate simple knowledge of American support for the government in the Second World War e.g.</p> <p><i>Some people in America were against the war effort. They did not like war.</i></p> <p>OR</p>	1–3

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

<p>very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>• <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Some people in America supported the war effort. They thought America was doing the right thing.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

SPECIMEN

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG) mark scheme **

<b>High performance</b> <b>4–5 marks</b>	<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>
<b>Intermediate performance</b> <b>2–3 marks</b>	<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>
<b>Threshold performance</b> <b>1 mark</b>	<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>
<b>No marks awarded</b> <b>0 marks</b>	<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>

## Assessment Objectives (AO) grid

## Section A

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	SPaG	Marks
1	5					5
2	5	5				10
3	5			20		25
4	5	5		10	5	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>65</b>

## Section B

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	Marks
5	2				2
6	5	5			10
7 (a/b)			10		10
8	12	6			18
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>40</b>

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN

J410/06

Mark Scheme

June 20xx

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN