

GCSE

History A (Explaining the Modern World)

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2025

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 2025

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**PREPARATION FOR MARKING****RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: RM Assessor Online Training: OCR Essential Guide to Marking.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are available in RM Assessor
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the required number of practice responses (“scripts”) and the required number of standardisation responses.

MARKING

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

5. Crossed-Out Responses

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

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM

Assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)

Multiple-Choice Question Responses

When a multiple-choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate). When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only one mark per response)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth two or more marks)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space).

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

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

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add the annotation 'SEEN' to confirm that the work has been seen and mark any responses using the annotations in section 11.
7. There is a NR (No Response) option. Award NR (No Response):
- if there is nothing written at all in the answer space
 - OR if there is a comment which does not in any way relate to the question (e.g., 'can't do', 'don't know')
 - OR if there is a mark (e.g., a dash, a question mark) which is not an attempt at the question.

Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).

8. The RM Assessor comments box is used by your Team Leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. Do not use the comments box for any other reason.
9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.
10. For answers marked by levels of response:
 To determine the level – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
 To determine the mark within the level, consider the following

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

11. Annotations

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

12. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

INTRODUCTION

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

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

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

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

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG) mark scheme

High performance 4–5 marks	• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate
Intermediate performance 2–3 marks	• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate
Threshold performance 1 mark	• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate
No marks awarded 0 marks	• The learner's response does not relate to the question • The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning

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

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

- 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 and was eligible for all the SPaG marks.
 - Check the cover sheet to see what has been dictated 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 (e.g. grammar only)	Mark if candidate eligible for two thirds (e.g. grammar and punctuation only)
0	0	0
1	0	1
2	1	1
3	1	2
4	1	3
5	2	3

Word processed scripts

- b. If a script has a **word processor cover sheet** attached to it, the candidate **can** still access SPaG marks unless the cover sheet states that the checking functionality is enabled, in which case no SPaG marks are available.
- c. If you have any queries please contact the OCR Special Requirements Team at srteam@ocr.org.uk

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

International Relations: the changing international order 1918–1975

1. Outline how the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were intended to ensure future peace.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows a clear understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.	Level 3 answers will typically develop in detail one or more ways in which the terms intended to keep the peace, e.g. <i>The authors of the Treaty of Versailles wanted to make Germany weaker so her army was reduced to 100,000 men and she was not allowed an air force. This weakened her so they couldn't start another war. (4)</i> <i>By demilitarising the Rhineland, they wanted to make sure Germany wouldn't be able to invade France again. (4)</i> <i>Another aspect of the Treaty was the creation of the League of Nations. This would be an international organisation with representatives of all the different countries. The intention was for the League to use their united strength to get countries to negotiate and come to a peaceful resolution, rather than resorting to war to settle disagreements. Representatives would meet regularly to deal with issues between countries and devise solutions. (5)</i> <i>The League of Nations was created in the Treaty to keep the peace. It was an international organisation, with representatives from all the different countries who met regularly to deal with disagreements between countries. (4)</i> Nutshell: One or more term(s) of the treaty used to explain how it would keep the peace.	4–5
Level 2 Response demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows some understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.	<u>Level 2 answers will typically identify and describe one or more terms of the Treaty which would help to keep the peace, e.g.</u> <i>The Treaty reduced Germany's army to 100,000 men to keep the peace. The country was not allowed any tanks, submarines or planes.</i> Nutshell: identifies and describes relevant terms 2 marks for one term, 3 marks for two OR	2–3

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	<u>Level 2 answers will identify a term and make a simple assertion about how it will keep the peace e.g.</u> <i>The Treaty reduced Germany's army to 100,000 men: this would make them weaker and so keep the peace.</i> 2 marks for one term, 3 marks for two Nutshell: identifies example(s), without explaining fully how it/they would keep the peace.	
Level 1 Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.	Level 1 answers will typically identify one or more term(s) with no reference to the intended outcome of preventing future war, or respond very generally e.g. <i>Germany's army was reduced to 100,000.</i> <i>They created a League of Nations.</i> <i>Germany lost its colonies.</i> <i>By punishing Germany.</i> <i>The Treaty was written by Britain, France and the USA.</i>	1
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

2. Explain why Cuba became a focus of tension between the USSR and the USA in the 1960s.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 5 answers will typically identify two reasons why Cuba was a focus of tension in the 1960s and explain them e.g. <i>There was increased tension between the USSR and USA over Cuba for several reasons.</i> <i>One reason was that the USSR was going to put nuclear weapons on Cuba, only 90 miles away from the USA. It wanted to protect Cuba from any attempted invasion by the USA and also did it as a response to the USA putting missiles on Turkey, directly threatening the USSR. When US spy planes found out about the missiles, the USA told the USSR to remove them and to stop their boats bringing any more. The USSR refused so President Kennedy set up a naval blockade to stop the boats reaching Cuba. This meant the USSR and USA were in a direct conflict. There was a real fear that it might lead to all out nuclear war: the biggest of tensions possible.</i> <i>Another reason was because there had been a revolution in Cuba against the US-supported government of Batista. The USA had supported Batista's government because they were fiercely anti-communist, and the USA was afraid because they did not want a socialist government 'in their backyard'. They imposed a trade embargo on Cuba, so Castro turned to the USSR for help. The USSR gave them \$100 million in economic aid and bought their sugar, their biggest product, so weakening the USA's trade embargo. This angered the USA who saw the USSR having too much influence in the USA's 'backyard'.</i> <i>N.B. Students may give a broader answer encompassing tensions arising after the revolution or they may just focus on the Cuban Missile Crisis. Alternatively, one of the reasons may be more general focusing on Cold War tensions, but the focus of this reason must be on Cuba. All three approaches are acceptable.</i> Nutshell: Explains TWO reasons.	9–10

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 4 Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 4 answers will typically identify one reason why Cuba was a focus of tension in the 1960s and explain it fully e.g. <i>One reason was that the USSR was going to put nuclear weapons on Cuba. It was only 90 miles away from the USA, and because of Cold War tensions this made the USA feel threatened and so responded with a naval blockade. (threshold answer)</i> Nutshell: Explains ONE reason.	7–8
Level 3 Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 3 answers will typically identify and describe one or more reasons why Cuba was a focus of tension but will not explain them fully e.g. <i>The most obvious reason for tension was that Cuba had become socialist country. This made them more aligned to the USSR who bought sugar from them.</i> <i>Or</i> <i>Cuba was a focus for tension because the USSR put nuclear bombs on Cuba and Cuba was very close to the USA.</i> <i>Or</i> <i>Cuba was a focus of tension because the USA thought Cuba was in its sphere of influence. When Castro made a deal with the USSR, it showed Cuba was now in the USSR's sphere of influence instead.</i> <i>Or</i> <i>Cuba became socialist after a revolution. This upset the US who feared that in fact they had become communist. Cuba was only 90 miles away from the USA and they believed that it was in their 'back yard' so in their sphere of influence. They were not happy about losing the influence they had had before the revolution and realised they couldn't control Fidel Castro. (see NB)</i> <i>The most obvious reason for tension was that Cuba had a revolution that made it a socialist country. This made them more aligned to the USSR. The USSR bought Cuban sugar, supporting the Cuban economy and provided the Cubans with money and weapons. (see NB)</i> N.B the question is about tension between the USSR and USA so if answers only explain tension between Cuba and the USA, or USA and USSR – it should not go higher than Level 3.	5–6
Level 2 Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to the situation in Cuba <i>The USA helped Cuban exiles to invade Cuba in 1961. This was called the Bay of Pigs invasion. The invasion went wrong. The attackers had no proper maps and their vehicles didn't have enough fuel. Castro's forces were able to beat the invaders. It made the Americans look weak.</i> <i>Or</i> <i>'Cuba became communist after a revolution. This upset the US who were opposed to communism'.</i>	3–4

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	OR Alternative Level 2: Identifies reasons for tension with no further development <i>Cuba became communist.</i> <i>The US didn't like Castro.</i> <i>The US thought Cuba was in its sphere of influence.</i> <i>The USSR armed Cuba.</i> <i>Castro overthrew Batista.</i> <i>The US wanted to kill Castro.</i> Nutshell: Identified cause of tension. 1 mark for each.	
Level 1 Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.	Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons for tension not specific to Cuba e.g. <i>The Americans felt threatened.</i> <i>The USSR wanted to support their ally.</i>	1–2
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on Neville Chamberlain and his policies in the period 1937–1939? Use other interpretations of the events of 1937–1939 and your knowledge to support your answer.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 - The response has a full and thoroughly developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a convincing and substantiated judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. - The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.	Level 5 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by developed use of two other interpretations OR developed use of one other interpretation and evaluation of Interpretation A based on the context of A. e.g. <i>Some historians would not regard interpretation A as fair. Trevor-Roper criticises Chamberlain, saying he had 'limited intelligence' and that he believed Hitler because of 'arrogance and stupidity'.</i> <i>Revisionist historians of the 1960s would not be so damning of Chamberlain. They would say that Chamberlain was in an impossible situation because the British military didn't have the power and weaponry to oppose Hitler at the time. They would say he did the best he could in difficult circumstances.</i> <i>However, historians of the 1940s view would say this was a fair interpretation. They said Chamberlain was following a foolish policy and that there was plenty of warning of Hitler's aggression that Chamberlain ignored, for example in <i>Mein Kampf</i>. As a result they would also criticise Chamberlain and somewhat agree with Trevor-Roper about his stupidity. (2 other interpretations)</i> OR <i>In some ways, this is a fair comment as historians from the 1940s and 1950s would definitely agree. Trevor-Roper says Chamberlain ignored evidence of Hitler's aggression. The authors who wrote Guilty Men during the war agreed Chamberlain ignored the evidence about his plans for aggression, such as what Hitler wrote in <i>Mein Kampf</i>. (threshold response)</i> <i>However, this Interpretation was written just after the war, when people were still angry that Britain hadn't acted earlier to stop Hitler. So it's not surprising he is still critical of Chamberlain. It was also written before government records had been released about Munich, so he wouldn't have been aware of Chamberlain's plans to rearm 'hope for the best but prepare for the worst', and the reasons for the compromises he thought he had to make, like lack of support from the British people and empire (one other interpretation and evaluation of A's context).</i>	21–25

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	Nutshell: Developed use of 2 other interpretations OR one other interpretation and an evaluation of A based on its context to answer the question. NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed. NB: For 22-25 marks responses should explain how other interpretations challenge or support specific aspects of Interpretation A (eg Chamberlain's lack of intelligence; character weaknesses, misunderstanding of Hitler) NB: Answers may refer to specific historians by name or use the term for that school of thought– this is not a requirement but should be credited.	
Level 4 - The response has a developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a fully supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. - The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.	Level 4 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by developed use of one other interpretation or evaluation of the context of Interpretation A e.g. <i>Some historians would regard interpretation A as quite fair. Trevor-Roper criticises Chamberlain, saying he had 'limited intelligence' and that he believed Hitler because of 'arrogance and stupidity'. Counter-revisionist historians of the 1990s would agree that Chamberlain made serious mistakes because of his own arrogance. Robert Parker said that Chamberlain believed he had a special influence over Hitler, and this explains his feelings of triumph at Munich. However, he then followed Munich by making lots of mistakes, for example in not allying with France and the USSR, or listening more to critics.</i> Nutshell: Developed use of ONE interpretation or evaluation of context of A to support/challenge Interpretation A. NB: For 17-21 marks responses should explain how other interpretations challenge or support specific aspects of Interpretation A (eg Chamberlain's lack of intelligence; character weaknesses; misunderstanding of Hitler).	16–20
Level 3 - The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied, and uses this to make a partially supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. - The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.	Level 3 answers will typically be based on a valid argument about fairness and support this with relevant knowledge of events OR undeveloped references to other interpretations to judge fairness e.g. <i>The comment is fair because it's true when it says that Chamberlain and his government '...did not want to strengthen the alliance against Hitler'. This is true. Chamberlain ignored advice to build a Grand Alliance to oppose Hitler. This was mainly because he didn't want to work with Russia to stop Hitler because he was more worried about the Communists than the Nazis. If he had done this, war might have been avoided as Hitler would have been worried about facing powerful enemies on two sides. (use of relevant knowledge of events).</i> OR <i>Trevor-Roper was writing in 1948. He was being very critical of Chamberlain's arrogance. I think this is fair because historians of the 1990s put 'Chamberlain back on trial' and would agree with him. (undeveloped use of relevant interpretation)</i> Nutshell: Valid argument based on relevant factual knowledge OR valid but undeveloped use of interpretation(s) NB: Responses are capped at this level if understanding of A is limited, EVEN IF other interpretations are used.	11–15

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 2 - The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and limited evaluation of other interpretations studied, and links this to a judgement of the given interpretation in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. - The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.	Level 2 answers will typically correctly describe other relevant interpretations without a valid argument on the question of fairness of A e.g. <i>Trevor-Roper's view is from the 1940s and he criticises appeasement. One interpretation about appeasement is from 'The Guilty Men' which says that Chamberlain was cowardly.</i> <i>Or</i> <i>The revisionists said that he was...</i> <i>The counter revisionists said...</i> Nutshell: No A or misunderstood - shows knowledge of interpretations but fails to address question of fairness validly.	6–10
Level 1 - The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in terms of the question. Other interpretations may be mentioned but there is no analysis or evaluation of them. - The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.	Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate understanding of Interpretation A and/OR offer undeveloped/unsupported assertions about fairness <i>Trevor Roper thinks that appeasement was a bad idea.</i> <i>Trevor Roper thinks Chamberlain was stupid.</i> <i>The Interpretation is right. He says Chamberlain is arrogant and could have done more against Hitler. I agree.</i> <i>This is harsh. Lots of other historians disagree and think he had no choice.</i> Nutshell: Shows understanding of A/unsupported assertions about fairness	1–5
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

4. Study Interpretation B. Explain why **not** all historians and commentators have agreed with this interpretation. Use other interpretations and your knowledge to support your answer.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 - The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a range of aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a thorough, detailed analysis of how the interpretations differ. - There is a fully supported and convincing analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. - Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. - This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 5 answers will typically provide developed explanations of how historian(s)/commentator(s) from two periods have disagreed with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B and explain why at least one of them disagrees, eg <i>It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. Schlesinger is saying that neither side actually planned a Cold War, but it happened because they didn't understand each other because 'there was a failure of communication' over Eastern Europe.</i> Western historians from the 1940s would disagree with this because they did not blame the USA and said that the Soviet Union was solely to blame because they tried to spread communist ideas across the world after the war, for example taking over Eastern Europe. Some of these historians even said that Stalin wanted a world revolution, which is why the US were afraid. However, most of these commentators were actually working with the US government at the time and were very anti-communist, so they would be unlikely to put any blame on the USA when they played a part in the decisions it made at the time. (H+W) [References to Kennan and Feis could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level. Equally labelling this interpretation as post-revisionist is worthy of credit.] <i>Other historians who would disagree would be revisionists. They argued that the Cold War was not a misunderstanding but was caused by the USA. They argued that the USA provoked the war by trying to achieve economic dominance in Europe. They saw Marshall Aid as an aggressive response to the communist takeover of Eastern Europe, a way to force Europe to follow its policies rather than Stalin's and said that Truman's get-tough attitude made the communists feel threatened. (H)</i> Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two periods disagree, and explanation as to why views from one period disagree: HW H.	17–20 

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	NB: For L5 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported NB: References to specific historians could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level. Equally labelling this interpretation as post-revisionist is worthy of credit.	
Level 4 - The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts some aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce an analysis of how the interpretations differ. - There is a supported analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. - Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. - This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 4 answers will explain how or why historian(s)/commentator(s) from two different periods agree or disagree with particular aspect(s) of interpretation B. OR will explain how and why historians from the same period agree or disagree. <i>It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. Schlesinger is saying that neither side actually planned a Cold War, but it happened because they didn't understand the other, and misinterpreted each other's actions. Western historians from the 1940s would disagree with this: they would say that the Soviet Union was to blame because they tried to spread communist ideas across the world after the war, for example, taking over Eastern Europe. In that sense the USA had to respond with Marshall Aid and the Truman Doctrine, it wasn't a misunderstanding by the USA. (H)</i> <i>However, some commentators would agree with the interpretation, especially those writing in the 1970s and 1980s (post revisionists). This was a time when there was a thawing of the Cold War and historians were more willing to see both sides in a more forgiving way rather than being affected by fear of the enemy. Commentators like Gaddis described Russia and the USA as overreacting to the actions of the other superpower. (H)</i> Nutshell: 2H different periods or 2W different periods or H+W same period or H+W different periods NB For L4 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported	13–16 
Level 3 - The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a partial analysis of how the interpretations differ. - There is some analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.	Level 3 answers will typically explain how historian(s)/commentator(s) from one period have agreed OR disagreed with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B <i>Post revisionist historians would agree with Schlesinger. Commentators like Gaddis said the Cold War was caused because Russia and the USA overreacted to the actions of the other superpower, misunderstanding things like the takeover of Eastern Europe, which is similar to Schlesinger saying that 'There was a failure of communication between America and Russia'. (H)</i> OR will explain valid reasons why historians/commentators from one period disagree or agree, <i>Orthodox historians would not accept this. Many of these commentators were actually government advisors at the time so it isn't likely that they would accept that they might be partly responsible for misunderstanding the Russians. (W)</i>	9–12 

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
- Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. - This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Nutshell: Explains how or why historian/commentator from one period agrees or disagrees (H or W) NB For L3 candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported	
Level 2 - The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of at least one other interpretation studied, to show how the interpretations differ. - There is a basic explanation of why the given interpretation and the other interpretation(s) differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. - Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. - This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 2 answers will typically identify historian(s)/commentator(s) who have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why they agreed/disagreed. <i>Not all historians would agree with Interpretation B about both sides being to blame. The historians of the late 1940s would have disagreed. (6)</i> <u>OR Level 2 answers will provide a chronological overview of the historiography but not examine interpretation B, or misunderstand it, e.g.</u> <i>Historians in the 1940s in the USA blamed the Soviets. In the 1960s revisionist historians blamed the USA. Post revisionists blamed both sides.</i> Nutshell: Identifies historian(s) / commentator(s) / schools of thought / periods but fails to address Interpretation B correctly NB: The term ‘many historians’ or similar expressions is usually not sufficient for L2 as its too unspecific- time period, school of thought or a named historian needed UNLESS it is clear from what the candidate says that that they are describing a specific school of thought. If the candidate correctly describes a school of thought but mislabels/offers an incorrect time period then this level is possible if the description is strong enough, although a lower mark within the level would be more likely.	5-8 
Level 1 - The response compares the candidate’s own knowledge and understanding to the interpretation, or uses knowledge and understanding of the time in which it was created, to analyse the given interpretation. - There is no consideration or no relevant consideration of any other interpretations.	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions about Interpretation B Or give their own critique of it e.g. <i>Some people would disagree with Interpretation B because the USA was more to blame than Russia.</i> <i>Not all historians would agree because lots were really critical of the Russians. Others said it was mainly America’s fault.</i> Nutshell: General assertions/own critique	1-4 

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
• Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. • There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.	NB: Award at this level if candidates give their own critique of B (ie not the views of other historians). This may well be phrased as 'other historians' but is in fact the candidate's own view.	
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

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

5. Describe **one** feature of the South African elections of 1994.

(2 marks)

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
N/A Points marking 1 mark for accurate but generic response that could be applied to other periods. Second mark must be specific about this period.	Possible examples: <i>The ANC won the election (1) with 62% of the vote (1).</i> <i>The ANC won (1) and then formed a Government of National Unity with other parties (1).</i> <i>Nelson Mandela was elected as President (1). He was the country's first black president (1).</i> <i>First fully democratic election (1) with citizens of all races being allowed a vote (1)</i> <i>It marked the end of decades of white rule (1) and a majority black government took over (1).</i> <i>It was a peaceful election (1) even though white racists let off bombs right up to the day of the elections to prevent the vote (1).</i> Accept any valid features.	2

6 Explain why PW Botha's 'total strategy' failed in the 1980s.

(10 marks)

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 - Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. - This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 5 answers will typically identify two reasons and explain them fully, e.g. <i>Botha's 'total strategy' was meant to prevent protests and resistance in South Africa and to improve relations with other countries and convince them not to impose economic sanctions. However, the strategy did not work as they hoped, for various reasons.</i> <i>One reason was that a large number of white South Africans did not support the strategy. They complained that the introduction of the Tricameral Parliament, which gave limited powers to 'coloured' and Indian South Africans, would weaken white minority rule. Some joined the breakaway Conservative party which campaigned against it. Others joined the violent far-right paramilitary organisation called the AWB. This made it hard for the government to implement the policy as they hoped.</i> <i>As part of the total strategy, Botha introduced reforms which he said would improve the lives of black South Africans and so make them less willing to support resistance groups. However, his changes had the opposite effect, because they just highlighted how black South Africans were being excluded. They weren't allowed to take part in the new parliament and their economic situation did not improve. As a result, opposition groups came together in an umbrella organisation called the UDF and coordinated actions to oppose Apartheid. This made their actions more effective.</i> THRESHOLD ANSWERS	9–10

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	<i>White South Africans were divided by the total strategy. They complained that the introduction of the new parliament, which gave limited powers to 'coloured' and Indian South Africans, would weaken white minority rule. Some joined the breakaway Conservative party which campaigned against it. Others joined the far-right paramilitary organisation called the AWB.</i> <i>Botha thought his changes would please black South Africans and so make them less willing to support resistance groups. However, his changes had the opposite effect because they just highlighted how black South Africans were being excluded, so actions by anti- Apartheid groups increased and became more effective.</i>	
Level 4 - Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. - This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 4 answers will typically identify one reason and explain it fully, e.g. <i>A large number of white South Africans did not support the National Party's policy. They complained that the introduction of the Tricameral Parliament, which gave limited powers to 'coloured' and Indian South Africans would weaken white minority rule. Some joined the breakaway Conservative party which campaigned against it. Others joined the far-right paramilitary organisation called the AWB. This made it hard for the government to implement the policy as they hoped.</i>	7–8
Level 3 - Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. - This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 3 answers will typically identify and describe one or more reasons without explain it/them, e.g. <i>Many white South Africans did not support it. They didn't like the idea of giving any more power to non-white groups. They voted for other parties, so the National Party lost support.</i> <i>Anti- Apartheid groups campaigned for people to boycott the elections to the new parliament. This was successful, with only a minority of Indians and 'coloureds' voting.</i> <i>The Anti- Apartheid movement became more successful in turning people against Apartheid and the total strategy didn't do anything to counter this.</i> <i>The actions of unions were more effective, now that they were legalised which undermined the TS.</i> <i>Candidates may also link the following reasons to the failure of the TS:</i> <i>Political consciousness of young people</i> <i>The military aspect of the total strategy.</i> <i>Increasing level of violence leading to the state of emergency</i> <i>The boycott of the new constitution/ elections</i>	5–6

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 2 - Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. - This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to the issue in the question e.g. <i>The total strategy included setting up a new constitution which gave more rights to Indian and 'coloured' South Africans. Black South Africans were only allowed to take part in local elections.</i> OR <i>Botha introduced reforms to improve the lives of black South Africans. These included an increase in education spending and allowing more black people to buy their own homes. They also sent the SADF to attack MK bases in other countries.</i> Alternative L2: Identifies reasons with no further development <i>There was resistance from the ANC.</i> <i>There were international protests and sanctions.</i>	3–4
Level 1 - Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. - There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points or assertions e.g. <i>The government tried to deal with its opponents.</i> <i>It happened in the 1980s.</i> <i>People were unhappy with the total strategy.</i>	1–2
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

7a. Study Source A. Explain how this source is useful to a historian studying Apartheid in South Africa.

(5 marks)

Assessment Objectives	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
Additional Guidance	No marks must be awarded for demonstration of knowledge and/or understanding in isolation, knowledge and understanding can only be credited where it is clearly and intrinsically linked to analysis of the source. The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response. The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the specific question about the source.	Level 3 answers will typically argue that the source is useful and support this with a valid inference from the source developed with effective use of content, provenance or context to support the inference <i>This source is useful because it tells us that Apartheid is recognised and defended by white South Africans. It defines what Apartheid is, from the point of view of the white South African government, and we can infer that Verwoerd wanted people to believe Apartheid was an acceptable policy. He says it's a policy of 'being a good neighbour' and that different groups 'can live together'. This is obviously not true because the system of Apartheid separated black people and made them live in townships and made them use pass books to move around. The speech was televised and seen around the world, so it's useful in seeing how they tried to persuade other counties to accept Apartheid and not impose sanctions.</i>	4–5
Level 2 Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct an argument in answer to the question about the source.	Level 2 answers will typically argue the source is useful (or not) based on reliability or unsupported inference(s) <i>I don't think this source is useful because it is not reliable. It is from Verwoerd who was the man who designed the policy of Apartheid. He wants to make it sound like it is acceptable so he can go on treating black people badly.</i> OR <i>This source is useful because it defines what Apartheid is from the point of view of the white South African government. We can infer that Verwoerd wanted people to believe Apartheid was an acceptable policy.</i>	2–3

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	<i>Other inferences could be:</i> <i>That the government were trying to cover up the reality of Apartheid</i> <i>That Verwoerd believed that black and white people were different.</i> <i>That the authors of Apartheid had good intentions.</i>	
Level 1 Response analyses the source in a basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance and using this to give a simple answer to the question about the source.	Level 1 answers will typically assert the usefulness of the content or focus on provenance simplistically <i>This is useful because Verwoerd was in the South African government so he would know what it was like.</i> <i>(N.B any attempt at inference should go into level 2)</i>	1
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

7b. Study Source B. What is the message of the cartoonist?

(5 marks)

Assessment Objectives	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
Additional Guidance	No marks must be awarded for demonstration of knowledge and/or understanding in isolation, knowledge and understanding can only be credited where it is clearly and intrinsically linked to analysis of the source. The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response. The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the question about the source.	Level 3 answers will typically identify the message of the cartoonist and support this through effective use of content and/or context <i>This cartoonist is criticising the system of Apartheid and the South African government for not allowing black South Africans to have rights. It shows a black South African protester being trampled on by a big boot which represents the South African police or government. We know there were many examples of the police attacking peaceful protests, like the Sharpeville massacre.</i> Or <i>The cartoonist is being sarcastic. The message is that Johannes Vorster is lying when he says that black South Africans have the right to campaign against Apartheid, because the police actually beat up or arrest protesters, shown by the boot, like they did in Sharpeville.</i> <i>(Candidates might focus on the 'Mandela sentences' placard in the cartoon and use the Rivonia trial as context when explaining the message – this is not necessary but should be credited if correct.)</i>	4–5
Level 2 Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct a supported argument in answer to	Level 2 answers will typically identify the message of the cartoon and support this through effective use of content and/or context. <i>The message of this cartoon is that black people are being treated badly by the police in South Africa, and they don't have the right to protest. It shows a black South African protester who has been trampled on by a big boot representing the South African police. We know there were many examples of the police attacking peaceful protests, like the Sharpeville massacre.</i>	2–3

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
the question about the source.	NB: Cartoon's message without support = mark at bottom of level NB: Valid identification of a sub-messages are also rewarded at L2. e.g.	
Level 1 Response analyses the source in a very basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance that is linked to the question.	Level 1 answers will typically make a valid comment about the content or provenance of the source. e.g. <i>The cartoon shows a black person being stood on by a big boot. It is wrong to treat black people like this.</i> OR <i>The cartoonist is making fun of the South African government.</i>	1
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

8.* 'In the 1970s, resistance against Apartheid was **not** effective.' How far do you agree?

(18 marks)

Assessment Objectives	AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [8]
Additional Guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response. The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level. No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 - The response has a full explanation and thorough analysis of historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is developed to reach a convincing, substantiated conclusion in response to the question. - This is supported by a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. - There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.	Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced and well-supported argument which uses a range of evidence to support the argument being made, e.g. <i>In some ways this is true. One example of resistance was the Soweto protests. Black schools were well below the standard of those of white children, and then the government tried to insist half of all lessons were taught in Afrikaans, a language many black children were unfamiliar with. Children protested by boycotting classes and holding demonstrations. However, the protests failed because not only did the government not change its policies but some of the people who participated were killed and hundreds were arrested. News of the deaths led to riots which lasted for months and led to the police using more violence.</i> <i>However, it is not completely true that the Soweto protesters failed to achieve any success. While they didn't achieve their immediate aims, the extreme reaction of the police led to a worldwide outcry and a growth in the international Anti-Apartheid movement. The events in Soweto were broadcast by international news crews, such as the BBC. The images of children being killed by the South African police were spread around the world and used by the A-A movement to gain support for sanctions and boycotts. In the longer term this would help lead to the ending of Apartheid.</i> <i>It is true that resistance from the ANC at this time was not very successful. They were in exile during the 1970s and the leaders were cut off from the people in South Africa. This meant they found it hard to direct resistance activities. They set up training camps in Tanzania, but the conditions were bad and they didn't have many resources. Many of the members deserted. The camps were closed down by the Tanzanian government and they had to move to other neighbouring countries, like Zambia.</i> <i>A form of resistance which was more successful was through Trade Unions. Unions were angry about the rise in the cost of living, low wages and poor working conditions. In 1973 a strike spread from Durban to other workplaces so that, over the next few months, there were 160 more strikes. In most cases these workers</i>	15–18

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	succeeded in winning pay rises of around 10-20% and the government finally officially agreed to recognise trade unions. This was a major achievement. Overall, it can be argued that in the short term most acts of resistance were not successful. Protesters were often violently attacked or killed by police or government forces, and because of the lack of leadership in the country, resistance was not coordinated very well. However, in the long term we could argue that resistance was successful because responses by the South African government led to criticisms from other countries and a decline in foreign investment and tourism. This led to an economic downturn and pressure on the South African government to change the system which would later be successful. N.B candidates may answer by giving 2 examples of resistance that were successful and 2 examples of resistance that were failures OR they might focus solely on one example of resistance e.g. give 2 'yes' and two 'no' arguments about the Soweto uprising. Either approach should be credited if correct. NB: international as well as well as domestic resistance can be credited NB: A clinching argument = one extra mark 16-17 marks = 4 explained points (3-1 or 2-2) 15-16 marks = 3 explained points (2-1)	
Level 4 - The response has a full explanation and analysis of the historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to develop a fully supported answer to the question. - This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. - There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.	Level 4 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument supported by at least two explained examples, OR a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one explained example e.g. <i>In some ways this is true. One example of resistance was the Soweto protests. Black schools were well below the standard of those of white children, and then the government tried to insist half of all lessons were taught in Afrikaans, a language many black children were unfamiliar with. Children protested by boycotting classes and holding demonstrations. However, the protests failed because not only did the government not change its policies but some of the people who participated were killed and hundreds were arrested. News of the deaths led to riots which lasted for months and led to the police using more violence.</i> <i>Equally, resistance by the ANC during this time was not very successful. They were in exile during the 1970s and the leaders were cut off from the people in South Africa. This meant they found it hard to direct resistance activities. They set up training camps in Tanzania, but the conditions were bad and they didn't have many resources. Many of the members deserted. The camps were closed down by the Tanzanian government and they had to move to other neighbouring countries, like Zambia.</i> NB: 14 marks- reserve for clinching argument. Standard mark is 12 marks unless one of points developed well.	11–14

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 - The response has an analysis and explanation of the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to give a supported answer to the question. - This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument with support from one explained example, e.g. <i>In some ways resistance in the 1970s could be seen as a success. For instance, in 1976 students protested against changes to the education system which meant lessons would be taught in Afrikaans. The students protested by boycotting classes and holding demonstrations against the changes. The police reacted violently to the protesters and images of dead and wounded children were shown around the world. The behaviour of the South African police inspired more people around the world to join the Anti-Apartheid movement and campaign against Apartheid. Their boycotts and protests caused problems for the South Africa government and put pressure on them to improve the situation for Black South Africans.</i> OR <i>It is true that most resistance failed in the 1970s. The ANC were in exile during this time, so they couldn't direct resistance activities very effectively. They set up training camps in neighbouring countries, but they were full of problems, like a lack of resources and poor conditions that led to many people just deserting or fighting amongst themselves.</i> NB: Sound answer is 8/9 marks.	7–10
Level 2 - The response has an explanation about the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and gives an answer to the question set. - This is supported by some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	Level 2 answers will typically identify and/or describe events related to forms of resistance, or identify and/or describe types of resistance but fail to satisfactorily link to success/failure e.g. <i>Resistance was successful from the trade unions. They got pay rises for black workers and got official recognition of their status.</i> <i>The BCM had mixed success. They made black people respect themselves more but the government also cracked down on their leaders and activities in supporting the poor.</i> <i>The ANC was not successful in the 1970s as they were trying to operate from exile and faced many difficulties with resources and securing bases in neighbouring countries.</i> <i>The International Anti-Apartheid Movement had little success at this time as sanctions were not supported.</i> <i>Black South Africans were unhappy about their education. They had to pay for their education (unlike whites) and their schools were overcrowded with unqualified teachers. Then the government said they should be taught in Afrikaans. They held a demonstration that spread throughout the townships called the Soweto Uprising. The police fired on them, and many were killed.</i>	4–6

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 1 - The response has a basic explanation about the historical events/period in the question, though the specific question may be answered only partially or the answer may be in the form of assertion that is not supported by the preceding explanation. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer. - There is basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions or demonstrate simple knowledge about resistance g <i>The Soweto uprising took place.</i> <i>Black South Africans started rioting.</i> <i>Trade unions went on strike</i> <i>Leaders of the ANC had to leave the country</i> Or <i>It was a failure because some people died.</i>	1–3
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

Need to get in touch?

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

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit



ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder



ocr.org.uk



Twitter/ocrextams



/ocrextams



/company/ocr



/ocrextams



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS & ASSESSMENT

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 2025 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

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

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

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

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

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