OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE

History A (Explaining the modern world)

Unit **J410/05**: International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001 and South Africa 1960-1994: The People and the State

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2018

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 2018

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.

USING THE MARK SCHEME

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

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.

Candidates’ answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of prepared answers that do not show the candidate’s thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

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

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

1. Outline the impact of the worldwide economic depression on international relations in Europe in the 1930s.

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 • The 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.	Please see following page	**4–5**
Level 2 • The 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.		**2–3**
Level 1 • The response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.		**1**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

1. Outline the impact of the worldwide economic depression on international relations in Europe in the 1930s.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically outline how the depression led to worsening international relations supported by at least one example e.g. *The Great Depression led to worsening international relations as countries followed more aggressive foreign policies. This was because countries were struggling economically. Important powers like Italy tried to expand and looked for new sources of raw materials by invading other nations. They believed this would help their economies revive, and give the public something to feel happy about. In Italy's case this led to the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935.* **Nutshell: Valid framing statement (see highlight) supported by one or more examples (higher mark for development or more examples)**	**4–5**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically outline one or more examples of the impact OR provide a framing statement without development e.g. *In 1935 Italy invaded Abyssinia. Mussolini believed that this would help the Italian economy recover from the depression as Abyssinia contained raw materials such as oil and tin.* *OR* *The Great Depression led to worsening international relations as countries followed more aggressive foreign policies.* **Nutshell: Describes example(s) of international impact** [Alternatively, candidates might refer to aggressive economic policies such as tariffs and duties or the calling in of loans, especially US loans to Germany, or the US even greater reluctance to involve itself in world affairs or support European sanctions. Do not credit Manchuria unless linked to League of Nations' response.] NOTE: Students may refer to worsening economic relations. For L3 this needs to link to political events.	**2–3**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically outline one or more event with little or no reference to the impact of the depression on international relations e.g. *Germany suffered from high unemployment and debt* *Britain experienced high unemployment* *The Wall Street Crash meant the USA went bust*	**1**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	Hitler came to power in Germany **Nutshell: Identifies impact of depression but national not international**	
Level 0		**0**

2. Explain why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s.

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 • The 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.	**Please see following page**	**9–10**
Level 4 • The 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.		**7–8**
Level 3 • The 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.		**5–6**
Level 2 • The 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.		**3–4**

Level 1 • The 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.		**1–2**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

2. Explain why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two reasons why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s and explain how these led to deeper involvement e.g. *The USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s for many reasons.* *One reason was the policy of containment. Many Americans believed that communism was evil and that China and Russia were trying to spread communism through Asia. They thought that if one county fell to communism, other countries would also fall like a row of dominoes. By 1965 the Vietcong were getting so much aid and military equipment from Russia and China, the USA believed that it had to send its own troops, or they feared the rebels would overthrow the government and the country would become communist. Sending aid and advisers was no longer enough.* *Another reason they got more involved was because they were worried about losing face. They got dragged in slowly from the 1950s until they got to a point in the 1960s where they couldn't pull back. Under Eisenhower in the 1950s they sent advisers and spent $2 billion helping the South Vietnam Government. However, because it was unpopular and corrupt they needed to help more to keep it in power, otherwise the communists would take over. Kennedy sent special forces and spent even more in the early 1960s, and then under Johnson it was as if they had reached the point of no return. When the South Vietnam government got too weak they felt they had to send troops or all they had spent would be for nothing which would be humiliating.* **Nutshell: Two reasons for involvement identified and explained.**	**9–10**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically identify at least one reason why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s and explain why/how it led to deeper involvement e.g. *One reason the USA got more involved was the policy of containment. Many Americans believed that communism was evil and that China and Russia were trying to spread communism through Asia. They thought that if one county fell to communism, other countries would also fall like a row of dominoes. By 1965 the Vietcong were getting so much aid and military equipment from Russia and China, the USA had to send their own troops or America feared they would overthrow the government and the country would become communist.* **Nutshell: Identifies reason(s) with one reason explained (explanation needs to be linked to Vietnam/South East Asia)** **NOTE: Answers at L4 may identify and attempt to explain several reasons but only be successful with one.**	**7–8**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically identify and describe one or more valid reasons but will not explain how the reason(s) led to deeper involvement. *The USA got more involved for many reasons. The policy of containment was one reason. So was the "Military-Industrial complex". And then there was the weakness of the Diem government. This was the leadership of South Vietnam which was unpopular and corrupt at times.* [Alternatively, candidates may focus on US support of military coup that murdered Ngo Dinh Diem; weakness of the AVRN; electioneering by Kennedy; Gulf of Tonkin incident; Kennedy wanted to look strong after Cuba; USA didn't want Communism to spread to protect its economy and trade]. **Nutshell: Identifies and describes reason(s) but fails to explain how it/they led to deeper involvement**	**5–6**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to US involvement in the war in Vietnam. *The US got involved first by sending aid and advisers to help Diem. The communists were attacking the government. Then they sent soldiers to attack the Vietcong after Diem was assassinated. America was trying to protect its interests.* **Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no reasons identified**	**3–4**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons not specific to Vietnam war e.g. *The Americans felt threatened* *America wanted to support their allies* **Nutshell: Unspecific points**	**1–2**
Level 0		**0**

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is a fair comment on the policy of appeasement? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of Appeasement 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. **Candidates are not required to refer to specific historians or schools of thought but should be given credit within the level if they do so correctly.**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 • 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.	**Please see following pages**	**21–25**
Levels	**Indicative content**	**Marks**
Level 4 • 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.		**16–20**
Level 3 • 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.		**11–15**
Level 2 • 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.		**6–10**

Level 1 • 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		**1-5**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.	.	**0**

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is a fair comment on the policy of appeasement? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of Appeasement to support your answer.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically address the question through fully developed analysis and evaluation of specific elements of Interpretation A, supported by relevant references to other interpretations or the context of Interpretation A *In Interpretation A Parker is criticising Chamberlain for the policy of appeasement. He calls him stubborn and he also says he was half hearted in opposing Hitler and should have done more to deter Hitler by standing up to him.* *This is not really a fair comment. Revisionist historians from the 1960s would not accept the idea that Chamberlain failed to stop Hitler because he was half hearted about opposing him. Revisionists argued that Chamberlain failed to oppose Hitler because he was constrained by Britain's poor financial situation and limited armed forces.* [Answers may refer to historians such as Dilks and Cameron Watt or use the term revisionist– this is not a requirement but should be credited] *OR* *In some ways, this is a fair comment as historians from the 1940s and 1950s would definitely agree. Parker says that Britain's attempts to block Hitler's expansion were half hearted and too late. The authors who wrote Guilty Men during the war thought that appeasement was a foolish and cowardly policy and in their own words 'The British Government did not exert itself to any great extent in the arming of our country, didn't do enough to prepare Britain for war'.* [Answers may refer to modern historians as post-revisionists, and those in the 1940s and 1950s as orthodox – this is not a requirement but should be credited] **Nutshell: Valid use of other interpretations or context (of A) to support OR challenge specific point(s) from Interpretation A** NOTE: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported.	**21-25**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically address the question of fairness through valid use of other interpretation(s) or the context of Interpretation A. Answers at this level will not specify the aspect(s) of Interpretation A which they consider fair or unfair. *In Interpretation A Parker is criticising appeasement.* *Churchill and the Orthodox historians would say this is fair. Although Churchill did admit that Chamberlain was a good man he believed that Chamberlain showed poor judgement and failed to see what Hitler was really like. As a result appeasement encouraged Hitler.* **Nutshell: Valid use of other interpretation(s) or context (of A) to support / challenge the general premise of Interpretation A**	**16-20**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically be based on a valid argument about fairness and support this with relevant factual knowledge OR undeveloped references to other interpretations to judge fairness e.g. *The comment is fair because it's true that Chamberlain and his government didn't want to build a barrier to Hitler's expansion. When Chamberlain chose not to help the Czechs defend the Sudetenland, and instead, agreed Hitler could have the territory, they were giving Hitler important industrial and military land: after it was gone the Czechs lost heart and were less able to defend against Hitler taking over the rest of their nation. He also refused to negotiate seriously with the Russians which is why in the end Stalin formed the Nazi-Soviet pact. If he had done this war might have been avoided as Hitler didn't want a war on two fronts in 1939.* *OR* *Parker is writing in 1993 and he is critical. I think this is fair because Cato would agree with this and be critical as well.* **Nutshell: Valid argument based on knowledge OR valid but undeveloped references to other interpretations to support / challenge the general premise of Interpretation A**	**11-15**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically describe relevant interpretations without addressing the question of fairness e.g. *Parker's view is from the 1990s and he criticises appeasement. One interpretation about appeasement is from 'The Guilty Men' which says that Chamberlain was cowardly. The revisionists said that he was…* **Nutshell: Demonstrates knowledge of interpretations without explicitly addressing fairness of A; OR after misunderstanding**	**6-10**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate understanding of Interpretation A and/OR offer undeveloped/unsupported assertions about fairness *Parker thinks that appeasement was a bad idea.* *Parker thinks Chamberlain was stubborn* *The Interpretation is right. He says Chamberlain is stubborn and could have done more against Hitler. I agree.* *This is harsh. Lots of other historians disagree and think he had no choice.* **Nutshell: Shows understanding of A/unsupported assertions about fairness**	**1-5**
Level 0		**0**

4. Study Interpretation B. Explain why **not** all historians and commentators agree with this interpretation. 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. Candidates are not required to refer to specific historians or schools of thought but should be given credit within the level if they do so correctly. Credit could be awarded within any level for candidates who explain (with valid support such as the new sources under the Public Records Act) that some historians **have** agreed with the interpretation.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 • 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. • The 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.	Please see following page(s)	**17–20**
Level 4 • 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.		**13–16**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
• The 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 3 • 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. • The 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.		**9–12**
Level 2 • 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. • The 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.		**5–8**
Level 1 • 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. • The 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.		**1–4**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically explain **how** historian(s) or commentator(s) from two or more periods have disagreed with Interpretation B and **explain the reason(s) for differences for at least one of them** *It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B.* *Paterson is saying that the responsibility for the Cold War should be shared as both the USA and the USSR were to blame. But in the 1940s through to the early 1960s most US historians blamed the Soviet Union, not the USA, and criticised it for trying to spread communist ideas across the world. However, most of these commentators were heavily influenced by feelings of Red Scare which were so strong in the 1950s, and so were unwilling to consider any explanations for the Cold War unless it blamed Russia. Some of these people had also been involved in the events they wrote about, as senior US officials or advisers, so they were less likely to criticise their own government or their own actions.* [References to Kennan and Feis could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level. Equally labelling Paterson's view as post-revisionist is worthy of credit.] *In the same way, some historians writing since the end of the Cold War would disagree. Since the Soviet archives were opened and lots more sources became available a number of historians have again criticised Russia, and Stalin in particular, for causing the Cold War. When Reagan was President in the 1980s he was aggressive in his actions and speech against the USSR, calling it an evil empire, and some historians in the early 1990s seem to have been influenced by this attitude. Not surprisingly, as historians often find what they are looking for, they found evidence in the Soviet archives to blame Russia again.* **Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two or more periods disagree, with explanation as to why at least one is different (probably based on context or the evidence used by the historian).** **NOTE 1: Marks can be awarded within level for quality of support or addressing specific aspects of Interpretation B rather than the general premise.** **NOTE 2: If a candidate explains how and why only one view differs mark at bottom of L5**	**17–20**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically explain **how** historian(s) or commentator(s) from **two or more periods** have disagreed with Interpretation B *Paterson is saying that the responsibility for the Cold War should be shared as both the USA and the USSR were to blame. But in the 1940s through to the early 1960s most US historians blamed the Soviet Union, not the USA, and criticised it for trying to spread communist ideas across the world.* [References to Kennan and Feis could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level.] *Other historians writing in the 1960s blamed the USA more. These historians said that the USA's 'get-tough' attitude with the Truman Doctrine made the Soviets feel threatened. They argue that the US was trying to create economic dominance with things like the Marshall Plan and that this threatened Stalin and provoked him to react. [References to Kolko or other revisionists* could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level.] **Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two or more periods disagree** **NOTE: Marks can be awarded within the level for quality of support or addressing specific aspects of Interpretation B rather than the general premise.**	**13–16**
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically **explain how** historian(s) or commentator(s) from **one period** have disagreed (or agreed) with Interpretation B *It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. Paterson is saying that both Russia and the USA were responsible for the start of the Cold War. But during the 1950s many writers argued that the Cold War was caused by Russian aggression and expansion. They wanted to spread their influence across Europe and then Asia.* **Nutshell: Valid explanation of how view from one period would disagree** **Alternatively**, Level 3 answers may give valid reasons why historians from one or more periods disagree (or agree) but fail to explain how Soviet historians would not accept this view. Soviet historians would have faced pressures of censorship and control. If they were to criticise the USSR they might have lost their job or worse. **Nutshell: Valid reason(s) why view from one period(s) is different/similar but not how.**	**9–12**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically identify historian(s) or commentator(s) who have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why eg *Not all historians would agree with Interpretation B about America being equally to blame. The historians of the late 1940s would have disagreed.*	**5–8**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	OR *Historians in the 1940s in the USA blamed the Soviets. In the 1960s revisionist historians blamed the USA. Post revisionists blamed both sides.* **Nutshell: Lists historians / schools of thought but no valid development**	
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions about Interpretation B or give their own critique of it e.g. *Some people would disagree with Interpretation B because Russia was more to blame than the USA.* *Not all historians would agree because lots were really critical of the Russians. Others said it was mainly America's fault.* **Nutshell: General assertions** 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.	**1–4**
Level 0 credit.		**0**

South Africa 1960–1994: The People and the State

5 Describe one way that the International Anti-Apartheid Movement showed its opposition to Apartheid.

Assessment Objectives	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2]
Additional Guidance	First mark for identification of policy + second mark for descriptive detail for each response. Note that a maximum of 1 mark can be given for correct identification of methods, even if more than one method is identified. All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of ways that the Anti-Apartheid movement showed opposition to Apartheid should also be credited.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
N/A Points marking	*One example of how the International Anti-Apartheid Movement showed its opposition to Apartheid was through boycotting sports events. For example, when the South African Rugby team toured Britain in 1970 protesters set up a 'Stop the tour' campaign which disrupted the matches.* OR *One example of how the International Anti-Apartheid Movement showed its opposition to Apartheid was through musicians refusing to play in South Africa. For example, Bob Dylan and Ringo Starr amongst others would not play at Sun City in the 1980s.*	**2**

6 Explain the consequences of the Sharpeville Massacre.

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 • 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.	*Please see following page(s)*	**9–10**
Level 4 • 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.		**7–8**
Level 3 • 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.		**5–6**
Level 2 • 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.		**3–4**
Level 1 • 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.		**1–2**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

6 Explain the consequences of the Sharpeville Massacre.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 •	Level 5 answers will typically identify two consequences and explain them fully, e.g. *The most significant consequence of the Sharpeville Massacre was the decision by the ANC and PAC to turn to an armed struggle against Apartheid. This meant that organisations such as Umkhonto We Sizwe (MK) were now prepared to use violence to fight against Apartheid. This was justified by leaders like Mandela as a result of the banning of the ANC and PAC by the National Party in April 1960 following the demonstrations after the Sharpeville Massacre. The banning meant that many of the leaders of these organisations could be arrested because membership was now illegal. Some, such as Oliver Tambo, decided to leave South Africa to set up ANC offices in other countries.* *A less significant consequence of the Sharpeville Massacre was that the United Nations called for economic sanctions, which coincided with a call for a boycott of South African goods by the ANC. However, this did not happen straight away and it took nearly 2 years before sanctions were introduced. Although many African, Asian and Eastern European countries supported the sanctions, Britain, the USA and Canada did not. This consequently weakened the impact of sanctions as these countries had heavily invested in South Africa.* ***Nutshell: Explains two consequences***	**9–10**
Level 4 •	Level 4 answers will typically identify one consequence and explain it fully, e.g. *One of the consequences of the Sharpeville massacre was the decision by the ANC and PAC to turn to an armed struggle against Apartheid. This meant that organisations such as Umkhonto We Sizwe (MK) were now prepared to use violence to fight against Apartheid. This was justified by leaders like Mandela as a result of the banning of the ANC and PAC by the National Party in April 1960 following the demonstrations after the Sharpeville Massacre. The banning meant that many of the leaders of these organisations could be arrested because membership was now illegal. Some, such as Oliver Tambo, decided to leave South Africa to set up ANC offices in other countries* ***Nutshell: Explains one consequence*** ***NOTE: Candidates are likely to attempt several consequences but only succeed in one case***	**7–8**
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically identify and describe one consequence, e.g *After the Sharpeville Massacre the South African government banned the ANC and PAC. This meant that many of the leaders of these organisations could be arrested because membership was now illegal. Some, such as Oliver Tambo, decided to leave South Africa to set up ANC offices in other countries.*	**5–6**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	Nutshell: Identifies one or more consequence ***NOTE: Candidates are likely to attempt several consequences but only succeed in one case***	
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events that is linked to the issue in the question, e.g. *The government were worried about the protests that took place after the Sharpeville Massacre. They arrested thousands of protesters and banned the ANC and PAC.* **Nutshell: Description of events but fails to identify consequences**	**3–4**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g. *The government tried to deal with its opponents.* OR *It was unpopular* **Nutshell: General points**	**1–2**
Level 0		**0**

7. Study Sources A and B. How similar are these sources?

Assessment Objectives	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [10]
Additional Guidance	Analysis of a single source, no matter how thorough, cannot achieve more than the top mark in Level 2. For Level 3, a reasonable coverage of both sources and a balance between the treatment of sources is expected. 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. 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
Level 3 • 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.	Please see following page(s)	**7–10**
Level 2 • Response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct an argument to answer the question about the sources.		**3–6**
Level 1 • 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).		**1–2**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

7. Study Sources A and B. How similar are these sources?

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically explain how the sources are similar in content but different in purpose or audience, e.g. *Sources A and B are quite similar. Both are trying to get the government to ease the repression on Black South Africans. The newspaper in Source A deliberately highlights the violence and casualties during the protest and how many students (10 000) were willing to march in an attempt to demonstrate the strength of feeling and excessive force used against them. As a Black newspaper it wants to pressure the government to deal with the issues Black Africans face. In Source B Bishop Tutu tries to persuade the government to do 'something' or 'bloodshed and violence are going to happen' as a result of the desperation that many Black South Africans felt.* ***Nutshell: Similar content, different purpose or audience***	**7–10**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically compare the message or the attitudes of the two sources e.g. *These sources are similar in some ways as they are both about the actions of desperate people and what they will do. In A the students are protesting because they do not want to be taught in Afrikaans and a new law has been introduced which they have no say over, in B Tutu predicts desperate people will turn to violence.* OR *The sources are different because B is a prediction of violence and bloodshed if people are treated unfairly in South Africa, while A describes the violence that happened only weeks later and how many people became casualties. It also refers to the trigger of the troubles, the new law on Afrikaans teaching in schools.* ***Nutshell: Similar message or attitudes***	**3–6**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically assert similarity or difference in general terms with limited or no support from sources e.g. *Both sources are about the unhappiness of some Black South Africans.* OR *One source is a newsreport and the other source is a letter.* *They have different dates* In this level, answers may focus almost entirely on one of the two sources. ***Nutshell: Source types or points of detail compared***	**1–2**
Level 0		**0**

8. ‘FW de Klerk was the most significant reason that Apartheid ended’ How far do you agree with this view about the collapse of Apartheid? (18 marks)

Assessment Objectives	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]
Additional Guidance	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 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 • 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. • This is supported by a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • *There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.*	Please see following page(s)	**15–18**
Level 4 • 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. • This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • *There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.*		**11–14**
Level 3 • 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. • This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • *There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.*		**7–10**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 2 • 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. • This is supported by some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • *There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.*		**4–6**
Level 1 • 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. • There is basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. • *The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.*		**1–3**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

8 'FW de Klerk was the most significant reason that Apartheid ended' How far do you agree with this view about the collapse of Apartheid? (18 marks)

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced and well-supported argument, e.g. *FW de Klerk played a significant role in ending apartheid in a number of ways. Firstly, he realised that South Africa was in a very difficult position at the end of the 1980s with the country on the verge of civil war. Also, he knew that the economy was in real trouble as a result of sanctions and strikes by African workers. He recognised that by ending apartheid the economy could recover. As a consequence, he agreed to hold secret meetings with the leaders of the ANC and was impressed by their willingness to co-operate. Therefore, de Klerk's role in ending apartheid was very significant as he had the foresight to see that major reforms were needed and was able to persuade the National Party to support his plans.* *However, it can also be argued that the pressure from opposition movements continued to put pressure on the National Party to end apartheid. The emergence of the United Democratic Front in 1983, which had over two million members, meant that protests were effectively co-ordinated. They launched campaigns such as 'Unban the ANC' and boycotted elections. In 1985 COSATU was formed which bought together the largest Trade Unions in South Africa and together with the UDF participated in the National Defiance Campaign in 1989 in which members broke the apartheid laws in mass protests. Therefore, opposition also played an important role in ending apartheid as the wide-ranging protests made governing South Africa very challenging.* *Overall it can be argued that both FW de Klerk played a more significant role than opposition movements because he was able to convince the National Party that Apartheid was no longer sustainable. If he was not able to carry the support of his party, it is unlikely that apartheid would have been ended, regardless of the impact of opposition.* ***Nutshell: Balanced argument with two explained points each side; or two explained points on one side and one point on other side*** ***NOTE: 18 marks = 2 explained points on each side, plus a clinching argument*** ***16-17 marks = 2 explained points on each side*** ***15 marks = 2 explained points on one side, and 1 on the other***	**15–18**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically set out a one-sided argument with supported by at least two valid examples e.g. *FW de Klerk played a significant role in ending apartheid in a number of ways. Firstly, he realised that South Africa was in a very difficult position at the end of the 1980s with the country on the verge of civil war. Also, he knew that the economy was in real trouble as a result of sanctions and strikes by African workers. He recognised that by ending apartheid the economy could recover. As a consequence, he agreed to hold secret meetings with the leaders of the ANC and was impressed by their willingness to co-operate. Therefore, de Klerk's role in ending apartheid was very significant as he had the foresight to see that major reforms were needed and was able to persuade the National Party to support his plans.* ***Nutshell One sided argument; two explained points of support*** **Alternatively**, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example eg *FW de Klerk played a significant role in ending apartheid. He realised that South Africa was in a very difficult position at the end of the 1980s with the country on the verge of civil war and the economy in great trouble. He recognised that by ending apartheid the economy could recover.* *However, it can also be argued that the pressure from opposition movements put pressure on the National Party to end apartheid. The emergence of the United Democratic Front in 1983 meant that protests were effectively co-ordinated and in 1985 COSATU was formed which bought together the largest Trade Unions in South Africa.* ***Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side***	**11–14**
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument with support, e.g. *FW de Klerk played a significant role in ending apartheid in a number of ways. Firstly, he realised that South Africa was in a very difficult position at the end of the 1980s with the country on the verge of civil war. Also, he knew that the economy was in real trouble as a result of sanctions and strikes by African workers. He recognised that by ending apartheid the economy could recover.* ***Nutshell One sided argument; one explained point of support***	**7–10**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically identify and describe events relating to the question, e.g. *FW de Klerk realised South Africa needed to change otherwise there would be civil war. He also knew that the economy was in real trouble and something needed to be done to improve it.* ***Nutshell: Description of events***	**4–6**

Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions or demonstrate simple knowledge of the BCM or the ANC e.g. *FW De Klerk was the Prime Minister that ended apartheid in South Africa. There was some opposition to Apartheid including strikes.* ***Nutshell: General points***	**1–3**
Level 0		**0**

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

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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 (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2018