

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

Unit **A017/01**: Aspects of international relations and The USA, Land of freedom? 1945–1975

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2015

Assessment Objectives (AOs)

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to:

AO1	Recall, select, use and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history.
AO2	Demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• key concepts: causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context• key features and characteristics of the periods studied and the relationships between them.
AO3	Understand, analyse and evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a range of source material as part of an historical enquiry• how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways as part of an historical enquiry.

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Year, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1		7	
1 (a)	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This cartoonist is worried about whether the League will be able to stand up to powerful aggressive countries. This is shown by the God of War threatening the members of the League. The members of the League look scared while the peace plans on the table seem to be ignored. Mussolini is smiling at all this. This is because the cartoon was published just after Mussolini's occupation of Corfu. He was trying to get compensation for Italians who had been killed by Greeks. The Council of the League was too scared to condemn Italy and made Greece apologise and pay compensation. This was a disaster for the League as is shown in the cartoon. The cartoonist believes the League has given into force and has therefore failed in its duty. It is a criticism of the League and of its leading members.</i></p> <p><i>Contextual knowledge must relate to Corfu, 1923</i></p> <p><i>Focus of main message must be the League of Nations.</i></p>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1		8	
1 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why the League of Nations had some successes in the 1920s.</p> <p>Level 3 (6–8 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the League had some successes in the 1920s. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the League had some successes in the 1920s. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why the League had some successes in the 1920s.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One of the reasons why the League had some successes in the 1920s was that many of the disputes it had to deal with involved less powerful countries who were ready to accept the authority of the League. They were not powerful enough to stand up to the League. This can be seen in the dispute between Sweden and Finland over the Aaland Islands. They both claimed them and asked the League to judge who they belonged to. When the League said they belonged to Finland, Sweden accepted the judgement and so the League had a success.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason the League was successful was that a lot of its work was to do with humanitarian work that did not involve disputes between countries. For example, the League was very effective in getting refugees back to their homeland after the First World War. The League was successful in stamping out cholera and dysentery in the refugee camps in Turkey. It also did useful work reducing malaria and against slavery. These were issues that simply benefited people and did not involve rivalries between countries who were happy to let the League get on with the work.</i></p>



Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939


Q	Answer	Mark s	Guidance
2		4	
2 (a)	<p>Q: Describe how Austria was punished in the Treaty of St Germain.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a new, much smaller, Republic of Austria created</i> • <i>land from the former Empire transferred to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Italy and Romania</i> • <i>Union between Austria and Germany not allowed</i> • <i>Austria to pay reparations</i> • <i>Austria's army limited to 30,000</i>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)	<p>Q: Explain the role played by Lloyd George in the peace negotiations at Versailles.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain the part played by Lloyd George at Versailles. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the part played by Lloyd George at Versailles and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about Lloyd George's role at Versailles.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Lloyd George was expected to ally with the French in the peace negotiations but in fact he supported a moderate peace settlement and tried to persuade Clemenceau not to be too harsh on Germany. One reason for this was that he was looking after Britain's interests and this meant Britain's future economy. This depended on economic revival in Europe which depended on the German economy recovering. Germany had been Britain's most important customer before 1914. If Clemenceau got his way and Germany lost the Rhineland where much of its industry was, then it would not have enough money to buy British goods. This is why Lloyd George acted as a moderating influence on Clemenceau.</i></p> <p><i>However, Lloyd George also had to worry about public opinion in Britain where many people wanted Germany to be punished. This led him to be a balance between Wilson and Clemenceau. Wilson wanted a fair peace that would last. He wanted to base it on his Fourteen Points which did not include reparations. Clemenceau, however, wanted high reparations to punish Germany for war damage and to weaken Germany in the future so it could not threaten France again. Lloyd George was in the middle. He knew people in Britain wanted to punish Germany 'until the pips squeak' but he did not want to create resentment in Germany that would leave it with grievances in the future. He managed to persuade Clemenceau to accept a lower figure for reparations but it was more than he really wanted.</i></p>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (c) 		16	<p> This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 38 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: 'At the time, most people thought the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the different reactions to the peace treaty in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the different reactions to the peace treaty in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p>	10	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>I agree that some people thought the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh but there were others who thought the opposite. The Germans thought it was too harsh. They were very angry about the war guilt clause and the reparations because they did not think they had caused the war, so why should they be punished for this. They also did not believe they had been defeated. The war had ended in an armistice not a surrender. This made it difficult to accept the fact that they were not involved in the discussions and that the whole peace settlement was a diktat. They had thought that the peace settlement would be based on the Fourteen points but they now found that self-determination was not being followed because many Germans would now be living under foreign rule. This led to trouble in Germany with several rebellions and putsches and with the people who agreed with the treaty being called the 'November Criminals'.</i></p> <p><i>However, the reaction in other countries was different. In Britain Lloyd George got a very good welcome when he returned. Massive crowds turned out to cheer him. Many people, especially those that had lost loved ones in the war, thought that Germany deserved to be punished harshly. However, by now Lloyd George was worried that the peace treaty was too harsh and would cause resentment in the future. Keynes thought the peace was a disaster because it did not allow Germany to recover economically. He argued this would cause problems in the future. Many people in France thought Germany had been dealt with too leniently. Many thought that France's eastern border should have been the Rhine. In 1920 Clemenceau gave up</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
<p>2 (c) </p>	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of reactions that claimed the peace treaty were too harsh, or reactions that claimed it was not harsh enough, in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify reactions to the peace treaty that claimed it was too harsh and that it was not harsh enough, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of reactions to the peace treaty.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>trying to be president and resigned as Prime Minister because he was unpopular. Wilson was disappointed because it was too harsh. Many people in America agreed with him Congress refused to approve the Treaty.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think that most people did not think that it was too harsh. While leaders like Lloyd George and Wilson believed that the harshness of the treaty would lead to problems later, the vast majority of people in France and Britain strongly felt that Germany deserved to be punished harshly as it has caused the war and also much devastation in France. Indeed, many of them would have punished Germany even more harshly.</i></p>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3		4	
3 (a)	<p>Q: Describe how Germany's position in Europe became stronger in 1935.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the Saar votes to rejoin Germany, a great propaganda success for Hitler (2)</i> • <i>Hitler announces the Luftwaffe</i> • <i>Hitler introduces conscription</i> • <i>the Anglo-German Naval Treaty allows Germany to build-up its navy(2)</i> • <i>Ineffectiveness of League in relation to Abyssinia</i> • <i>Rearmament rally in Germany</i>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3		6	
(b)	<p>Q: Explain why Britain followed a policy of appeasement in the 1930s.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why Britain followed a policy of appeasement. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Britain followed a policy of appeasement and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why Britain followed a policy of appeasement.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason why Britain followed a policy of appeasement was that it believed Germany had been treated badly in the Treaty of Versailles. When Hitler started to demand that Germany should be able to defend itself with a good size army and navy, this looked like a reasonable request. Also when Hitler started to argue that Germans had the right to live under German rule, this also sounded reasonable. Why should Germans in parts of Czechoslovakia be forced to live under foreign rule as the Treaty of Versailles had dictated.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was Britain was afraid of communism, and in particular the Soviet Union. In fact, British politicians feared communism much more than Nazism. This was because communism seemed to be the opposite to the way people lived in Britain. Britain needed a strong anti-communist country in the middle of Europe to defend the rest of Europe from communism. Hitler's Germany with its anti-communist ideas was the answer. If Germany became even stronger through Hitler's demands, this would create an even stronger obstacle for communist Russia. This was why Britain was willing to give in to many of his demands.</i></p>

Part 1: Section A -The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) ✍		16	✍ This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 38 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: Which was more important in bringing about the Second World War, the failure of Britain and France to act over the remilitarisation of the Rhineland or the Munich Agreement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the Munich Agreement in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the Munich Agreement in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and</p>	10	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>I think the remilitarisation of the Rhineland was key. It had been made a demilitarised zone by the Treaty of Versailles. This was to give the French security from a German attack. However, for Hitler it was a reminder of the way Germany had been humiliated at Versailles. Hitler's constant and clear aim was to destroy all the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. He sent troops into the Rhineland in 1936. The army he sent in was much smaller than the French army and it had no air support. If the French or the British had acted, the German army would not have stood a chance. However, they did nothing. Many people in Britain thought it was reasonable for the Germans to have troops in the Rhineland to defend themselves. The League of Nations did nothing because of the Abyssinian crisis. All this told Hitler that the western powers would not stand up to him and that he could get away with more if he adopted an aggressive foreign policy.</i></p> <p><i>The Munich Agreement, where Chamberlain agreed that Germany could have the Sudetenland, was meant to guarantee 'peace for our time'. In fact, it did the opposite. The promises Hitler made that he would not touch the rest of Czechoslovakia were worthless. Munich taught him that Britain and France were not strong enough to fight him and they did not have the will do so. You can argue that Munich made the fall of the rest of Czechoslovakia inevitable. His invasion of Czechoslovakia was the first act Hitler had followed that could not be justified by self-determination. It showed that he was actually after the domination of Europe. This made war inevitable because Britain and France would have to stand up to this aim eventually. On the other hand, this is all brought about by the failure to stop Hitler in the</i></p>

<p>3 (c) </p>	<p>punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland or the Munich Agreement in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify consequences of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the Munich Agreement, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and/or the Munich Agreement.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>Rhineland. This was his first use of force and the western powers were strong enough to stop him. When they failed to stand up to him he became confident enough to carry out the rest of his foreign policy including taking over Czechoslovakia and the events that led to war. So I think the Rhineland was more important because it led to the rest of Hitler's aggressive policies that led to war.</i></p>
--	--	--	---

Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4		7	
4 (a)	<p>Q: What is the cartoonist's message. Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist is criticising the IRA. He is saying that they are brutal murderers who have no compassion. The cartoon was published in 1971 and this was when the IRA campaign of violence was reaching a climax. The Northern Ireland government introduced internment and this made the IRA resort to more extreme tactics. By 1971 it was all out war. The IRA launched a major bombing campaign. They targeted the army and Protestant shops, businesses and pubs where British soldiers went. This is why the IRA man is warning babies not to use pubs used by British troops. This is making a mockery of IRA warnings not to go to these pubs. The cartoonist is suggesting that the IRA don't really care how many innocent people they kill. All the gravestones represent the people they have killed and the gun he is holding also refers to this. The cartoonist is saying the IRA don't care who they kill in their campaign against the British.</i></p> <p><i>Examples of sub-messages:</i> IRA committed terrorist acts IRA carrying out bombings</p> <p><i>Contextual Knowledge:</i> General awareness of pub bombings, short warnings provided by IRA terrorists, influx of British soldiers into Ireland. Must be based on events in Ireland. The mainland terror campaign did not begin until 1974 although the first attack was in 1972 (non-civilian). Anything to do with events in Ireland gets credited as CK.</p>

Part 1: Section B – A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4		8	
(b)	<p>Q: Explain why terrorism has often failed in achieving its aims. You must refer to at least one terrorist organisation that you have studied.</p> <p>Level 3 (6–8 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why terrorism has often failed. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why terrorism has often failed. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why terrorism has often failed.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Terrorism often does not work. The PLO discovered that the use of violence can often be counterproductive. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the PLO, using its base in Jordan, used terrorist methods such as hijacking planes. This did not help the organisation keep the support of King Hussein of Jordan. In 1970 the terrorists forced three planes to land at Dawson's Field in Jordan. They demanded that terrorist prisoners be released. When the Israelis refused they blew the planes up. This angered King Hussein who was trying to negotiate for a settlement of the refugee question. This ruined his efforts and he used his army to drive the PLO out of Jordan. By 1973 Yasser Arafat realised that terrorism was not working and he denounced the terrorists and began concentrating on peaceful methods.</i></p> <p><i>The IRA in Ireland found something similar. The violence used by the IRA through the 1970s, 80s and 90s certainly brought the issue of the treatment of Catholics in Northern Ireland to everyone's attention. However, it also brought decades of bombings, murders, British troops in Northern Ireland and internment. The Omagh bombing of 1998 lost them a lot of support especially when the people of Northern Ireland voted for the Good Friday Agreement. People like Gerry Adams realised that terrorism could not achieve any more and he began to support peaceful negotiations. Through these talks the Catholics have achieved a share in running Northern Ireland, something that terrorism by itself could never achieve.</i></p> <p>NB Compromise is a valid id.</p>



4 (b)			The same factor for two different groups can constitute a multi-causal response.
----------	--	--	--


Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the building of the Berlin Wall and its impact on Berliners.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>barbed wire barricades put up without warning overnight in 1961, a more substantial wall built later</i> • <i>it divided the city in half</i> • <i>built by East Germany under instructions from the Soviet Union</i> • <i>it stopped East Berliners emigrating to the West for a better life</i> • <i>it divided families</i> • <i>many were unable to go to work</i> • <i>East Berliners who tried to cross were shot</i> <p><i>Allow bullet points.</i></p>

Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5		6	
5 (b)	<p>Q: Why did the Polish government find it difficult to deal with Solidarity? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The government found it hard to deal with Solidarity for several reasons. First, it was very well organised. It had a committee, spokespeople and a newspaper which was printed on the shipyard printing press. They also had a charismatic leader, Lech Walesa. They were also organised enough to have a clear set of demands. All of this made them very different from earlier movements in Hungary and Czechoslovakia that were not nearly so well organised. This level of organisation meant it could win and use support all over the country which made it hard for the government to silence and defeat.</i></p> <p><i>It also won support in vast numbers far more than earlier protestors in eastern-bloc countries. This made it difficult to deal with. The reason for its support was that its demands were national ones that people from all over the country could support. The movement also won support because it was very careful not to use violence and in the early years never set itself up as an alternative to the Communist Party. So people could join it but still be loyal to the Party. Walesa was also enormously popular. He was a devout catholic which helped and he was regarded as an ordinary worker who could be trusted.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c) 		16	<p> This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 38 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: 'The Hungarian Uprising in 1956 and the Prague Spring in 1968 were very similar.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the</p>	10	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>I think there are many ways in which they are similar. They were both caused by resentment towards Soviet rule, and the communist regimes in the two countries. In both the people wanted more political freedom and a better standard of living. Both wanted an end to censorship and more freedom of speech. The Soviet Union was very worried about both events because it saw them as threats to its control over Eastern Europe. In both events the hated Communist leader was replaced. In Hungary Nagy was appointed to carry on reforms and in Czechoslovakia Dubcek was appointed to do the same. Both countries had a short period when the new government introduced the reforms that people wanted. Both risings ended in failure because of the Soviet Union. In both cases the Soviet army moved in to crush the risings. In Hungary Nagy was executed and in Czechoslovakia Dubcek was dismissed.</i></p> <p><i>However, there were also differences. In Hungary the rising was led by the people. Students started demonstrating and were joined by workers and soldiers. But in Czechoslovakia it was the leadership of Dubcek that started it, with the people following. Another difference was that Dubcek insisted he was loyal to the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union while Nagy was opposed to them. He said Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact and he appealed to the UN for help. In Hungary the rebels fought the Soviet soldiers but this did not happen in the Prague Spring.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think the similarities are fundamental while the differences are details. Both events were against Soviet rule and for more freedom and in both the Soviet army put them down. This makes them fundamentally the same because differences such as having different</i></p>



<p>5 (c) </p>	<p>Prague Spring in order to explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the Hungarian Uprising and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>types of leadership, did not change the fundamental similarities which were more important.</i></p> <p><i>NB Examiners use L2 annotation for an id.</i></p>
--	--	--	---

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6		4	
6 (a)	<p>Q: Describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>he was a dictator, President and in charge of the army, he tried to copy Stalin's methods</i> • <i>use of censorship, indoctrination in schools</i> • <i>he used purges and terror against opponents or anyone he saw as a rival or threat</i> • <i>he tried to unite the country and ran a ruthless campaign against the Kurds using mustard gas and caynide. Many were killed, displaced or fled</i> • <i>he dealt with Shiite revolts brutally</i> • <i>attacked the Marsh Arabs and their marshes</i> • <i>used a personality cult</i> • <i>modernised the economy e.g. electrification, social improvements such as more schools and hospitals</i> <p><i>Allow bullet points.</i></p>

Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6		6	
6 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why there was opposition around the world to the invasion of Iraq in 2003.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was that many people did not believe that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. This was one of the major reasons that Bush and Blair used to justify the invasion. They claimed that these weapons posed an immediate threat to the West. UN weapons inspectors went into Iraq to find them but could not find any. They were ignored by the US and Britain who claimed they were there. None were found during or after the war. This showed that the war had been fought on a lie and this upset a lot of people given the numbers of lives that were lost. They suspected that the real reason for the invasion was to get American control of Iraq's oil.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that many people did not accept Bush's claim that the Iraqi government had been working with Al Qaeda which was responsible for the attacks on New York on 9/11. The US Secretary of State told the UN Security Council that Iraq was protecting a terrorist cell. The Americans claimed that because of this terrorist connection Iraq had to be disarmed. Most people simply did not believe that Saddam was harbouring terrorists. They did not accept that there was any connection between Iraq and 9/11 and so there was no justification for the invasion. They did not accept that the invasion was part of the war on terrorism. In fact some argued that invading Iraq would make matters worse and would increase radical Islamists around the world.</i></p>

Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 		16	<p> This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 38 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: Do you agree that the international consequences of the Iraq War were more important than the consequences inside Iraq? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p>	10	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The results of the war inside Iraq were disastrous for many Iraqis. Although the terrible regime of Saddam Hussein had ended, the war caused chaos and instability. After the war there was an insurgency using guerrilla tactics against the Americans which caused more violence. The war itself had led to about 2 million people being displaced within Iraq and about 2 million fled to other countries. The instability caused by the invasion and the fighting led to massive unemployment and about one third of the population lived in poverty. For many people their normal lives disappeared with schools, hospitals, drinking water and electricity all becoming rare. There was also a breakdown in law and order with no police force for a long time. Rivalries between Sunni and Shiite led to much fighting and the Kurds were more or less ruling their own region. It was clear that the invading forces had given no thought about what they would do after the invasion was completed and they had also made a dreadful mistake of disbanding all the Iraqi forces of law and order. Even the elections of 2005 did not help much because by 2006 Iraq was in a civil war.</i></p> <p><i>The international consequences of the war were that the US and Britain were viewed as occupiers of Muslim land by many Arab states and became very unpopular. In particular it led to hatred among 'home grown' Islamists in Britain and America who have committed terrorist acts. It also led to more terrorist acts around the world. The destruction of Iraq as a major power in the area has also increased Iran's power in the area leading to a dangerous imbalance of power in the region. This is particularly worrying to Israel because of Iran's</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War in order to explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the consequences of the Iraq War</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>threats against it.</i></p> <p><i>I think that the international consequences were more important because they affected the whole world and have had on people in the USA, in Britain and right across the Middle East. They have also made the West be more cautious about intervening in the Middle East. However, they are connected with the consequences in Iraq. These were dreadful for the Iraqi people but also meant Iraq became a breeding ground for terrorism which affected the whole world. So the two cannot be separated.</i></p> <p><i>NB Examiners use L2 annotation for an id.</i></p> <p><i>Credit both positive and negative consequences.</i></p>

Part 2: The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7		7	
7 (a)	<p>Q: Study Source A. 'In the period 1947 to 1954 McCarthyism was successful in America mainly because of events outside America. How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (6-7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that McCarthyism was successful mainly because of events outside America.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that McCarthyism was successful mainly because of events outside America.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that McCarthyism was successful mainly because of events outside America.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The source supports this view. It says that Americans were obsessed by the Soviet Union and communism. The author thinks this is very strange as America was the most powerful country in the world and had nothing to fear. However, he had been accused of having communist sympathies so this might be why he is saying America had nothing to fear from Russia. On the other hand Hoover wrongly accused many people of being communists. There is other evidence that the international situation was making Americans fearful. In 1949 Communists took over in China and the Russians exploded their first atomic bomb. The situation looked even worse in 1950 when North Korea invaded South Korea. All these events made some Americans think that they were under threat from communism that was taking over the world, which explains the success of McCarthyism.</i></p> <p><i>McCarthy himself had a lot to do with the popularity of McCarthyism. He ran a campaign claiming that there were communists in the government and in many other walks of life in America. Thousands of people were made to defend themselves before the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was all made more believable when the Rosenbergs were convicted of selling secrets to the USSR. However, it is difficult to see how McCarthy could have had this impact without the political situation in the world generally. McCarthy's accusations were not backed up by any evidence and I don't think anyone would have taken much notice of him if they were not afraid of communist advances in other parts of the world. However, it needed someone to use these fears and whip them up into a witch-hunt and this is what McCarthy did as well.</i></p>

Part 2: The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Study Source B. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (5 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit. answer.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist is obviously a supporter of McCarthy. The cartoon was published in the early 1950's which is when McCarthy produced his list of 205 state department officials who he claimed were communists. The Republicans backed him up as a way of attacking the Democrats and the frenzy started. The cartoonist is suggesting that communists are swearing loyalty to America when really they do not mean it. The man is drawn in a threatening way. He is barely human - just like communists. He is clearly not taking the oath seriously, He is mocking it. On his back is the symbol of the USSR and this shows his true loyalty. So the message is that there are communists in America who are taking the oath when they really are loyal to the USSR. The cartoonist thinks they need hunting down.</i></p> <p><i>Cartoonists view is supporting McCarthy's anti-Communist witch-hunt.</i></p> <p><i>Cartoon message Communists are infiltrating America.</i></p> <p><i>Sub-message: Don't trust Communists Communists are inhuman or a threat</i></p>

Part 2: The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)	<p>Q: Study Source C. Why was this cartoon published in 1954? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (6-7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of McCarthyism and the reaction to it. They interpret the purpose of the cartoon to produce a response explaining its intended impact.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of McCarthyism and the reaction to it. They interpret the message of the cartoon and produce a response explaining why it was published.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge of McCarthyism and reactions to it, but they do not relate it to the message or purpose of the cartoon or they explain the message or purpose without setting it in context.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates use surface details of the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This cartoon was published in 1954 when the tide had turned against McCarthy. He made the mistake of attacking the US army and claiming that it contained communists. The Senate hearings about this were televised and everybody saw his bullying methods and the fact that he had no evidence to support his claims. Public opinion began to turn against him. The cartoonist is obviously making fun of McCarthy and his claims. His supporters are shown as ridiculous people who even suspect girl scouts of witchcraft and other practices. The cartoonist has used girl scouts because they were innocent and couldn't possibly be involved in anything wrong. He is trying to turn people against McCarthy and get them to see how silly all of his accusations were. Not one of the people McCarthy accused was ever proved to be a communist agent.</i></p> <p><i>Purpose is the intended impact ie to turn public opinion against McCarthy.</i></p> <p><i>Message is to ridicule McCarthy.</i></p>

Part 2: The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	<p>Q: Describe the methods and ideas of the Black Panthers.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>they used violence</i> • <i>they had armed citizens' patrols to monitor police behaviour</i> • <i>they worked through community action</i> • <i>set up free food programs and free health clinics</i> • <i>they stood up for the oppressed from any minority</i> • <i>they wanted equality in education, employment, housing and civil rights</i> • <i>Huey Newton accused of shooting a policeman</i> <p><i>Allow bullet points.</i></p>

Part 2: The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why Malcolm X was important for African Americans.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Malcolm X was important. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Malcolm X was important. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Malcolm X.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason why Malcom X was important for African Americans was that he led the Nation of Islam and argued that achieving equality for African Americans was impossible because white people were basically racist. He argued for a separate state inside the US which would be ruled by Black people. Eventually he wanted them to go back to their roots. He wanted Black Americans to be proud of being black and of their African heritage. This message was very different from King's and was attractive to young black Americans and he became a symbol for black power and black self-respect. He had a lot of influence on the black power movement that emerged with people like Stokely Carmichael.</i></p> <p><i>He was also important because he put much more emphasis than King on social and economic issues. He won a lot of support in the urban ghettos where King was not so popular. He recognised that problems over slum housing, unemployment and poor housing were just as important for Black Americans as the kind of civil rights that King was supporting.</i></p>

Part 2: The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)		10	
	<p>Q: 'By 1975, African Americans had made much progress in fighting inequality.' How far do you agree with this statement. Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the struggle by African Americans to explain how much progress had been made by 1975. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the struggle by African Americans to explain how much progress had been made by 1975. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the struggle by African Americans to explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	10	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In some ways a lot had been achieved by African Americans. The situation for them in the 1950s was dreadful. There was segregation in many southern states in things like schools, buses and cafes. Martin Luther King led the campaign for civil rights. In 1963 he showed how far the civil rights movement had come compared to the 1950s when 250,000 people joined the march in Washington. This march had a great effect and in 1964 the Civil Rights Act was passed outlawing discrimination in employment, schools and hotels. This was followed by other reforms about voting rights and inter-racial marriages.</i></p> <p><i>However, there was still a lot to achieve. Many black Americans in the north lived in poverty and in city ghettos. They had poor housing, schools and health care. Black babies were twice as likely to die as white babies. The running of the cities, and the police, where they lived was in the hands of white Americans. Achieving voting rights did not necessarily help with all these issues. These problems led in the late 1960s to rioting in Watts, the black district of Los Angeles, where 35 people were killed. There were more riots in Newark and Detroit.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the struggle by African Americans and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the struggle by African Americans.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>Overall, by 1975, civil rights had been won and black Americans had the vote but there was still much to be done. There were few black Americans voted into office around the country and the riots in Newark and Detroit showed that there was still a lot of white racism mixed with discrimination and poverty. It is significant that when he was assassinated in 1968 King was organising a Poor People's March. This suggests that he knew that getting the vote was only the beginning. African Americans were still not equal in economic terms.</i></p>

Part 2: The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the discrimination in the USA towards Hispanic Americans in the 1960s and 1970s.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>few graduated from High School</i> • <i>many did not have health coverage</i> • <i>many lived in poverty</i> • <i>they earned less than white Americans</i> • <i>stereotyping such as 'bandido' and 'macho', lazy and shiftless</i> • <i>Lack of citizenship</i> <p><i>Accept bullet points.</i></p>

Part 2: The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why was the 1965 Immigration Act important? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the 1965 Immigration Act was important. They produce a multi-causal response that explains why it was important and demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the 1965 Immigration Act was important. They produce a response that explains one reason why it was important.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the 1965 Immigration Act.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>This Act was enormously important. It basically changed the whole basis on which immigration into America worked. Before 1965 immigration law was very racist. Northern Europeans were seen as a superior race for immigration purposes and the quota system discriminated against other groups. The Act produced a level playing field for immigration and was regarded at the time as a great civil rights achievement. Colour and national origin were no longer factors in the selection process.</i></p> <p><i>The Act also greatly increased the size of immigration into America and this had the effect over a number of years of transforming American society into the mix of races and religions that exists today. For the first time large numbers came from Asia, Africa and the Middle East. It also started the large immigration from Latin America. Once in America, immigrants petitioned for their relatives to join them and numbers went up again.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Q: 'In the period 1960 to 1975 women made more progress than Native Americans in achieving civil rights.' Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to explain whether they think women made more progress than Native Americans. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion OR to produce a complex explanation of the statement.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain whether they think women achieved more progress than Native Americans. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion OR to produce a developed explanation of the statement.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In 1960 women were still very much second class citizens. They were paid less than men and their place was regarded as being in the home. Those that did go out to work went into 'women's' occupations such as shop work. However, changes were starting. One important factor was the use of the pill which meant women could plan their families so that they could have a career. The 1964 Civil Rights Act banned discrimination on the ground of sex as well as race. Women's groups set out to make sure that the Act was actually put into effect and to stop practices such as banning Airline stewardesses from marrying. New laws let girls follow the same curriculum at school as boys. There were other achievements such as the legalisation of abortion in 1973.</i></p> <p><i>Native Americans did begin to make progress in this period. They had suffered from discrimination in schools or from badly funded schools but the National Indian Education Association started to fight for, and improve, their education. In 1968 the Indian Civil Rights Act was passed. This gave Native Americans civil rights such as equal protection under the law and free speech. Their right to vote was upheld in 1965. However, they were still not treated equally and in 1973 some Native American occupied and seized the town of Wounded Knee. They accused the US Government of not fulfilling treaties with the Indian people. The incident created a lot of public sympathy for the injustices the Indians were still suffering.</i></p> <p><i>I think that both groups made some important progress but still had a long way to go. Since 1968 the African American Indian Movement has been fighting for more rights. Native Americans still suffered much discrimination and poverty and claimed that many of their tribal lands such as the Black Hills should be returned to them. Some states that had large Indian reservations like Arizona still tried to take Indian voting</i></p>


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the civil rights of women and Native Americans to explain one side of the argument OR to explain the statement. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the civil rights of women and Native Americans and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the civil rights of women and Native Americans.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p>		<p><i>rights away. On the whole women did win more rights but, as happened with Native Americans, despite all the reforms and new rights some things did not change. The gap between what men and women earned barely changed and there were still few women elected to Congress or in top jobs. They had hit a 'glass ceiling'.</i></p>


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid

<i>High performance 5-6 marks</i>
Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.
<i>Intermediate performance 3-4 marks</i>
Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a good range of specialist terms with facility.
<i>Threshold performance 1-2 marks</i>
Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, they use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Assessment Objectives (AO) Grid

(includes Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar )

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	SPaG	Total
1/4 (a)	1	2	4		7
1/4 (b)	4	4	0		8
2/3/5/6 (a)	4	0	0		4
2/3/5/6 (b)	3	3	0		6
2/3/5/6 (c) 	4	6	0	6	16
7 (a)	1	2	3		6
7 (b)	1	2	4		7
7 (c)	1	2	4		7
8/9 (a)	4	0	0		4
8/9 (b)	3	3	0		6
8/9 (c)	4	6	0		10
Totals	30	30	15	6	81

* Questions marked with a pencil () carry 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2015

