OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE

History A (Explaining the modern world)

Unit **J410/06**: International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001 with The USA 1919-48: 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

Annotations

Stamp	*Description*
✔ 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
BP	Blank Page

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 OR provides framing statement** [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 Level 3 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* *Hitler came to power in Germany* **Nutshell: Identifies impact of depression but national not international**	**1**
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**
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.*	**5–6**

	[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**	
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**
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**

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** *NOTE: Cannot be based on a misunderstanding of interpretation.*	**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** NOTE: Place in this level answers which seem to show some knowledge of context or other interpretations but have misunderstood interpretation A	**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. • 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.		**13–16**

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**
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.]	**13–16**

	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.**	
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.* *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**	**5–8**
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**

The USA 1919–1948: The People and the State

5. Describe one example of racial tension in the USA in the 1940s.

Assessment Objectives	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2]
Additional Guidance	All content is indicative only and any other details about racial tension in the USA in the 1940s should also be credited

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
N/A Points marking	*Riots broke out in Detroit in 1943 [1]. These quickly escalated and white youths travelled to the area to attack Black neighbourhoods [+1].* *The Ku Klux Klan were a source of racial tension [1], as was the internment of Japanese Americans during the Second World War [2].* *Segregation caused tension in the 1940s [1] for example during the Second World war white and black soldiers had to serve in different units [2].*	**2**

6. Explain how Prohibition affected the USA in the 1920s.

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**

6. Explain how Prohibition affected the USA in the 1920s.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two effects prohibition had on the USA and explain them fully e.g. *Prohibition made the sale, transport and manufacture of alcohol illegal. As a result, alcohol was forced underground, and thousands of illegal bars sprang up in most cities. Speakeasies were places where alcohol could be bought and sold secretly, and where people were protected from prying eyes by closed doors and secret passwords to get in. America became a nation of law-breakers because they hated this 'noble experiment' and refused to go without alcohol.* *Another impact it had was that it led to the rise of organised crime and corrupted the police. Because there was still such a demand for alcohol, and because there were such high profits to be made, gangsters got involved in the transport and sale of it, this resulted in turf wars and violence on the streets of large cities like Chicago and New York. High profits also meant they were able to bribe the police to turn a blind eye to their activities, which meant not only that it continued, but that police corruption became a real issue: in some forces one in twelve federal prohibition agents were sacked for accepting bribes.* **Nutshell: Two effects of Prohibition identified and explained.**	**9–10**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically identify at least one effect Prohibition had on the USA and explain it fully e.g. *Prohibition made the sale, transport and manufacture of alcohol illegal. As a result, alcohol was forced underground, and thousands of illegal bars sprang up in most cities. Speakeasies were places where alcohol could be bought and sold secretly, and where people were protected from prying eyes by closed doors and even having secret passwords to get in. America became a nation of law-breakers because they hated this 'noble experiment' and refused to go without alcohol.* **Nutshell: Identifies effect(s) with one effect explained.** **NOTE: Answers at L4 may identify and attempt to explain several reasons but only be successful with one.**	**7–8**
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically identify and describe one or more effect(s) of Prohibition e.g. *Prohibition affected America badly. It led to the growth in organised crime and gangsters who transported and sold alcohol in large towns and cities. They also smuggled it across borders from Canada and Mexico.* **Nutshell: Identifies and describes effect(s) but fails to explain it/them**	**5–6**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to Prohibition e.g. *There were a lot of illegal bars in America. The police were bribed to ignore what gangsters were up to.* **Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no effects identified**	**3–4**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g. *Prohibition started in 1920. It was introduced because of pressure from rural states and Temperance Movements.* **Nutshell: General points**	**1–2**
Level 0	No response or nothing worthy of credit	**0**

7. Study Sources A and B. Is one source more reliable than the other as evidence about the impact of the Great Depression?

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. 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 • The 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	**7–10**
Level 2 • The 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 • The 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. Is one source more reliable than the other as evidence about the impact of the Great Depression?

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically assess the reliability of the source(s) as evidence about the impact of the Depression based on an evaluation of one or both sources using source content, provenance or relevant context e.g. *I do not think source A is reliable about the impact of the depression because he is really exaggerating the worst effects. We can see this in some of his language, for example where he says 'every large city… workers are dropping, dying and dead from starvation and exposure.' That is extreme: people did die of malnutrition but not everywhere, and not so obviously in the streets. He is the leader of the Communist Party so would want to criticise capitalism and democracy. He would also sympathise with the ordinary working people and highlight the worst things happening to them as a result of the Depression.* [Alternatively, candidates might argue that Source B is a reliable source about the impact of the Depression on the worst hit people in society, cross referencing A's points about suffering with own knowledge of Hoovervilles or other relevant contextual knowledge.] *Source B is less reliable about the impact on most people because he is talking about an untypical group and not most people. He talks about how well he was doing in the Depression, and claims the Depression wasn't that visible. However, he over-generalises, talking about 'less than twenty percent' being unemployed. That may have been true in his part of town, but in the USA as a whole by 1933 it was 25%, and in some areas of the Rust Belt it was up to 80%. And that ignores the number of people who had pay cuts and reduced hours because of the economic slump. Life got harder for the vast majority in the Depression so his view isn't that reliable for them.* [Towards the bottom of the level only one source will be evaluated, using source content, provenance or relevant context.] **Nutshell: Valid reliability of source(s) as evidence about impact of Depression**	**7-10**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically assess the reliability of the source(s) in general terms based on evaluation of one or both sources *I don't think either of the sources are reliable. William Foster is the leader of the American Communist party which favours the workers so I think he would exaggerate how hard life it for them. I think B isn't reliable because he earned $2000 a month which is a huge amount of money so he is not typical of an American at the time.* [Towards the bottom of the level, answers will concentrate on only one of the two sources] **Nutshell: Valid but generalised evaluation of one/both sources (i.e. not addressing as evidence about impact of Depression)**	**3-6**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically assert reliability in general terms with limited or no support from sources, e.g. *Source A is more reliable because it backs up what I know about unemployment and poverty.* OR *Source B is more reliable because it happened to him.*	1-2

	Alternatively, answers at this level will make valid inferences about usefulness even though they may use the term 'reliability', e.g. *Source A is more reliable because it shows what a major impact the Depression had on the working classes.* [In this level, answers may focus almost entirely on one of the two sources.] **Nutshell: Assertions about reliability based on undeveloped provenance or context or source type**	
Level 0		

8.* 'The New Deal's achievements were greater than its failings.' How far do you agree with this statement?

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	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. 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' 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 second page following	**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**
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.* 'The New Deal's achievements were greater than its failings.' How far do you agree with this statement?

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced and well-supported argument e.g. *I agree with this. The New Deal had many achievements. Alphabet agencies like the CCC created millions of new jobs which meant that Roosevelt's plan to stimulate the economy worked, spending and production increased and America slowly crept out of depression. He also succeeded in reforming America: the New Deal was a huge economic and social programme and help on this scale would not have been possible before it. The Social Security act gave the first state pensions and unemployment benefit to many of the most vulnerable in society and it and other agencies set the tone for future government policies to help people. This was a major breakthrough in a society which prided itself on rugged individualism.* *On the other hand, there were failings. Many criticised the regulations and bureaucracy in the New Deal and looking back it is not totally clear whether the New Deal really worked to revive America. When FDR cut back on funding the Second New Deal in 1937 the recovery stuttered, which suggests that he had not succeeded in priming the pump and getting the economy going, but was merely propping it up. He had not dealt with its underlying issues. Equally, although some vulnerable individuals were helped, many groups continued to be discriminated against, like black Americans, women and native Americans. There was segregation in the TVA in Norris Town for example. This suggested the reforms did not go far enough.* *Having said that, I think it is harsh to criticise the New Deal too much. Its achievement was in establishing a new way for US government to act, a way which tried to support its people better. If FDR had done more to tackle discrimination, he might have lost the support he needed to sort out America's other problems.* [NB This would be a L5 answer without the conclusion, but lower in the level.] **Nutshell: Balanced argument with two explained points each side, or two explained points on one side and one point on the other side.** **NOTE: 18 marks = as below plus a clinching argument** **16-17 marks = 4 explained points (3-1 or 2-2)** **15 marks = 3 explained points (2-1)**	**15-18**
Level 4	*Level 4 answers will typically set out a one-sided argument with support from at least two valid examples OR construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.* *I agree with this. The New Deal had achievements. Roosevelt also succeeded in reforming America: the Social Security Act gave state pensions and unemployment benefit to many of the most vulnerable people in America. This was a major breakthrough in a society which believed in rugged individualism.* *On the other hand, there were failings. Many people criticised the regulations and bureaucracy in the New Deal and looking back it is not clear whether the New Deal really worked to put America back to work. Unemployment did not drop to the level of before 1929 until 1941 when rearmament gave the economy a real boost.*	**11-14**

	Nutshell One-sided argument; two explained points of support OR balanced argument; one explained point on each side **NOTE: Reserve 14 marks for a clinching argument**	
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument with support from one valid example e.g. *I agree with this. The New Deal had many achievements. Alphabet agencies like the CCC created millions of new jobs which meant that Roosevelt's plan to stimulate the economy worked, spending and production increased and America slowly crept out of depression.* **Nutshell: One sided argument, one explained point of support** **NOTE: Many answers at L3 will attempt a balanced answer and a wider range of support but only achieve one valid explanation**	**7-10**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically identify and describe events relating to the New Deal e.g. *The New Deal created alphabet agencies. For example the CCC created work for young men in forestry and conservation. They lived away from home and received a dollar a day to send home.* *The New Deal had failings like black Americans were segregated in the CCC. This was the same in the TVA. When Norris dam was built the town that was built to house the workers was segregated.* **Nutshell: Relevant events / developments but not addressing issue of achievements**	**4-6**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions e.g. *The New Deal improved things.* *The New Deal set up alphabet agencies.* *The New Deal failed to help everyone.* **Nutshell: General assertions**	**1–3**
Level 0	No response or nothing worthy of credit	**0**

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

High performance ***4–5 marks***	• 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 ***2–3 marks***	• 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 ***1 mark***	• 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 ***0 marks***	• 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

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