



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

**GCSE**

**History A Explaining the Modern World**

**J410/02: Germany 1925-1955: The People and the State**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

**Mark Scheme for June 2023**

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 2023

**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 **number of required** 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:

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

<i>Stamp</i>	<i>Ref No.</i>	<i>Annotation Name</i>	<i>Description</i>
	1191	Tick 1	Level 1
	1201	Tick 2	Level 2
	1211	Tick 3	Level 3
	1221	Tick 4	Level 4
	1231	Tick 5	Level 5
	811	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
	501	NAQ	Not answered question
	1371	H Wavy Line	Extendable horizontal wavy line
	1681	BP	Blank page
	151	Highlight	Highlight

## 1. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

### INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

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

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



### 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 who [srteam@ocr.org.uk](mailto:srteam@ocr.org.uk) can check what access arrangements were agreed.
- e. If the script has a **transcript, Oral Language Modifier, Sign Language Interpreter or a Practical Assistant cover sheet**, award SPaG as normal.

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

#### 1. Outline how the USA took action against the spread of communism around the world in the 1960s.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows a clear understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.</p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically <b>develop in detail two examples</b> of US action against the spread of communism around the world in the 1960s</p> <p><i>The USA took action in the 1960s by trying to remove the communist leader of Castro through the Bay of Pigs invasion (2). Although it failed, the US did not give up and tried many ways to assassinate Castro to overthrow his regime (3). They also got involved in war in Vietnam to keep the Northern communists and vietcong from overthrowing the capitalist leaders of South Vietnam (4). They trained the army in the south and sent hundreds of thousands of their own ground troops to fight against the communists (5).</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Develops TWO identification/example- rationale or actions</b> <b>NB 4 marks if L2 example only gained 2 marks.</b></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <p>Response demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows some understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.</p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically <b>develop in detail one example</b> of US action against the spread of communism around the world in the 1960s.</p> <p>e.g. <i>In the 1960s the USA began to take military action in <b>Vietnam</b> where they feared the communist North would take over the capitalist South (2). They did this using Operation Rolling Thunder, including dropping napalm and Agent Orange to reveal Vietcong bases.(3).</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Develops ONE identification/example- rationale or actions</b> NB: Do not credit generic issues at this level (such as 'containment') unless linked to specific US actions in the 1960s. NB: 2 identified examples about Cuba are possible: Bay of Pigs AND CMC</p>	<b>2–3</b>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <p>Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.</p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically <b>outline very simply one or more actions</b> or <b>arenas</b> of involvement in the 1960s e.g.</p> <p><i>Got involved in Vietnam. Launched the Bay of Pigs Put sanctions on Castro. They put a naval blockade on Cuba. They took action against the spread of communism around the world in the 1960s by standing up to the communists The USA followed the policy of containment They used napalm. USA put money into non-communist countries to encourage them to resist communism.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: SIMPLE identifications of arena or action.</b></p>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>DO NOT CREDIT</b> <i>Marshall Plan, Berlin Blockade and Airlift, Berlin Wall.</i></p>	<b>0</b>

## 2. Explain why there was tension in Europe in the 1930s.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically <b>identify two reasons for tension and explain</b> them e.g.</p> <p><i>Hitler came to power in the 1930s and took aggressive action to make Germany stronger. He left the League of Nations in 1934, reintroduced conscription in 1935, and in 1936 German troops marched into the Rhineland, which was forbidden under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. <b>This made France feel threatened as there were now German troops stationed on her border.</b> (8 marks)</i></p> <p><i>The League of Nations was weak in the 1930s and countries lost confidence in it. For example, in the Manchurian and Abyssinian invasions, the aggressive actions of dictators were not challenged. This encouraged Hitler to think that he could get away with more, <b>which led to tensions with Britain and France when Hitler demanded the Sudetenland.</b> (10 marks)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Explains how TWO issues cause tension.</b>  <b>NB: Lower mark for threshold answer.</b></p>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically <b>identify and explain why one reason caused tension</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>Hitler came to power in the 1930s and took aggressive action to make Germany stronger. He left the League of Nations in 1934, reintroduced conscription in 1935, and in 1936 German troops marched into the Rhineland, which was forbidden under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. <b>This made France feel threatened as there were now German troops stationed on her border</b> (8 marks).</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Explains how ONE issue causes tension</b>  <b>NB: Lower mark for threshold answer.</b></p>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically <b>identify and describe one or more causes of tension but will not explain how they caused tension</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>Hitler came to power in the 1930s and took aggressive action to make Germany stronger. He left the League of Nations in 1934, reintroduced conscription in 1935, and in 1936 German troops marched into the Rhineland, which was forbidden under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. (6 marks)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identify and describe causes of tension. 1 mark for each.</b></p>	<b>5–6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Level 2 answers will typically contain <b>description of events linked</b> to the tension in the 1930s e.g..	<b>3–4</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Hitler left the League of Nations in 1934, reintroduced conscription in 1935, and in 1936 German troops marched into the Rhineland.</i></p> <p><b><u>Alternative L2: Identifies reasons with no further development</u></b></p> <p><i>Hitler came to power and broke the Treaty of Versailles</i></p> <p><i>Appeasement encouraged Hitler.</i></p> <p><i>Failure of the League encouraged Hitler.</i></p> <p><i>Depression led to a breakdown in cooperation.</i></p> <p><i>Treaty of Versailles led to Hitler's election.</i></p> <p><i>Rhineland/ Sudetenland crisis</i></p> <p><i>Rearmament/ Anschluss</i></p> <p><i>Invasion of Poland</i></p> <p><i>Hoare Laval Pact/ Spanish civil war/ Stresa Front</i></p> <p><i>The fear of the spread of communism across Europe</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identified cause of tension. 1 mark for each.</b></p>	
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons e.g.</p> <p><i>Dictators threatened peace.</i></p> <p><i>Hitler came to power.</i></p> <p><i>Mussolini's actions.</i></p> <p><i>Treaty of Versailles.</i></p> <p><i>Failure of League</i></p> <p><i>Manchurian/Abyssinian invasion</i></p> <p><i>Great depression</i></p> <p><i>Appeasement</i></p> <p><i>Hitler came to power</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Generalised reasons</b></p>	<p><b>1-2</b></p>
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this 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.

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


Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full and thoroughly developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a convincing and substantiated judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 5</b> answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is <b>fair/unfair</b> supported by <b>developed use of two other</b> interpretations e.g.</p> <p><i>A is praising Chamberlain and saying he has done a good job with appeasement and saved the country from war. Some historians would say this is unfair, for example those who support the <b>popular political view</b>. They would have criticised it, so I don't think Interpretation A is fair. A book was written during the war by a group calling themselves <b>Cato</b>, and they argued that appeasement was a foolish policy and that Chamberlain was a coward for giving in to Hitler's demands instead of standing up to him. <b>Their view was that by appeasing Hitler at Munich Chamberlain actually encouraged him to make greater demands, and that Chamberlain should have been more aware of Hitler's ambitions, by reading Mein Kampf.</b> (20)</i></p> <p><i>I think Interpretation A could also be a fair comment, since <b>revisionist historians</b> also praised Chamberlain's actions. They argued that Britain was <b>neither economically nor militarily powerful enough</b> to stand against Hitler's Germany in 1938 <b>and appeasement was the right policy</b> in order to give Britain time to rearm fully to confront Germany at a later date. They would argue that Chamberlain's 'refusal to give in' at Munich bought Britain enough time to stand against Nazi Germany when war did come, which suggests that Interpretation A is fair. (25)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Developed use of 2 other interpretations to support / challenge Interpretation A.</b> NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced.</p>	<b>21–25</b>
<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a fully supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 4</b> answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is <b>fair/unfair</b> supported by <b>developed use of one other</b> interpretation e.g.</p> <p><i>A is praising Chamberlain and saying he has done a good job with appeasement and saved the country from war. Some historians would say this is unfair, for example those who support the <b>popular political view</b>. They would have criticised it, so I don't think Interpretation A is fair. A book was written during the war by a group calling themselves <b>Cato</b>, and they argued that <b>appeasement was a foolish policy and that Chamberlain was a coward for giving in to Hitler's demands instead of standing up to him.</b> (18)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Developed use of ONE interpretation to support / challenge Interpretation A.</b></p>	<b>16–20</b>

<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied and uses this to make a partially supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3</b> answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is <b>fair/unfair</b> and support this with <b>relevant factual knowledge</b>.</p> <p><i>The newspaper from the time is praising Chamberlain for avoiding war, and I think this is a fair comment based on what I know. After the terrible memories of the First World War and the impact of the Depression on Britain, the country neither wanted to fight nor had the capability to do it. People wanted to avoid the horrors of another war and this why when Chamberlain declared 'peace in our time' he was met on his return with cheering crowds and received thousands of letters praising what he had done. Because of this I'm not surprised at all by the newspaper's front page and think it's a fair comment (use of relevant factual knowledge).</i></p> <p><b>Alternative Level 3</b> answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is <b>fair/unfair</b> and <b>support this with undeveloped references to other interpretations</b> to judge fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>'A is praising Chamberlain. I don't think this is a fair comment because post revisionist historians would disagree and they criticised Chamberlain.'</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid argument based on contextual knowledge OR valid but undeveloped use of interpretation(s)</b></p>	<p><b>11–15</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and limited evaluation of other interpretations studied, and links this to a judgement of the given interpretation in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 2</b> answers will typically <b>correctly describe relevant interpretations without a valid argument</b> on the question of <b>fairness</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>The revisionist view would say this is fair. They argued that Britain was not ready for war and did not have a strong enough military. [does not tell us what A is saying which revisionists would disagree with]</i></p> <p><i>Historians writing straight after the war were critical of Chamberlain. Cato set this off by saying that appeasement was a foolish and cowardly policy. Ones writing in the 1960s thought he did the best job he could have done. (No source/no fairness argument).</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: No or misunderstood A/ Shows knowledge of interpretations but fails to address question of fairness validly.</b></p>	<p><b>6–10</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in terms of the question. Other interpretations may be mentioned but there is no analysis or evaluation of them.</li> <li>The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 1</b> answers will typically demonstrate <b>understanding of Interpretation A</b> and/ OR offer <b>undeveloped or unsupported assertions</b> about fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is praising appeasement.</i>  <i>'The Sketch' thinks Chamberlain was a great man.</i></p> <p><i>This Interpretation is fair because I agree that Chamberlain refused to give in.</i>  <i>This Interpretation is wrong. Chamberlain made a big mistake with appeasement..... (usually lots more contextual knowledge of events but not historians' views)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Shows understanding of A OR unsupported assertions about fairness.</b></p>	<p><b>1–5</b></p>



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.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO4 (a, b and c): Analyse individual interpretations and how and why interpretations differ. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a range of aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a thorough, detailed analysis of how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is a fully supported and convincing analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically provide developed explanations of <b>how</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>two</b> periods have disagreed with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B and explain <b>why</b> at least <u>one of them</u> disagrees, e.g.</p> <p><i>In Interpretation B, Gaddis is arguing that the United States and the Soviet Union were responsible for the beginnings of the Cold War because the things that drove them were so different they were bound to clash. The two sides misunderstood each other.</i></p> <p><b>Orthodox</b> historians would have disagreed with Gaddis. <b>Writing in the 1940s and 1950s, they argued that the USSR was responsible for the Cold War because of their aggressive attempts to expand Communism across Eastern Europe after the Second World War. Bailey argued that the USA wanted world revolution.</b></p> <p><i>These historians were influenced by fear of persecution during the 'Red Scare' of that time, and were anxious to avoid being victimised at the hands of men like McCarthy, so wrote their accounts in such a way as to follow the anti-Soviet position of the American government. This 'self-censorship' was typical of many American historians of the time. (HOW and WHY)</i></p> <p><i>Another group of historians that would have disagreed with Gaddis were those writing in the 1960s. Many of these – including American historians – believed that the USA should shoulder the sole responsibility for the Cold War because of their aggressive attempts to control Europe through economic domination, such as the Marshall Plan. They wrote at the time of the Vietnam war. (HOW)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two periods disagree, with explanation as to why at least one of these disagrees, eg HW H</b></p>	<p><b>17–20</b></p> 



<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts some aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce an analysis of how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is a supported analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will explain <b>how or why</b> historians from <b>two</b> different periods agree or disagree with particular aspect(s) of interpretation B.  <b>OR</b> will explain <b>how and why</b> historians from <b>the same</b> period agree or disagree.</p> <p><i>Gaddis argued that the USA and USSR bear <b>joint responsibility</b> for the Cold War because their attitudes were so different they were bound to clash. Historians writing at the start of the Cold War – especially ones from the United States itself – would have disagreed and argued that the USSR’s aggressive actions in Eastern Europe (rigging elections and other methods to ensure communist governments dominated) were the cause and that American actions were a response to that (<b>HOW</b>) On the other hand, many historians writing after the fall of the Soviet Union would agree with Gaddis. When the Cold War ended, western historians gained access to many Soviet sources for the first time, and found evidence among these sources that suggested either superpower could be held responsible for the conflict (Stalin acted provocatively and the USA overreacted), and so argued that both were to blame. (<b>WHY</b>)</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Gaddis says that ‘both’ Russia and America were responsible for starting the Cold War. One group of historians that would have disagreed with Gaddis were those writing in the 1960s. Many of these – including American historians – believed that the USA should shoulder the sole responsibility for the Cold War because of their aggressive attempts to control Europe through economic domination, such as the Marshall Plan. They based this understanding on looking at how the USA was acting in Vietnam in the 1950s and 60s, where the USA used a very aggressive approach to contain communism. (<b>HOW and WHY</b>)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: 2H different periods or 2W different periods or H+W same period or H+W different periods</b></p>	<p><b>13–16</b></p> 
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a partial analysis of how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is some analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3</b> answers will typically explain <b>how</b> historian(s) and commentator(s) <b>from one period</b> disagree with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B</p> <p>OR will explain valid reasons <b>why</b> historians from one period <b>disagrees</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>Gaddis says that ‘both’ Russia and America were responsible for starting the Cold War. <b>American historians writing in the early years of the Cold War</b> would have disagreed with him. These <b>orthodox</b> historians would have argued that the USSR was responsible for the Cold War <b>because of their aggressive attempts to expand Communism across Europe after the Second World War</b>, by rigging elections and other methods to ensure communist governments dominated. (HOW-11 marks)</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Historians writing in the USSR would not have accepted Gaddis’ view as he blames the USSR as well as USA. <b>This was because</b> there was <b>no freedom of speech in the USSR</b> during the Cold War and historians who <b>criticised the USSR’s actions would have been punished</b> by the government, so they were bound to blame the US for the Cold War. Many would also have been affected by <b>the general mood of anti-US</b> feeling in the USSR. (WHY- 12 marks)</i></p>	<p><b>9–12</b></p> 

<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of at least one other interpretation studied, to show how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is a basic explanation of why the given interpretation and the other interpretation(s) differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Nutshell: Explains How or Why one group disagrees.</b></p> <p><b>Level 2</b> answers will typically <b>identify historian(s)</b> who have disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why</p> <p><i>I don't think orthodox historians would have agreed with what Gaddis says in Interpretation B.</i></p> <p><i>Revisionists would not have agreed either.</i></p> <p><b>Alternative Level 2</b> will provide an overview of the <b>historiography</b> but <b>not examine interpretation B, or misunderstand it</b> e.g</p> <p><i>Blame for starting the Cold War has changed over time. At the start of it, the orthodox view was that the USSR was responsible. Later, revisionist historians blamed the USA and then even later on there were post-revisionists who blamed both countries.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identifies historians / schools of thought / periods but fails to address Interpretation B correctly</b></p> <p>NOTE: The term 'many historians' or similar expressions is usually not sufficient for L2 as its too unspecific- a time period, school of thought or a named historian needed UNLESS it is clear from what the candidate says that that they are describing a specific school of thought. However, if the candidate correctly describes a school of thought but mislabels/offers an incorrect time period then this level is possible if the description is strong enough, although a lower mark within the level would be more likely.</p>	<p><b>5-8</b></p> 
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response compares the candidate's own knowledge and understanding to the interpretation, or uses knowledge and understanding of the time in which it was created, to analyse the given interpretation.</li> <li>There is no consideration or no relevant consideration of any other interpretations.</li> <li>Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make <b>general assertions</b> about Interpretation B or <b>give their own critique</b> of it e.g.</p> <p><i>Gaddis is blaming both.....</i></p> <p><i>I disagree because I think the USSR was to blame for the Cold War.</i></p> <p><i>Other historians blamed one of the two countries for starting the Cold War, not both.</i></p> <p><i>I disagree because the USSR alone was to blame. In Berlin Stalin blocked off the land routes. That was a terrible thing to do. People could have starved.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: General assertions/own critique</b></p> <p>NOTE: Award at this level if candidates give their own critique of B (i.e. not the views of other historians). This may well be phrased as 'other historians' but is in fact the candidate's own view using contextual knowledge.</p>	<p><b>1-4</b></p> 
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p>0</p>

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

5. Describe **one** strength of the Weimar Republic in the period 1925-1928.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
N/A  Points marking	<p><i>Politics was stable (1). This was because the government had dealt with the threats from extremist parties (+1).</i></p> <p><i>The Weimar government was democratic (1) and used a system of proportional representation which made every vote count (+1).</i></p> <p><i>The economy recovered from hyperinflation (1) thanks to loans from the USA through the Dawes Plan (+1).</i></p> <p><i>By 1928 German industry had recovered to pre-war levels (1) and wage levels were rising (+1)</i></p> <p><i>Money from the Dawes Plan was used to build new infrastructure in the country (1)</i></p> <p><i>Stresemann's foreign policy helped to improve the image of Germany (1). As a result, Germany was accepted into the League of Nations in 1926 (+1).</i></p> <p><i>Germany signed the Locarno treaty (1) which brought security to their western borders (+1)</i></p> <p><i>Culture thrived in Weimar Germany (1) as the Weimar Government allowed free expression of ideas (+1). Cabaret shows sprang up all over Berlin in which artists would criticise political leaders (+1).</i></p> <p><i>And any other acceptable development of this period</i></p>	<b>2</b>

## 6. Explain the impact of de-Nazification on Germany in the period 1945-1950.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.  No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 5</b> answers will typically <b>identify two or more</b> impacts of de-nazification and <b>explain them fully</b>, e.g.</p> <p><i>De-nazification involved attempts to punish ex-Nazi party members. In both parts of Germany investigations took place, which involved putting ex-Nazis on trial. In the Western zones 3.5 million cases were investigated, and in the Soviet sector <b>300,000 Germans were convicted of low-level involvement</b> with the regime. Therefore, one result of denazification was the <b>removal of Nazi influences by dismissing and punishing those who were guilty of supporting the Nazi regime.</b></i></p> <p><i>Denazification also resulted in re-education in Germany. The Nazis' school curriculum and textbooks were scrapped and one third of German teachers were removed in the Soviet sector. Teachers were also investigated and dismissed in the Western zones. These measures aimed to <b>purge German education of Nazi influence</b>, and were quite successful.</i></p>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 4</b> answers will typically <b>identify one</b> impact of de-nazification and <b>explain it fully</b>, e.g.</p> <p><i>De-nazification involved attempts to punish ex-Nazi party members. In both parts of Germany investigations took place, which involved putting ex-Nazis on trial. In the Western zones 3.5 million cases were investigated, and in the Soviet sector 300,000 Germans were convicted of low-level involvement with the regime. Therefore, one result of denazification was the removal of Nazi influences by dismissing and punishing those who were guilty of supporting the Nazi regime.</i></p>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3</b> answers will typically <b>identify and describe</b> results or process of de-nazification <b>without explaining</b> the impact.</p> <p>e.g. <i><b>Nazi symbols</b> such as flags, banners and the swastika, <b>were removed</b> and it became illegal to display them. The <b>Nuremburg trials</b> were held where the allies put leading Nazis on trial for their war crimes.</i></p>	<b>5–6</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Denazification involved the <b>re-education</b> of Germans. German people were made to watch films showing concentration camp footage.</i></p> <p><i>In the western zone everyone over the age of 18 had to fill in <b>questionnaires</b> to reveal their past political activities and beliefs.</i></p> <p><i><b>Tribunals</b> were set up in both parts of Germany, which involved German people being put on trial. Some were executed.</i></p> <p><i>In 1945 <b>Review Boards</b> were set up to investigate people's relationships and involvement with the Nazi Party. They were run by Germans appointed by the Allies.</i></p> <p><i><b>School curriculums</b> and textbooks were scrapped and over a third of teachers in the East were sacked.</i></p> <p><i>East Germans <b>executed Party leaders</b> and officials after sending them to camps.</i></p> <p><i>500 ex-Nazis were executed in the Western zones.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 2</b> answers will typically contain <b>description of events</b> linked to denazification, e.g.</p> <p><i>Ex-Nazis were taken on tours of concentration camps. They wanted them to see the horrors they had created.</i></p> <p><b><u>Alternative L2: Identifies reasons with no further development</u></b></p> <p><i>Nazi symbols were removed.</i></p> <p><i>Nuremberg trials were held.</i></p> <p><i>Officials were imprisoned in camps.</i></p> <p><i>School curriculums were changed.</i></p> <p><i>Review Boards were set up.</i></p> <p><i>Questionnaires were completed by German people.</i></p> <p><i>Change in attitude (lack of change in attitude).</i></p> <p><i>East was treated differently from west.</i></p> <p><i>There was no impact because the job was too big.</i></p> <p><i>Germans were re-educated.</i></p>	3–4
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 1</b> answers will typically contain <b>general points</b> or assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>Nazis were punished.</i></p> <p><i>People were made to think about their actions.</i></p> <p><i>Leaders tried to make Germany change.</i></p> <p><i>There were arrests.</i></p> <p><i>There wasn't a big impact.</i></p> <p><i>It was huge.</i></p>	1–2
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		0

7a. Study Source A. Explain why this source was published in Germany at this time.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	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
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the specific question about the source.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3</b> answers will make a clear statement of <b>purpose</b> based on intended outcome and support this with reference to the content of the <b>source AND context to explain</b>, e.g.</p> <p><i>This poster was published to encourage Germans children to join the Hitler Youth. By including Hitler's image it aimed to show that Hitler thought this was the right thing to do (SCE). When it was published in 1939 there was the growth of some opposition groups to the HJ, and therefore the Nazis wanted to win back the loyalty of the youth (CK).</i></p> <p><i>Other relevant CK may include the introduction of compulsory membership, the coming of war, youth weariness of HJ.</i></p>	4–5
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct a supported argument in answer to the question about the source.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 2</b> answers will identify and explain <b>the message OR purpose</b> of the source, and for the highest mark in the level use relevant source <b>content OR context to explain</b>, e.g.</p> <p><i>This poster was published to encourage Germans children to join the Hitler Youth. (PURPOSE) It was published in 1939 when membership of the Hitler Youth became compulsory and so it was a piece of propaganda to reduce opposition.(CK)</i></p> <p><i>This poster was published to promote the Hitler Youth (MESSAGE). The HJ was very popular as it not only gave lessons in Nazi ideology, but it also did lots of camps, sports and outward bound activity which many young people enjoyed, so would be attracted by. (CK)</i></p> <p><b>NB: L2/2 marks for Message or Purpose. L2/3 Message or purpose + CK or SCE</b></p> <p><i>Ensure that the contextual knowledge and source is used to explain the message/purpose</i></p>	2–3
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 1</b> answers will typically provide <b>general comments</b>, or argue the source was meant <b>to provide information</b>, OR <b>assert the context</b> of the source without relevant reference to it.</p> <p><i>It was published to spread Nazi ideology/as propaganda</i></p> <p><i>This poster was published to show that the youth of Germany served the Führer.</i></p> <p><i>The source was published because it was nearly time for war.</i></p>	1
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		0

7b. Study Source B. Explain how this source is useful to a historian studying Nazi Germany.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	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
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source 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 source.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3</b> answers will typically argue that the source is <b>useful and support this with a valid inference</b> from the source developed with effective use of <b>content, provenance OR context</b> to support the inference, e.g.</p> <p><i>This source is useful for telling us that <b>Nazi speakers were given guidance about how to address issues</b>. These guidelines may have been given to speakers because the Nazi Party weren't happy with the lack of hostility towards Jewish people in Germany at this point, so it's useful for showing us how this was dealt with, by telling Germans Jews were 'undermining society'.</i></p> <p><i>The source is also useful for telling us how the <b>Nazis were trying to get the public ready for the announcement of the Nuremberg Laws</b>. The source was produced a month before the Nuremberg Laws were announced. These laws escalated persecution of Jewish people in Germany, for example, Jews were no longer considered German citizens. This source provides evidence of how the Nazis were trying to get people to accept these laws, through propaganda.</i></p>	4–5
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct a supported argument in answer to the question about the source.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 2</b> answers will typically argue the source is useful or not based on <b>unsupported inferences or reliability</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>It's useful for telling us <b>how</b> the Nazis tried to get the German people to follow their anti-Semitic goals.</i></p> <p><i>It shows us the importance of propaganda in trying to achieve Nazi goals.</i></p> <p><i>The source is useful because it tells us the <b>Nazis thought Jews weren't being persecuted</b> enough.</i></p> <p><i>It shows that <b>German people were not as anti-Semitic</b> as the Nazis wanted them to be;</i></p> <p><i>It shows that <b>Germans are ignoring anti Jewish propaganda</b> and need to be persuaded to boycott Jewish businesses;</i></p> <p><i>It shows us the Nazis view the <b>Jews as trying to undermine German society</b>.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>This source is not very useful <b>because it's not reliable</b>. It was produced by the Nazi Party's propaganda office so presumably they would have exaggerated the issues they identify in the source – the German people's tolerance of Jews in Germany. (2)</i></p> <p><i>NB: An answer that argues the source is <b>not useful</b> is limited to L2/2.</i></p>	2–3
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source in a very 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 1</b> answers will typically <b>assert</b> the usefulness of the content or focus on provenance simplistically, or give relevant contextual knowledge e.g.</p> <p><i>The source is useful because it is telling us about the guidance given to speakers, which was about which shops to use.</i></p> <p><i>The source is useful because it comes from the Nazi Party so it's shows what they wanted to happen in Germany at that point.</i></p> <p><i>It tells us the Nazi attitude to the Jews (if explain what this was then its an unsupported inference).</i></p>	1

	<i>It was produced just before the Nuremberg Laws</i>	
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>



8. ‘Opposition within Germany to the Nazi regime increased during the Second World War.’ How far do you agree?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [8]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- The ‘Indicative content’ shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</li> <li>- No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.</li> </ul>

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response has a full explanation and thorough analysis of historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is developed to reach a convincing, substantiated conclusion in response to the question.</li> <li>• This is supported by a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>• <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 5</b> answers will typically construct a <b>balanced argument</b> which uses a range of evidence to support the argument being made e.g.  <i>The statement is true. There are examples of organised resistance to the Nazi regime from the wartime period because some German people <b>became more disheartened with the German war effort</b>. High ranking Nazi officials in the army, who were led by Stauffenberg, tried to assassinate Hitler in July 1944. There had been 4 other attempts on Hitler’s life. <b>This shows increasing opposition as the war went badly.</b></i></p> <p><i>Resistance groups also sprang up from normal German people – Hans and Sophie Scholl’s White Rose Group spread anti-Nazi leaflets. The Nazis also faced wartime opposition from clergymen. Dietrich Bonhoeffer made contact with the Allies to try and negotiate during the war, and he also helped Jews to escape from Germany. <b>The fact the Nazis tried and executed the White Rose and Edelweiss Pirates leaders</b>, despite the risks of lowering morale during the war, <b>shows they were worried about levels of opposition increasing.</b></i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the extent of opposition to the Nazi regime during the Second World War should not be overestimated. Despite there being <b>examples of opposition, they were not widespread</b>, and many Germans remained loyal to the Nazi regime. <b>The White Rose Group were voluntarily reported to the Gestapo</b>, and complicity from the German people allowed the arrests of others who opposed the regime. Many members of the armed forces remained loyal to Hitler to the end, even when it was clear the Germans were going to lose the war. There was bitter hand to hand fighting on the streets of Berlin in the last days of the war, and little sign of hostility to the Nazi regime.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, some people argue that <b>Allied bombing raids, towards the end of the war, actually increased the Germans’ loyalty to the regime</b>. For example Dresden was flattened with carpet-bombing in February 1945 and up to 150,000 died, but the feeling on the ground seems to have been of grim stoicism, rather than anything less supportive.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst it’s fair to say that opposition increased due to the war effort, this was not widespread. On the whole, Germans remained loyal to the German state, which can be evidenced by the fact that the Gestapo continued to operate during the war. The Second World War just presented a new reason for opposition but it didn’t mean there was an overwhelming loss of faith in Nazi leadership. (18)</i></p> <p><b>NB:</b>  <b>18 marks = As below plus a clinching argument</b>  <b>16-17 marks = 4 explained points (3-1 or 2-2)</b>  <b>15 marks = 3 explained points (2-1)</b></p>	<p><b>15–18</b></p>

<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full explanation and analysis of the historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to develop a fully supported answer to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 4</b> answers will typically construct a <b>balanced or one-sided argument</b> with <b>support from at least two valid examples explained</b>, e.g.</p> <p><i>The statement is true. There are examples of organised resistance to the Nazi regime from the wartime period because some German people became more disheartened with the German war effort. High ranking Nazi officials in the army, who were led by Stauffenberg, tried to assassinate Hitler in July 1944. This was not an isolated incident – some of the men who supported this assassination attempt had been involved in previous attempts on Hitler’s life. Resistance groups also sprang up from normal German people – Hans and Sophie Scholl’s White Rose Group populated anti-Nazi leaflets. The Nazis also faced wartime opposition from clergymen. Dietrich Bonhoeffer made contact with the Allies to try and negotiate during the war, and he also helped Jews to escape from Germany. Therefore, there are examples of opposition from different groups and levels of society, which were spurred on by dissatisfaction during the Second World War.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>The statement is true. There are more examples of organised resistance to the Nazi regime from the wartime period because some German people became more disheartened with the German war effort. Opposition in the army grew as a result of losses in the war, and high ranking Nazi officials in the army tried to assassinate Hitler in July 1944. This was not an isolated incident – some of the men who supported this assassination attempt had been involved in previous attempts on Hitler’s life. Therefore, there are examples of opposition growing.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the extent of opposition to the Nazi regime during the Second World War should not be overestimated. Despite there being examples of opposition, they were not widespread, and many Germans remained loyal to the Nazi regime. The White Rose Group were voluntarily reported to the Gestapo, and complicity from the German people saw to the arrests of others who opposed the regime.</i></p> <p><b>NB: 14 marks- reserve for clinching argument. Standard mark is 12 marks unless one of points developed well.</b></p>	<p>11–14</p>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an analysis and explanation of the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to give a supported answer to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 3</b> answers will typically construct a <b>one-sided argument</b> with support from <b>one valid example explained</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>The statement is true. There are examples of organised resistance to the Nazi regime <b>from the wartime period</b> because some German people became more disheartened with the German war effort. There were five attempts on Hitler’s life between 1940 and 1943. Again in July 1944 high ranking members of the army led by von Stauffenberg tried to assassinate him and nearly succeeded. The army was a notable group of opposition because only they stood much chance of removing him, but they failed due to poor planning and organisation. However these many attempts prove that opposition was increasing. <b>10 marks</b></i></p> <p><b>NB: Sound answer is 8/9 marks.</b></p>	<p>7–10</p>

<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an explanation about the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and gives an answer to the question set.</li> <li>This is supported by some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 2</b> answers will typically <b>describe and/or identify examples of opposition or challenge the statement</b> but will <b>not explain</b> the points made e.g.</p> <p>+ <i>I agree. There were assassination attempts on Hitler's life. (Von Stauffenberg plot)</i></p> <p>+ <i>Galen led a campaign against euthanasia of the mentally handicapped in 1941 which forced the Nazis to change plans</i></p> <p>+ <i>Nazis arrested and hanged the leaders of the Edelweiss pirates in Cologne in 1944 following an increase in activity.</i></p> <p>+ <i>I disagree because of the existence of organisations like the White Rose Group.</i></p> <p>+ <i>Impact of bombing on morale as the war moved into its final stages.</i></p> <p>+ <i>Bishop Galen criticised the Nazis throughout the 30s but 40s but he was still not arrested</i></p> <p>- <i>I disagree; in this period people still reported acts of disloyalty to the Gestapo.</i></p> <p>- <i>Early days of war were positive and military success brought spoils</i></p> <p>- <i>Settlement of the occupied East and rest of Europe led to large scale benefits in terms of products sent to Germany</i></p> <p>- <i>Volkssturm was established in February 1945 and raised enthusiastic recruits even at this late stage in the war.</i></p> <p>- <i>Propaganda was used to persuade people to donate 1.5 million fur coats for the soldiers in the Eastern Front</i></p> <p>- <i>Lack of response to Stauffenberg from elsewhere in society</i></p> <p>- <i>Resistance shown by slow fighting in Berlin in March/April 1945</i></p> <p>+ <i>Difficulty of assessing levels of support and opposition given the nature of the Nazi state</i></p> <p><b>NB: One mark for each identification</b></p>	4–6
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a basic explanation about the historical events/period in the question, though the specific question may be answered only partially, or the answer may be in the form of assertion that is not supported by the preceding explanation. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Level 1</b> answers will typically make general, unspecific assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>Nazi support went up.</i></p> <p><i>There was some opposition. Groups published propaganda leaflets.</i></p>	1–3

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li><li>• <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></li></ul>		
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

## 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](https://ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder)

 [ocr.org.uk](https://ocr.org.uk)

 [Twitter/ocrexams](https://twitter.com/ocrexams)

 [/ocrexams](https://twitter.com/ocrexams)

 [/company/ocr](https://www.linkedin.com/company/ocr)

 [/ocrexams](https://www.youtube.com/ocrexams)



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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

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

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

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

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

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