



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

## **GCSE (9–1)**

### **History A (Explaining the Modern World)**

**J410/02:** International Relations: the changing international order 1918-2001 with Germany 1925-1955: The People and the State

General Certificate of Secondary Education

### **Mark Scheme for November 2020**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2020

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
 1	Level 1
 2	Level 2
 3	Level 3
 4	Level 4
 5	Level 5
 SEEN	Noted but no credit given
 NAQ	Not answered question
	Extendable horizontal wavy line

## 1. 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.

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

### INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 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 seemingly 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.

### Awarding Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar to scripts with a scribe coversheet

- a. If a script has a **scribe cover sheet** it is vital to check which boxes are ticked and award as per the instructions and grid below:
- i. Assess the work for SPaG in accordance with the normal marking criteria. The initial assessment must be made as if the candidate had not used a scribe (or word processor) and was eligible for all the SPaG marks.
  - ii. Check the cover sheet to see what has been dictated (or what facilities were disabled on the word processor) and therefore what proportion of marks is available to the candidate.
  - iii. Convert the SPaG mark to reflect the correct proportion using the conversion table given below.

SPaG mark awarded	Mark if candidate eligible for one third (e.g. grammar only)	Mark if candidate eligible for two thirds (e.g. grammar and punctuation only)
0	0	0
1	0	1
2	1	1
3	1	2
4	1	3
5	2	3

- b. If a script has a **word processor cover sheet** attached to it the candidate **can** still access SPaG marks (see point a. above) unless the cover sheet states that the checking functionality is enabled, in which case no SPaG marks are available.
- c. If a script has a **word processor cover sheet AND a scribe cover sheet** attached to it, see point a. above.
- d. If you come across a typewritten script **without** a cover sheet please check with the OCR Special Requirements Team at [specialrequirements@ocr.org.uk](mailto:specialrequirements@ocr.org.uk) who can check what access arrangements were agreed.
- e. If the script has a **transcript, Oral Language Modifier, Sign Language Interpreter or a Practical Assistant cover sheet**, award SPaG as normal.

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

1. Outline the actions of Al-Qaeda in the period 1995–2001.

<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 should also be credited.

2. Explain why countries lost confidence in the League of Nations in the 1930s.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically <b>outline the reason(s) / motive(s) / consequence(s) for the actions</b> of Al-Qaeda in the period 1995–2001 <b>supported by at least one example</b>, OR <b>describe two examples of their actions</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>The actions of Al-Qaeda were inspired by hatred of Western democracies and the belief that they should wage war against their enemies. They tried to cause as many American deaths as possible, for example the 1998 attacks on American embassies in Africa, which made Americans abroad feel less secure.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Al-Qaeda attacked the Twin Towers in New York. There were over 3000 casualties when they flew two planes into the World Trade Centre. They also attacked the Pentagon and another plane crashed because the passengers fought back. They also launched a suicide attack on a US warship, the USS Cole [2]. 17 sailors were killed when a boat packed with explosives was driven straight into them by an Al Qaeda cell.</i></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify two examples of their actions OR identify and describe one <b>example of their actions</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>In 2000 an Al-Qaeda terrorist cell launched a suicide attack on a US warship, the USS Cole [2]. 17 sailors were killed when a boat packed with explosives was driven straight into them.[3]</i></p> <p>. OR</p> <p><i>Al-Qaeda’s development aimed to attack Western democracies who they believed were a threat and enemy to Islam.[3]</i></p>	<b>2–3</b>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <p>Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.</p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify one example of Al-Qaeda actions OR outline one or more events with little or <b>no reference to the actions of Al-Qaeda</b> e.g.</p> <p>The 9-11 attack</p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>There was a war on terror</i></p> <p><i>There was tension in the Middle East</i></p> <p><i>President Bush blamed Iraq</i></p> <p><i>The Taliban were powerful in Afghanistan</i></p>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

<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> Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 5 answers will typically <b>identify at least two reasons</b> why countries lost confidence in the League of Nations in the 1930s <b>and explain</b> them fully e.g.  <i>Countries lost confidence in the League in the 1930s for several reasons. One reason was the Manchurian Crisis. In 1931 Japan, who was a leading member of the League, invaded Manchuria in China. The League lacked an army, and instead of intervening sent Lord Lytton to carry out an investigation. This took almost a year, by which time Japan had taken control of Manchuria and then left the League when asked to return it to China. This made countries lose confidence in the League as they had failed to stop the invasion or control one of their own members. Another reason was the Abyssinian Crisis. In 1935 Italy – another member of the League – invaded Abyssinia in Africa. Again the League did very little, and in fact Britain and France tried to make a secret deal with Mussolini to give him part of Abyssinia which caused great embarrassment when it became public. Mussolini conquered Abyssinia and left the League. The main members of the League of Nations had failed to protect smaller countries and acted in their own self-interest, which again caused countries to lose confidence in it.</i>  <b>THRESHOLD ANSWERS</b> <i>Countries lost confidence in the League because of Japan's invasion of Manchuria. Japan was a leading member of the League but it still acted aggressively and did not use the League to solve its dispute. This went against everything the League stood for and when it left, the League had been weakened. When the League failed to get Italy out of Abyssinia countries also lost confidence in it. It tried to use economic sanctions but did too little too late, and some of its own members refused to stop trading in coal so sanctions weren't very successful. The sanctions didn't stop Italy and in the end it continued its conquest and nothing more was done.</i>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 4</b> Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 4 answers will typically <b>identify at least one reason</b> why countries lost confidence in the League of Nations in the 1930s <b>and explain</b> it fully e.g.  <i>Countries lost confidence in the League in the 1930s because important countries left it. Japan was a founding member of the League but left in 1932, and in 1934 Hitler's Germany walked out of the League too. The League was supposed to work on the basis of collective security but this wasn't possible if countries weren't members. The more countries that left the League, the less confidence countries had in it.</i>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>		<b>5–6</b>

<p>Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically <b>identify and/or describe one or more</b> reasons why countries lost confidence in the League but <b>will not</b> explain e.g.</p> <p><i>Countries lost confidence in the League because the Disarmament Conference it held in the early 1930s failed.</i></p> <p><i>Countries like Germany and Italy left the League, making countries lose confidence in it.</i></p> <p><i>The Hoare-Laval Pact between Britain, France and Italy made countries lose confidence in the League.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain <b>description of events linked</b> to the weakness of the League of Nations in the 1930s.</p> <p><i>In 1935 Mussolini invaded Abyssinia, to gain land and raw materials. The Abyssinian emperor Haile Selassie made a speech at the League demanding action be taken against Mussolini, and eventually the League agreed to impose sanctions on Italy but this took time to introduce and did not include coal and oil.</i></p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. 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.</p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons not specific to the weakness of the League of Nations e.g.</p> <p><i>Hitler got stronger.</i></p> <p><i>There was a greater chance of war in the 1930s.</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>

3. Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on Chamberlain and the policy of Appeasement between 1937 and 1939? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of Appeasement between these dates 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>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <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 argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by <b>developed use of two</b> other interpretations OR <b>developed use of one</b> other interpretation and evaluation of Interpretation A based on the context of A e.g</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is arguing that British policy towards Germany was a mistake and Chamberlain was foolish to trust Hitler, because Hitler had a track record of not keeping his promises.</i></p> <p><i>In some ways this is a fair comment because historians writing immediately after the Second World War believed that Chamberlain misjudged Hitler and so appeasement was a mistake. They argued that whilst it was morally right to try and avoid war, giving in to Hitler was not going to work and so appeasement was a miscalculation. These historians would have agreed with Cato that Hitler could not have been trusted and that appeasement was not the right policy to use.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might refer to Churchill's 'The Gathering Storm' or to the orthodox school of thought; this is not a requirement but should be credited]</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, people in 1938 would not have thought Interpretation A to be a fair comment on British policy towards Germany at the time. They thought that appeasement was the right policy, that war should be avoided at all costs and that Chamberlain was right to trust Hitler. Chamberlain received thousands of letters of support in 1938 and these people would have felt Cato's comments to be unfair.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might refer to the 'popular majority view'; this is not a requirement but should be given credit]</i></p> <p>NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported.</p> <p><b>Nutshell: Developed use of other interpretations or context (of A) to support/challenge Interpretation A</b>  <b>NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported.</b>  <b>NOTE For L5 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair</b></p>	<p><b>21–25</b></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 argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by <b>developed use of one</b> other interpretation or the context of Interpretation A eg</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is saying appeasement was a bad policy.</i></p> <p><i>Historians writing in the 1960s to the 1980s would disagree with this, so the interpretation isn't fair. They would argue that because of Britain's economic and military position appeasement was the best policy in the circumstances and held off war for as long as possible.</i></p> <p><i>[Answers might refer to the revisionist school of thought or to specific historians such as Taylor or Watt. This is not required but should be credited]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Developed use of ONE interpretation or context (of A) to support / challenge Interpretation A</b>  <b>NOTE For L4 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair</b></p>	<p><b>16–20</b></p>
<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 argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by relevant factual knowledge OR undeveloped use of relevant interpretation(s) eg</p> <p><i>This comment is fair because Hitler went on to prove he could not be trusted. The Munich Agreement involved Britain and France agreeing that Hitler would be allowed to occupy the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia as Germans lived there, but that he would make no more claims for land. Several months later Hitler went on to invade the rest of Czechoslovakia which proves that he could not be trusted and makes the opinion expressed in Interpretation A a fair one.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Counter-revisionists writing in the 1990s would agree with Cato that appeasement was not the right policy</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid argument based on contextual knowledge OR valid but undeveloped use of interpretation(s)</b>  <b>NOTE For L3 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair</b></p>	<p><b>11–15</b></p>
<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</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically describe interpretation(s) without explaining whether it/they support or contradict Interpretation A eg</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is being critical of appeasement. Another view was that of the revisionist historians who thought appeasement was a good policy. Winston Churchill said that appeasement was a mistake.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Cannot be based on a misunderstanding of interpretation</i></p>	<p><b>6–10</b></p>

<p>historical events studied to answer the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Nutshell: Describes interpretation(s) but fails to address question</b></p>	
<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>Cato thinks that Hitler shouldn't be trusted.</i>  <i>This shows was people thought in 1940.</i>  <i>I agree that Mr Chamberlain was wrong to have trusted Hitler when he had lied in the past.</i></p> <p>NB: Place in this level answers which seem to show some knowledge of context or other interpretations but have misunderstood interpretation A</p> <p><b>Nutshell: Shows understanding of A/unsupported assertions about fairness</b></p>	<p><b>1-5</b></p>
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

4. Study Interpretation B. Explain why not all historians and commentators have agreed with this interpretation of the early stages of the Cold War. 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 developed explanations of <b>how</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>two</b> periods have disagreed with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B and explain <b>why</b> at least <u>one of them</u> disagrees, eg</p> <p><i>Williams is arguing that the United States was to blame for the Cold War because aggressive American policies left the USSR with no choice but to confront America. Most Western historians writing during the early Cold War would disagree with Williams as they argued that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War and that their attempts to spread Communism in Europe and the wider world caused the tension. Many of these writers were influenced by the Red Scare in America in the early 1950s when it was widely believed that Soviet agents were trying to infiltrate American society and destroy it, so this would affect their views of history. Some American historians had connections with the US government at the time so they would be unlikely to criticise their own government and this influenced their view that the USSR was responsible for the Cold War.</i> [Either example given here of the reason for difference would be sufficient for credit in Level 5]</p> <p><i>Many historians writing in the 1970s and 1980s would also have disagreed with Williams, as they believed that the Cold War arose because neither the USA nor the USSR were able to understand each other's motives, and these misunderstandings led to the Cold War. After the shock of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 there had been a gradual improvement in relations between the USA and USSR symbolised by the process of détente. This influenced historians to think less of blame and more of misunderstandings. They argued that the USA exaggerated the threat Russia posed and the USSR mistakenly believed American actions were aggressive. As they attributed some of the responsibility to Russia they would have disagreed with Williams.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might refer to schools of thought such as orthodoxy or post-revisionism, or to specific historians such as Feis or Gaddis. These could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two periods disagree, with explanation as to why at least one is different: HW H.</b> <b>NOTE; For L5 candns need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported</b></p>	<p><b>17–20</b></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 explain <b>how or why</b> historians from <b>two</b> different periods agree or disagree with particular aspect(s) of interpretation B.  <b>OR</b> will explain <b>how and why</b> historians from <b>one</b> period agree or disagree.</p> <p><i>Williams is arguing that the United States was to blame for the Cold War because aggressive American policies left the USSR with no choice but to confront America. Most Western historians writing during the early Cold War would disagree with Williams as they argued that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War and that their attempts to spread Communism in Europe and the wider world caused the tension.</i></p> <p><i>Many historians writing in the 1970s and 1980s would also have disagreed with Williams, as they believed that the Cold War arose because neither the USA nor the USSR were able to understand each other's motives, and these misunderstandings led to the Cold War. They argued that the USA exaggerated the threat Russia posed and the USSR mistakenly believed American actions were aggressive. As they blamed Russia the most they would have disagreed with Williams.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might refer to schools of thought such as orthodoxy or post-revisionism, or to specific historians such as Feis or Gaddis. These could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: 2H different periods or 2W different periods or H+W same period or H+W different periods</b>  <b>NOTE: For L4 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported</b>  <b>NB: Agreements can reach this level.</b></p>	<p><b>13–16</b></p>
<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 explain <b>how</b> historian(s) and commentator(s) have <b>agreed OR disagreed</b> with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B, eg</p> <p><i>Williams is arguing that the United States was to blame for the Cold War because aggressive American policies left the USSR with no choice but to confront America. Most Western historians writing during the early Cold War would disagree with Williams as they argued that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War and that their attempts to spread Communism in Eastern Europe and the wider world caused the tension.</i></p> <p><u>Alternatively</u> answers will explain valid reasons <b>why</b> historians from one period <b>disagrees or agrees</b> but fail to explain how, e.g</p> <p><i>Most Western historians writing during the early Cold War would disagree with Williams. Many of these writers were influenced by the Red Scare in America in the early 1950s when it was widely believed that Soviet agents were trying to infiltrate American society and destroy it, so this would affect their views of history. American popular culture produced films like 'Invasion of the Body Snatchers' which also influenced historians.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Explains how or why historian from one period agrees or disagrees (H or W)</b>  <b>NB: For L3 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported</b></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 identify historian(s) who have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why OR will provide a chronological overview of the historiography but not examine interpretation B, or misunderstand it, eg:</p> <p><i>Historians writing in the 1980s would not have agreed with Interpretation B that the United States was responsible for the Cold War.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively</b></p> <p>Level 2 answers will give a basic but correct account of the historiography e.g</p> <p><i>Orthodox historians argued that the USSR caused the Cold War, but revisionist historians said it was the USA's fault. Post-revisionist historians then said it was down to both sides.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identifies historians / schools of thought / periods but fails to address particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B</b> NOTE: The term 'many historians' or similar expressions is not sufficient for L2 as its too unspecific- time period, school of thought or a named historian needed.</p>	<p><b>5-8</b></p>
<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 make general assertions about Interpretation B or give their own critique of it e.g.</p> <p><i>Some historians would argue that both sides were responsible for causing the Cold War.</i></p> <p><i>Interpretation B is biased against the USA.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: General assertions/own critique</b> NOTE: Award at this level if candidates give their own critique of B (ie not the views of other historians). This may well be phrased as 'other historians' but is in fact the candidate's own view using contextual knowledge.</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>

**Section B**

**Germany 1925-1955: The People and the State**

5. Describe **one** feature of the Nazis' National Community (Volksgemeinschaft).

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of the Nazis' Volksgemeinschaft should also be credited. 2 eggs or one egg explained= 2 marks.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
N/A  Points marking	<p><i>One feature of the Nazis' Volksgemeinschaft was the Winter Relief organisation (1). During the winter months, the Nazis set up soup kitchens and handed out clothing and coal to help poorer Germans (+1).</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>One feature of the Nazis' Volksgemeinschaft was propaganda aimed to show Germans that only Aryans were racially-worthy and should be included in German society (1). School textbooks and children's books were critical of Jews (+1).</i></p>	<b>2</b>

6. Explain why there was so little opposition to the Nazi regime.

<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>
<p>Level 5</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.</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 <b>identify two or more reasons</b> for there being so little opposition to the Nazi regime and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p><i>There was so little opposition to the Nazi regime as the police state created fear. Even though the threat of the Gestapo may have been exaggerated, German people were terrified of this organisation - it held sweeping powers and worked outside the normal justice system. Its influence can be demonstrated by the fact that 80% of denunciations reported to the Gestapo were voluntary. Therefore, there was little opposition because people feared the consequences if they did resist.</i></p> <p><i>There was also so little opposition to the Nazi regime because the Nazis' initial policies were popular with the German people. Hitler was able to deliver on key areas that were causing problems for Germany. In 1932, roughly one third of the German workforce were unemployed, but by 1939 there was virtually no unemployment. Therefore, people were unwilling to oppose the Nazi regime because Hitler had provided a solution to one of the country's major problems.</i></p> <p><b>THRESHOLD EXPLANATION VERSIONS</b></p> <p><i>There was so little opposition to the Nazi regime as the police state created fear. Its influence can be demonstrated by the fact that 80% of denunciations reported to the Gestapo were voluntary. Therefore, there was little opposition because people feared the consequences if they did resist.</i></p> <p><i>There was also so little opposition to the Nazi regime because the Nazis' policies like creating jobs were popular. The Nazi's solved unemployment by rearming the country and through public works schemes, reducing unemployment.</i></p>	<p><b>9–10</b></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 <b>identify one reason</b> for there being little opposition to the Nazi regime and explain it fully e.g.</p> <p><i>There was so little opposition to the Nazi regime as the Police State created fear, and so many German people did not want to oppose the government. Even though the threat of the Gestapo may have been exaggerated, German people were terrified of this organisation - it held sweeping powers and worked outside of the normal justice system, so they could imprison or execute people without a fair trial. Its influence can be demonstrated by the fact that 80% of denunciations reported to the Gestapo were voluntary. Therefore, there was little opposition because people feared the consequences if they did resist.</i></p>	<p><b>7–8</b></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 identify and describe reasons for a lack of opposition to the Nazi regime without explaining them e.g.</p> <p><i>The presence of a Police State in Germany created fear. People were scared of institutions like the SA and SS.</i></p> <p><i>Hitler's policies were popular. He concentrated on problems the Weimar politicians had failed to fix.</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 descriptions of features of a lack of opposition to the Nazi regime e.g.</p> <p><i>A Police State existed in Nazi Germany. The SA, SS and Gestapo were powerful.</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 <b>general points</b> or assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>Hitler gave the people what they wanted.</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>

--	--	--

7. **Study Sources A and B.** Why do Sources A and B give such different views about Weimar Germany in the late 1920s?’

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [10]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>Analysis of a single source, no matter how thorough, cannot achieve more than the top mark in Level 2.</p> <p>For Level 3, a reasonable coverage of both sources and a balance between the treatment of sources is expected.</p> <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
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses both the sources 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 sources.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically explain the contrasting attitudes and purposes of the two sources as they explain how they disagree.</p> <p><i>They give such different views because they were written with different purposes. Source A was written by the Nazis to discredit the Weimar Republic and its parties and undermine faith in democracy, which would make people vote for the Nazis. In 1927 when it was written many still believed in the democratic system and the Nazis were trying to make people question it, to increase their support. By 1931 faith was wavering and the Nazis are reminding them that the system has betrayed them so they should support the Nazis in the elections.</i></p> <p><i>By contrast in Source B Shirer is writing in support of the Weimar Republic and its parties, to make others see that it was not doomed. He is showing that the people who ran him out of Germany in the 1940s were very unpopular in the late 1920s, that democracy was working well and so is implying that something else happened to undermine the political system. He probably wants to justify his own hostility to the Nazis, which is why they targeted him and caused him to flee in the 1940s.</i></p>	<b>7–10</b>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content and</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically compare how the sources disagree.</p> <p><i>The sources are different because one is saying Weimar Germany’s politics is corrupt and has betrayed the people, but the other is saying that it was working well. In Source A the</i></p>	<b>3–6</b>

<p>provenance or historical context to construct an argument to answer the question about the sources.</p>	<p><i>Nazis talk about the parties being bad and dishonest and so should be thrown out. They would say that. On the other hand, Shirer uses election results to show the Weimar Republic is doing well, as the democratic parties like the Social Democrats are doing well and the more extreme parties like the Nazis and Nationalists have little or are losing popularity.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the sources 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(s).</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically compare the type of source or will make only very general statements.</p> <p><i>They are different because A was written in the 1920s and B the 1940s.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>They are different because A was written by a Nazi and B by someone who disagreed with them</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>They aren't that different: they are both talking about political parties in Germany at the time.</i></p> <p>NB: In this level, answers may focus almost entirely on one of the two sources.</p>	<p><b>1–2</b></p>
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

8\*. 'Defeat and occupation were the largest impact of the Second World War on the German people.' How far do you agree with this statement?

<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>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>Answers at Level 4 require one point on each side of the argument and one element of support. Answers with more valid support than this should be awarded L5</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>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced and well-supported argument which uses a range of evidence to support the argument being made, e.g.</p> <p><i>Defeat certainly had a huge impact, leading to a massive refugee crisis in Germany. 12-14 million German speakers became refugees from eastern Europe and trudged to Germany, many pulling all of their possessions on hand carts. Allied policy was that all German speakers should move to Germany, whether they had originally lived there or not, to avoid revenge attacks. This helped created a huge accommodation and food crisis in the already ruined country.</i></p> <p><i>However it could be argued that the post war division of Germany had a greater impact. At Yalta it was agreed that Germany would be divided and governed by the Allies and by 1949 two Germanys and Berlins had emerged, the east communist and the west capitalist. Travelling between the two was restricted from the east, families were split and relationships strained. This had a major impact on life for civilians.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand it could be argued that bombing during the war had the greatest impact. This created trillions of pounds of damage and led to major loss of life. Aerial attacks increased after 1942 and led to tens of thousands of deaths when key industrial cities like Hamburg, Cologne and Berlin were targeted. In just two nights between 35 000 and 150 000 were killed in Dresden alone in February 1945. This was a massive impact.</i></p> <p><i>Overall it has to be agreed that defeat and occupation did have the biggest impact. It was this that led to the division of Germany and the refugee crisis. Although bombing helped accelerate defeat and had a terrible impact on civilians, the effects of defeat were much more long-term.</i></p> <p><b>NB: 18 marks: At least 3 explained examples plus a clinching argument</b></p> <p><b>15-17 marks: 3 explained examples</b></p>	<p><b>15–18</b></p>

<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> <li><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically set out a <b>one-sided argument</b> with support from <b>at least two</b> valid explained examples <b>OR</b> construct a <b>balanced argument</b> with each side explicitly supported by one explained example, e.g.</p> <p><i>Defeat certainly had a huge impact, leading to a massive refugee crisis in Germany. 12-14 million German speakers became refugees from eastern Europe and trudged to Germany, many pulling all of their possessions on hand carts. Allied policy was that all German speakers should move to Germany, whether they had originally lived there or not, to avoid revenge attacks. This helped created a huge accommodation and food crisis in the already ruined country.</i></p> <p><i>However it could be argued that the post war division of Germany had a greater impact. At Yalta it was agreed that Germany would be divided and governed by the Allies and by 1949 two Germanys and Berlins had emerged, the east communist and the west capitalist. Travelling between the two was restricted from the east, families were split and relationships strained. This had a major impact on life for civilians.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Defeat certainly had a huge impact, leading to a massive refugee crisis in Germany. 12-14 million German speakers became refugees from eastern Europe and trudged to Germany, many pulling all of their possessions on hand carts. Allied policy was that all German speakers should move to Germany, whether they had originally lived there or not, to avoid revenge attacks. This helped created a huge accommodation and food crisis in the already ruined country.</i></p> <p><i>Defeat also led to the division of Germany. At Yalta it was agreed that Germany would be divided and governed by the Allies and by 1949 two Germanys and Berlins had emerged, the east communist and the west capitalist. Travelling between the two was restricted from the east, families were split and relationships strained. This had a major impact on life for civilians and was the consequence of defeat.</i></p> <p><b>NB: 14 marks- reserve for clinching argument. Standard mark is 12 marks unless one of points developed well.</b></p>	<p><b>11–14</b></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><i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument with support from one valid example explained e.g.</p> <p><i>I disagree with the statement. The greatest impact of war was the changes to life in Germany during the war. After 1942 Germany was forced to develop a strong war economy which focused on armaments building. Postal services were suspended, entertainments except cinemas shut down, Germans had to work longer hours and cut back on heating. Rationing and censorship was also tightened and the SS became an even more fearsome force as it implemented these changes. This had a dramatic impact on civilian lives compared to earlier in the war when Germany could do no wrong militarily and pillaging from occupied territories buoyed its war effort.</i></p>	<p><b>7–10</b></p>

<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><i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify and / or describe the German people's experience of World War Two but will stop short of linking this to how it affected them e.g.</p> <p><i>The allied bombing raids destroyed German cities such as Berlin and Dresden.</i>  OR  <i>Rationing of basic food items was introduced as part of Germany's war economy.</i>  OR  <i>Germany was divided into communist and capitalist dominated states.</i></p>	<p><b>4–6</b></p>
<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 very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> <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>Level 1 answers will typically make general, unspecific assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>Germany had a war economy.</i></p> <p><i>Allied bombing raids happened in Berlin.</i></p> <p><i>Germany was divided</i></p>	<p><b>1–3</b></p>
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

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

<b>High performance</b> <i>4–5 marks</i>	<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> <i>2–3 marks</i>	<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> <i>1 mark</i>	<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> <i>0 marks</i>	<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>

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored