



**GCSE**

**History B (Modern World)**

Unit **A972/22**: British Depth Study, 1939-1975

General Certificate of Secondary Education

**Mark Scheme for June 2014**

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 2014

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	<b>Blank Page</b> – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
	Unclear
	Development
	Evaluation
	Significant section of answer
	Significant amount of material that does not answer the question
	Level 1
	Level 2
	Level 3
	Level 4
	Level 5
	Significant section of answer
	Point has been noted, but no credit has been given

## Subject-specific Marking Instructions

**GENERAL POINTS**

1. This marking scheme has been designed to assess candidates' understanding of the key concepts of the course, and their ability to use source material to illustrate their understanding. These concepts, and the ability to interpret and evaluate source material, are central to GCSE History, and it is, therefore, upon these that the marking scheme focuses. The candidates' factual knowledge is important, but it is only rewarded if it is used to back up the demonstration of understanding of these concepts.
2. Targets, which are directly related to the Assessment Objectives for the course, are given for all questions. The marking scheme is constructed to assess the level of understanding or skill needed to approach these targets.
3. This type of marking scheme, in rewarding the level of understanding/skill reached by the candidate, demands that if a candidate reaches a particular level, s/he **MUST** be rewarded within the mark band for that level, whether or not s/he included lower level responses within that answer. A response which corresponds with a level description but which is a weak example of the level **MUST NOT** be placed in a lower level than the one to which the answer corresponds. Reward candidates for what they understand, know, and can do.
4. Marks are not cumulative. Please do not try to count up marks for 'points' made.
5. Exhaustive suggestions for factual support are not given. There will usually be a choice of factual support which a candidate may choose to deploy and so examiners should use their knowledge and discretion as to whether this is valid. Examiners who are in any doubt should contact their Team Leader immediately.

**MARKING**

1. Half marks should not be used.
2. Do not transfer marks from one part of a question to another.
3. Examples of responses which are given within levels are intended to act as examples only. They are not prescriptive or fully developed at the higher levels, and there may be other answers which correspond to each level. The important aspect of each level is the level descriptor. Do not try to match the words of the example with the words of the candidate. Instead, compare the type of answer which a candidate makes with the level descriptor.
4. If you come across an answer which is valid but does not appear to fit any of the level descriptions, you should try and find the level which demonstrates an equivalent level of understanding. If in any doubt, contact your Team Leader.

5. Where they are merited do not worry about awarding top marks in levels or for complete questions. You should also, where appropriate, not hesitate to award bottom marks or even no marks at all. Avoidance of awarding top marks in particular will lead to a bunching or an unnatural depression of marks.
6. The mark scheme allows for the assessment of written communication in those parts of a question where written communication is applicable. Written communication will be question 6. Candidates' answers should first be placed in the appropriate level in the mark scheme. Where there is a range of marks in the level, the quality of the candidates' written communication should be one of a number of factors used in determining which mark to award a response. In general, an answer displaying good quality written communication skills should score more marks than an answer displaying poor communication skills.
8. The standardisation meeting will include discussion of the range of acceptable responses. Where you are uncertain of how the mark scheme should be applied to a particular response a telephone call to your team leader should resolve the situation.
9. **Awarding Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar 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:
- 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.
  - 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.
  - 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 (eg grammar only)	Mark if candidate eligible for two thirds (eg grammar and punctuation only)
0	0	0
1	0	1
2	1	1
3	1	2
4	1	3
5	2	3

6	2	4
7	2	5
8	3	5
9	3	6

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

1	<b>Study Source A.</b> <b>What is the cartoonist's message? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b>		
	<b>Level 0</b> No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	0	
	<b>Level 1</b> <b>Describes surface detail</b>	1	<i>Example: The cartoonist is saying that people are going round in armour.</i>
	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Misinterprets message of cartoon</b> <b>OR</b> <b>Interprets part(s) of cartoon</b>	2	<i>Example: The cartoonist is warning about how serious teenage violence is.</i>  <i>Example: In the cartoon, we can see the people have put on armour to defend themselves. This is because at this time, there were many serious incidents of violence involving teenagers at seaside resorts.</i>
	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Identifies or explains secondary or partial message of cartoon</b>  At this level answer shows awareness that cartoon is drawn to make a point but the point identified is not the main point of the cartoonist	3-4	<i>Example: The cartoonist is saying that people feel really afraid of teenage violence.</i>  <i>Example: The cartoonist is saying that people feel really afraid of teenage violence, which is why they are drawn wearing armour to protect themselves.</i>  <i>Example: The cartoonist is saying that people feel really afraid of teenage violence. This is because at this time, there were many serious incidents of violence involving teenagers at seaside resorts.</i>
	<b>Level 4</b> <b>Identifies main message of cartoonist – cartoonist is mocking the overreaction to teenage violence</b>	5	<i>Example: The cartoonist is saying that people are completely overreacting to teenage violence.</i>
	<b>Level 5</b> <b>Explains main message of cartoonist – cartoonist is mocking the overreaction to teenage violence</b>	6-7	<i>Example: The cartoonist is mocking the press for overreacting to teenage violence by publishing a joke information poster telling people to wear armour.(6 marks)</i>

2	<b>Study Source B</b> <b>What can you learn from this source? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b>		
	<b>Level 0</b> No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	<b>0</b>	
	<b>Level 1</b> <b>General assertion or describes surface detail</b>  <b>OR</b> <b>Irrelevant evaluation</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> It shows young people on bikes and scooters.</i>  <i><b>Example:</b> We don't learn anything because we do not know who the photographer was.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> It's wrong, Mods and Rockers were not friends.</i>
	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Valid inference from source</b>	<b>3-4</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> We learn that there were rival youth groups at this time. The ones shown here are Mods and Rockers.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> The Mods and Rockers didn't hate each other.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> We learn that young people are affluent at this time. We can see that they can afford motorbikes and scooters.</i>
	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Valid inference from source developed with relevant context</b>	<b>5</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> We learn about how teenagers used their leisure time. Some joined youth groups like the Mods and Rockers. The Mods rode scooters and dressed more smartly than the Rockers.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> This photograph shows that not all teenagers were involved in the kind of violence that happened at Clacton in 1964. The rivalry was friendly.</i>
	<b>Level 4</b> <b>Valid comment on positive impression of Mods / Rockers / young people given by source</b>	<b>6</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> From the source we get quite a good view of Mods and Rockers. We usually think of them as violent because of events like the fights in Clacton in 1964. Here the rivalry looks friendly with no trouble. They are messing about a bit but they are basically behaving well.</i>
	<b>Level 5</b> <b>Explains how we learn about media portrayal of teenagers from source</b>	<b>7</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> We can see that the media were not really worried about teenage violence because the caption is ironic. The teenagers are obviously not really doing battle and are getting on quite well.</i>  <i><b>Example:</b> We can learn how the media portrayed teenage gangs like Mods and Rockers as violent thugs who threatened society. The newspaper has given this the caption 'on the way to do battle' but they are actually quite friendly, just playing at kicking each other.</i>



3	<b>Study Sources C and D.</b> <b>Which of these sources do you trust more? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b>		
	<b>Level 0</b> No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	0	
	<b>Level 1</b> <b>General assertion OR summary of source(s)</b>	1	<i><b>Example:</b> I trust Source C more because it really shows what it was like in the riots.</i>
	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Selects relevant points and simply asserts reliability / unreliability of sources or fails to address issue of trust</b> NOTE: Answers must make some selection from source(s)  <b>OR</b> <b>Generalised comments about provenance of one / both sources</b> Comments at this level could refer to almost any source	2	<i><b>Example:</b> I trust Source D more because it says positive and negative things, some were violent and some were good.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> I trust Source D as it says they were just bored whereas Source C says they were high and violent.</i>  <i><b>Example:</b> Source C is just a newspaper report so it could be exaggerated.</i>
	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Argues C or D using undeveloped comments on provenance or tone</b> Answers at this level make assertions about provenance or tone but they are clearly about C or D and are attempting to address which is more trustworthy	3-4	<i><b>Example:</b> Source C is obviously sensational and over the top so I don't trust it.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> I do not trust Source D because it is based on what some young people said so they would not criticise themselves.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> I trust C more because the reporter was there and saw what happened. There are facts in the report like 'fifty arrested.'</i>
	<b>Level 4</b> <b>Developed evaluation of 1 source</b> Answers at this level are likely to evaluate the source through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed comments on tone to argue that the newspaper sensationalised in order to make the events seem more exciting</li> <li>• Explains how purpose of D makes it unreliable (organisation is aiming to restore image of young people)</li> <li>• Supporting or contradicting details of either source by cross reference to knowledge or other sources</li> </ul>	5-6	<i><b>Example:</b> We cannot really trust Source C. It is a newspaper report and is obviously designed to make the events look sensational. The headline, 'Battle of Brighton' is obviously over the top and there are other phrases like 'holiday makers huddled in terror' which show that the newspaper is exaggerating.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> I trust Source D more than Source C. It says the violence was caused by a small minority. This is backed up by Source E which says a small minority came looking for violence.</i>

	Credit tone / language only if it supports a valid point being made.		
	<b>Level 5</b> <b>Evaluates both sources positively or both sources negatively</b>	7	<i><b>Example:</b> I don't trust C because it is a newspaper report and is obviously designed to make the events look sensational. The headline, 'Battle of Brighton' is obviously over the top and there are other phrases like 'holiday makers huddled in terror' which show that the newspaper is exaggerating. On the other hand, D is also unreliable because the letter was written by an organisation which was trying to restore the image of teenagers after the events in Brighton and other seaside towns, so he downplays the incidents as no more than 'high spirits.'</i>
	<b>Level 6</b> <b>Argues one source is more reliable than the other, evaluating both</b>  NOTE: Argument must be consistent with the evaluation presented	8	<i><b>Example:</b> I don't trust C because it is a newspaper report and is obviously designed to make the events look sensational. The headline, 'Battle of Brighton' is obviously over the top and there are other phrases like 'holiday makers huddled in terror' which show that the newspaper is exaggerating. On the other hand, I trust D a lot more because the claim that only a minority of youngsters were 'looking for trouble' fits in with other reports like Source H, which agrees that 'most of the young people wanted to keep away from the violence.'</i>

4	<b>Study Sources E and F.</b> <b>How similar are these two sources? Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b>		
	<b>Level 0</b> No evidence submitted or response does not address the question	<b>0</b>	
	<b>Level 1</b> <b>Summarises / selects details but no valid comparison made</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>Example: Source E says most young people were bored so some became Mods. Source F says boredom was a reason.</i>
	<b>Level 2</b> <b>General assertion or simplistic comparison of provenance</b>	<b>2-3</b>	<i>Example: They're not really similar because one source is a newspaper but the other is from an interview with a former Mod.</i> <i>Example: They are different because one is from the time and the other is much later.</i>
	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Argues Sources E and F are similar OR different by comparing details from the sources</b> Answers do not need detailed quotations from the sources but do need to indicate contrast.	<b>4-5</b>	<i>Example: They are similar because they both say that most of the young people in Hastings were not Mods or Rockers.</i> <i>Example: They are similar because both sources talk about how young people were bored.</i>
	<b>Level 4</b> <b>Argues Sources E and F are similar AND different by comparing details from the sources</b> Answers do not need detailed quotations from the sources but do need to indicate contrast.	<b>6-7</b>	<i>Example: They are similar because both agree that most of the young people at Hastings were not Mods or Rockers. But they are also different because Source E talks about how the press was stirring up trouble whereas Source F says the trouble was caused by boredom.</i>
	<b>Level 5</b> <b>Argues sources are similar because of their overall positive attitude towards young people</b>	<b>8</b>	<i>Example: Sources E and F are similar in their positive attitude towards young people. Source E is trying to defend the Mods by saying the press were stirring things up and that the troublemakers weren't the Mods and Rockers at all. Source F is similar to this because it says that the vast majority of young people in Hastings were 'perfectly ordinary'. He even says that the view that Mods and Rockers were troublemakers should be ended.</i>

5	<b>Study Source G.</b> <b>How far are you surprised by this source? Use details of the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b>		
	<b>Level 0</b> No evidence submitted or no valid response to question	<b>0</b>	
	<b>Level 1</b> <b>General assertion</b> <b>OR Valid comment but fails to address question of surprise</b>	<b>1</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> I am surprised the teenagers are just standing there.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> There were youth groups like Mods and Rockers who gathered in seaside resorts.</i>
	<b>Level 2</b> <b>Everyday empathy – surprised or not with no understanding of context</b>	<b>2</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> I am not surprised because teenagers like to hang out together like they are doing here.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> I am not really surprised by this source. There is a big crowd of teenagers so it makes sense that the police were watching them.</i>
	<b>Level 3</b> <b>Uses relevant contextual knowledge to assert or imply source is surprising or not surprising</b>	<b>3</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> I am surprised. In 1964 Mods and Rockers clashed in Brighton, Clacton and other seaside towns.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> In 1964 there was serious trouble in many seaside towns involving Mods and Rockers. Strangely, these teenagers are just standing around not really doing anything.</i>
	<b>Level 4</b> <b>Surprised and/or not surprised by content of source (using generalised context)</b>	<b>4-5</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> I am not surprised. The photograph shows two distinct youth groups standing separately. This isn't surprising because in the 1960s different youth cultures developed. Mods liked smart suits and rode scooters. In contrast, the Rockers preferred leather jackets and motorbikes. There was rivalry between the two groups.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> Mostly I am not surprised. The photograph shows two distinct youth groups standing separately. This isn't surprising because in the 1960s different youth cultures developed. Mods liked smart suits and rode scooters. In contrast, the Rockers preferred leather jackets and motorbikes. There was rivalry between the two groups. So I am a bit surprised there is no trouble between them.</i>
	<b>Level 5</b> <b>Surprised or not surprised by content of source (using specific context of 1964 or X-ref)</b>  NOTE: Context which uses the background information may be credited as a x-ref.	<b>6-7</b>	<i><b>Example:</b> I am not very surprised by this source. It shows us teenagers in Margate in 1964. We know there was a lot of violence between Mods and Rockers that year in places like Margate. That's why the police are there, to keep them apart.</i> <i><b>Example:</b> I am very surprised by this source. It shows us teenagers in Margate in 1964. We know there was a lot of violence between Mods and Rockers that year in places like Margate. So the source is a bit surprising because the teenagers are just</i>

			<p><i>standing there not really doing much.</i></p> <p><b>Example:</b> <i>I am not really surprised. Source E tells us that the majority of teenagers were ordinary and were not troublemakers and that is what we can see here.</i></p>
	<p><b>Level 6</b></p> <p><b>Surprised or not surprised that the picture was not published</b></p>	<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>Example:</b> <i>I am not surprised that the picture was not published. The scene it shows is a bit boring with teenagers not doing anything. Newspapers would have wanted pictures of the violence. This photograph would have been no use alongside an article like Source C, which is dramatising the violence in 1964.</i></p> <p><b>Example:</b> <i>I am surprised that the picture was not published. I would have thought that The Times could have used it to go with the article in Source F because it is defending young people and saying that most of them aren't troublemakers.</i></p>

6	<p><b>Study all the sources, A-H.</b>  <b>'In 1964 people were worried about the younger generation'.</b>  <b>How far do the sources in this paper support this statement? Use details from the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use.</b></p>		
	<p><b>Level 0</b>  No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</p>	<b>0</b>	
	<p>Level 1  General answers unsupported from the sources  NOTE: Answers based exclusively on factual knowledge with no reference to sources to be marked at this level.  <b>OR</b>  Uses the sources without addressing the question</p>	<b>1-4</b>	<p><i>Example: In Source A the people are wearing armour. In Source B the mods and rockers are kicking each other ...</i></p>
	<p><b>Level 2</b>  One sided answer with explanation of how the sources support OR oppose the statement   NOTE- Mark at bottom of level if only one source used.</p>	<b>5-7</b>	<p><i>Example: In Source C the newspaper is reporting that holidaymakers were 'huddled in terror' because of the teenage violence. So obviously it agrees with the statement. In source D ...</i></p>
	<p><b>Level 3</b>  Balanced answer with explanation of how the sources support AND oppose the statement  NOTE – Use the range of sources employed and the quality of the development to determine the mark within the range. Small number of sources well developed is just as worthy as a large number treated lightly.</p>	<b>8-10</b>	<p><i>Example: As Level 2 plus ...  Some sources disagree with the statement. In Source D the source says that the press has exaggerated the violence. So does Source E; in fact he blames the press ...</i></p>
	<p>Allow up to 2 additional marks for effective evaluation of sources within the answer. This might be tackled on the basis of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effective evaluation of the sources used which could be based on evaluation of attitude / language / purpose</li> <li>context</li> </ul>	<b>+2</b>	

Source A	Agree (shows people think they need armour) Disagree (mocking overreaction)	Source E	Disagree (minority of idiots; trouble caused by press)
Source B	Disagree (ironic) Agree (going to battle)	Source F	Disagree (troublemakers a minority) Agree (points out popular explanation = Mod/Rocker trouble)
Source C	Agree (violence / excitement)	Source G	Disagree (they look peaceful)
Source D	Disagree (most young people not violent)	Source H	Disagree (no serious violence) Agree (rumour of violence = widely believed)

## Assessment Objectives Grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1	3	0	4	7
2	1	2	5	8
3	2	2	4	8
4	2	1	4	7
5	3	0	5	8
6	2	2	8	12
<b>Totals</b>	12	7	31	50

## APPENDIX 1

## Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) Assessment Grid

<b>High performance 3 marks</b>
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.
<b>Intermediate performance 2 marks</b>
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.
<b>Threshold performance 1 mark</b>
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.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2014

