



GCSE (9–1)

History A (Explaining the Modern World)

J410/01: International Relations: the changing international order

1918–c.2001 with China 1950–1981: The People and the State

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2019

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 2019

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
✓ 1	Level 1
✓ 2	Level 2
✓ 3	Level 3
✓ 4	Level 4
✓ 5	Level 5
SEEN	Noted but no credit given
NAQ	Not answered question
~~~~	Extendable horizontal wavy line

## **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.

### **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.

## Section A

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

#### 1. Outline how international peace was encouraged in the 1920s.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The 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.</li></ul>	Please see following page	4–5
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The 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.</li></ul>		2–3
<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.</li></ul>		1
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

1. Outline how international peace was encouraged in the 1920s.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify a way in which peace was encouraged and develop the answer e.g.</p> <p><i>To encourage peace a League of Nations was created in the 1920s. Many countries joined to try and keep peace through talking about disputes rather than resorting to violence. Countries made agreements between themselves to avoid a repetition of the First World War which had killed millions.</i></p> <p><i>The League of Nations encouraged peace by resolving disputes. A good example of this working was the dispute between Sweden and Finland over the Åland Islands in 1921, where the case was brought to the League who ruled that the islands belonged to Finland. Sweden accepted the decision and this encouraged peaceful solutions.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Supported example of approach eg Agreement / League (4 marks) with how it encouraged peace (5 marks)</b>  Development is most likely to involve the aims/reasons for or methods of the organization/action identified.</p>	<b>4–5</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify one or more example(s) of international peace being encouraged in the 1920s e.g.</p> <p>A League of Nations was created (2) to sort out disputes (3)  Countries made treaties (2)  Countries started to disarm (2)  They agreed the Locarno treaty (3) (to get L3 needs how it would promote peace - some support about Locarno and / or Locarno being part of wider pattern of co-operation).  Trade was encouraged to foster better relations (2)</p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identifies example(s) of how peace was encouraged.</b></p>	<b>2–3</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically outline one or more event with little or no reference to encouraging international peace, or respond very generally e.g.</p> <p><i>Countries agreed to keep the peace.</i></p>	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 0</b>		<b>0</b>

2. Explain why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949.

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

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li><li>• This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li></ul>	Please see following page	9–10
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li><li>• This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li></ul>		7–8
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li><li>• This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li></ul>		5–6
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li><li>• This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li></ul>		3–4
<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li><li>• There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li></ul>		1–2
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		0

2. Explain why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two reasons why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p><i>One reason the USA and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949 was that they could not agree on how to deal with Germany after the Second World War. Stalin wanted to force Germany to pay massive reparations for all the damage done to the USSR during the war but President Truman believed this would make a repeat of war more likely, just like after the First World War. Stalin became concerned that the USA was trying to build up Germany as an ally against the USSR.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason that they clashed over Germany was due to the Berlin Blockade. In 1948 Stalin blocked off access to West Berlin, which was occupied by the Allies but deep inside Soviet-occupied East Germany. Stalin was trying to force the Allies out, but they responded by transporting huge amounts of supplies to West Berlin by plane in what became known as the Berlin Airlift.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Two reasons for problems identified and explained.</b>  <b>NB: 2 threshold answers – 9 marks</b></p>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify one reason why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany and explain it fully e.g.</p> <p><i>The USA and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949 because they could not agree on how to deal with Germany after the Second World War. Stalin wanted to force Germany to pay massive reparations for all the damage done to the USSR during the war but President Truman blocked this. Stalin became concerned that the USA was trying to build up Germany as an ally against the USSR.</i></p> <p><b>THRESHOLD ANSWERS</b>  <i>One reason was they couldn't agree on how to deal with Germany after the war. Stalin wanted Germany to pay huge reparations, but Truman blocked this. This caused a clash.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason that they clashed was due to the Berlin Blockade. In 1948 Stalin blocked off access to West Berlin which was occupied by the Allies to try to force them out. They responded by transporting supplies to West Berlin by plane.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One reason for problems identified and explained.</b>  <b>NB: 1 threshold answer – 7 marks</b></p>	<b>7–8</b>

<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify or describe at least one reason why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany. e.g.</p> <p><i>Berlin was a source of tension between 1945 and 1949 because it was deep inside the Soviet zone of occupation but the Allies controlled the West of the city. The Allies had pumped large amounts of money into West Berlin to rebuild it but the East of Berlin remained poor.</i></p> <p><i>Truman thought that Stalin's desire for reparations would make Germany want revenge.</i></p> <p><i>Stalin thought Truman wanted to build Germany up as an ally against Russia.</i></p> <p><i>Stalin wanted Germany weak, the USA wanted to help build it up.</i></p> <p><i>The USA, Britain and France united the currency in their zones and Stalin was furious.</i></p> <p><i>Berlin was deep in the Soviet zone and Stalin resented western influence there.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identifies and describes reason(s) but fails to explain how it/they led to a clash</b></p>	<b>5–6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to the USA and USSR clashing over Germany e.g.</p> <p><i>In 1947 the British and Americans merged their zones of occupation in West Germany to become Bizonia. The following year Stalin blocked off access to West Berlin, which was in the Soviet zone.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no reasons identified</b></p>	<b>3–4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g.</p> <p><i>After the war Germany was split into four parts.</i></p> <p><i>They clashed over Berlin.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Unspecific points</b></p>	<b>1–2</b>
<b>Level 0</b>		<b>0</b>

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is a fair comment on the reasons why the Cold War began? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of the early stages of the Cold War to support your answer.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The response has a full and thoroughly developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a convincing and substantiated judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li><li>The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li></ul>	<b>Please see following pages</b>	<b>21–25</b>
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The response has a developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a fully supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li><li>The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li></ul>		<b>16–20</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied, and uses this to make a partially supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li><li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li></ul>		<b>11–15</b>
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and limited evaluation of other interpretations studied, and links this to a judgement of the given interpretation in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li><li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li></ul>		<b>6–10</b>
<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in terms of the question. Other interpretations may be mentioned but there is no analysis or evaluation of them.</li><li>The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question</li></ul>		<b>1–5</b>
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	.	<b>0</b>

3.



3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is this a fair comment on the reasons why the Cold War **began**? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of the early stages of the Cold War to support your answer.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	<p>Level 5 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by <b>developed use of two</b> other interpretations OR <b>developed use of one</b> other interpretation and evaluation of Interpretation A based on the context of A e.g</p> <p><i>In Interpretation A Nettl is arguing that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War, however its actions were understandable and to an extent justifiable. He is claiming that by trying to take control of Eastern Europe and keep Germany weak Stalin was looking to protect the USSR rather than expand it.</i></p> <p><i>In many ways this is a fair comment. Recent post-revisionist historians would have shared Nettl's view as they see Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe as defensive. These historians see the origins of the Cold War as being the result of mistrust and misunderstanding between the two sides which resulted in a cycle of action and reaction. They agree that Stalin was to blame for some aspects, but argue that his actions were often misunderstood by the US, just as in this extract Nettl tries to explain Stalin's actions without criticising them.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand other historians would disagree with Nettl, and place the blame for the Cold War mainly at the feet of the US. These revisionist historians argued that the USA caused the Cold War by trying to dominate Europe economically, with Marshall Aid and using its 'Open Door' policy. This was an attempt to give the US access to states it could dominate.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates could argue that other historians would disagree with Nettl partly and blame the USSR for helping to cause the Cold War, but see its actions as premeditated and about wanting to spread revolution around the world.]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Developed use of other interpretations or context (of A) to support/challenge Interpretation A</b>  <b>NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported.</b>  <b>NOTE For L5 cards need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair</b></p>	21–25
Level 4	<p>Level 4 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by <b>developed use of one</b> other interpretation or the context of Interpretation A eg</p> <p><i>Interpretation A argues that Stalin caused the Cold War because he was trying to protect the USSR, not because he was acting aggressively. That is why he took control of Eastern Europe.</i></p> <p><i>In many ways this is a fair comment. Other historians in the 1980s and 90s agree he caused the Cold War because although he was acting defensively, his actions were misunderstood by the USA and they overreacted to him, thinking that he was looking for world revolution. This then led to a cycle of reaction and action which made the situation very tense.</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><i>This is not a fair comment. Revisionist historians would not agree as they saw the USA's actions as to blame for the Cold War, not the USSR's. These historians believe the US was trying to spread its influence and power which is why it was willing to give Marshall Aid to Europe, as it would help its own economy to recover and strengthen ties with Europe. This aggravated Stalin who saw it as 'dollar imperialism'</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Developed use of ONE interpretation or context (of A) to support / challenge Interpretation A</b>  <b>NOTE For L4 cards need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair</b></p>	16–20

<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by relevant factual knowledge OR undeveloped use of relevant interpretation(s) eg</p> <p><i>The comment is fair that the USSR caused the Cold War because when it took steps to expand into Eastern Europe this was spreading Communism and was seen as aggressive by the United States. When Stalin used tactics like bringing Red Army soldiers into Eastern Europe, staging rigged elections and assassinating non-Communist politicians like in Czechoslovakia Stalin was being reckless and ignoring agreements made at Yalta. (use of relevant factual knowledge)</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>This comment is fair that the USSR caused the Cold War because orthodox historians agree that it was the USSR who caused it by acting aggressively and expanding. (undeveloped use of relevant interpretation)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid argument based on contextual knowledge OR valid but undeveloped use of interpretation(s)</b>  <b>NOTE For L3 cands need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair</b></p>	<b>11–15</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically describe interpretation(s) without explaining whether it/they support or contradict Interpretation A eg</p> <p><i>Orthodox historians think that the Cold War was the result of aggressive expansion by the USSR. Revisionists blamed the USA more than the USSR because the USA provoked USSR with the Truman Doctrine.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Describes interpretation(s) but fails to address question</b></p>	<b>6–10</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points about Interpretation A accompanied by basic knowledge or a general statement about other interpretations e.g.</p> <p><i>Nettl is being fair. The USSR was at risk and wanted to protect itself.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is not fair. Many historians would disagree with what Nettl has said.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Shows understanding of A/unsupported assertions about fairness</b></p>	<b>1–5</b>
<b>Level 0</b>		<b>0</b>

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

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO4 (a, b and c): Analyse individual interpretations and how and why interpretations differ. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p> <p>Candidates are not required to refer to specific historians or schools of thought but should be given credit within the level if they do so correctly.</p> <p>Credit could be awarded within any level for candidates who explain (with valid support such as the new sources under the Public Records Act) that some historians <b>have</b> agreed with the interpretation</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b>	<p>Please see following page(s)</p>	<b>17–20</b> 
<b>Level 4</b>		<b>13–16</b> 
<b>Level 3</b>		<b>9–12</b> 

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a partial analysis how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is some analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>		
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of at least one other interpretation studied, to show how the interpretations differ.</li> <li>There is a basic explanation of why the given interpretation and the other interpretation(s) differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate.</li> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>		<b>5–8</b> 
<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response compares the candidate's own knowledge and understanding to the interpretation, or uses knowledge and understanding of the time in which it was created, to analyse the given interpretation.</li> <li>There is no consideration or no relevant consideration of any other interpretations.</li> <li>The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>		<b>1–4</b> 
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

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.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	<p>Level 5 answers will typically provide developed explanations of <b>how</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>two</b> periods have disagreed with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B and explain <b>why</b> at least <u>one of them</u> disagrees, eg</p> <p><i>Taylor is arguing that Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was a mistake and that Chamberlain, through 'fear', simply encouraged Hitler to make more and more demands and so made war inevitable rather than preventing it.</i></p> <p><i>In the late 1930s, many commentators would have strongly disagreed with this view. Many people at the time saw Chamberlain's actions as keeping the peace. In a world that still remembered the horrors of the First World War and had seen the effects of modern warfare in the Spanish Civil War many commentators respected Chamberlain and viewed him as a hero. Most MPs approved of his actions and Chamberlain was cheered by the people when he returned from the Munich Conference. (How and Why)</i></p> <p><i>Writing in the late 1960s, many historians also shared the view that Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was a reasonable one and so they too would not have agreed with Interpretation B. By this time more documents had become available that demonstrated just how weak Britain was in the 1930s and Britain's failure in the Suez Crisis in the 1950s had shown standing up to dictators with military force could end in failure. (How and Why)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Valid explanation of how views from two periods disagree, with explanation as to why at least one is different: HW H.  <b>NOTE For L5</b> candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported</p>	17–20 
Level 4	<p>Level 4 answers will explain <b>how</b> or <b>why</b> historians from <b>two</b> different periods agree or disagree with particular aspect(s) of interpretation B.  <b>OR</b> will explain <b>how and why</b> historians from <b>one</b> period agree or disagree.</p> <p><i>Not all historians and commentators shared Taylor's view that Chamberlain's actions were a mistake and encouraged Hitler. Many at the time would have disagreed with Interpretation B. Tens of thousands of letters and telegrams were sent to Chamberlain praising him for his actions. In a world that still remembered the horrors of the First World War and had seen the effects of modern warfare in the Spanish Civil War many commentators respected Chamberlain and viewed him as a hero.</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><i>Writing years after the events, many historians in the late 1960s shared the view that Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was a reasonable one and would not have agreed with Interpretation B. By this time more documents had become available that demonstrated how weak Britain was in the 1930s, and that the Great Depression and disarmament in the 1920s had left Britain too weak to use military force against Hitler. Because of this, Chamberlain was seen having no other real option but to try and appease Hitler's demands, and in fact bought Britain the time it needed to rearm and stand up to Germany.</i></p> <p><i>[Alternatively, candidates could balance their argument with reference to those who might agree with Interpretation B, such as the authors of 'Guilty Men', or Churchill].</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> 2H different periods or 2W different periods or H+W same period or H+W different periods  <b>NOTE For L4</b> candidates need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported  NB: Agreements can reach this level.</p>	13–16 

<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically explain <b>how OR why</b> historian(s) and commentator(s) <b>from one period</b> have <b>agreed OR disagreed</b> with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B e.g.</p> <p><i>Many revisionist historians would have disagreed with the view that the failure of appeasement was down to Chamberlain. They argued he was working under very difficult circumstances and had little choice but to appease Hitler when the British military was still unprepared for war in 1938. (12)</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><i>Many historians and commentators would actually have agreed with Interpretation B that Chamberlain was afraid. Straight after the war broke out a book called 'Guilty Men' accused Chamberlain and his colleagues of cowardice and failing to stand up to Hitler. (12)</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><i>Interpretation B is critical of Chamberlain. Counter-revisionists' historians writing in the 1990s would agree as they have criticised Chamberlain too, saying that he overestimated the power Germany possessed and that he continued to use Appeasement long after it was obviously not going to work. (10)</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><i>Revisionist historians would not accept this view that Chamberlain was motivated by fear. Most of them were looking at evidence that was made available after the 50 Year Rule was changed to the 30 Year Rule in the late 1960. They saw that in reality Chamberlain did not have many options other than to appease Hitler because of the state of Britain's economy and military. (12)</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Explains how or why historian from one period agrees or disagrees (H or W)</b>  <b>NOTE For L3 cards need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported</b></p>	<b>9-12</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify historian(s) who have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why OR will provide a chronological overview of the historiography but not examine interpretation B, or misunderstand it, eg:</p> <p><i>Some historians in the 1960s (or Revisionists) were more sympathetic towards Chamberlain because they thought he was in a no win situation.</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><i>Commentators in the late 1930s praised Chamberlain. The orthodox view criticised him. The revisionists understood his actions and justified them and then the post revisionists criticised him again for stubbornness.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identifies historians / schools of thought / periods but fails to address particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B</b>  <b>NOTE: The term 'many historians' or similar expressions is not sufficient for L2 as its too unspecific- time period, school of thought or a named historian needed.</b></p>	<b>5-8</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions about Interpretation B or give their own critique of it e.g.</p> <p><i>Many commentators would have disagreed with Interpretation B because they were there at the time and would see things differently.</i></p> <p><i>Some historians would also have disagreed because they would have access to sources that would allow them to have different views.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: General assertions/own critique</b>  <b>NOTE: 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 using contextual knowledge.</b></p>	<b>1-4</b>

## Section B

### China 1950–1981: The People and the State

5. Describe **one** example of the way that Deng Xiaoping changed the economy of China between 1976 and 1981.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>First mark for identification of change + second mark for descriptive detail for each response.</p> <p>Note that a maximum of 1 mark can be given for correct identification of change, even if more than one example of change is identified.</p> <p>All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of <b>change</b> should also be credited.</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
N/A Points marking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>One way Deng changed China's economy was by allowing peasants to sell any surplus crops they produced [1]. This was intended to motivate peasants to produce more food [2].</i></li><li><i>Deng changed China's economy by encouraging small businesses [1]. This led to more consumer goods being available [2].</i></li></ul>	2

6. Explain why the Chinese government took action against opposition in China between 1976 and 1981.

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b>	<i>Please see next page</i>	<b>9–10</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>		<b>7–8</b>
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>		<b>5–6</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>		<b>3–4</b>
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>		<b>1–2</b>
<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>		<b>0</b>
<b>Level</b>		

6. Explain why the Chinese government took action against opposition in China between 1976 and 1981.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two reasons why the Chinese government took action against opposition and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p>• <i>One reason the Chinese government took action against opposition in this period was to secure its position. When Mao died his widow and three other key Communists (called the 'Gang of Four') tried to seize power. They failed but Mao's wife remained a powerful figure and might have threatened the government so in 1981 they were put on trial in a highly public way and given long prison sentences. By putting the Gang of Four on trial, Deng was sending out a very powerful signal to the Party that he was in charge of the government and that opposition within the Party would not be tolerated.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason the government acted against opposition was because they felt that changes in Chinese society were going too far. Because Deng's 'Four Modernisations' were changing China's economy some people thought the political system was also going to change and talked about a 'Fifth Modernisation'; democracy. There was even a 'democracy wall' of posters demanding more freedoms set up in Beijing. By 1981, though, the leaders of this democracy movement had all been arrested. The government took action against the people to show that the Party controlled China and that talk of democracy was not acceptable.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Two reasons for problems identified and explained.</b></p> <p><b>NB: 2 threshold answers – 9 marks</b></p>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify one reason why the Chinese government took action against opposition and explain it fully e.g.</p> <p>• <i>The government took action to stop talk of democracy. The Chinese economy was changing at this time, and some people thought the political system was also going to change and talked about a 'Fifth Modernisation'; democracy. There was even a 'democracy wall' of posters demanding more freedoms set up in Beijing. By 1981, though, the leaders of this democracy movement had all been arrested because the government had no intention of giving power to the people and crushed this opposition.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One reason identified and explained.</b></p> <p><b>NB: 1 threshold answer – 7 marks</b></p>	<b>7–8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify and describe one reason why the Chinese government took action against opposition and what was done, without explaining it e.g.</p> <p>• <i>The Gang of Four wanted a more extreme version of communism than the one Deng had introduced in China. The government placed them under house arrest in 1976 and then in 1981 they were subjected to a 'show trial' and imprisoned.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identifies and describes reason(s) but fails to explain how it/they led to action</b></p>	<b>5–6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events that is linked to Chinese government action against opposition e.g.</p> <p>• <i>Wei Jingsheng was arrested for his views about democracy, and the Gang of Four were imprisoned.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no reasons identified</b></p>	<b>3–4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g.</p> <p>• <i>Because the Chinese government did not like people who opposed them.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>They wanted to crush all their opposition.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: General points or assertions</b></p>	<b>1–2</b>
<b>Level</b>	No response or no response worthy of credit	<b>0</b>

7a. Study Source A. Explain how this source is useful to a historian studying China in the 1950s.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>Please see next page</b>	<b>4–5</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the specific question about the source.</li> </ul>		
<b>Level 2</b>		<b>2–3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct an argument in answer to the question about the source.</li> </ul>		
<b>Level 1</b>		<b>1</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses the source in a basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance and using this to give a simple answer to the question about the source.</li> </ul>		
<b>Level 0</b>		<b>0</b>
No response or no response worthy of credit.		
<b>Level</b>	No response or no response worthy of credit	<b>0</b>

7a. Study Source A. Explain how this source is useful to a historian studying China in the 1950s.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>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 e.g.</p> <p><i>Source A is useful because it presents us with evidence of how the Chinese government wanted women to be seen and shows the measures it took to enhance their status. The source shows that women were seen as crucial to economic growth ('power our economy' and associating them with new power sources like electricity). It shows how they were a force for good, knocking away old-fashioned ideas of how things are done, represented by the small man to the right who is overpowered by the woman's size and force. This attempt to raise the status and importance of women was also seen in the Marriage Law of 1951 which gave greater equality.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Useful based on inference with support</b></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically argue the source is useful based on unsupported inference(s) OR on reliability or selections from the content e.g.</p> <p><i>This source is useful because it shows what was going on in China in the 1950s. Women were playing a big role in Chinese society and in fact one of Mao's slogans was 'the times have changed, so men and women are the same'. Women worked alongside men in the collective farms and earned work-points to gain money for the family just like men.</i> OR <i>The source is not useful because it was produced by the government who had a clear idea about what they wanted the role of women to be. It doesn't tell us the role women actually played in society so isn't that reliable in reality.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Usefulness of source(s) based on unsupported inferences/reliability.</b> <b>NB: Not useful as not reliable = L2/2</b></p>	<b>2–3</b>
<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically assert utility of content or provenance eg</p> <p><i>The source is useful because it is a primary source, a poster from the time.</i> OR <i>This source is propaganda. This means it is not useful because it cannot be trusted.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Undeveloped use of content or provenance</b></p>	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

7b. Study Source B. How reliable is this source as evidence about how the Chinese government dealt with their opponents in the early 1950s?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p>

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will produce a developed evaluation of the source (usually based on purpose or context) to explain whether it is or is not reliable about the issue specified in the question e.g.</p> <p><i>Sometimes a photograph can be staged to exaggerate, but based on what it shows and what I know about conditions in China at the time I do think it's reliable as evidence about how the government dealt with opposition. Firstly, the provenance states the photograph was smuggled out of China so that makes it more likely to be accurate because it shows things the government wouldn't want outsiders to see. The 'people's tribunal' looks to be treating Huang brutally as he is tied up and being forced to kneel and this makes the source more likely to be reliable as it's true that hundreds of thousands of landlords such as Huang were executed as part of Mao's Land Reform campaign and many more were subjected to the humiliation of 'struggle sessions'.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: reliable / not about treatment of opponents with support</b></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically argue the content of the source is/is not reliable in general terms (usually based on their own knowledge or provenance) e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't think this source is reliable. It was taken by opponents of the Communist regime and then published in the West so it was designed to discredit China.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: reliable / not reliable in general terms</b></p>	<b>2–3</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically argue the source is or is not reliable based on selections from it or assertions about provenance e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't think this source is reliable because it's a photograph and photographs can be staged to show something false.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Generalised comments on reliability based on source type</b></p>	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	No response or no response worthy of credit.	<b>0</b>

8. 'Intellectuals suffered more than any other group in China between 1966 and 1976'. How far do you agree?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [8]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>Answers at Level 4 require one point on each side of the argument and one element of support. Answers with more valid support than this should be awarded L5</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p> <p>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full explanation and thorough analysis of historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is developed to reach a convincing, substantiated conclusion in response to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	<i>Please see next page</i> <b>15–18</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full explanation and analysis of the historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to develop a fully supported answer to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	<b>11–14</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an analysis and explanation of the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to give a supported answer to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></li> </ul>	<b>7–10</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an explanation about the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and gives an answer to the question set.</li> <li>This is supported by some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></li> </ul>	<b>4–6</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a basic explanation about the historical events/period in the question, though the specific question may be answered only partially or the answer may be in the form of assertion that is not supported by the preceding explanation. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> <li>There is basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li><i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></li> </ul>	<b>1–3</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	No response or no response worthy of credit.	<b>0</b>

8. 'Intellectuals suffered more than any other group in China between 1966 and 1976'. How far do you agree?

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 5</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced and well-supported argument explaining how far e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On one hand intellectuals suffered between 1966 and 1976, as during the Cultural Revolution people like teachers and writers were accused of damaging Communism and working against Mao. Teachers and university lecturers were often forced to wear dunce's caps and kneel on broken glass. Intellectuals lived in fear of being denounced, and had to attend 'struggle sessions' where they were bullied, bombarded by accusations and forced to listen to criticism. Many lost their jobs, some were killed and others committed suicide. They suffered terribly because to many Red Guards they were the main target – and so the victims – of the Cultural Revolution.</li> <li>On the other hand many young people also suffered in this period. Although the students in the Red Guards carried out much of the violence of the Cultural Revolution, they were also its victims. Thousands died in fighting between rival groups of Red Guards. In the late 1960s Mao launched the 'Down to the Countryside Movement' and millions of young people were sent to the countryside to work with the peasants. This meant young people also suffered because many of them lost chance of an education and it created a 'lost generation' in China.</li> <li>On balance, intellectuals suffered more than any other group in China because they were almost wiped out as a group. The young did suffer, but much of their suffering was because of the action taken against intellectuals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument with at least two examples on one side and one on the other side</b>  <b>NOTE: 18 marks = As below plus a clinching argument</b>  <b>Award within mark range 15-17 for quality of each of the three points</b></p>	<b>15-18</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced and supported argument e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On one hand intellectuals suffered between 1966 and 1976, as during the Cultural Revolution teachers and lecturers were accused of damaging Communism and working against Mao. They were often forced to wear dunce's caps and kneel on broken glass. Intellectuals lived in fear of being denounced and had to attend terrible 'struggle sessions'. Many lost their jobs, some were killed, and others committed suicide.</li> <li>On the other hand, the Cultural Revolution was also aimed at Party officials whom Mao disagreed with and millions of them suffered. After Mao wrote his 'Bombard the Headquarters' article in 1966 there was a period of intense criticism of several Party leaders. This spread to the wider party, and over a million Party cadres lost their positions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided (two explained examples of support); or balanced argument (one explained example of support on each side)</b>  <b>14 marks- reserve for clinching argument</b></p>	<b>11-14</b>

<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument with support e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>I disagree, because the people of Tibet also suffered during this period. Part of the Cultural Revolution was Mao's attack on the 'Four Olds', and this was carried out aggressively by the Red Guards operating in Tibet. By 1976 thousands of Tibetan monasteries – such as Ganden, one of the largest Buddhist monasteries in the world – were destroyed and only a handful remained. Hundreds of thousands of monks were either killed or driven into exile. This shows that the Tibetan people suffered greatly during this period because their traditional way of life was almost destroyed.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, one explained example to support</b></p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Many answers at L3 will attempt a balanced answer and a wider range of support but only achieve one valid explanation</p>	<b>7-10</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify and describe events relating to whether intellectuals suffered more than any other group between 1966 and 1976 e.g.</p> <p><i>Intellectuals were humiliated at 'struggle sessions', where they were forced to stand for long periods of time and were subjected to abuse. Students lost their education because they were sent into the countryside to 'learn from the peasants'. Around 3 million Party cadres were victimised by the Red Guards. Tibetan religious books were condemned as 'poisonous weeds' and banned or destroyed.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: identify and describe relevant events/developments but not explaining in relation to question.</b></p>	<b>4-6</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate simple knowledge of whether intellectuals suffered more than any other group between 1966 and 1976 or make general assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>I think intellectuals did suffer more than any other group because they were the main targets.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: General assertion about intellectuals or others</b></p>	<b>1-3</b>
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

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

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

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2019

