

Appendix C : Sample LORMS for proposed Change and Continuity SEQs

Generic LORMS template for Change and Continuity SEQ (8 mark question)

| Level | Description | Marks |
|--------------|--|--------------|
| L1 | Describes without change/stand | 1–2 |
| L2 | Describes with changes/stands Award 2–3 marks for one described change/stand and 3–4 marks for two described changes/stands. | 3–4 |
| L3 | Explains with changes/stands Award 5–6 marks for one explained change/stand and 7–8 marks for two explained changes/stands. | 5–8 |

Generic LORMS template for Change and Continuity SEQ (12 mark question)

| Level | Description | Marks |
|--------------|--|--------------|
| L1 | Describes without change/stand | 1–2 |
| L2 | Explains Yes OR No Award 3 marks for explanation of one side, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks. | 3–6 |
| L3 | Explains Yes AND No Award 7 marks for explanation of both sides, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks. | 7–10 |
| L4 | Weighs changes/stands Requires an explicit consideration of ‘How far?’ using criteria beyond | 11–12 |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | those used in L3. Award higher mark for more developed answers. | |
|--|---|--|

Framing 1 : the evaluation question (narrative + directionality)

‘Nazi rule in Germany brought about an improvement in the lives of the German people.’
How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

| Level | Description | Marks |
|-------|--|-------|
| L1 | <p>Describes without change</p> <p><i>e.g. Nazi rule in Germany involved remilitarisation.</i></p> | 1–2 |
| L2 | <p>Explains Yes OR No</p> <p>Award 3 marks for explanation of one side, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks.</p> <p><i>e.g. Nazi rule in Germany led to an improvement in the lives of the unemployed. For example, many Germans were re-employed to work on the autobahns or conscripted as soldiers, and unemployment fell from 6 million in 1933 to 1 million by 1938. As a result, formerly unemployed Germans were able to find jobs, which gave them an income. This income helped them to feed their families and removed the deep fears and uncertainties during the Depression. Thus, by increasing employment, Nazi rule improved the lives of the German people.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Nazi rule in Germany led to a worsening in the lives of homosexuals and the disabled. For example, the Nazis set up a special Gestapo division in 1934 to deal with homosexuals, and during Nazi rule around 100,000 homosexual men were arrested and thrown into concentration camps. They also forced the sterilisation of over 300,000 disabled people. As a result, homosexuals and the disabled were arbitrarily deprived of basic rights. Those who were thrown in concentration camps had to suffer from being confined and forced labour, and those who were forcibly sterilised could no longer have children of their own. Thus, by arbitrarily persecuting homosexuals and the disabled, Nazi rule worsened the lives of the German people.</i></p> | 3–6 |
| L3 | <p>Explains Yes AND No</p> <p>Award 7 marks for explanation of both sides, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks.</p> | 7–10 |

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| | e.g. Both aspects of L2. | |
| L4 | <p>Weighs changes</p> <p>Requires an explicit consideration of ‘How far?’ using criteria beyond those used in L3. Award higher mark for more developed answers.</p> <p><i>e.g. [L3+] In the final analysis, I agree with the statement to a large extent. This is because while some groups were targeted and persecuted, the great majority of Germans enjoyed greater political and economic stability, and could look forward to better days. They had far better employment rates than during the Depression, and breadwinners could put food on the table again, which created both material improvement and psychological comfort for many German families. When looking at German society as a whole, we can say that more people enjoyed better livelihoods under Nazi rule than the small minority who suffered from terror and intimidation. Thus, on balance, Nazi rule improved the lives of the German people.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. [L3+] In the final analysis, I agree with the statement to a small extent. This is because the persecution of minorities created a culture of fear that spread throughout society, even amongst well-behaved German people. Furthermore, workers were badly treated under the Third Reich: while people were employed, their working hours increased to up to 72 hours a week, and conditions worsened over time. The economic gains were illusory, and concealed a culture of excessive discipline and order that took an unmeasured psychological toll on the entire German population trembling in fear of the Gestapo. Thus, on balance, Nazi rule worsened the lives of the German people.</i></p> | 11–12 |

Framing 2 : the watershed question (narrative + process)

‘Japan’s invasion of China in 1937 was a watershed in Japanese history.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

| Level | Description | Marks |
|-------|---|-------|
| L1 | <p>Describes without stand</p> <p><i>e.g. Japan invaded China following the 1937 Marco Polo Bridge Incident.</i></p> | 1–2 |
| L2 | <p>Explains Yes OR No</p> <p>Award 3 marks for explanation of one side, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks.</p> <p><i>e.g. Japan’s invasion of China in 1937 was a watershed, because it marked the beginning of Japan’s total war against the Allied Powers. For example, Japan massively increased her troop levels in China to 600,000 in 1937 and 1 million by 1939. As a result, Japan decisively chose to use force rather than diplomacy, and her titanic struggle with China could no longer be quickly brought to a close, unlike the previous conflicts.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Japan’s invasion of China in 1937 was not a watershed, because it was merely another step in her aggressive imperialist approach to China. For example, she seized Taiwan in 1895, took Qingdao in 1915, and invaded Manchuria in 1931. As a result, the invasion of China can be seen as the continuation of her prior invasion of Manchuria, wherein Japan forcibly occupied a large swathe of north China.</i></p> | 3–6 |
| L3 | <p>Explains Yes AND No</p> <p>Award 7 marks for explanation of both sides, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 10 marks.</p> <p><i>e.g. Both aspects of L2.</i></p> | 7–10 |
| L4 | <p>Weighs stands</p> <p>Requires an explicit consideration of ‘How far?’ using criteria beyond</p> | 11–12 |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>those used in L3. Award higher mark for more developed answers.</p> <p><i>e.g. [L3+] In the final analysis, I agree with the statement to a large extent. While Japan's invasion of China in 1937 can be seen in light of its previous aggressions, her decision to commit to a full-scale, total war against China was unprecedented and wholly different from her previous limited engagements. It also set Japan on a collision course with the USA, which would end in total defeat, unconditional surrender, and millions of war dead. Therefore, 1937 was truly a watershed for Japanese history.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. [L3+] In the final analysis, I agree with the statement to a small extent. The real watershed was in 1931, when Japan blatantly invaded Manchuria against the prevailing spirit of disarmament and warnings by the other Great Powers. 1931 marked the break from cooperation to competition with other imperial powers, including Japan's erstwhile ally Britain. Given that Japan began encroaching further on Chinese territory after occupying Manchuria, the full-scale war with China became a matter of when the Nationalists would finally decide that enough was enough and to resist the Japanese. Thus, 1937 cannot be considered a watershed in Japanese history.</i></p> | |
|--|---|--|

Framing 3 : the given change question (narrative + simultaneity)

‘The 1950–1953 Korean War led to the globalisation of the Cold War.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

| Level | Description | Marks |
|-------|--|-------|
| L1 | <p>Describes without stand</p> <p>e.g. <i>The Korean War involved the superpowers, the USA and the USSR.</i></p> | 1–2 |
| L2 | <p>Explains Yes OR No</p> <p>Award 3 marks for explanation of one side, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks.</p> <p>e.g. <i>The Korean War led to the globalisation of the Cold War because it shifted the focus of the Cold War to Asia. For example, after the Korean War, multiple Cold War proxy conflicts began to emerge in Asia, including the 1954–1955 and 1958 Taiwan Straits Crises and the 1955 US intervention in the Vietnam War. As a result, the Cold War evolved from a limited post-war clash that concerned only Europe to a wider geopolitical struggle that involved countries all around the world. Cold War calculations swept up the conflicts that were emerging from the decolonisation process, including the wars of independence in Vietnam, Indonesia, and Malaya, and invited both overt and covert superpower interventions.</i></p> <p>e.g. <i>The Korean War did not lead to the globalisation of the Cold War, because it preceded a stabilisation in US-USSR relations. For example, the “Khrushchev thaw” from 1956 onwards saw increasing cooperation between the US and USSR, and even saw a visit by Premier Khrushchev to the USA in 1959. As a result, the early tensions in the Cold War magnified by Stalin and Truman’s mutual suspicions were moderated in the late 1950s. This implies that the Korean War of the early 1950s did not expand the conflict; instead, the war convinced the new Soviet leaders that it was better to stay out of costly confrontations with the USA.</i></p> | 3–6 |
| L3 | <p>Explains Yes AND No</p> <p>Award 7 marks for explanation of both sides, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of</p> | 7–10 |

| | | |
|----|--|-------|
| | <p>10 marks.</p> <p>e.g. Both aspects of L2.</p> | |
| L4 | <p>Weighs stands</p> <p>Requires an explicit consideration of ‘How far?’ using criteria beyond those used in L3. Award higher mark for more developed answers.</p> <p>e.g. <i>[L3+] In the final analysis, I agree with the statement to a large extent. The Korean War precipitated a massive and irreversible expansion of the geographical terms of the Cold War. It signalled the willingness of the US to put “boots on the ground” for the very first time. Even if the temperature of the conflict went down temporarily in the 1950s, the US involvement in Asia became permanent, especially with Vietnam would only increase in intensity over the next decades. Therefore, on balance, it is true that the Korean War led to a globalisation of the Cold War.</i></p> <p>e.g. <i>[L3+] In the final analysis, I agree with the statement to a small extent. The Korean War was merely one of many proxy conflicts that had already been fought between the US and USSR, such as the 1945–1949 Chinese Civil War. On the other hand, the fact that the Korean War was followed by increased diplomacy and reduced tensions means that it was not a turning point towards worldwide conflict. Therefore, on balance, it is false that the Korean War led to a globalisation of the Cold War.</i></p> | 11–12 |

Framing 4 : the periodisation question (narrative + periodisation)

‘It was the 1936 Moscow Trial, not the 1934 Kirov Affair, that marked the beginning of Stalin’s Great Terror.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

| Level | Description | Marks |
|-------|---|-------|
| L1 | <p>Describes without change</p> <p><i>e.g. Stalin’s Great Terror led to massive purges of the Party and harsh persecutions of the people in the USSR.</i></p> | 1–2 |
| L2 | <p>Explains Yes OR No</p> <p>Award 3 marks for explanation of one side, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of 6 marks.</p> <p><i>e.g. It was the 1936 Moscow Trial that marked the beginning of Stalin’s Great Terror, because they initiated a wave of mass repression in the USSR between 1936 and 1938. For example, the Trial itself claimed the lives of Lenin’s old comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Bukharin. At the same time, the military was purged, as 13 out of 15 three-star generals and 8 out of 9 admirals were removed. Even the heads of the NKVD, Yagoda and Yezhov, were shot amidst the Great Terror. As a result, the 1936 Moscow Trial served as a public spectacle that legitimised mass repression and also encouraged new waves of recrimination, accusations, and arrests.</i></p> <p><i>e.g. It was the 1934 Kirov Affair that marked the beginning of Stalin’s Great Terror, because the Kirov affair was the pretext for Stalin’s purges of his rivals in the Party. For example, Kirov’s assassination 1934 was seized upon by Stalin as a pretext for a purge of the party, in particular of cadres in the Leningrad branch which served as Kirov’s power base. As a result, the Kirov Affair showcases how Stalin’s murderous suspicions pivoted back to the elite, and marked the beginning of his political purges.</i></p> | 3–6 |
| L3 | <p>Explains Yes AND No</p> <p>Award 7 marks for explanation of both sides, with more marks for additional reasons or supporting details for reasons, to a maximum of</p> | 7–10 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|--------------|
| | <p>10 marks.</p> <p>e.g. Both aspects of L2.</p> | |
| <p>L4</p> | <p>Weighs changes</p> <p>Requires an explicit consideration of ‘How far?’ using criteria beyond those used in L3. Award higher mark for more developed answers.</p> <p>e.g. <i>[L3+] In the final analysis, I agree with the statement to a large extent, as the Great Terror was primarily about a massive and indiscriminate wave of persecution. The 1936 Moscow Trial is a better boundary option, because it clearly demarcates a coherent period of intense persecution of the whole of society carried out by Stalin. Furthermore, the Moscow Trials acquired an accelerative logic, as denunciations in court sparked more and more arrests. On the other hand, while the 1934 Kirov Affair was important, its effects were limited to the Leningrad party organisation, and the top hierarchy of the party as well as the military and ordinary people were left unscathed. Therefore, the 1936 Moscow Trial marked the beginning of Stalin’s Great Terror.</i></p> <p>e.g. <i>[L3+] In the final analysis, I agree with the statement to a small extent, as the Great Terror was primarily about Stalin’s consolidation of political power. The 1934 Kirov Affair is a better boundary option, because it was the first consequence of Stalin’s decision to purge his potential rivals before they could threaten him. This decision implied that there would be more purges, which proved true with the 1936 Moscow Trial. On the other land, the 1936 Moscow Trial can be understood as another consequence of Stalin’s decision to purge his remaining rivals, and was clearly planned far in advance of the actual court trial, which suggests that it can be understood in light of Stalin’s earlier actions in 1934. Therefore, the 1934 Kirov Affair marked the beginning of Stalin’s Great Terror.</i></p> | <p>11–12</p> |