

GCSE (9–1)

History A (Explaining the Modern World)

J410/02: International Relations: the changing international order 1918-2001 with Germany 1925-1955: The People and the State

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2019

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.












This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2019

Annotations

| Annotation | Meaning of Annotation |
|---|--|
|  | Blank page |
|  | Point has been noted, but no credit has been given (big) |
|  | Not Relevant |
|  | Level 5 |
|  | Level 4 |
|  | Level 3 |
|  | Level 2 |
|  | Level 1 |
|  | Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question |
|  | |
|  | Evaluation |

| | |
|------------|-------------|
| DEV | Development |
| ? | Unclear |

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.

You should ensure also that you are familiar with the administrative procedures related to the marking process. These are set out in the OCR booklet **Instructions for Examiners**. If you are examining for the first time, please read carefully **Appendix 5 Introduction to Script Marking: Notes for New Examiners**.

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

USING THE MARK SCHEME

Please study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide 'correct' answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide 'best guesses' about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

The Examiners' Standardisation Meeting will ensure that the Mark Scheme covers the range of candidates' responses to the questions, and that all Examiners understand and apply the Mark Scheme in the same way. The Mark Scheme will be discussed and amended at the meeting, and administrative procedures will be confirmed. Co-ordination scripts will be issued at the meeting to exemplify aspects of candidates' responses and achievements; the co-ordination scripts then become part of this Mark Scheme.

Before the Standardisation Meeting, you should read and mark in pencil a number of scripts, in order to gain an impression of the range of responses and achievement that may be expected.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The co-ordination scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the Team Leaders and will be discussed fully at the Examiners' Co-ordination Meeting.
- 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 prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

Section A

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

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

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

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|---|---------------------------|------------|
| Level 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows a clear understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events. | Please see following page | 4–5 |
| Level 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows some understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events. | | 2–3 |
| Level 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question. | | 1 |
| Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit. | | 0 |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.




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



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

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



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




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

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| Level 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a range of aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a thorough, detailed analysis of how the interpretations differ. There is a fully supported and convincing analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question. | Please see following page(s) | 17–20  |
| Level 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts some aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce an analysis of how the interpretations differ. There is a supported analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question. | | 13–16  |
| Level 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a partial analysis how the interpretations differ. There is some analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the | | 9–12  |

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

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

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

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

Section B

Germany 1925-1955: The People and the State

5. Describe **one** impact of the Allied occupation on Germany after World War Two. (2)

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Assessment Objectives | AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2] |
| Additional Guidance | All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of the impact of the Allied occupation on Germany in the period should also be credited. |

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|---------------------------|---|--------------|
| N/A Points marking | Germany was divided into zones as a result of Allied occupation [1]. The victors (Britain, France, Russia and USA) each controlled a part [2]. OR Parts of Germany were rebuilt as a result of Allied occupation after World War Two [1]. The Allies in charge of the Western Zones put a lot of money into reconstruction projects [2]. OR Economy grew by 8% (1) Nuremberg Trials were held (1) for war crimes (2) Denazification (1) Education was denazified (1) | 2 |

6. Explain how Allied bombing campaigns affected the German war effort during the Second World War. (10)

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

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

6. Explain how Allied bombing campaigns affected the German war effort during the Second World War. (10)

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| Level 5 | <p>Level 5 answers will typically identify two or more ways in which the German war effort was affected as a result of the Allied bombing campaigns and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p><i>Allied bombing campaigns affected the German war effort negatively as they resulted in decreased morale. During the bombing of Dresden in February 1945, 13 square miles of the city were destroyed. This scale of destruction resulted in the deaths of 300,000 Germans from the start of the bombing campaigns, and this led to growing dissatisfaction in Germany.</i></p> <p><i>Over time the bombing campaigns started to target industrial sites which crippled Germany economically. In July 1943, a raid on Hamburg created a firestorm that virtually destroyed the industrial centre, leaving one million people homeless. Although Germany was still producing arms towards the end of the war it's fair to say that the bombing campaigns limited Germany's ability to do so from 1943.</i></p> <p><i>THRESHOLD ANSWERS</i></p> <p><i>Allied bombing campaigns affected the German war effort by leading to falling morale. During the bombing of Dresden much of the central city was destroyed. This led to growing dissatisfaction in Germany.</i></p> <p><i>Over time the bombing campaigns targeted industrial sites which crippled Germany. For example there was a huge raid in Hamburg that destroyed the industrial centre. These raids made it difficult for Germany to produce arms.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Two reasons identified and explained.</p> | 9–10 |
| Level 4 | <p>Level 4 answers will typically identify one way in which the German war effort was affected as a result of the Allied bombing campaigns and explain it fully e.g.</p> <p><i>Allied bombing campaigns affected the German war effort negatively as they resulted in decreased morale. During the bombing of Dresden in February 1945, 13 square miles of the city were destroyed. This scale of destruction resulted in the deaths of 300,000 Germans from the start of the bombing campaigns, which led to decreased morale.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One reason identified and explained At this level many candidates will try to explain more than one reason but only explain one to the required standard</p> | 7–8 |

| | | |
|----------------|--|------------|
| Level 3 | <p>Level 3 answers will typically identify and/or describe the impact of Allied bombing campaigns without explaining how this affected the civilian war effort e.g.</p> <p><i>The Allied bombing campaigns increased in intensity and frequency as the war went on. It is estimated that 20% of the total housing in Germany was destroyed. Some major cities such as Hamburg and Dresden were virtually destroyed. In Hamburg one million people were left homeless.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One or more reasons identified or described but no explanation</p> | 5–6 |
| Level 2 | <p>Level 2 answers will typically contain descriptions of the Allied bombing campaigns e.g.</p> <p><i>The Allied bombing campaigns targeted German cities. They also targeted industrial sites. Lots of buildings were destroyed and many people were left homeless.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no reasons identified.</p> | 3–4 |
| Level 1 | <p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g.</p> <p><i>The Allied bombing campaigns were very harsh.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: General points or unrelated events</p> | 1–2 |

7a Study Source A. Explain why this source was produced in Germany at this time. (5)

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

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| <p>Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the question about the sources. | <i>Please see following pages</i> | 4-5 |
| <p>Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct an argument to answer the question about the sources. | | 2-3 |
| <p>Level 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses the sources in a basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance and using this to give a simple answer to the question about the source(s). | | 1 |
| <p>Level 0</p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> | | 0 |

7a Study Source A. Explain why this source was produced in Germany at this time. (5)

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|----------------|---|------------|
| Level 3 | <p>Level 3 answers will typically make a clear statement of purpose based on intended outcome and/or audience and support this with reference to content of the source and context e.g.</p> <p><i>The person who produced this poster was critical of the fact that you could not exist in Nazi Germany unless you were loyal to the state, The poster was intended to make people question the way in which the Nazis ruled Germany. They were trying to do this by demonstrating the Nazis violence shown by the dead man.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Purpose (+ ck + sce for 5 marks)</p> | 4–5 |
| Level 2 | <p>Level 2 answers will typically identify and explain the message of the source using relevant source content or context e.g.</p> <p><i>This poster was published by Nazi opponents to show how brutal the Nazis were. It was published straight after the Night of the Long Knives which was a purge of the SA. This poster shows how they treat any threats to their authority, even by their own people.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Message (+ ck or sce for 3 marks)</p> | 2-3 |
| Level 1 | <p>Level 1 answers will typically argue the source was meant to provide information OR describe the context in which the source was produced e.g.</p> <p><i>It was published to show the Nazis killed people.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>It was published to show someone saluting the Nazis.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: sce as information or CK</p> <p>L0 If the candidate thinks the poster was produced by the Nazis.</p> | 1 |

7b Study Source B. Explain how this source is useful to a historian studying Nazi Germany. (5)

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

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| <p>Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the question about the sources. | <i>Please see following pages</i> | 4-5 |
| <p>Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct an argument to answer the question about the sources. | | 2-3 |
| <p>Level 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response analyses the sources in a basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance and using this to give a simple answer to the question about the source(s). | | 1 |
| <p>Level 0</p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> | | 0 |

7b Study Source B. Explain how this source is useful to a historian studying Nazi Germany. (5)

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|----------------|---|------------|
| Level 3 | <p>Level 3 answers will typically argue that the source is useful and support this with a valid inference from the source developed with effective use of content, provenance or context to support the inference e.g.</p> <p><i>This source is useful because it reveals some of the first methods the Nazis used to consolidate power. It tells us the leading Nazis like Ley felt that the power of the trade unions needed to be limited. They arrested senior trade union officials, like the source says and held them under police 'protection'.</i></p> <p><i>It is also useful because it shows how much control the Nazis had achieved very soon into Hitler's time as Chancellor.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Usefulness of source(s) based on valid supported inferences.</p> | 4–5 |
| Level 2 | <p>Level 2 answers will typically argue the source is useful or not based on reliability or unsupported inferences e.g.</p> <p><i>The source is useful because its reliable. It talks about Nazi control over the unions. Once the Nazis got to power they banned all other political parties and sent opponents to concentration camps, so it doesn't surprise me they wanted to control the unions as well.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>This source is useful because it reveals some of the first methods the Nazis used to consolidate power: controlling the unions.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Usefulness of source(s) based on unsupported inferences/reliability.</p> <p>NB: Not useful as not reliable = L2/2</p> | 2–3 |
| Level 1 | <p>Level 1 answers will typically assert the usefulness of the content or provenance, or give relevant ck only eg</p> <p><i>The source is not useful because it's produced by a Nazi so it's one sided.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>This source is useful because it tells us that people were taken into custody.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: assertions OR relevant contextual knowledge</p> | 1 |

8.* 'The use of propaganda was more important than the Nazi police state in controlling Germany in the 1930s.' How far do you agree? (18)

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

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

8.* 'The use of propaganda was more important than the Nazi police state in controlling Germany in the 1930s.' How far do you agree? (18)

| Levels | Indicative content | Marks |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 5 | <p>Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced and well-supported argument which uses a range of supporting evidence to support the argument being made, e.g</p> <p><i>I agree with this statement to an extent, but think both forms of control were necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Firstly, it could be argued that the Nazis' use of propaganda was the main way in which they guaranteed control of the masses. Goebbels had strict control of the media in Germany as Minister of Propaganda and made sure that pro-Nazi material was a part of German people's everyday lives. Loudspeakers were placed on the streets, and cheap radios were available (these were known as the 'People's Radio'). These reiterated key Nazis ideas and policy, and eventually many German people were brainwashed.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the Nazi police state created a fear in society, which kept people in check as they were too scared to oppose the Nazis. Torture chambers and concentration camps were created by the SS as early as 1933. The SS were supported by the work of the Gestapo who held up the regime by using surveillance and repression and although it was less widespread than people believed, fear of it was an effective way of maintaining control.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument with at least two examples on one side and one on the other side NOTE: 18 marks = As below plus a clinching argument Award within mark range 15-17 for quality of each of the three points</p> | 15–18 |
| Level 4 | <p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided argument with support from at least two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree with this statement to an extent, but think both forms of control were necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Firstly, it could be argued that the Nazis' use of propaganda was the main way in which they guaranteed control of the masses. Goebbels had strict control of the media in Germany and made sure that pro-Nazi material was a feature of German people's everyday lives, brainwashing many into believing the Nazis were the saviours of the nation.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the Nazi police state created a fear in society, which kept people in check as they were too scared to oppose the Nazis. Torture chambers and concentration camps were created by the SS as early as 1933 to punish political and other offenders.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided (two explained examples of support); or balanced argument (one explained example of support on each side) 14 marks- reserve for clinching argument</p> | 11–14 |

| | | |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| Level 3 | <p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument with support from one valid example e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree with the statement. The Nazis' use of propaganda was the main way in which they guaranteed control of the masses. Goebbels had strict control of the media in Germany and made sure that pro-Nazi material was a feature of German people's everyday lives. Cheap radios were available (these were known as the 'People's Radio'). These reiterated key Nazis ideas and policy, and eventually many German people were brainwashed.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument, one explained example to support</p> <p>NOTE: Many answers at L3 will attempt a balanced answer and a wider range of support but only achieve one valid explanation</p> | 7–10 |
| Level 2 | <p>Level 2 answers will typically identify and or describe ways in which opposition was prevented but will stop short of explaining how these methods prevented opposition, and why they were effective e.g.</p> <p><i>The SS and Gestapo punished people who opposed the Nazi state. However, propaganda made people loyal to the state: children were indoctrinated from a young age.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: identify and describe relevant events/developments but not explaining in relation to question.</p> | 4–6 |
| Level 1 | <p>Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate simple knowledge of prevention of opposition in Nazi Germany e.g.</p> <p><i>Propaganda was used to brainwash people.</i></p> <p><i>The SS destroyed opposition.</i></p> <p><i>The Gestapo rooted out opposition.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: General assertions</p> | 1–3 |

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

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

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

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2019

