



GCSE (9–1)

History B (Schools History Project)

J411/39: The Making of America, 1789-1900 with Living under Nazi Rule, 1933-1945

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for November 2020

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 2020

Annotations

Stamp	Annotation Name	Description
✓ 1	Tick 1	Level 1
✓ 2	Tick 2	Level 2
✓ 3	Tick 3	Level 3
✓ 4	Tick 4	Level 4
✓ 5	Tick 5	Level 5
✓ 6	Tick 6	Level 6
SEEN	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
NAQ	NAQ	Not answered question
~~~~	Wavy Line	Development / Evidence / Support of valid point
BP	BP	Blank page

## 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.

## Mark Scheme

## Section A: The Making of America, 1789 - 1900

## Question 1 – 3 marks .

- a) Identify one difficulty migrants faced when travelling to the Far West in the 1840s.
- b) Name one of the railroad companies which built lines across the Plains after 1860.
- c) Identify one way in which US Government policies affected Native American culture between the years 1877-1900.

Guidance	Indicative content
1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(a), likely valid responses include: crossing the mountains of the Sierra Nevada, or the Blue mountains; diseases like cholera; autumn snows trapping them in the mountains; crossing swollen rivers; stampeding buffalo; hostile Indians.</i>
1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(b), likely valid responses include: Central Pacific Railroad Company, Union Pacific Company, Kansas Pacific, Santa Fe, Great Northern.</i>
1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(c) likely valid responses include: splitting up tribes; confining to reservations and reliance on rations; setting up government structures like those of the US government; conversion to Christianity; children sent away to white boarding schools; losing power to run their own courts.</i>  Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.

<b>Question 2 – 9 marks</b> 2. Write a clear and organised summary that analyses slavery in the years 1793-1838. Support your summary with examples.	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 3 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates a well-selected range of valid knowledge of characteristic features that are fully relevant to the question, in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows sustained logical coherence, demonstrating clear use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i>  <i>Answers could consider aspects of one or more of the following: how slavery expanded, the reasons for the expansion of slavery; the geographical growth of slavery across the US; diversity within the growth ie reasons for growth in the south and not north etc; the impact of the expansion and slavery in general during this period, on people and/or places and the economy, how slavery affected the different parts of the USA</i>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates a range of knowledge of characteristic features that are relevant to the question, in ways that show understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows some logical coherence, demonstrating use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>Answers may show understanding of second order concepts such as cause and consequences; continuity and change; significance</i>  <i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise their answer, but the concepts do need to be apparent from the connections and chains of reasoning in the summary in order to meet the AO2 descriptors (see levels descriptors).</i>
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of characteristic features with some relevance to the question, in ways that show some limited understanding of them (AO1). The summary shows a very basic logical coherence, demonstrating limited use of at least one second order concept in attempting to find connections and to provide a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 2—9 marks	
2. Write a clear and organised summary that analyses slavery in the years 1793–1838. Support your summary with examples.	
	<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L3 will typically be organised around a second order concept such as causes/ consequences, change/continuity, diversity. Answers will be supported with two or more valid examples e.g.</p> <p>[Causation/change]  <i>Slavery expanded over time during this period. One reason was the US acquired more land in the Deep South. For example, after the Louisiana purchase in 1803, the slave states of Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi were added to the union, boosting the spread of plantations and slavery and creating the 'Cotton Kingdom'. Another reason was the invention of the cotton gin in 1793 which increased the speed and quality of cotton production. Planters could now process cotton much faster and this speeded up the expansion of cotton fields and increased the use of slavery on the plantations.</i></p> <p>[Consequence]  <i>Slavery had an entirely negative impact on the lives of black Americans who were forced into slavery. Under the 'pushing system' in Georgia, slaves work from dawn to dusk, planting, weeding and picking, and faced brutal punishments such as whipping if their rate of work dropped. Another impact was on the US economy, which became increasingly dependent on slavery. By 1820, cotton made up 42 per cent of all US exports. Owners of the plantations in the South depended on slave labour for the huge profits they made.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Summary based on second order concept(s) with two or more valid supporting examples</b>  <b>Note: Do not allow answers which veer away from time frame specified in the question, e.g. 1789–93.</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L2 will typically be organised around a second order concept, supported with a valid example e.g.</p> <p>[Diversity]  <i>In the US there were different attitudes towards slavery. The North was less supportive of the system than the South because the nature of the land and the type of work in the North did not lend itself to keeping a workforce of enslaved people. So slavery died out in the North.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L1 will typically list or describe relevant events or developments with no clear organisation around a second order concept e.g.</p> <p><i>Slavery was a brutal system. Georgia men bought slaves in the old states like Maryland and force-marched them for sale to plantation owners in the Deep South.</i>  <i>OR</i>  <i>There was a lot of support for slavery in this period.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: List of events / developments with no clear organising concept.</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 3 – 10 marks</b> <b>What was the impact of the Pikes Peak gold rush on the development of the American West? Explain your answer.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 5 (9–10 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sophisticated understanding of one or more second order concepts in a fully sustained and very well-supported explanation (AO2).	<i>Explanations could consider: it led to the development of cities like Denver in areas that Native Americans believed were their own, heightening tensions between settlers and natives; it stimulated farming and the development of Eastern Kansas as these areas provided goods and produce for gold-mining districts; it led to greater population of Kansas Territory which led to it becoming a state in 1861; (100,000 people had made the journey to Kansas by 1859 increasing population) and it led to a clash the US government and Native Americans and the realisation that the Indian vision of the Plains had to change.</i>
<b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show strong understanding of one or more second order concepts in a sustained and well-supported explanation (AO2).	<i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation and consequence and change and continuity but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sound understanding of one or more second order concepts in a generally coherent and organised explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show some understanding of one or more second order concepts in a loosely organised explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Uses these to show some basic understanding of one or more second order concepts, although the overall response may lack structure and coherence (AO2).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 3–10 marks What was the impact of the Pike's Peak gold rush on the development of the American West? Explain your answer. Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 5 (9-10 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two impacts of the Pike's Peak gold rush on the American West and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p><i>One impact was on the growth of Kansas. The mining in western Kansas led to the development of farming in the eastern part. The farmers could make a good living by selling food to the new towns springing up in the gold-mining districts. This growth in population led to Kansas Territory becoming a state in 1861.</i></p> <p><i>The Pike's Peak gold rush also had a really negative effect on the Native American population because it brought more white settler who started to populate the 'missing' middle states of the USA. This meant that the Plains was no longer just a region to pass through, but to settle in. Cities like Denver were growing in regions where the Arapaho and Southern Cheyenne lived. The competition for grazing land meant they were forced to travel much further from their lands to hunt in the summer.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Two or more specific impacts identified and explained.</b></p>
<b>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify at least one impact of the Pike's Peak gold rush on the American West and explain it fully e.g.</p> <p><i>The Pike's Peak gold rush also had a really negative effect on the Native American population because it brought more white settler who started to populate the 'missing' middle states of the USA. This meant that the Plains was no longer just a region to pass through, but to settle in. Cities like Denver were growing in regions where the Arapaho and Southern Cheyenne lived. The competition for grazing land meant they were forced to travel much further from their lands to hunt in the summer.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One specific impact identified and explained.</b></p>
<b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify at least one valid, specific impact e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It led to the growth towns like St. Joseph.</i></li> <li>• <i>It led to increased conflict with Native American tribes who lived there.</i></li> <li>• <i>Kansas grew and eventually became a state.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell: Identifies one or more valid, specific impact(s) but no development or supporting evidence</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: 5 marks for one impact identified; 6 marks for two or more</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain correct descriptions of the Pike's Peak gold rush or related events without linking these to impact on the development of the American West, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>When gold was discovered in Pike's Peak in 1858 many people flocked there using the railway lines to St. Joseph. More than 100,000 people came by 1859.</i></li> <li>• <i>'Town boosters' tried to get people to set off to Pike's Peak from their town.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell: Describes Pike's Peak gold rush or related events without linking to the question</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers that identify or explain the impact/s of California and/or gold rushes more generally should also be marked in L2</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points, or generalised/ unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Towns grew.</i></li> <li>• <i>Some people got rich</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell: Assertion(s)</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 4* – 18 marks</b> <b>How far do you agree that the lives of African Americans changed little during the Civil War 1861-1865? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Levels</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2).</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description BUT to achieve the highest two levels answers must consider both sides of the argument before reaching a conclusion.</i></p>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2).</p> <p><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of significance; causation and consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2).</p> <p><i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: slaves and free black Americans continued to be treated unequally to whites: before autumn 1862 they were not officially allowed to fight in the Northern army; once they were allowed to join the army they were often treated poorly by white generals, black Americans who fought in the war were paid less than whites until June 1864, and were never allowed to become officers. Life for African Americans in the South changed little as they remained as slave labourers.</i></p>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2).</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: as the war developed, many plantations fell to Union forces and escapee slaves were allowed to work for the Northern army rather than return to their masters; after the Second Confiscation Act of 1862 many slaves on confiscated land were freed and allowed to farm the divided estates or employed there on subsistence wages by Northern investors; many of these were taught to read and write by missionaries by 1865, after the Emancipation Proclamation many had the hope of freedom and equality. For African American troops in the Union Army in the sense that before then they had not been in the army.</i></p>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2).</p> <p><i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2).</p> <p><i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 4* – 18 marks How far do you agree that the lives of African Americans changed little during the Civil War 1861-1865? Give reasons for your answer. Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 18 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>To some extent I agree. In the 'limited war' phase, there was little change to African Americans' lives. Slavery continued just as before. Slaves could not get jobs or earn money and had little if any education. They were treated as property. This was not altered with the outbreak of war. A handful of slaves did work for the Confederate army but they were not allowed to fight. Additionally, in the North, some aspects of life changed little. The black soldiers in the union army were sometimes poorly treated by white generals and were not allowed to become officers. They were often given heavy labour duties and until 1864 did not have equal pay.</i></p> <p><i>However, there was some more change during the 'total war' phase. After the Emancipation Proclamation, black regiments were set up in the Union army for the first time and this helped to start to change white attitudes towards African Americans. There were also more opportunities for freed slaves in the South. For the first time ever, African Americans in the South could find paid work as things like firemen, mechanics and labourers. Some were earning over \$45 a month.</i></p> <p><i>To conclude, the statement is too simplistic. For African Americans in both the North and the South, changes to their lives was minimal during the first 'limited' phase of war, but far greater after 1862. However, I think the change was greater for those in the South because being freed was in itself a momentous change to their daily lives.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side OR three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 18 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 3 valid examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>To some extent I agree. In the 'limited war' phase, there was little change to African Americans' lives. Slavery continued just as before. Slaves could not get jobs or earn money and had little if any education. They were treated as property. This was not altered with the outbreak of war. A handful of slaves did work for the Confederate army but they were not allowed to fight. Additionally, in the North, some aspects of life changed little. The black soldiers in the union army were sometimes poorly treated by white generals and were not allowed to become officers. They were often given heavy labour duties and until 1864 did not have equal pay.</i></p> <p><i>However, there was some more change during the 'total war' phase. After the Emancipation Proclamation, there were also more opportunities for freed slaves in the South. For the first time ever, African Americans in the South could find paid work as things like firemen, mechanics and labourers. Some were earning over \$45 a month.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; three explained points of support (i.e. two on one side and one on the other)</b>  <b>NOTE: Candidates may argue three valid points on one side of the argument and this would be credited at this level</b></p>
<b>Level 4 (10-</b>	Level 4 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.

12 marks)	<p><i>I agree. In the 'limited war' phase, there was little change to African Americans' lives. Slavery continued just as before. Slaves could not get jobs or earn money and had little if any education. They were treated as property. This was not altered with the outbreak of war. A handful of slaves did work for the Confederate army but they were not allowed to fight. Additionally, in the North, some aspects of life changed little. The black soldiers in the union army were sometimes poorly treated by white generals and were not allowed to become officers. They were often given heavy labour duties and until 1864 did not have equal pay.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p>
	<p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>To some extent I agree. In the 'limited war' phase, there was little change to African Americans' lives. Slavery continued just as before. Slaves could not get jobs or earn money and had little if any education. They were treated as property. This was not altered with the outbreak of war. A handful of slaves did work for the Confederate army but they were not allowed to fight. However, there was some more change during the 'total war' phase. After the Emancipation Proclamation, black regiments were set up in the Union army for the first time and this helped to start to change white attitudes towards African Americans.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree. In the 'limited war' phase, there was little change to African Americans' lives. Slavery continued just as before. Slaves could not get jobs or earn money and had little if any education. They were treated as property. This was not altered with the outbreak of war. A handful of slaves did work for the Confederate army but they were not allowed to fight.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b></p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the statement but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because black soldiers did not have equal pay.</i>  <i>No, I don't agree because in 1861 Lincoln freed the slaves with the Emancipation Proclamation.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 2 answers will typically describe relevant events/ African American lives, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>In September 1862, Lincoln said that if the South did not surrender, he would free every last slave permanently. The Emancipation Proclamation was issued on 1 January 1863.</i></li> <li><i>In the North, African Americans weren't enslaved but did not get equal access to jobs. Most schools were segregated.</i></li> <li><b>Nutshell: Description of relevant events/lives without linking this to the question</b></li> </ul>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general and unsupported assertions eg</p> <p><i>No, some African Americans had better jobs during the war.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell General/ unsupported assertion(s)</b></p>

<p><b>Question 5* – 18 marks</b>  <b>'The main reason for conflict between Native and White Americans after 1861 was the broken promises of the US Government.' How far do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer.</b></p>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT, to achieve the two highest levels, answers must consider some of the grounds for arguing the opposite point of view to the one that they finally support.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of significance, and causation but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<i>Grounds for agreeing include: failure to provide sufficient food to reservation Crow Indians leading to Little Crow's War in 1861; failure to uphold the Fort Laramie treaty when the Bozeman trail crossed Indian land, sparking Red Cloud's Wars; failure to uphold the second Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 leading to the Great Sioux War of 1877,</i>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include: the growth of a cross-tribe warrior culture to oppose the US government; Native American's desire for revenge following perceived offences by the US government, for example Little Crow's attacks on farms and towns in Minnesota, Red Cloud's attacks on US forts; different visions of how land should be used and owned, US fear and heavy handed treatment of Indian issues; impact of railroads and Homesteaders; ecological tensions between Natives and White Americans; increased gun ownership and race theories which encouraged ideas of white supremacy over the use of land.</i>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

<b>Question 5* – 18 marks</b> <b>‘The main reason for conflict between Native and White Americans after 1861 was the broken promises of the US Government.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 18 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>To some extent I agree. In 1862, the discovery of gold in Montana led to war between the Lakota Sioux and the US army. The miner John Bozeman established a trail to the mines, but his trail ran through the hunting grounds of the Sioux. This broke the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851 and led to conflict because Red Cloud began attacking travellers along the Bozeman Trail. Another example would be the breaking of the second 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty. This had promised that no white Americans would enter Sioux lands around the Black Hills of Dakota without permission. However, in 1874, gold was discovered in the Black Hills and by 1875, there were tens of thousands of miners in Sioux lands. This led to the Great Sioux War.</i></p> <p><i>However, other factors played a role as well, such as the loss of land and lack of resources. For example, the Santee Sioux were forced to give up 28 million acres of land in exchange for a small reservation in Minnesota. In 1862, a lack of food meant they were starving. After the US government agent refused to open up the emergency stores, the Sioux were furious and started to attack farms, towns and army forts. Also, some conflict happened when one side wanted revenge. For example, in 1864, a white settler was killed by a Cheyenne warrior in Colorado. In revenge, the Colorado army volunteers took revenge at Sand Creek, massacring 105 women and children, and 28 men.</i></p> <p><i>To conclude, I would not wholly agree with the statement. Although the US government did repeatedly make promises which they then broke, the underlying reasons for this were mainly to do with conflict over land and resources. It's not clear that their promises were ever intended to be kept.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side OR three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 18 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 3 valid examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>To some extent I agree. In 1862, the discovery of gold in Montana led to war between the Lakota Sioux and the US army. The miner John Bozeman established a trail to the mines, but his trail ran through the hunting grounds of the Sioux. This broke the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851 and led to conflict because Red Cloud began attacking travellers along the Bozeman Trail. Another example would be the breaking of the second 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty. This had promised that no white Americans would enter Sioux lands around the Black Hills of Dakota without permission. However, in 1874, gold was discovered in the Black Hills and by 1875, there were tens of thousands of miners in Sioux lands. This led to the Great Sioux War.</i></p> <p><i>However, other factors played a role as well. Some conflict happened when one side wanted revenge. For example, in 1864, a white settler was killed by a Cheyenne warrior in Colorado. In revenge, the Colorado army volunteers took revenge at Sand Creek, massacring 105 women and children, and 28 men.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; three explained points of support (i.e. two on one side and one on the other)</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Candidates may argue three valid points on one side of the argument and this would be credited at this level</b></p>
<b>Level 4 (10-</b>	Level 4 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.

12 marks)	<p><i>I agree. In 1862, the discovery of gold in Montana led to war between the Lakota Sioux and the US army. The miner John Bozeman established a trail to the mines, but the his trail ran though the hunting grounds of the Sioux. This broke the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851 and led to conflict because Red Cloud began attacking travellers along the Bozeman Trail. Another example would be the breaking of the second 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty. This had promised that no white Americans would enter Sioux lands around the Black Hills of Dakota without permission. However, in 1874, gold was discovered in the Black Hills and by 1875, there were tens of thousands of miners in Sioux lands. This led to the Great Sioux War.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p>
	<p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>To some extent I agree. In 1862, the discovery of gold in Montana led to war between the Lakota Sioux and the US army. The miner John Bozeman established a trail to the mines, but the his trail ran though the hunting grounds of the Sioux. This broke the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851 and led to conflict because Red Cloud began attacking travellers along the Bozeman Trail. However, some conflict happened when one side wanted revenge. For example, in 1864, a white settler was killed by a Cheyenne warrior in Colorado. In revenge, the Colorado army volunteers took revenge at Sand Creek, massacring 105 women and children, and 28 men.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree. In 1862, the discovery of gold in Montana led to war between the Lakota Sioux and the US army. The miner John Bozeman established a trail to the mines, but the his trail ran though the hunting grounds of the Sioux. This broke the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851 and led to conflict because Red Cloud began attacking travellers along the Bozeman Trail.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b></p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the statement but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because in 1862 the US broke the Fort Laramie Treaty.</i></p> <p><i>No, I don't agree because sometimes the discovery of gold led to conflict such as with the Great Sioux War in 1875.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 2 answers will typically describe conflict/relevant events, e.g.</p> <p><i>In 1876 there was the Battle of the Little Bighorn between Custer and the Sioux led by Crazy Horse. Custer was forced to retreat and was killed.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of relevant events/lives without linking this to the question</b></p>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general and unsupported assertions eg</p> <p><i>No, it was mainly over land.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell General/ unsupported assertion(s)</b></p>
0 marks	

## Section B: Living under Nazi Rule, 1933–1945

<b>Question 6 – 7 marks</b> <b>What can Source A tell us about the Nazi dictatorship in July 1934? Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer.</b>	
<b>Levels</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 2 marks</b> <b>AO3</b> Analyse sources (contemporary to the period). <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO3 are equal in levels 1, AO3 carries greater weight in level 2 and greater weight again in level 3.</b>	
<b>Level 3 (6–7 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). Shows strong awareness of how sources can be used critically and constructively by e.g. considering the limitations and/or benefits of the source, using wider contextual knowledge to confirm, challenge or raise questions about what the source says or shows to analyse the source to identify a wide range of features that relate to the focus of the question; some of which may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	<i>Valid features that answers could identify include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features (L1) – tells us people were killed in the Night of the Long Knives; tells us people were shocked that others apart from Rohm were killed; tells us that Hitler did not know or approve of all the murders; tells us people were relieved that Rohm's plot did not succeed.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 2 (3–5 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). Shows some awareness of how sources can be used critically and constructively by e.g. considering the limitations and/or benefits of the source, using wider contextual knowledge to confirm, challenge or raise questions about what the source says or shows to analyse the source to identify some features that relate to the focus of the question; some of which may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Inferences from the source's content (L2) – tells us about the rivalry / political tension between Hitler and Rohm/the SA; tells us that Hitler had not achieved complete power before this point / that Rohm and the SA still threatened his position; tells us that the regime was prepared to use violent/illegal methods to gain full control; tells us about how the regime 'sold' / presented the murders to the public to gain acceptance, ie as necessary to prevent a coup by Rohm; tells us about how the regime tried to 'bury' murders of those 'unconnected with the Rohm revolt'; tells us about the personal importance of Hitler in the public's minds, ie he must not be seen to be connected to the 'excess' murders; tells us the Nazis were keen to promote Hitler as a saviour who could do no wrong.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). Analyses the source to identify at least one feature that relates to the focus of the question; this may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Inferences from the source's production (L3) – the fact that the Gestapo were monitoring and reporting on the public's reaction to the events tells us that regime was concerned about its image, and having genuine support from the public. It was important to the regime that it was seen to have acted legitimately. It was keen to give the violence a legal base.</i></li> </ul>
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	<i>Examples of relevant additional characteristic features shown at levels 2 or 3 could include: Hitler's position in 1934 was still threatened by his rival, Rohm, and the 3 million strong SA. Hitler was also keen to secure the loyalty of the German army, who saw the SA as a threat. On the 30 June 1934, the SS murdered at least 85 people, including 12 prominent Reichstag deputies</i>

	<p>who could also rival Hitler's power. On 3 July, a law was passed by the Reichstag legalising the action.</p> <p>There is no requirement to mention any possible limitations of the source and indeed in this particular source it is difficult to see what limitations candidates could refer to beyond generic or speculative comments about reliability eg that the report is exaggerating.</p> <p>Candidates will be credited for recognising features of the source such as its production or tone and explaining how these are <b>helpful</b> to historians. These could include the production of the source which reveals the Gestapo's monitoring of popular opinion. This helps us to recognise the importance of true popular support to the regime. Similarly the tone of the source is oblique and euphemistic, eg 'excesses' is used to describe mass murder. This also highlights the regime's wish to whitewash its actions and give them a legal veneer.</p> <p>No reward can be given for raising concerns over the limitations of the source unless this is explicitly used to help to say what the source "can tell us" in relation to the focus of the question.</p> <p>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Question 6 – 7 marks</b> <b>What can Source A tell us about the Nazi dictatorship in July 1934? Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer.</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 3 (6-7 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically make a valid inference from the source's <b>production</b> to explain what this tells us about the Nazi dictatorship, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The fact that the Gestapo were monitoring and reporting on the public's reaction to the Night of the Long Knives tells us that regime was concerned about its image, and having genuine support from the public. (6) We can tell this because the report contains detail about the people's reaction to the events ('sigh of relief' ... 'deeply shocked'). (7)</i></li> <li><i>The fact that the Gestapo were monitoring and reporting on the public's reaction to the events reveals that it was clearly important to the regime that it was seen to have only legitimately. (6) It was keen to give the violence a legal base by emphasising the 'plot against the Führer' and downplaying the violence as 'excesses'. (7)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell: Explains what source tells us about the Nazi dictatorship by using a valid inference from production of source</b>  <b>NOTE: Valid inference with valid support = 7 marks, no valid support = 6 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (3-5 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically make a valid inference to explain what the content of the source reveals about the Nazi dictatorship, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The source tells us about the rivalry / political tension between Hitler and Rohm/the SA. The source mentions a 'plot by Rohm' to 'overthrow the Führer'. Whether or not this is true, Rohm has been 'suppressed' and killed, which tells us Hitler saw Rohm as a threat to his power.</i></li> <li><i>The source tells us that Hitler had not achieved complete power before this point because Rohm and the SA still threatened his position.</i></li> <li><i>The source tells us that the regime was prepared to use violent/illegal methods to gain full control; it mentions 'excesses' and 'shootings'.</i></li> <li><i>The source tells us about how the regime 'sold' / presented the murders to the public to gain acceptance – they are saying they were as necessary to prevent a coup by Rohm.</i></li> <li><i>The source tells us about the personal importance of Hitler in the public's minds. The source suggests he must not be seen to be connected to the 'excess' murders. The Nazis were keen to promote Hitler as a saviour who could do no wrong.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell: Explains what source tells us about the Nazi dictatorship by using a valid inference from content of source</b>  <b>NOTE: Valid inference with no relevant support = bottom of level</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically use surface features of the source to suggest what the source tells us about the Nazi dictatorship, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>It tells us people were happy and relieved that Rohm's plot did not succeed.</i></li> <li><i>It tells us people were killed in the Night of the Long Knives.</i></li> <li><i>It tells us people were shocked that others apart from Rohm were killed.</i></li> <li><i>It tells us that Hitler did not know or approve of all the murders.</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically make valid but general assertions from the source to suggest what the source tells us about the Nazi dictatorship e.g.</p> <p><i>The source tells us information about what happened on the Night of the Long Knives.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Lifts surface detail from source to address question or makes general assertion(s)</b></p>

<b>0 marks</b>	<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit (including answers which do not consider Hitler or the Nazis in 1933 eg describing racial policy)
--------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Question 7 – 15 marks</b> <b>How useful are Sources B and C and Interpretation D for a historian studying control and opposition in Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1933? In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO3</b> Analyse, evaluate and use sources (contemporary to the period) to make substantiated judgements, in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>Please note that while the descriptors for AO3 and AO4 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources and interpretations may be combined in responses.</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences etc.). Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features of sources (L2) – eg B is useful as it shows people did not criticise, it shows Nazi control of radio and press, it shows there is a lot of propaganda; C is useful as it shows people liked and admired Hitler; C is useful for telling us about control because we can see the troops; D useful for telling us the Hitler Youth went on marches through working class areas.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the content of the sources (L3 and L4) – eg B useful for showing nature of opposition /ways people did oppose eg private criticism; C useful for ways in which the Nazis controlled the population, eg military force; C is useful for telling us about reasons people did not oppose the Nazis, eg providing work and national pride; D useful for revealing opposition from workers as Hitler Youth are used to 'remind them'; D useful for showing methods of intimidation through Hitler Youth marches; D useful for showing methods of indoctrination via Hitler Youth.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the sources' publication, purpose or existence (L5), eg B is useful as evidence of organised opposition, even if limited, ie socialists sending reports abroad; B is useful because of the fact that the report is being sent abroad to socialist leaders in exile reveals the limited scope for such opposition within Germany; C is useful as it shows one way the Nazis tried to control the people, ie visual propaganda. It does this by ...; the need for such propaganda in C reveals that at least some sections of the population were not convinced.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3). Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features of sources (L2) – eg B is useful as it shows people did not criticise, it shows Nazi control of radio and press, it shows there is a lot of propaganda; C is useful as it shows people liked and admired Hitler; C is useful for telling us about control because we can see the troops; D useful for telling us the Hitler Youth went on marches through working class areas.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the content of the sources (L3 and L4) – eg B useful for showing nature of opposition /ways people did oppose eg private criticism; C useful for ways in which the Nazis controlled the population, eg military force; C is useful for telling us about reasons people did not oppose the Nazis, eg providing work and national pride; D useful for revealing opposition from workers as Hitler Youth are used to 'remind them'; D useful for showing methods of intimidation through Hitler Youth marches; D useful for showing methods of indoctrination via Hitler Youth.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the sources' publication, purpose or existence (L5), eg B is useful as evidence of organised opposition, even if limited, ie socialists sending reports abroad; B is useful because of the fact that the report is being sent abroad to socialist leaders in exile reveals the limited scope for such opposition within Germany; C is useful as it shows one way the Nazis tried to control the people, ie visual propaganda. It does this by ...; the need for such propaganda in C reveals that at least some sections of the population were not convinced.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3).	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features of sources (L2) – eg B is useful as it shows people did not criticise, it shows Nazi control of radio and press, it shows there is a lot of propaganda; C is useful as it shows people liked and admired Hitler; C is useful for telling us about control because we can see the troops; D useful for telling us the Hitler Youth went on marches through working class areas.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the content of the sources (L3 and L4) – eg B useful for showing nature of opposition /ways people did oppose eg private criticism; C useful for ways in which the Nazis controlled the population, eg military force; C is useful for telling us about reasons people did not oppose the Nazis, eg providing work and national pride; D useful for revealing opposition from workers as Hitler Youth are used to 'remind them'; D useful for showing methods of intimidation through Hitler Youth marches; D useful for showing methods of indoctrination via Hitler Youth.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the sources' publication, purpose or existence (L5), eg B is useful as evidence of organised opposition, even if limited, ie socialists sending reports abroad; B is useful because of the fact that the report is being sent abroad to socialist leaders in exile reveals the limited scope for such opposition within Germany; C is useful as it shows one way the Nazis tried to control the people, ie visual propaganda. It does this by ...; the need for such propaganda in C reveals that at least some sections of the population were not convinced.</i></li> </ul>

<p>Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<p><i>Understanding of appropriate characteristic features could include: propaganda as a method of controlling the population; the use of terror organisations such as the SS to intimidate the population; the indoctrination of young people via youth organisations; the suppression of political opposition and trade unions.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses which comment on features of extract(s) which make them particularly interesting or useful to historians rather than seeing them as limitations could include (L5) –</li> <li>• Developed comments on how bias, purpose or existence of sources make them more useful eg B's existence is useful as evidence of organised opposition; C's bias/purpose is useful as evidence of Nazi methods of control; C's purpose is useful to reveal the need for such propaganda.</li> </ul>
<p>Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Gives a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3).</p> <p>Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Gives a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less well developed comments will probably include –</li> <li>• (L3) Comments which support or challenge the evidence presented in sources with candidates' own knowledge, rendering sources more or less useful in terms of typicality or reliability. Candidates may show how the sources/interpretation agree and/or disagree with each other.</li> <li>• (L2) Undeveloped comments on how provenance of sources make them unreliable and therefore not useful, eg C is Nazi propaganda and therefore not useful; D produced after the war and therefore not useful.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).</p> <p>Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, making appropriate cross-references or identifying significant themes that they have in common.(AO3)</p> <p>Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, making appropriate cross-references or identifying significant themes that they have in common.(AO4)</p> <p>There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about usefulness of the interpretation(s) and the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question, or there is an assertion but this lacks any support or historical validity</p>	<p>Candidates should not be rewarded above Level 1 for simply saying what is 'missing' from the sources. 'ie Not useful because it has no information about ...'</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>No reward can be given for raising concerns over the limitations unless this is explicitly used to help to say how it affects usefulness for the context given. Evaluation of usefulness may also involve making valid substantiated suggestions of other lines of enquiry for which the collection may be useful, but the focus given in the question must also be addressed.</p> <p>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</p>

**Question 7 – 15 marks**

**How useful are Sources B and C and Interpretation D for a historian studying control and opposition in Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1939? In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.**

**Guidance and indicative content**

<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically make inference(s) from the <b>publication, purpose or existence</b> of B or C to explain why this <b>makes it useful</b> to a historian studying control and opposition 1933–39. They will also make valid comments on <b>at least one other</b> source/ interpretation eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source B is useful as evidence of highly organised opposition, even if it is only limited in scale, because the socialists are managing to successfully send their reports abroad. This indicates some kind of underground network.</i></li> <li>• <i>Source C is useful because it shows one way the Nazis were trying to control people, through the use of visual propaganda. The image is there to keep up support by reminding people in the beer hall of the benefits the Nazis have brought to Germany such a work and military strength.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Supported explanation of why the publication, purpose or existence of B or C makes it useful, plus valid comments on one more</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Answers at this level should be awarded 15 marks. They <b>MUST</b> explain how the bias/purpose/context of B or C make the source useful to the historian. Answers which argue the limitations make the extract not useful should <b>not</b> be rewarded at this level.</p> <p><b>NOTE 2:</b> do not credit answers at this level which merely say 'C is useful because it shows the Nazis used propaganda' – this is L2.</p> <p><b>Other valid uses of purpose at this level:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Nature/ existence of B:</b> useful because of the fact that the report is being sent abroad to socialist leaders in exile reveals the limited scope for such opposition within Germany;</li> <li>• <b>Existence of C:</b> useful because the need for such propaganda reveals that some sections of the population were not convinced.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatively,</b> Level 5 answers will typically make inference(s) from the <b>content of two or more</b> of B, C or D to explain why this <b>makes them useful</b> to a historian studying control and opposition 1933–39. Answers will be supported with reference to the source <b>OR</b> contextual knowledge e.g.</p> <p><i>Source B is useful for showing us the nature of opposition that existed. It reveals that although there is little outward criticism there is widespread private and 'sharpest criticism'. Interpretation D is useful for revealing that there was at least some opposition from workers because the Hitler Youth were used to 'remind them'.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Valid, supported inferences to explain why at least two of B, C, D are useful as evidence about control/ opposition 1933–39.</p> <p><b>NOTE 1:</b> Answers at this level should be awarded 13-14 marks. They may attempt to comment on B, C and D but only make valid inferences from two of them</p> <p><b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b></p> <p>Level 4 answers will typically make valid, supported inference(s) from the <b>content of at least one of</b> B, C or D to explain why this <b>makes it useful</b> to a historian studying control and opposition. Answers will be supported with reference to the source <b>OR</b> contextual knowledge e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source B is useful for showing us the nature of opposition that existed. It reveals that although there is little outward criticism there is widespread private and 'sharpest criticism'.</i></li> </ul>
----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Source C is useful for revealing the ways in which the Nazis controlled the population, such as through military force – we can see lots of troops in the background. It's also useful for telling us about reasons people did not oppose the Nazis – it shows how they have provided work.</li> <li>Interp D is useful for revealing that there was at least some opposition from workers because the Hitler Youth were used to 'remind them'.</li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Valid, supported inferences from content to explain why one of B, C, D = useful about control / opposition 1933–1939.</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Answers at this level may comment on more than one of B, C and D but must make valid inference(s) from at least one of them.</p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically make valid but unsupported inference(s) from the content of <b>at least one of</b> B, C or D to explain why this <b>makes it useful</b> to a historian studying control and opposition 1933–39, e.g.</p> <p><i>D is useful for showing us the kinds of methods of intimidation and indoctrination that were used to control workers and youth.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Valid, <u>unsupported</u> inference(s) from content to explain why one of B, C, D = useful about control / opposition 1933–1939.</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Answers at this level may comment on more than one of B, C and D but only make a valid inference from one of them</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will argue that one or more of B, C or D are <b>useful or not useful</b> based on developed cross-reference to contextual knowledge and/or other sources, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Source B says that the Nazis controlled the press and radio and I think this is useful because it's true – In 1934, all radio stations were taken over by the Reich Radio Company. The Nazis also produced cheap radio sets so that people could listen to their propaganda.</li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Cross reference with contextual knowledge/other sources to argue that one or more of B, C or D are useful or not useful.</p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically extract surface features or points from B, C or D and argue that these details are useful e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>B is useful as it shows people did not criticise the regime and how the Nazis were controlled the radio. There was a lot of propaganda.</i></li> <li><i>C is useful as it shows people liked and admired Hitler. It's also useful for telling us about control because we can see the troops.</i></li> <li><i>D useful for telling us the Hitler Youth went on marches through working class areas.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Uses surface features of extracts to argue source(s) are useful.</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> Mark basic comments on Source C at this level, e.g. 'Source C is useful because it showed the Nazis were using propaganda'.</p> <p>OR Level 2 answers may argue that the extract(s) are <b>useful/ not useful</b> on the grounds undeveloped provenance, e.g. <i>C is Nazi propaganda and therefore not useful; B was written at the time so I think that is very useful.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Argues useful/not useful on the basis of undeveloped provenance</p> <p>OR Answers at this level may argue the extract(s) are not useful on the grounds of what they do not contain eg <i>Interpretation C is not very useful. It's about the Hitler Youth. I know that the Hitler Youth went on camps and took part in military training but the source doesn't mention those things.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Argues not useful because of what information the source(s) do not contain</p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points or unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>The sources are really useful because they each tell us something different. C tells us about youth.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell:</b> Assertion(s)</p>

Question 8* – 18 marks “The Second World War had a negative impact on the German people between 1939 and 1945.” How far do you agree with this view?	
Levels	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<p><i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 5 and 6, this must involve considering both areas of positive and negative impact of the war on German people.</i></p>
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of consequence (impact of war), causation (reasons for positive/negative impact) and diversity (similarity/across different groups of people), and change/continuity (how impact changed as war progressed) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<p><i>Grounds for agreeing may include: Rationing and shortages, eg diet became very monotonous, hot water was allowed on only 2 days per week, toilet paper not available; many businesses, schools, beer halls and cafés were forced to close because of lack of coal; from 1939, women aged under 25 had to complete six months Labour Service before being allowed to enter full employment; 1940 RAF bombing campaign against industrial areas in the north and west of Germany and people in many cities were faced with air raids three or four nights each week; KLV evacuation programme sent children to disciplined camps and separated them from parents; the tide of war began to turn after the invasion of the Soviet Union and ‘total war’ brought a deterioration in conditions, eg professional sport was ended, magazines were closed and non-essential businesses were shut down; production of civilian clothes was ended; propaganda and censorship increased; in 1943 the Allies bombed Hamburg and Berlin – half of Hamburg was destroyed and more than 40,000 civilians were killed; in Berlin, about half a million people were left homeless and nearly 100,000 were injured; in 1944, as the Allies advanced through Nazi-occupied countries, native Germans poured back into</i></p>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

	<p><i>Germany –refugees added to the pressures on fuel and food; theatres, opera houses and music halls were closed in 1944; in 1945, the country began to fall apart – there were severe food shortages and people faced starvation; Allied bombing of Dresden in 1945 – firestorm led to the deaths of around 25,000 people.</i></p> <p><b><i>NB This question asks about the impact of war on the German people, so any points about Jewish Germans in this period must be explicitly linked to the war, e.g. German Jews being deported to Polish ghettos as a result of invasion of Poland. Do not credit general points about or descriptions of the Holocaust.</i></b></p> <p><i>Grounds for disagreeing may include: The first year of the war went well for Germany and food and luxury goods were imprinted from conquered territories; limited food rationing was introduced soon after war began in September 1939 and as a result, 2 out of 5 Germans ate better than before the war; German industries prospered from war contracts, which meant there was a demand for workers; the restrictions on women in education from 1933-1939 were lifted during the war, eg more women entered the workforce – In 1939, 760,000 women worked in war industries and this had risen to 1.5 million by 1941.</i></p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Question 8* – 18 marks</b> <b>“The Second World War had a negative impact on the German people between 1939 and 1945.” How far do you agree with this view?</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 18 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. Firstly, the war brought shortages and so the Nazi government introduced rationing. Hot water was allowed on only 2 days per week and toilet paper not available. In the last few months of the war, ration cards became useless as the shops ran out of goods. There were severe food shortages and many faced starvation. Additionally, the war brought danger of bombing. For example, in 1943, the Allies bombed Hamburg and Berlin – half of Hamburg was destroyed and more than 40,000 civilians were killed. These things were definitely a negative impact on people's lives.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there some evidence to challenge the statement. For example, the first year of the war went relatively well for Germany and Hitler controlled much of Europe. Some people benefitted from this because food and luxury goods were imported from the conquered territories and 'pure' Aryan Germans were encouraged to settle in conquered territories and therefore gained land. Also, in some ways the war was beneficial for the position of women. For example, the pre-1939 restrictions on women in education from were lifted and more women entered the workforce. In 1939, 760,000 women worked in war industries and this had risen to 1.5 million by 1941.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think the statement is true. There were pockets of people who did benefit but this was in a relatively limited and short-term way compared to the widespread discomfort and danger brought to vast swathes of the population by shortages and bombing throughout the war.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side OR three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 18 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 3 valid examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. Firstly, the war brought shortages and so the Nazi government introduced rationing. Hot water was allowed on only 2 days per week and toilet paper not available. In the last few months of the war, ration cards became useless as the shops ran out of goods. There were severe food shortages and many faced starvation. Additionally, the war brought danger of bombing. For example, in 1943, the Allies bombed Hamburg and Berlin – half of Hamburg was destroyed and more than 40,000 civilians were killed. These things were definitely a negative impact on people's lives.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there some evidence to challenge the statement. For example, the war was beneficial for the position of women. For example, the pre-1939 restrictions on women in education from were lifted and more women entered the workforce. In 1939, 760,000 women worked in war industries and this had risen to 1.5 million by 1941.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; three explained points of support (i.e. two on one side and one on the other)</b>  <b>NOTE: Candidates may argue three valid points on one side of the argument and this would be credited at this level</b></p>

<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. Firstly, the war brought shortages and so the Nazi government introduced rationing. Hot water was allowed on only 2 days per week. In the last few months of the war, the shops ran out of goods and many faced starvation. Additionally, the war brought danger of bombing. For example, in 1943, the Allies bombed Hamburg and Berlin – half of Hamburg was destroyed and more than 40,000 civilians were killed. These things were definitely a negative impact on people's lives.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. Firstly, the war brought shortages and so the Nazi government introduced rationing. Hot water was allowed on only 2 days per week. In the last few months of the war, the shops ran out of goods and many faced starvation. However, in some ways the war was beneficial for the position of women. For example, the pre-1939 restrictions on women in education were lifted and more women entered the workforce. In 1939, 760,000 women worked in war industries and this had risen to 1.5 million by 1941.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. Firstly, the war brought shortages and so the Nazi government introduced rationing. Hot water was allowed on only 2 days per week and toilet paper not available. In the last few months of the war, ration cards became useless as the shops ran out of goods. There were severe food shortages and many faced starvation.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the statement but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because there was rationing and bombing during the war.</i>  <i>No, some women did well out of the war because they were allowed to return to work.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 2 answers will typically describe relevant wartime events/policies e.g.</p> <p><i>In 1941 Hitler invaded the Soviet Union. Thousands of wounded Germans were brought home from USSR in 1942. Germans worked longer hours and Goebbels increased censorship.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of relevant events/policy without linking this to the question</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general and unsupported assertions eg</p> <p><i>No, some people did benefit to begin with although things were worse by the end of the war.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell General/ unsupported assertion(s)</b></p>

Question 9* – 18 marks “The most common response to Nazi occupation was collaboration.” How far do you agree with this view of Nazi rule in Europe between 1939 and 1945?	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 5 and 6, this must involve considering both areas of collaboration/accommodation and resistance to Nazi occupation.</i>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of consequence (impact of Nazi rule), causation (reasons for collaboration, accommodation and resistance) and diversity (similarity/difference in the responses to Nazi rule) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Grounds for agreeing may include: In the Netherlands, at first there was compliance with Nazi regulations, eg in October 1940, when civil servants were forced to complete ancestry forms to remove ‘Jewish elements’, nearly everyone filled in the forms; evidence of widespread accommodation and collaboration in France, eg Petain’s government and their actions, eg Forced Labour Service; case study of Coco Chanel; Hungarian farmers’ assistance in the transportation of Jews to the camps; Channel Islanders’ actions, eg relationships with German soldiers; Paxton’s estimates – only 2% of the adult male population were resisters, so about 400,000 French; Burrin’s estimates that 1940–1942 between 1/5–1/6 of all French ‘favoured collaboration’ – so between 6.6 million and 8 million;</i>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing may include: Polish people formed one of the largest resistance movements; the Polish government escaped to London in 1939 and helped to set</i>
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b>	

<p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2).</p> <p><i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	<p><i>up Delegatura, a secret state within Poland; in August 1944, the Poles staged an uprising in Warsaw – lasted for two months; Dutch resistance, eg on Prince Bernhard's birthday, many Dutch citizens wore carnations in support of the royal family in exile; Feb 1941 Dutch workers' strike organized by communists; Dutch resistance developed as men hid from forced labour and joined the resistance; by 1944, there were 300,000 men in hiding; many illegal printing presses were established, producing anti-Nazi leaflets; armed resistance began as registry offices were attacked for ration coupons and blank identity cards; in September 1944, the Dutch government in exile called for railway strikes and 30,000 rail workers went into hiding; evidence of resistance on Channel Islands, eg 4000 sentenced for breaking the law; French Resistance movement underwent a guerilla war against the occupation; French communists carrying out assassinations, attacks on trains, the sabotage of communications, setting up of underground press; case study of Andre Trocme; Paxton's estimates that 2 million people, about 10% of the population, read the underground newspapers; by spring 1942, Vichy surveillance reports showed that 'Down with Pétain propaganda' was no longer a rarity and that images of the Marshal were no longer greeted with applause in cinemas.</i></p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Question 9* – 18 marks</b> <b>“The most common response to Nazi occupation was collaboration.” How far do you agree with this view of Nazi rule in Europe between 1939 and 1945?</b>	
<b>Guidance and indicative content</b>	
<b>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</b>	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 18 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. For example, at the beginning of Nazi occupation in the Netherlands, there was generally compliance with Nazi laws and regulations. For instance, in October 1940, when civil servants were forced to complete ancestry forms to remove ‘Jewish elements’, nearly everyone filled in the forms. Also, even though the French had a very famous resistance, probably less than 5% of the population were active resisters. Politicians in the south under Philippe Pétain collaborated with the Nazis and set up Vichy France and often went beyond what the Nazis asked them to do. For example, in 1942 they passed a law which deported workers to Germany, where they took part in forced labour.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there also much evidence to challenge the statement. For example, when Poland was invaded in 1939, the Polish government escaped to London in 1939 and helped to set up Delegatura, a secret state within Poland. The Polish people went on form one of the largest resistance movements against the Nazis. For instance, 1944, the Warsaw uprising lasted for two months. Additionally, as time went on, resistance in the Netherlands increased: in 1941 there were strikes organised by the communists and many workers began to hide from forced labour and joined the resistance. By 1944, there were 300,000 men in hiding.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I don’t think the statement is true. Although most people in occupied territories were unlikely to take up armed resistance, this does not mean that they were all active collaborators. Taking part in minor acts of resistance such as listening to the BBC was widespread. It must also be remembered that life in occupied countries was very dangerous for those who actively resisted Nazi rule.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side OR three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 18 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</b>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 3 valid examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. For example, even though the French had a very famous resistance, probably less than 5% of the population were active resisters. Politicians in the south under Philippe Pétain collaborated with the Nazis and set up Vichy France and often went beyond what the Nazis asked them to do. For example, in 1942 they passed a law which deported workers to Germany, where they took part in forced labour.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there also much evidence to challenge the statement. For example, when Poland was invaded in 1939, the Polish government escaped to London in 1939 and helped to set up Delegatura, a secret state within Poland. The Polish people went on form one of the largest resistance movements against the Nazis. For instance, 1944, the Warsaw uprising lasted for two months. Additionally, as time went on, resistance in the Netherlands increased: in 1941 there were strikes organised by the communists and many workers began to hide from forced labour and joined the resistance. By 1944, there were 300,000 men in hiding.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; three explained points of support (i.e. two on one side and one on the other)</b>  <b>NOTE: Candidates may argue three valid points on one side of the argument and this would be credited at this level</b></p>

<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is much evidence to challenge the statement. For example, the Polish people went on form one of the largest resistance movements against the Nazis. For instance, 1944, the Warsaw uprising lasted for two months. Additionally, as time went on, resistance in the Netherlands increased: in 1941 there were strikes organised by the communists and many workers began to hide from forced labour and joined the resistance.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. For example, even though the French had a very famous resistance, probably less than 5% of the population were active resisters. Politicians in the south under Philippe Pétain collaborated with the Nazis and set up Vichy France. In 1942 they passed a law which deported workers to Germany, where they took part in forced labour. On the other hand there also much evidence to challenge the statement. For example, in the Netherlands, in 1941 there were strikes organised by the communists and many workers began to hide from forced labour.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is plenty of evidence to support this statement. For example, even though the French had a very famous resistance, probably less than 5% of the population were active resisters. Politicians in the south under Philippe Pétain collaborated with the Nazis and set up Vichy France and often went beyond what the Nazis asked them to do. For example, in 1942 they passed a law which deported workers to Germany, where they took part in forced labour.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the statement but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because in Hungary there were farmers who collaborated by rounding up of Jews. No I don't agree because there were many groups who resisted occupation such as the communists in Poland who organised strikes.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 2 answers will typically describe relevant events/ groups/ actions related to occupation, e.g.</p> <p><i>In 1939 Germany invaded Poland. The Polish government fled to London.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of relevant events without linking this to the question</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general and unsupported assertions eg</p> <p><i>No, some people did resist and resistance also increased by the end of the war.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell General/ unsupported assertion(s)</b></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

**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