GCSE

History A (Explaining the Modern World)

J410/05: South Africa 1960-1994: The people and the state

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2024

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.

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING
RM ASSESSOR

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.

2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal http://www.rm.com/support/ca

3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses ("scripts") and the **required number of** standardisation responses.

MARKING
1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.

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

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions
Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*
Contradictory Responses
When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.
Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)
Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*
Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)
If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)
Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

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

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.

7. Award No Response (NR) if:
- there is nothing written in the answer space

Award Zero '0' if:
- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.

9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer

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

Descriptor	**Award mark**
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. **Annotations**

Stamp	*Ref No.*	*Annotation Name*	*Description*
L1	311	Tick 1	Level 1
L2	321	Tick 2	Level 2
L3	331	Tick 3	Level 3
L4	341	Tick 4	Level 4
L5	441	Tick 5	Level 5
SEEN	811	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
NAQ	501	NAQ	Not answered question
	1371	H Wavy Line	Incorrect/muddled/unclear
BP	1681	BP	Blank page
	151	Highlight	Part of the response which is rewardable (at one of the levels on the MS)
	11	Tick	Tick

12. 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/PE.

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

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

2 The specific task–related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.

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

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'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

N.B. where NR is recorded for lack of response, SPaG for that question should also be NR, not 0.

Awarding Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar and the use of specialist terminology to scripts with a scribe coversheet

a. If a script has a **scribe cover sheet** it is vital to check which boxes are ticked and award as per the instructions and grid below:

i. Assess the work for SPaG in accordance with the normal marking criteria. The initial assessment must be made as if the candidate had not used a scribe (or word processor) and was eligible for all the SPaG marks.

ii. Check the cover sheet to see what has been dictated (or what facilities were disabled on the word processor) and therefore what proportion of marks is available to the candidate.

iii. Convert the SPaG mark to reflect the correct proportion using the conversion table given below.

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

b. If a script has a **word processor cover sheet** attached to it the candidate **can** still access SPaG marks (see point a. above) unless the cover sheet states that the checking functionality is enabled, in which case no SPaG marks are available.

c. If a script has a **word processor cover sheet AND a scribe cover sheet** attached to it, see point a. above.

d. If you come across a typewritten script **without** a cover sheet please check with the OCR Special Requirements Team at srteam@ocr.org.uk who can check what access arrangements were agreed.

e. If the script has a **transcript, Oral Language Modifier, Sign Language Interpreter or a Practical Assistant cover sheet,** award SPaG as normal.

International Relations: the changing international order 1918–1975

1. Outline the main disagreements between the leaders of the Allied powers at the Yalta and/or Potsdam conference(s).

Assessment Objectives	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
Additional Guidance	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples should also be credited.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows a clear understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.	Level 3 answers will typically **develop in detail one or more examples** of disagreements e.g. *The Allied leaders disagreed about what to do with Germany after the war. Although they agreed to divide Germany into 4 zones Stalin wanted to cripple Germany economically, but Truman wanted to be less harsh, not wanting to repeat the mistakes of Versailles.* *They also disagreed about Soviet plans for Eastern Europe. Stalin wanted pro-Soviet governments as a buffer, but Truman thought this showed the USSR was planning a Soviet empire and didn't want to accept this.* **Nutshell: Develops ONE OR MORE identifications/examples of disagreement** **Development is most likely to involve the reasons for their disagreement and/or the view of each side.** Award 4 marks if only one disagreement is included.	**4–5**
Level 2 Response demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows some understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.	Level 2 answers will **identify one or more specific disagreements** e.g *They disagreed about what to do with Poland's borders. (Yalta)* *They could not agree on reparations Germany should pay. (Potsdam)* *They could not agree on how much Germany should be crippled. (Potsdam)* *There was unease and difficulties over the nature of Stalin's sphere of influence. (Potsdam)* **Nutshell: Identifies one or more specific disagreements.** NB 2 marks for one example, 3 marks for 2+. NB Atomic bomb/invasion of Japan cannot be developed into L2 as they were not disagreements	**2–3**
Level 1 Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.	Level 1 answers will typically **outline facts about the conferences** without focus on the topics of disagreement or they will respond very generally e.g. • *They met before the war had finished.* • *They had different political views, capitalist and communist.* • *They disagreed about what to do about Germany/ Poland* • *The leaders were the USSR, the US and Britain.* • *They discussed how to end the war.* • *There was tension about the atomic bomb/invasion of Japan* **Nutshell: Knowledge about conferences** **NB: If the answer is about Versailles/Munich then no marks should be awarded.**	**1**

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

2. Explain why Germany was unhappy with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

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.	Level 5 answers will typically **identify two reasons for Germany's unhappiness and explain them** e.g. *One reason that Germany was unhappy was because of having to take the blame for the war which meant they would also have to pay for the damage caused by the war and pay high reparations. They were told they had to pay £6.6 billion in reparations, but they said they couldn't afford to pay that. Their economy was already in trouble because of all they had spent on the war, and they feared that the reparations would cripple them.* *Another reason was the amount of land that the Treaty took from Germany. The Treaty took 10% of its land including Alsace Lorraine. Land was given to France, Denmark and to the new country of Poland. This meant Germany would lose coal fields and agricultural land which would have a terrible effect on its economy.* **Nutshell: Explains TWO reasons.**	**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.	Level 4 answers will typically **identify one reason for Germany's unhappiness and explain it.** *One reason that Germany was unhappy was with the level of reparations they were forced to pay. They were told they had to pay £6.6 billion in reparations, but they said they couldn't afford to pay that. Their economy was already in trouble (7) because of all they had spent on the war. They feared that the reparations would cripple them. (8)* **Nutshell: Explains ONE reason** (they thought this was unfair because…….)	**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.	Level 3 answers will typically **identify and describe terms imposed on Germany**, but **will not explain** why Germany was unhappy about each e.g. *One reason that Germany was unhappy was with the level of reparations they were forced to pay. They were told they had to pay £6.6 billion in reparations, but they said they couldn't afford to pay that. (6)* *Germany was unhappy because of having to take the blame for the war. This was Article 231, the War Guilt clause which they thought was unfair.*	**5–6**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	Germany was unhappy that they were only allowed 100,000 men in their army and only 6 ships but no tanks or air force which seemed really harsh. *Germany was unhappy with all the land they lost at home and abroad. They lost Alsace Lorraine and land to Poland, and they lost South West Africa and Togoland.* *They were unhappy at losing important industrial areas like Upper Silesia, the Saar and Alsace Lorraine, which meant they lost coalfields and resources.* *They were unhappy that Germany was split into two by losing the Polish corridor (West Prussia). (5)* *They called the Treaty a diktat as they had no say and hated it for this reason.* **Nutshell: Identify and describe terms (in detail without explaining why Germany was unhappy).**	
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.	Level 2 answers will typically contain **description of events linked** to the Treaty of Versailles e.g. *The Treaty of Versailles was signed on June 1919. It was made by the Big Three leaders of the USA, Britain and France. They wanted to make sure that Germany could not start another war in the future.* **OR Alternative Level 2: Identifies reasons/terms of Treaty with no further development** e.g. *The Treaty made them accept War Guilt.* *The Treaty made them pay reparations.* *They called it a diktat.* *They lost Alsace Lorraine.* *Their army was reduced to 100,000.* **Nutshell: Identified cause of tension. 1 mark for each.**	**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.	Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons without being specific e.g *The Treaty took away land.* *It took resources.* *They had to pay.* *They lost their army.* *They said it was unfair. They were struggling.* **Nutshell: General reasons**	**1–2**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on the British policy of appeasement? Use other interpretations of the events of 1937–1939 and your knowledge to support your answer.

Assessment Objectives	AO4 (a and d): Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. [20] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
Additional Guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response. The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
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.	**Level 5** answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is **fair/unfair** supported by **developed use of two other** interpretations OR **developed use of one** other interpretation **and evaluation** of Interpretation A based on the context of A e.g *In this Interpretation Thomson is **criticising the policy of appeasement**. He says it was built on a '**completely mistaken belief**' that **Hitler's aims were limited**, and says Chamberlain believed Hitler had 'legitimate grievances'.* ***Historians from the 1980s and 90s** who put Chamberlain 'back on trial' would agree with this and see it as **fair.** They thought Chamberlain made a big mistake, **believing that he failed to understand Hitler and arrogantly assumed he could do a deal** with him and stop aggression. Thomson's view supports this when he says 'His basic mistake was to think that someone as fanatical as Hitler had only limited aims' so they would say the interpretation is fair. [18]* *However, **this is not really a fair comment**. **Revisionist** historians from the 1960s would not accept the idea **he made a mistake**. Revisionists argued that **Chamberlain did the best he could in the situation**. They'd say he couldn't oppose Hitler because he was **limited by Britain's poor financial situation and limited armed forces**, not because he thought Germany had had a 'raw deal'. Britain was worried that it would not be strong enough to fight Germany and possibly Italy and Japan if they joined in to help their ally, so Chamberlain was forced to appease and buy time to prepare the military. [23]* [Answers may refer to modern historians as counter-revisionists or post-revisionists, and those in the 1940s and 1950s as orthodox – this is not a requirement but should be credited. Also, answers may refer to historians by name; this is not a requirement but should be credited] **Nutshell: Developed use of 2 other interpretations to support/challenge Interpretation** A OR one other interpretation and an evaluation of A based on the context. NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced. NB: For L5 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair.	**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	**Level 4** answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is **fair/unfair** supported by **developed use of one other** interpretation or **evaluation of the context of Interpretation A e.g.** *This is a fair comment. Thomson is **criticising the policy of appeasement**. He says it was built on a '**completely mistaken belief**' that **Hitler's aims were limited**, and says Chamberlain believed Hitler had 'legitimate grievances'. **Thomson was writing in the 1950s**, by which time **opinions had softened on Chamberlain** compared to the massive criticism he received from Cato in the early 1940s. The interpretation is still criticising him, but the **prevailing mood was set by Churchill in his 1950s book The Gathering Storm which blamed the policy and not the man**. [18]* *People were no longer in the grip of a war they might lose (as Cato had been) and many felt that Chamberlain had made a mistake with appeasement like Thomson says, but that Chamberlain had good intentions. [20] (eval)* **OR**	**16–20**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
understanding that is fully relevant to the question.	*Thomson is writing in 1957 and says Chamberlain misjudges Hitler. I think this is unfair because revisionist historians like Taylor would disagree with this as they said Chamberlain had few options and Hitler was unpredictable. Revisionists explained that Chamberlain was under pressure from the Treasury and Imperial office who believed Britain couldn't afford war yet and didn't have imperial support for it. This meant that appeasement was a necessity not a 'misjudgement' and guided by British needs and not German grievances.* **Nutshell: Developed use of ONE interpretation or evaluation of context of A to support / challenge Interpretation A.** NB: For L4 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair**.**	
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.	Level 3 answers will typically be based on a **valid argument about fairness** and support this with relevant **factual knowledge** *The comment is fair because it's true that Chamberlain and his government thought they could stop Hitler if they gave into some of his demands. That's what Thomson says, that Chamberlain thought Hitler had legitimate' demands and would 'settle down' once he achieved them. Chamberlain chose not to help the Czechs defend the Sudetenland, and instead, agreed Hitler could have the territory. But, they were giving Hitler important industrial and military land so Chamberlain actually made it so Germany was strong enough to ask for more. If Chamberlain had stood up to him earlier, war might have been avoided* *OR* **OR Level 3** answers will be based on **a valid argument about fairness** and **support this with undeveloped references to other interpretations** to judge fairness **or a slightly developed reference which doesn't explain how it shows fairness or unfairness e.g.** *Thomson is writing in 1957 and he is critical of Chamberlain and appeasement. This is fair because orthodox historians like Churchill would agree with this as they were also critical of appeasement and said Chamberlain had made a mistake. (13)* *Thomson is writing in 1957 and says Chamberlain misjudges Hitler. I think this is unfair because revisionist historians like Taylor would disagree with this as they said Chamberlain had few options and Hitler was unpredictable. (13)* *Thomson says appeasement is a bad idea. This is fair because orthodox historians would agree. (11)* **Nutshell: Valid argument based on relevant factual knowledge OR valid but undeveloped use of interpretation(s)** NB: For L3 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair.	**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.	Level 2 answers will typically **correctly describe relevant interpretations without a valid argument** on the question of **fairness** e.g. ***Fails to tell us what A believes*** *The revisionist view would say this is unfair. They argued that Britain was not ready for war and did not have a strong enough military.* ***OR No fairness*** *Thomson's view is from the 1950s and he criticises appeasement. One interpretation about appeasement is from 'The Guilty Men' which says that Chamberlain was cowardly. The revisionists said that he couldn't be blamed for not understanding what Hitler wanted.* **Nutshell: No or misunderstood A - but shows knowledge of interpretations but may fail to address question of fairness validly.**	**6–10**
Level 1 • The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in	Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate understanding of Interpretation A and/OR offer undeveloped/unsupported assertions about fairness e.g. *Thompson thinks that appeasement was a bad idea.* *He thinks Chamberlain was mistaken about Hitler.*	**1–5**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
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.	*The Interpretation is right. He says Chamberlain was mistaken. 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.**	
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

4. **Study Interpretation B. Explain why not all historians and commentators have agreed 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; other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with 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 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. • Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 5 answers will typically provide developed explanations of **how** historian(s) or commentator(s) from **two** periods have disagreed with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B and explain **why** at least **one** historian/commentator disagrees, e.g. *It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. Nekrasov is saying that the* ***USA was responsible for the Cold War*** because of an **aggressive American policy** ***of using NATO*** *to threaten the USSR.* *In the* ***1940s and up to the early 1960s most US historians would not agree*** *as they blamed the Soviet Union, not the USA. They criticised Stalin for keeping troops in Eastern European countries after liberating them and trying to spread communist ideas across the world.* ***[How]*** *However, most of these commentators were heavily influenced by anti-Soviet propaganda and worries about the Red Scare which were very strong in the 1950s. They would be unlikely to consider any explanations for the Cold War unless it blamed Russia****. [Why]*** *(13)* *Some (****post/counter revisionist) historians*** *writing in the 1990s and after would disagree because they believe that both the USSR and USA were equally to blame, because they couldn't understand each other's actions. They would say that the USA thought the USSR was stronger than it was and so overreacted, which made the USSR overreact in return****. [How]****(19)These historians were writing at a time when the Cold War was thawing in the 1970s and there was an attempt for the two sides to try to understand each other more. The approach of these historians reflected this. (****Why) [20 marks]*** **Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two periods disagree, and explanation as to why views from one period disagrees:** H+H+W **NOTE For L5 they need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported**	**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. • Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 4 answers will explain **how or why** historians from **two** different periods agree or disagree with particular aspect(s) of interpretation B. **OR** will explain **how and why** historians from **the same** period agree or disagree, e.g. *It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. Nekrasov is saying that the USA were responsible for the Cold War because of an aggressive American policy of using NATO to threaten the USSR. In the* ***1940s and up to the early 1960s most US historians*** *blamed the Soviet Union, not the USA. They criticised Stalin for keeping Soviet troops in Eastern European countries after liberating them and trying to spread communist ideas across the world. These historians were very critical of the Soviets and saw the US as liberators.* ***(How)*** *Some historians writing* ***since the end of the Cold War*** *would also disagree. Since the Soviet archives were opened and lots more sources became available, a number of historians used this new evidence to blame Stalin in particular for causing the Cold War. Communism had been defeated and commentators in the USA described it as a victory over the 'evil empire' they had been fighting. Some historians in the early 1990s seem to have been influenced by this attitude. They used the evidence in the Soviet archives to justify blaming Russia again.* ***(Why) [15 marks]*** **Nutshell: 2H different periods or 2W different periods or H+W same period or H+W different periods** **NOTE for L4 cands need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported**.	**13–16**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
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 of how the interpretations differ. • There is some analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. • Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	**Level 3** answers will typically explain **how** historian(s) and commentator(s) **from one period** agree or disagree with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B OR will explain valid reasons **why** historian(s) from **one period** agree or **disagree** e.g. *It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. Nekrasov is saying that the USA was to blame because it was preparing for war against the USSR. But during the **1940s and 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 which is why they helped communist leaders in Eastern Europe, Korea and North Vietnam. [How] 10 marks* *OR* *Some historians would disagree with Nekrasov as he is **blaming the US** for causing the Cold War. When the **Soviet archives were opened after 1990** more sources became available. This gave historians **new evidence to blame Stalin** for causing the Cold War, as his **personality was so paranoid and suspicious** he created many of the problems. [11 marks]* **Nutshell: Explains how or why historian(s) from one period agrees or disagrees (H or W).** **NOTE For L3 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported**	**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. • 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.	Level 2 answers will typically **identify historian(s)** who have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why they agree/disagree **OR** will provide a chronological overview of the historiography but not examine interpretation B, or misunderstand it, e.g. *Not all historians would agree with Interpretation B about **America being to blame**. US historians of the late 1940s would have disagreed. [6 marks]* *Actually, not all historians would have disagreed. Many **historians in the USA in the 1960s would have agreed** as they also blamed the USA. [6 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. [6 marks]* **Nutshell: Identifies historians / schools of thought / periods but fails to address Interpretation B correctly** NOTE: The term 'many historians' or similar expressions is usually not sufficient for L2 as its too unspecific- time period, school of thought or a named historian needed UNLESS it is clear from what the candidate says that that they are describing a specific school of thought. If the candidate correctly describes a school of thought but mislabels/offers an incorrect time period then this level is possible if the description is strong enough, although a lower mark within the level would be more likely.	**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. • Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.	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 and said it was their fault.* *I think the USA was at fault because they dropped the Atom bomb to scare the Russians.* **Nutshell: General assertions/own critique**	**1-4**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
• 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.	NOTE: Award at this level if candidates give their own critique of B (i.e. not the views of other historians). This may well be phrased as 'other historians' but is in fact the candidate's own view using contextual knowledge.	
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

Section B
South Africa 1960–1994: The People and the State

5. Describe **one** example of the part played by women in the anti- Apartheid movement in South Africa.

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 correct examples should be credited. 2 egs or one eg explained= 2 marks.

Levels	**Indicative content**	**Marks**
N/A Points marking	Women protested against the Pass Laws (1) One example is the Black Sash movement (1) This was a group of white women who demonstrated over the Pass Laws (2) and ran advice centres that offered legal help to people who found themselves in trouble because of the Pass Laws (2). One example is when in 1955 the government announced that women would have to carry pass books as well as men (1). Albertina Sisulu led demonstrations which ended up with passes being burnt (2). *Other examples could be the actions of prominent women like Winnie Mandela or Fatima Meer, Black Community programmes of the BCM, Black Women's Federation, Black Parents' Association.*	**2**

6 Explain why resistance groups were unable to defeat Apartheid in South Africa in the 1970s.

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.	Level 5 answers will typically **identify two reasons why resistance groups were unable to defeat Apartheid and explain** them fully, e.g. *One reason was because it was hard to organise effective resistance. This was because the leaders of the ANC were in jail or in exile in neighbouring African countries, or were under banning orders, so it was hard for them to organise effective resistance. It was hard for the groups to communicate with each other. It was hard for them to cross the border from their training camps into South Africa and they were easily captured.* *Another reason was that the South African government was able to restrict the activities of resistance groups with the new laws they introduced. In 1976 they passed a law that meant they could detain suspects without trial for 12 months and detain witnesses for 6 months in solitary confinement. This allowed them to remove anyone they thought was a threat and so made it really difficult for people to oppose the government.* **Nutshell: Explains TWO reasons.**	**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.	Level 4 answers will typically **identify one reason why resistance groups were unable to defeat Apartheid and explain it fully** e.g. *One reason was because, in the 1970s, most of the resistance was organised from outside of South Africa. The leaders of the ANC were in jail or in exile in neighbouring African countries, or were under banning orders, so it was hard for them to organise effective resistance. Any attempt to have coordinated action failed because it was hard for the groups to communicate with each other. It was hard for them to cross the border from their training camps into South Africa and they were easily captured. Morale amongst the ANC activists was low because conditions in the ANC training camps were unpleasant with inadequate food and resources, and so many volunteers left to go back to South Africa.* **Nutshell: Explains ONE reason** **NB: Candidates may identify more than one reason, but only explain one fully.**	**7–8**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
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.	Level 3 answers will typically **identify and describe actions of resistance groups (or the state) but will not explain why resistance groups were unable to defeat Apartheid** e.g. *The SA Government introduced new laws such as one that meant they were able to detain suspects without trial for 12 months and to detain witnesses for 6 months in solitary confinement.* *The SA state expanded police numbers and introduced conscription of young men into the army.* *Nationalists won their greatest ever victory in 1977, and they were more likely to introduce tougher restrictions* *Minister of information, Mulder, organised an orchestrated attempt to have a positive news spin in the foreign press on South African government activities.* *The development of Bantustans divided black communities so there was a less concerted opposition.* *Throughout the 1970s most resistance groups were based outside South Africa. Communication was difficult. Many leaders were in prison.* **Nutshell: Identify and describe actions of resistance groups or state** **NB Typically, one mark for each identification and description.**	**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.	Level 2 answers will typically contain **description of events** that are linked the question *The ANC headquarters moved to Tanzania and Zambia.* *Nelson Mandela was in prison.* *Steve Biko's Black Consciousness Movement was emphasising Black identity.* **OR** Alternative Level 2: Identifies reasons with no further development e.g. *Government action was very severe against resistance groups.* *The leaders were mostly in prison.* *Violent resistance increased white support for Apartheid.* **Nutshell: Description of linked events or identified reasons.**	**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	Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons without being specific e.g. *Apartheid had been around a very long time* *Black South Africans found it hard to resist* *The world did not care* **Nutshell: General reasons**	**1–2**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.		
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

7. Study Sources A and B. Why are these sources so different about attempts to reform Apartheid in the 1980s? Explain your answer.

Assessment Objectives	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [10]
Additional Guidance	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.	Level 3 answers will typically use the contrasting purposes (see note below) of the two sources to explain why they disagree. *In Source A Botha is speaking to his own party and wants their support for the reforms. He is trying to preserve Apartheid by making some concessions to the Black population such as housing. He also speaks about equality but it is clear that he does not intend to give the vote to Blacks, because that would be the end of Apartheid. Tambo just wants rid of Apartheid. [7]* *Sources A and B are quite different both because each has a different purpose.* *Botha is speaking to his own party and wants their support for the reforms. He is trying to preserve Apartheid by making some concessions to the Black population such as housing. He also speaks about equality but it is clear that he does not intend to give the vote to Blacks, because that would be the end of Apartheid. In contrast, Tambo wants to destroy apartheid and change South Africa's government by giving Black South Africans a role in running the country. He says that he will not accept the reforms Botha is offering, even though they would improve the lives of some Black people. He says the reforms like sex and marriage laws will not bring equality. [10]* **NOTE 1:** Exemplars above focus on 'domestic' aspects of purpose. Candidates may also explain the international dimension eg that Botha is trying to present SA positively internationally (perhaps to ease sanctions) and Tambo is hoping to maintain or increase international pressure on SA. **NOTE 2:** For A, purpose is more than preserving apartheid, it is preserving apartheid and maintaining white rule or refusing power to the Black majority. For B, destroying apartheid is not sufficient as purpose for L3. Cands must point to Tambo's principal purpose of destroying apartheid and giving power to Black South Africans. **7-8 marks for explaining purpose but comparison is vague or implicit (7 for one source, 8 for both)** **9-10 marks for explaining attitudes with clear comparison (9 for one source, 10 for both)**	**7–10**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
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.	Level 2 answers will typically identify and explain the contrasting attitude(s) or message(s) of one or both sources, without comparing or leaving comparison implicit *In A Botha thinks that he can improve the situation in South Africa with social reforms like housing [3]. However he is not prepared to give Back South Africans the vote [4].* *In Source A Botha is trying to convince his party that SA needs a range of reforms which will improve the lives and rights of all South Africans. This will include housing reform but not giving the vote. [4]* *In B Tambo hates apartheid and wants to get rid of it. [3] He also sees Botha's policies as a bribe to buy off Black South Africans. [4]* *In B Tambo is urging Black South Africans to reject Botha's reforms [3] because they won't give Black South Africans the rights they want. [5]* *Source A and B clearly disagree strongly. In A Botha is trying to save apartheid with social reforms like housing. Tambo responds bitterly to this. He clearly hates apartheid and wants to get rid of it. He also sees Botha's policies as a bribe to buy off Black South Africans and stop them being able to vote, saying that Botha just wants to preserve apartheid. [6]* **NOTE 1:** Mark at this level for limited identification of purpose eg A wants to save apartheid / B wants to get rid of apartheid. This needs to be developed further for L3 (see notes in L3) **3-4 marks for explaining attitude / message but comparison is vague or implicit (3 for one source, 4 for both)** **5-6 marks for explaining attitude / message with clear comparison (5 for one source, 6 for both)**	**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 sources.	Level 1 answers will typically compare the provenance **OR** simple summaries **OR** pick out contrasting extracts to show how they differ *One is by Oliver Tambo and the other is by P.W. Botha 1* *Or* *Tambo does not think the reforms will do any good 1* *Or* *One talks about reforms to housing the other talks about reforms to the sex and marriage laws 2*	**1–2**
Level 0		**0**

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

8.* 'The most significant consequence of the Sharpeville Massacre was the formation of Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK).' How far do you agree? (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	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.*	**Level 5** answers will typically construct a **balanced argument** which uses a range of evidence to support the argument being made e.g. *The formation of* Umkhonto we Sizwe *(MK) was a very significant consequence of the Sharpeville Massacre. The massacre happened when a peaceful anti-pass law march in the Transvaal was met by armed police who fired on the protesters killing 69 people and wounding another 180.* The massacre had a significant impact on the ANC's strategy. Its leaders realised peaceful protest alone wouldn't end apartheid so they formed an armed wing which became the MK. MK's formation marked a significant shift from nonviolent resistance to armed struggle against apartheid. They carried out acts of sabotage against government installations and infrastructure, such as power stations and government buildings in an attempt to disrupt the state and create a climate of unrest. MK also engaged in armed combat against the South African security forces. They received military training in other countries such as Algeria and Mozambique then came back to South Africa secretly to conduct guerrilla warfare operations, ambushes, and attacks on military and police installations. Although MK fighters were not as well-equipped or organized as the state's security forces, they inflicted damage and casualties. This makes the formation of the MK as an extremely significant consequence of the Sharpeville massacre. However, it was not the only consequence of the massacre. The police violence was widely reported around the world. It led to more people calling for an end to Apartheid, putting pressure on countries around the world to impose economic sanctions and arms embargos. It resulted in South Africa's isolation and eventual expulsion from international organizations like the Commonwealth. It also prompted the United Nations to impose sanctions against South Africa. Some foreign investment was removed from South Africa leading to economic problems for the country. Another consequence was the actions of the South African government. Instead of accepting that their police had reacted badly to the protests, they refused to compromise and blamed the violence on the black protesters being 'bold'. They declared a state of emergency which gave the police increased	**15–18**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	powers to arrest and detain activists and political leaders, with 2000 being arrested by May of that year, so the massacre actually led to more oppression of black South Africans. Overall, it can be argued that the Sharpeville massacre had a wide-ranging impact inside and outside of South Africa, and that the consequences are actually connected. The Government's state of emergency banned the ANC so they went underground and became more militant. Their more militant activities and the government's violent reaction to them kept the issue of apartheid in the international news and this put more pressure on foreign leaders to condemn apartheid and take action against them, all of which in the long term led to the ultimate dismantling of Apartheid. **NB: A clinching argument = one extra mark** **16-17 marks = 4 explained points (3-1 or 2-2)** **15-16 marks = 3 explained points (2-1)**	
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.*	Level 4 answers will typically construct a **balanced or one-sided** argument with **support from at least two valid explained examples e.g.** *I don't agree. I think the main* consequence was the actions of the South African government. Instead of accepting that their police had reacted badly to the protests, they refused to compromise and blamed the violence on the black protesters being 'bold'. They declared a state of emergency which gave the police increased powers to arrest and detain activists and political leaders, with 2000 being arrested by May of that year, so the massacre actually led to more oppression of black South Africans. This led to another important consequence. The police violence was widely reported around the world. It led to more people calling for an end to Apartheid, putting pressure on countries around the world to impose economic sanctions and arms embargos. It resulted in South Africa's isolation and eventual expulsion from international organizations like the Commonwealth. It also prompted the United Nations to impose sanctions against South Africa. Some foreign investment was removed from South Africa leading to economic problems for the country. **Alternatively**, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly explained with one point e.g. *The formation of* Umkhonto we Sizwe *(MK) was a very significant consequence of the Sharpeville Massacre. The massacre happened when a peaceful anti-pass law march in the Transvaal was met by armed police who fired on the protesters killing 69 people and wounding another 180.* The massacre had a significant impact on the ANC's strategy. Its leaders realised peaceful protest alone wouldn't end apartheid so they formed an armed wing which became the MK. MK's formation marked a significant shift from nonviolent resistance to armed struggle against apartheid. They carried out acts of sabotage against government installations and infrastructure, such as power stations and government buildings in an attempt to disrupt the state and create a climate of unrest.	**11–14**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	However, another consequence was the actions of the South African government. Instead of accepting that their police had reacted badly to the protests, they refused to compromise and blamed the violence on the black protesters being 'bold'. They declared a state of emergency which gave the police increased powers to arrest and detain activists and political leaders, with 2000 being arrested by May of that year, so the massacre actually led to more oppression of black South Africans. **NB: 14 marks- reserve for clinching argument. Standard mark is 12 marks unless one of points developed well.**	
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.*	Level 3 answers will typically construct an **argument** with support from **one explained example** e.g. *The formation of* Umkhonto we Sizwe *(MK) was a very significant consequence of the Sharpeville Massacre. The massacre happened when a peaceful anti-pass law march in the Transvaal was met by armed police who fired on the protesters killing 69 people and wounding another 180.* The massacre had a significant impact on the ANC's strategy. Its leaders realised peaceful protest alone wouldn't end apartheid so they formed an armed wing which became the MK. MK's formation marked a significant shift from nonviolent resistance to armed struggle against apartheid. They carried out acts of sabotage against government installations and infrastructure, such as power stations and government buildings in an attempt to disrupt the state and create a climate of unrest. **NB: Sound answer is 8/9 marks.**	**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.*	Level 2 answers will typically **identify and describe events** related to the Sharpeville massacre/ MK **OR** identify other consequences but will not explain them or develop them into an argument e.g *The Sharpeville Massacre in 1960 happened when a peaceful anti-pass law march in the Transvaal was met by armed police who fired on the protesters. 69 people were killed and another 180 were wounded. The government also used this as an excuse to declare a state of emergency and ban the ANC and PAC.* *OR* *There was a lot of opposition after the massacre. The South African government was thrown out of the Commonwealth.* *(Other possible examples would be to identify/ describe, pressure from new UN countries, radicalisation of young black South Africans,)* **NB: 1 mark for each identification, unless well developed**	**4–6**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
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.*	Level 1 answers will typically make **general** assertions or demonstrate **simple knowledge** of opposition e.g. *The Sharpeville Massacre was very bad because a lot of people were killed and wounded.* *Or* The MK was the armed wing of the ANC. It bombed places to upset the south African government.	**1–3**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

Need to get in touch?

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

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder

ocr.org.uk

Twitter/ocrexams

/ocrexams

/company/ocr

/ocrexams

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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