



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE (9-1)

History A Explaining the Modern World

J410/14: International Relations: the changing international order 1918-1975

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2022

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 2022

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**PREPARATION FOR MARKING****RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor 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 RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number of** standardisation responses.

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 RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% 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 or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.

5. Crossed Out Responses

Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)









Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

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. Award No Response (NR) if:
 - there is nothing written in the answer spaceAward Zero '0' if:
 - anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.
8. The RM Assessor **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 RM Assessor 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:
 - a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer

b. To determine the mark within the level, consider the following:

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

11. 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.

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

1. Outline the events, between 1936 and 1939, that resulted in the outbreak of the Second World War.

Assessment Objectives	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]	
Additional Guidance	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples should also be credited.	
Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 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.	Level 3 answers will typically describe events or developments from the relevant period (1936-39) and show how at least one of these contributed to the outbreak of war. e.g. <i>In 1939 the Nazis signed the Nazi-Soviet Pact with the USSR. Hitler could now invade Poland knowing that Stalin would not stop him. Britain and France had promised to help Poland should it be invaded, and so Britain and France declared war on Germany. [4]</i> <i>In 1936 Hitler remilitarised the Rhineland and found that Britain and France, too concerned with the Abyssinian crisis, did not intervene. This gave Hitler the confidence to challenge the Versailles Treaty further in Austria and Czechoslovakia. This worried Britain and France, leading to tensions which eventually resulted in war. [4]</i> <i>From 1936-39 Hitler was trying to achieve his ideological aims. He wanted Lebensraum (living space) for the German people. He therefore took aggressive measures like the Anschluss with Austria and taking over the Sudetenland. This alarmed Britain and France and they started preparing for war. When Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 Britain and France declared war on Germany. [5]</i> Nutshell: Supported examples of events and how they contributed to the outbreak of war.	4–5
Level 2 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.	Level 2 answers will typically describe event(s) or development(s) from the relevant period (1936-39) e.g. <i>In 1936 Hitler remilitarised the Rhineland and found that Britain and France did not intervene. This gave Hitler confidence. [2]</i> <i>In 1936 Hitler remilitarised the Rhineland, which broke the Treaty of Versailles. Britain and France did not stop him. After that he marched into Austria in 1938. Later in 1938 he took control of the Sudetenland with the Munich Agreement. The British and French were appeasing Hitler and nobody stopped him. In 1939 the Nazi-Soviet Pact was signed. [3]</i> Nutshell: Describes event(s) / development(s)	2–3
Level 1 Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.	Level 1 answers will typically identify event(s) or development(s) with no valid development e.g. <i>Hitler remilitarised the Rhineland</i> <i>Hitler wanted Lebensraum</i> <i>The Nazis invaded Poland</i> <i>Hitler became very powerful</i> <i>Hitler was very anti-communist</i> Nutshell: Identifies events or developments.	1
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

2. Explain why the USA failed to win the Vietnam War between 1965 and 1975.


Assessment Objectives	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]
Additional Guidance	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.




Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Level 5 answers will typically identify and explain two reasons why the USA failed e.g.</p> <p><i>The USA failed to win in Vietnam because the Viet Cong fought a guerrilla war, which the Americans struggled to deal with. The Americans were expecting a conventional war, but their bombers and tanks were ineffective against the Viet Cong, who were hard to identify and hid in tunnels, set booby traps and staged ambushes on American patrols. This all led to American failure in Vietnam because they found it impossible to defeat the Viet Cong.</i></p> <p><i>Loss of support at home made a big contribution to the USA's failure to win the Vietnam War. Many Americans objected to the war and the loss of life that was reported in the media, and were horrified by American atrocities like the Mai Lai Massacre in 1968. Student protests in 1970 led to the 'Kent State Massacre', when several students were killed by American troops, and this made the opposition to the war even more intense. This all put pressure on the President to pull out, resulting in failure.</i></p>	9–10
Level 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify and explain one reason why the USA failed e.g.</p> <p><i>The USA failed to win the Vietnam War because of the conditions they had to fight in. The soldiers were not used to the jungles of Vietnam. They struggled to deal with the Viet Cong, who hid in jungles and tunnels, set booby traps and ambushed American soldiers, which resulted in a war the USA simply couldn't win. [7]</i></p> <p><i>Negative public opinion and reactions to events like the Mai Lai Massacre also led to the USA being unsuccessful in Vietnam as it put huge pressure on the President to withdraw American soldiers from the country. [7]</i></p> <p><i>American tactics were counter-productive during the Vietnam War. Search and Destroy resulted in the burning of many Vietnamese villages and Operation Rolling Thunder failed to destroy the Ho Chi Minh trail. Tactics like 'Search and Destroy' to find the Viet Cong resulted in 'zippo raids' that burned down many villages, and anxious American soldiers sometimes killed innocent civilians, as with the Mai Lai Massacre. The USA failed because their tactics caused anger and led to greater support for the Communists and the Viet Cong among the Vietnamese people, and less for the Americans. [8]</i></p>	7–8


<p>Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Level 3 answers will typically identify and describe one or more reasons why the USA failed e.g.</p> <p><u>American tactics were counter-productive during the Vietnam War. Search and Destroy resulted in the burning of many Vietnamese villages and Operation Rolling Thunder failed to destroy the Ho Chi Minh trail.</u></p> <p><u>The soldiers were not used to the jungles of Vietnam and the Viet Cong were, so the USA failed to win the Vietnam War because of the conditions they had to fight in.</u></p> <p><u>The policy of Vietnamisation was a mistake and led to America failing in Vietnam. The President withdrew many American soldiers and instead trained South Vietnamese soldiers to fight in their place.</u></p> <p><u>Most of the American soldiers were young men who had been drafted to fight and faced with the conditions in Vietnam some turned to drugs to blot out their surroundings and so American soldiers lacked the will to fight the war.</u></p> <p><u>Because Vietnam was a televised war and turned people against the war. People at home could see American troops being brutal to Vietnamese civilians eg using napalm.</u></p> <p>NOTE: Identified reason underlined – this is what differentiates from L2</p>	<p>5–6</p>
<p>Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to reasons why the USA failed to win the Vietnam War between 1965 and 1975 e.g.</p> <p><u>The USA fought a long war in Vietnam. American planes carpet bombed parts of Vietnam and carried out raids to root out Viet Cong soldiers some of which got out of hand and led to events like the Mai Lai Massacre. In 1968 they had to beat off a huge Viet Cong attack called the Tet Offensive in 1968.</u></p> <p>Alternative Level 2 Identifies reasons with no further valid development eg <u>Because Vietnam was a televised war and turned people against the war.</u></p>	<p>3–4</p>
<p>Level 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons not specific to reasons why the USA failed to win the Vietnam War between 1965 and 1975 e.g.</p> <p><u>The USA was fighting a war it could not win.</u> <u>There was lots of opposition [failing to specify whether in US or Vietnam].</u> <u>American tactics were ineffective.</u> <u>Viet Cong tactics were good.</u></p>	<p>1–2</p>
<p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p>0</p>

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on the causes of the Cold War? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of the early stages of the Cold War (before 1950) to support your answer.

Assessment Objectives	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]
Additional Guidance	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.


Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<p>Level 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. 	<p>Level 5 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by developed use of two other interpretations OR developed use of one other interpretation and evaluation of Interpretation A based on the context of A e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is arguing that the USA was responsible for causing the Cold War since they set out with 'deliberate aims' for economic control of the world whereas the Russians were trying to follow 'cautious policies' and so should not be seen as responsible. This could be seen as a fair comment as many historians writing around the time of the Vietnam War argued that the USA's 'Open Door' economic policies after the Second World War were part of an American plan to dominate the world both economically and politically. This aggressive action caused the Cold War by forcing the Soviets to respond. They point to policies like Marshall Aid - which Stalin criticised as 'dollar imperialism' – as evidence that the USA's actions were aggressive and caused the Cold War.</i></p> <p>[Candidates might make reference to historians like Williams, Paterson, Gaddis, Cox or to the 'revisionist view' or the 'orthodox view' and whilst this is not necessary, it should be credited].</p> <p><i>On the other hand, historians writing in the 1950s would disagree that Interpretation A was a fair comment and would place the blame at the feet of the USSR instead. These historians would say that Stalin's expansion in Eastern Europe and Germany in particular was an entirely aggressive move and that American policies like the Truman Doctrine was an essential response to contain Communism. As they would disagree that Soviet actions were 'cautious', they would not consider A a fair comment.</i></p> <p>[If candidates refer to the 'orthodox' school of thought or of historians like Kennan or Feis, this should be given credit but is not essential].</p> <p>Nutshell: Developed use of 2 other interpretations OR one other interpretation and an evaluation of A based on the context.</p> <p>NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported. NOTE For L5 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair</p>	<p>21–25</p> 


<p>Level 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. 	<p>Level 4 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by developed use of one other interpretation or the context of Interpretation A e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is arguing that the USA caused the Cold War because its attempts to create a world ‘dependent on America’ provoked the USSR into responding. Many historians writing in the 1960s would see this interpretation as a fair comment. They argue that the American ‘Open Door’ policy was intended to dominate Europe economically and politically, and the ‘cautious’ USSR were only responding to this ‘deliberate’ aggression.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Many historians writing after the 1960s would not see this as a fair comment as they would also place blame on the USSR, arguing that the superpowers misunderstood each other’s actions after the Second World War and this caused the tension. For example, whilst the USA saw the Truman Doctrine as ‘containing’ Communism, the USSR saw it as a ‘encirclement’ they needed to break.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Developed use of ONE interpretation or context (of A) to support / challenge Interpretation A. NOTE For L4 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair.</p>	<p>16–20</p> 
<p>Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. 	<p>Level 3 answers will typically be based on a valid argument about fairness and support this with relevant factual knowledge to judge fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is a fair comment about the beginnings of the Cold War because the USA did indeed attempt to create a ‘worldwide economic system dependent on America’. Marshall Aid was offered to countries in Europe to stop them from turning to Communism and Stalin hated it and called it ‘dollar imperialism’ (use of factual knowledge to judge).</i></p> <p>Alternative Level 3 undeveloped references to other interpretations to judge fairness e.g. <i>Kolko is saying that the United States caused the Cold War. I do not think this is a fair comment because many historians writing during the period of détente would disagree with him and blame both sides (undeveloped use of relevant interpretation).</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid argument based on contextual knowledge OR valid but undeveloped use of interpretation(s) NOTE For L3 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair</p>	<p>11–15</p> 
<p>Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. 	<p>Level 2 answers will typically describe relevant interpretations without addressing the question of fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>Kolko is writing in the 1960s and says the USA was responsible for the beginnings of the Cold War. Post-revisionist historians writing in the 1970s say that the USA and USSR struggled to understand each other. Orthodox historians say that...</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Describes interpretation(s) but fails to address question (eg historiography essay)</p>	<p>6–10</p> 



<p>Level 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. 	<p>Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate understanding of Interpretation A and/OR offer undeveloped/unsupported assertions about fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>Kolko thinks America was to blame.</i> <i>Interpretation A says America tried to make the world dependent on its money.</i> <i>I agree with this interpretation because America followed reckless policies at the time.</i> <i>Lots of historians would disagree with Kolko.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Shows understanding of A/unsupported assertions about fairness</p> <p>NOTE Place in this level answers which seem to show some knowledge of context or other interpretations but have misunderstood interpretation A (eg good use of CK to argue Interp A is not fair because it blames USSR)</p>	<p>1-5</p> 
<p>Level 0</p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p>0</p>


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

Assessment Objectives	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]
Additional Guidance	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.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<p>Level 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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. 	<p>Level 5 answers will explain how or why historians from two different periods agree or disagree with particular aspect(s) of interpretation B. OR will explain how and why historians from one period agree or disagree e.g.</p> <p><i>Immediately after the war many historians took the view that Chamberlain had badly miscalculated with his policy of appeasement and so they would have disagreed with the view in Interpretation B that it was the right policy that bought Britain time. To these historians Chamberlain had wrongly believed that Hitler was a reasonable man who would keep to an agreement. This miscalculation caused appeasement to be a failure rather than the success B claims it to be.</i> <i>On the other hand, many commentators writing at the time of appeasement itself would have agreed with the view in Interpretation B. They had witnessed the horrors of the First World War and viewed Hitler's rearmament with fear. Because of this they viewed appeasement as the right policy and saw Chamberlain as a hero for giving peace a chance.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Orthodox historians, particularly Winston Churchill, would probably disagree with Interpretation B. Rather since rather than agreeing with B that Chamberlain followed the correct policy in appeasing Hitler, Churchill said that Chamberlain should have forged an alliance with France, the USA and the USSR and opposed Hitler strongly [HOW]. At the time he was writing, Churchill was concerned by the developing Cold War between the USA and the USSR. He saw the USSR as a threat to Europe and he thought it was similar to how Hitler had threatened Europe. He wrote the story of the 1930s as a way to persuade the USA and other states that they needed to stand up to the USSR. {WHY}</i></p> <p>Nutshell: 2H different periods OR 2W different periods OR H+W different periods OR H+W same period NOTE For L4 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported</p>	<p>9-10</p> 

<p>Level 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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. 	<p>Level 4 answers will typically explain how historian(s) and commentator(s) from one period have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B eg <i>Post revisionist historians would not agree with Interpretation B that Chamberlain handled appeasement effectively. They argue that Chamberlain refused to listen to other people or consider other options and this led appeasement to fail. He assumed Hitler was a reasonable man which was not the case. (how)</i></p> <p>OR will explain valid reasons why historians from one period disagrees or agrees but fail to explain how e.g. <i>Historians writing since the fall of the Berlin Wall would not accept this view because they were able to look at documents that were not available before, for example, showing that Chamberlain had not wanted to form an alliance with Stalin which could have prevented the Nazi-Soviet pact. So they would argue it was not handled as effectively as Interpretation B suggests. (why)</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Explains how or why historian from one period agrees or disagrees (H or W) NOTE For L4 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported</p>	<p>7-8</p> 
<p>Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. <p>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 identify historian(s) who have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why eg <i>Commentators writing during the Second World War itself would have disagreed with the view in Interpretation B that appeasement was a success. [5]</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Correctly identifies historians / schools of thought / periods which (dis)agree with B 5 marks one 'school', 6 marks for two 'schools'</p> <p>Alternative Level 2 valid and developed critique of B based only on contextual knowledge eg <i>Historians would disagree with Interpretation B because events like the Munich Agreement of 1938 actually encouraged Hitler. Czechoslovakia had a modern army and was prepared to fight Hitler if Britain and France had agreed to support the Czechs. [5]</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Critique based on CK Max 5 marks for this type of response</p>	<p>5-6</p>

<p>Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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>Level 2 answers will typically provide a chronological overview of the historiography but not examine interpretation B (or may misunderstand it) e.g.</p> <p><i>Historians writing straight after the Second World War believed that Chamberlain misjudged Hitler. Commentators writing in 1938 thought that appeasement was the best policy to follow. Counter-revisionists say that Chamberlain was too confident in his own abilities.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Identifies historians / schools of thought / periods but fails to address how or why they (dis)agree with B</p> <p>NOTE: The term ‘many historians’ or similar expressions is usually not sufficient for L2 as its too unspecific: a time period, school of thought or a named historian is needed UNLESS it is clear from what the candidate says that they are describing a specific school of thought. If the candidate correctly describes a school of thought but mislabels/offers an incorrect time period then this level is possible if the description is strong enough, although a lower mark within the level would be more likely.</p>	<p>3-4</p> 
<p>Level 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. There is no consideration or no relevant consideration of any other interpretations. 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>Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate understanding of Interpretation B and/OR make general assertions about Interpretation B e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation B is obviously favourable towards Chamberlain, and not all historians would agree.</i></p> <p><i>Some historians and commentators would disagree because they disliked what Chamberlain did.</i></p> <p><i>A lot of historians and commentators have supported appeasement but other historians have criticised it.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: General assertions/own critique</p> <p>NOTE: Award at this level if candidates give their own critique of B (i.e. 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>1-2</p> 
<p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p>0</p>

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

High performance <i>4–5 marks</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate
Intermediate performance <i>2–3 marks</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate
Threshold performance <i>1 mark</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate
No marks awarded <i>0 marks</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learner writes nothing • The learner's response does not relate to the question • The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning

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 (eg grammar only)	Mark if candidate eligible for two thirds (eg 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 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.

Assessment Objectives (AO) grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	SPaG	Marks
1	5					5
2	5	5				10
3	5			20	5	30
4	2	3		5	5	15
Total	17	8		25	10	60

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrexams



/ocrexams



/company/ocr



/ocrexams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2022 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.