

Sample assessment materials for first
teaching September 2016

Paper 2: **Period study** and British depth
study (1HI0/26 and 27)

Part A: Period study options

**Options 26/27: Superpower relations
and the Cold War, 1941–91**

Part A: Period study: Superpower relations and the Cold War, 1941–91

Question		
1		<p>Explain two consequences of the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962).</p> <p>Target: Analysis of second order concepts: consequence [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1].</p> <p>AO2: 4 marks.</p> <p>AO1: 4 marks.</p> <p>NB mark each consequence separately (2 x 4 marks).</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised comment is offered about a consequence. [AO2] • Generalised information about the topic is included, showing limited knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Features of the period are analysed to explain a consequence. [AO2] • Specific information about the topic is added to support the explanation, showing good knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]
<p>Marking instructions</p> <p>Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).</p> <p>Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying no qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge <i>and</i> understanding.</p> <p>Indicative content guidance</p> <p>Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It led to the Soviet Union removing all its nuclear missiles from Cuba and, later, American missiles from Turkey. • It encouraged a more positive atmosphere in the Cold War. From the depths of near-war came the setting up of the hotline between Washington and Moscow. • It led to the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty in 1963 and a further thaw in the Cold War. • It resulted in Kennedy being seen as a strong world leader, but it damaged Khrushchev's position and he was dismissed in 1964. 		

Question	
2	<p>Write a narrative account analysing the key events of the Berlin Crisis, 1948–49.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>You may use the following in your answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stalin’s fears • the Airlift <p>You must also use information of your own.</p> </div> <p>Target: Analytical narrative (i.e. analysis of causation/consequence/change) [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics) [AO1].</p> <p>AO2: 4 marks.</p> <p>AO1: 4 marks.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simple or generalised narrative is provided; the account shows limited analysis and organisation of the events included. [AO2] • Limited knowledge and understanding of the events is shown. [AO1]
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A narrative is given, showing some organisation of material into a sequence of events leading to an outcome. The account of events shows some analysis of the linkage between them, but some passages of the narrative may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is added, showing some knowledge and understanding of the events. [AO1] <p><i>Maximum 4 marks for answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>
3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A narrative is given which organises material into a clear sequence of events leading to an outcome. The account of events analyses the linkage between them and is coherent and logically structured. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the key features or characteristics of the events. [AO1] <p><i>No access to Level 3 for answers which do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying no qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge and understanding.

The middle mark in Levels 2 and 3 may be achieved by stronger performance in either AO1 or AO2.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.

Relevant points may include:

- The Allies’ rebuilding of the economy in western Germany through the Marshall Plan caused Stalin’s increased concern.
- The formation of Bizonia and a new currency led Stalin to fear that western Germany would be an economic threat to the Soviet Union’s security.
- Stalin cut off road and rail routes into West Berlin (starting 15 June 1948) to force the Allies to back down and possibly abandon their zones.
- The Allies decided to bypass the blockade by flying supplies into Berlin. This was because the alternative was to break the blockade, which might cause war.

- The Allies made a large number of flights into different parts of Berlin and developed Tegel airport to receive supplies. This brought about the defeat of Stalin's plan.
- As a consequence of the Allies' action, Stalin called off the blockade. This made the Allies look strong and discredited Stalin. Further consequences were that in May 1949, West Germany was formed and in October 1949 East Germany was formed.

Question		
3		<p>Explain two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of the events in Hungary in 1956 for the development of the Cold War. • The importance of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia (1968) for relations between the US and the Soviet Union. • The importance of Gorbachev’s ‘new thinking’ for Soviet control of Eastern Europe. <p>Target: Analysis of second order concepts: consequence/significance [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1]. AO2: 8 marks. AO1: 8 marks. NB mark each part of the answer separately (2 x 8 marks).</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simple or generalised answer is given, showing limited development and organisation of material. [AO2] • Limited knowledge and understanding of the topic is shown. [AO1]
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation is given, showing an attempt to analyse importance. It shows some reasoning, but some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is added, showing some knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]
3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An explanation is given, showing analysis of importance. It shows a line of reasoning that is coherent and logically structured. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1]
<p>Marking instructions</p> <p>Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).</p> <p>Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying no qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>The middle mark in Levels 2 and 3 may be achieved by stronger performance in either AO1 or AO2.</p> <p>Indicative content guidance</p> <p>Answers must be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.</p> <p>The importance of the events in Hungary in 1956 for the development of the Cold War</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Khrushchev had been in power for only two years and so needed to show the strength of his leadership, which intensified the Cold War. • Khrushchev had criticised Stalin’s approach to the Warsaw Pact countries and events in Hungary offered him a chance to show the world (and the Warsaw Pact) that the Soviet Union still intended to keep control. • Nagy’s threat to leave the Warsaw Pact undermined the Soviet approach to controlling Europe and ensuring the safety of the Soviet Union. • The failure to act discredited the west as upholders of democratic freedom. The United Nations was also discredited. Khrushchev was strengthened and any hope of a thaw in the Cold War ended. 		

The importance of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia (1968) for relations between the US and the Soviet Union

Relevant points may include:

- Brezhnev had only just come to power and US was waiting to see his policies. His firm action made them realise that he would be a tough adversary.
- The types of reform being proposed in Czechoslovakia (trade unions, foreign travel etc) could threaten Soviet control of the Warsaw Pact and encourage the US to take a tougher stance in Europe.
- Brezhnev took strong measures, which showed his determination to maintain control. The Brezhnev Doctrine made it plain that events in Czechoslovakia had not weakened the stance of the Soviet Union, so Soviet/US relations would continue to be strained.
- It showed that wider politics between the US and the Soviet Union were more important than individual countries. The US and Soviet Union had secretly agreed that the Soviets would not intervene in Vietnam and the US would not interfere in Czechoslovakia.

The importance of Gorbachev's 'new thinking' for Soviet control of Eastern Europe

Relevant points may include:

- Gorbachev's new thinking was based on recognition of the weakness of the Soviet economy and loss of faith in communism, so this might encourage the rest of Eastern Europe to consider leaving the Warsaw Pact.
- The type of reforms being introduced in the Soviet Union were what reformers in Warsaw Pact countries wanted (especially the abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine and the freeing of dissidents), so they encouraged opposition to Moscow.
- Gorbachev's new thinking encouraged policies which actually weakened the Soviet Union and caused division, making control of Eastern European countries more difficult. They ultimately led to the breakup of the Soviet Union.
- Gorbachev withdrew troops from Eastern Europe because the Soviet Union was short of money, so this weakened central control.