

**A LEVEL**

**Examiners' report**

# **HISTORY A**

**H505**

For first teaching in 2015

**Y218/01 Summer 2022 series**

# Contents

Introduction .....	3
Paper Y218/01 series overview .....	4
Question 1 (a) .....	5
Question 1 (b)* .....	6
Question 2 (a) .....	7
Question 2 (b) .....	9

## Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers is also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

### Advance Information for Summer 2022 assessments

To support student revision, advance information was published about the focus of exams for Summer 2022 assessments. Advance information was available for most GCSE, AS and A Level subjects, Core Maths, FSMQ, and Cambridge Nationals Information Technologies. You can find more information on our [website](#).

#### Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

## Paper Y218/01 series overview

Almost all responses adhered to the correct convention and answered both questions from either Section A or Section B. On occasion, candidates selected one or more questions from both sections. Section A was slightly more popular than Section B.

Overall, the standard of written communication was reasonably good and references to specific knowledge showed accuracy although there was some generalisation. However, there were some well-developed responses showing sound knowledge and analysis.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally did the following:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally did the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• understood the key issues in the questions</li> <li>• knew the key events with reasonable depth of knowledge to be able to effectively support their arguments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• did not focus their responses on the question asked</li> <li>• had a generalised knowledge rather than detailed knowledge</li> <li>• did not manage their time effectively to be able to fully complete both responses.</li> </ul>

### Advice to centres – wording of questions

Candidates would enhance their performance in their responses to all questions if the wording of the questions were considered carefully so that they are more likely to be aware of the specific demands of the question.

### Question 1 (a)

- 1 (a) Which of the following had the greatest impact upon European relations up to 1941?
- (i) The Spanish Civil War
  - (ii) The Nazi-Soviet Pact

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

[10]

The focus of this question was for candidates to provide a comparative analysis of which of these two events had a greater impact on European nations up to 1941. Overall candidates had a good understanding of the Spanish Civil War and recognised that it had an impact of European nations because it brought Germany and Italy together closer together and therefore, strengthened fascism.

Higher achieving responses recognised that Britain and France's non-intervention strained relations with the USSR contributing to Stalin's isolation and openness to new alliances. The more accomplished responses understood that the Nazi-Soviet Pact made World War Two more likely and this became the basis of the argument that the Pact had a greater impact on European relations. There were a significant number of responses that demonstrated a lack of understanding of the difference between a pact and an alliance.

One of the common errors in this type of question is that responses provide relevant knowledge of the events but then do not use it to provide a comparative narrative related to the question, as shown in Exemplar 1.

#### Exemplar 1

		Nevertheless, the Spanish Civil War also increased tensions and allowed Mexican powers to see the increasing likelihood of
		war. Despite the best efforts of the majority of nations - war was becoming a very <sup>harsh</sup> <del>protruding</del> reality. The Spanish Civil War was an explosion of social dissatisfaction between 1936-1936 which had been gradually increasing since 1932. General Franco led the revolt in an attempt to coup the hybrid monarchy and dictatorship. The term 'Civil war' is not appropriate to use in this instance because Italy, Germany and the USSR became actively involved. For Germany and Italy the ideology the democracies were using (side of General Franco) resonated minutely to Fascism. Therefore Hitler seized the opportunity to initiate his 4,000 Luftwaffe aircrafts and train his 2,287,000

		million men. Not only was it a training ground but it also
		provided an opportunity for two fascist leaders to become closer,
		Mussolini and Hitler. This impacted European relations but
		it meant that alternative methods to avoid war could be
		instigated before it was formally declared.

Exemplar 1 is an extract from a response that provides some relevant and detailed knowledge of the Spanish Civil War and at the end, adds that it 'impacted on European relations' but does not go on to analyse the extent of the impact. A Level 3 response.

### Question 1 (b)\*

(b)\* 'The Treaty of Versailles was the cause of deteriorating relations between Japan and her former First World War allies during the period from 1918 to 1941.' How far do you agree?

[20]

The focus of this question was to analyse the reasons for deteriorating relations between Japan and her WW1 allies with the Treaty of Versailles being given as the main factor. Most candidates were aware of the significance of the Treaty of Versailles in deteriorating relations, explaining that Japan was denied the Racial Equality Clause and were only successful with some of their land claims. Better responses also drew attention to Japan's exclusion from the council of four. Only a minority of the best responses highlighted that Japan was well rewarded at the Treaty of Versailles, in terms of land gained and their inclusion in the permanent council of the League of Nations. Many responses analysed Japan's own actions in damaging relations, particularly with reference to Manchuria and the Sino-Japanese War. More developed responses explored factors such as the Washington Naval Conference, economic problems, rising global nationalism and the actions of the USA in deteriorating relations.

Some of the weaker responses were hindered by a lack of detailed knowledge and some focused on the Treaty of Versailles, concentrating on how the treaty punished Germany rather than addressing the question of Japan.

## Question 2 (a)

2 (a) Which was the greater failure of international diplomacy?

(i) The Corfu Incident

(ii) The Washington and London Naval Agreements

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

[10]

The focus of this question was for candidates to provide a comparative analysis of which of these two events was the greater failure of international diplomacy. The majority of candidates understood the key events of the Corfu Incident and wrote about how Italian aggression went unpunished. Better responses were able to explain why the response of the international community was a failure, explaining how it undermined the League of Nations and its aims, particularly because the incident was referred to the Council of Ambassadors to resolve.

Good responses also highlighted that the incident showed that major powers were inconsistent when dealing with conflicts involving smaller and major powers. Most candidates were also able to explain how the Washington and London Naval Agreements contributed to disarmament and failed because the agreements benefitted Britain and the USA and angered nations such as Japan. Better responses also recognised that Japan had to cede land in the Washington Naval Agreement, making it feel further isolated. Only a minority of candidates explained that the agreements failed because the terms of the agreements were violated, and because they were largely abandoned in the mid-1930s.

Accomplished responses were able to attempt at a comparative analysis of the greater failure of these two events (see Exemplar 2). Weaker responses showed little relevant knowledge of the events in Corfu, and demonstrated misconceptions, e.g., discussing how the Naval Agreements affected Germany.

## Exemplar 2

Overall, though the Washington and London Naval Agreements were failures in international diplomacy as they worked to isolate and enrage Japan, they also did bring a spirit of cooperation and were successful in securing some levels of disarmament. Corfu, on the other hand, was a complete failure of diplomacy as it highlighted the weakness of the League, who had no military force, to deal with disputes involving larger powers. The League was also undermined by the influence of the Conference of Ambassadors. As the League was the primary peace keeping organisation, its failure and weakness can be seen as a huge failure in international diplomacy, as without a strong League, there would be no deterrent to avoid aggression, as can be seen in the following years with the Manchurian and then Abyssinian crises.

Exemplar 2 is an extract from a Level 4 response that makes a good attempt to provide a comparative analysis of these two events, namely the Corfu incident and the Washington and London Naval Agreements. A Level 4 response.



## Question 2 (b)

**(b)\*** 'For much of the period from 1929 to 1939, the policy of appeasement was mostly successful.'  
How far do you agree? **[20]**

The focus of the question was for candidates to analyse whether the policy of appeasement was successful or not. Most responses were able to comment on why appeasement failed, referring to the British and French failure to effectively deal with Germany in places such as the Rhineland, Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia. Better responses went beyond Germany analysing how appeasement of Italy and Japan failed. Surprisingly few candidates paid attention to appeasement's successes and this meant that these responses were partially addressing the question and, therefore, were unable to achieve the higher levels despite the quality of their analysis of appeasement's failures. Those which did examine successes explored the popularity of appeasement among the general publics of Britain and France, the fact that neither country was ready to fight war due to economic problems and lack of preparation, and the ways in which appeasement gave these countries additional time to rearm so that they were better prepared to fight. Effective responses also drew attention to the fact that appeasement delayed the start of World War Two.

Some responses did not adhere to the time frame in the question and provided knowledge and analysis of events in the 1920's using the League of Nations as the focal point of their analysis.

---

# Supporting you

---

## Post-results services

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

## Keep up-to-date

We send a weekly roundup to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

## OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our [website](#) or visit [OCR professional development](#).

## Signed up for ExamBuilder?

**ExamBuilder** is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. [Find out more](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

## Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

[Find out more](#).

## Need to get in touch?

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

Call us on  
**01223 553998**

Alternatively, you can email us on  
**support@ocr.org.uk**

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/company/ocr**

 **/ocrexams**

## We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



**I like this**



**I dislike this**

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2022 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

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

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

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

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

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

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