

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

HISTORY A

H505

For first teaching in 2015

Y321/01 Summer 2023 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper Y321/01 series overview	4
Section A overview	5
Question 1	5
Section B overview	14
Question 2*	14
Question 3*	21
Question 4*	27

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Would you prefer a Word version?

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

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

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

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

Paper Y321/01 series overview

Y321 is one of twenty one units for Paper 3 of the revised A Level examination for GCE History. This unit tests an extended period of History of at least one hundred years through an interpretation option on a named in-depth topic and two essays. The paper is divided into two sections. In Section A candidates are required to use contextual knowledge to test the views of two historians about one of the three named in-depth topics or an aspect of one. The question does not require them to comment on the style of writing or the provenance of the interpretation. In Section B candidates are required to answer two essay questions from a choice of three. In Section B candidates are required to answer two essay questions from a choice of three.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • showed a clear understanding of the views of the two interpretations in relation to the question • were able to use contextual knowledge to test the interpretations, linking that knowledge directly to the interpretation through evaluative words • were able to consider both the strengths and limitations of both interpretations using contextual knowledge • in answering the essay questions, covered the whole period in a balanced way • adopted a thematic approach • made links and comparisons between aspects of the topic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explained the links and comparisons • supported their arguments with precise and relevant examples • reached a supported judgement about the issue in the question • demonstrated an understanding and familiarity with the different command verbs, e.g. identify, describe, explain and discuss. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • showed a limited understanding of one or both of the interpretations • did not go beyond a basic explanation of part of the interpretation • did not link any contextual knowledge directly to the interpretation and therefore did not evaluate the interpretation • in answering the essay adopted a chronological rather than thematic approach • did not make links or comparisons even if events from different parts of the period were discussed in the same paragraph • did not cover the whole period • did not focus on the precise wording of the question • made unsupported comments about issues which were no more than assertions.

Section A overview

To do well on Section A, candidates need to explain the view of each interpretation in relation to the question and then evaluate the interpretation by the application of contextual knowledge. Responses should show an understanding of the wider debate connected to the issue.

Question 1

- 1 Evaluate the interpretations in **both** of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing as an explanation of the Suez Crisis and the Second Arab-Israeli War. [30]

The interpretation question was, on the whole, answered well. The majority of candidates were able to access the higher levels by clearly linking their own knowledge to the views and opinions mentioned. At the top end of the mark range, candidates used precise and accurate own knowledge. They explained that Interpretation A argues that a new Arab nationalism had emerged following the First Arab-Israeli War and that the area became of concern for Great Power politics, whereas B argues that the 1949 armistice agreements had not resolved problems, particularly of settlements and refugees.

The most successful responses dealt with each interpretation in turn before coming to a measured conclusion. Answers which attempted a thematic approach often were confused and lacked evaluation, leading to an essay-like approach. There was also an increased tendency in this series for some candidates to simply list the views presented without any supporting evidence.

Centres should be aware that credit is given in assessing the relative convincingness of the views that are present in each interpretation, and that this is tested by using wider contextual knowledge. Answers which proceeded to list impacts that were not present in each interpretation did not score highly, as they were not explicitly evaluating the view of each historian. This was often highlighted or prefixed by the phrase "fails to mention". Candidates should not be evaluating what is not there, but instead focusing on the actual views presented and testing them against historical knowledge. This tendency was more prevalent in this series than in the past.

Centres should also be aware that there is no requirement to mention other historians, nor indeed to evaluate their provenance.

Exemplar 1

1	<p>Passage A argues that the influence of Great powers and their political interests in the region is the most convincing explanation of the Suez crisis and second Arab-Israeli war.</p> <p>Passage A argues that Britain and France's political interests in the region, such as winning back influence in Israel and reasserting control over the Arab nationalist states, such as Egypt and Algeria, did what paved the way for the Suez crisis of 1956. Passage B on the other hand differs and argues that tensions between Arab states and the status of Palestinian refugees after the events of the first Arab-Israeli war in 1948 led to bitterness from the Arab states towards Israel and subsequent insecurity for them Israel, therefore leading them to lead their preventive attacks on the Arabs. Overall passage A offers a more convincing explanation of the Suez crisis and second Arab Israeli war, as the role of Britain and France is undeniable.</p>
	<p>Passage A argues that Britain and France's declining influence in the region and their aim to gain influence and reassert control caused the events of the Suez crisis in 1956. Pass Passage A states 'Britain lost influence over the Zionists in 1948'</p>

This is valid because, to a Britain's mandate in Palestine ended due to them being forced out by ~~egress~~ violent, terrorist attacks by the Zionist militant groups Irgun and Stern Gang, in 1946 the King David Hotel, Britain's headquarters in Mandate Palestine, was bombed by Irgun, this shows Britain's decline ~~of power in the~~ of influence over the Zionists, ~~and had had the~~ ~~use of~~ ~~as~~ ~~they~~ as they were effectively forced in fleeing the mandate, and therefore shows reasons as to why Britain worked to reaffirm their influence in the region through winning back the Suez Canal in 1956 with the help of Israel. The interpretation further states London did try to reassert their position with the Baghdad Pact. This is also valid as ~~due to the influence of Nasser~~ ~~and the voice of the Arabs~~, he convinced ~~A Arab states~~ not to sign the pact, ~~as~~ as Nasser himself did not sign the pact ~~against~~ which and also convinced other Arab states such as Jordan not to either through his radio influence over the radio 'Voice of the Arabs'. Passage A ~~then~~ goes on to say that ~~this~~ ~~part~~ the Britain's lack of control of the region went on to invite 'Russian Penetration' this is also valid as it

Russia's influence over Nasser was shown in the Czech arms deal of 1954, where Russia helped Egypt develop its military. These events all show why Britain wished to reassert their power and dominion in the region, through embarrassing Nasser by reclaiming ~~the Suez canal~~ the newly nationalised canal in 1956. Britain's embarrassment and anger and Nasser's ~~was~~ due to his growing influence ~~had~~ over other Arab regions, ~~and the~~ as well ~~at the~~ called them to try and overthrow him by ruining his newly established image as the Hero of Arab nationalism. Furthermore the Suez crisis would allow Britain to establish new relationships with the Zionists and regain influence in Israel. Interpretation A further states that 'Nasser replaced Zionism as the ~~the~~ the threat to the British power base'. This is also valid as Nasser's vast influence over Arab states was clear, ~~rebellions~~ and ~~USA~~ caused them to move away from ~~pro-British~~ Britain, for example in Jordan, ~~of~~ General Glubb was dismissed as general of the Arab legion which effectively ended British control of ~~the~~ the Jordanian military. Furthermore in ~~1954~~ 1958 ~~the~~, pro-British Prime Minister of Iraq was overthrown in

a Revolution. This therefore shows that Britain and France ~~wished the end~~ were angered by Nasser's line and his role in their decline in influence and wished to end him through Israel. ~~Ussrael~~ ~~was~~ The interpretation is also valid in ~~showing Ussrael to~~ Israel stating 'Israel was the beneficiary' as Ben Gurion was tense and after the events of 48 and the fragile armistice ~~to~~ was at risk of ending any ~~in~~ moment, therefore Israel wished to force the Arabs into recognising the Jewish state and making peace without negotiation, the overthrow of Nasser through Suez crisis ~~is~~ provided Israel with a perfect opportunity to do so and ~~Benyere~~ shows how Britain and France were ~~the~~ the key causes of the conflict as they ~~of~~ provided Israel with the opportunity to gain peace from the Arabs. Overall Passage A is ~~an~~ a very convincing explanation for the Suez crisis in 1956, as it clearly shows the importance of the great powers; Britain and France in instigating conflict to gain back lost influence over the region.

Passage B on the other hand argues that inter-Arab rivalries and discontent due to the events of the 1948 war, led to the insecurity for ~~to~~ Israel causing them to instigate their premature attacks in 1956 and 1967. Passage B argues that ~~(the attitude of Nasser - role of Nasser)~~ the 1948 armistice lines were fragile and contested. This is valid because neither Israel ~~def~~ or the Arabs were pleased with the lines. Israel feared the borders ~~so~~ temporary war borders were too small as they left the vulnerable to attack from the Arabs who were too close. The Arabs on the other hand felt all land ~~occupied~~ claimed by Israel was unjustified and belonged to the Palestinians. This is seen by the hostile rhetoric from Arab leaders ~~such as Nasser through~~ the voice of ~~him~~ especially Nasser ~~and~~ his such as 'throwing Israel into the sea'. This therefore shows that the situation after 48 was unstable and lacked security for Israel therefore causing them to act aggressively in the Suez crisis to overthrow Nasser and the threat he posed by through his hostility towards Israel, and ~~the~~ furthermore by expanding their territory ~~and~~

even to establish greater security for
 example, easing the Sinai Peninsula
 in 1956 and ~~the~~ ~~occupying~~ then
~~occupation~~ of again in 67 along with
 the Golan Heights and the West Bank
 and Gaza. Passage B also argue that
 the future of Palestinian refugees was also
 an 'unresolved major source of tension' this
 is also valid as many thousands of
 Palestinians were forced to flee Israel after
 the events of 1948, such as Plan Dalet
 and the Deir Yassin massacre. Many
 refugees who ~~temporarily~~ temporarily relocated
 in Jordan, & carried out attacks on
 Israel threatening their safety, therefore
 leading Israel's attacks. Passage B
 further states that 'the mutual sense
 that ~~the~~ of insecurity led all sides to
 expect another round of fighting' this
 is not valid as the Arabs in 1956
 posed ~~to~~ no serious threat to Israel.
 Their newly established governments ~~and~~
 militaries were disorganised and
 did not in anyway compare to Israel's
 & advanced military ~~to~~, which was
 developed due to French military aid.
 Furthermore Passage B fails to take
 into account the role of Britain
 and France in providing Israel with the

~~Opposition~~ support to take on Egypt in 1956. The passage B is further invalid as valid, however, as the cause: Israeli ~~interest~~ in expanding Israeli army during the second Arab Israeli war were too expand their borders due to ~~safety~~ concerns ~~of~~ so for the safety of their state leading them to occupy the Golan heights, Sinai peninsula.

Overall passage B does provide a somewhat convincing explanation for the Suez crisis as the tensions between the Arab states and Israel were in fact ~~threatening~~ and seemed to call for another round of fighting, however passage B fails to show the role of Great Powers in the conflict and giving the go ahead to Israel in the case of both the Suez crisis and USA's support for Israeli pre-emptive war in 1967.

To conclude passage A provides a stronger argument for the causes of the Suez crisis and 1967 war, as the role of Britain and France and their aims to regain influence are undeniable, ~~but~~ & furthermore Israel was fairly secure due to

		protection provided to their advanced
		military provided to them from France
		and the USA and therefore showing
		that Britain and France, deceased
		instigation and planning of the Suez
		crisis are a more important conclusion
		explanation for Israeli involvement in
		the Suez crisis.

Exemplar 1 was marked in Level 6 and contains excellent knowledge and evaluation. It has sustained judgements at the end of each paragraph and in the conclusion, alongside an appropriate introduction. The response does not dwell on what is not present, but evaluates the views presented in the interpretations.

Section B overview

To do well on Section B, candidates need to make connections and links across the whole period, explaining similarities and differences between the events they are discussing in order to show an awareness of continuity and change across the whole period unless instructed otherwise. The comparisons made may be either between periods within the topic or between regions. The strongest responses will test a hypothesis and reach a supported judgement.

Question 2*

- 2* 'The Oslo Accords of 1993 and 1995 were the most important turning point in relations between Israel and the Palestinians.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1908 to 2011? [25]

This was a popular question. Candidates were able to focus on thematic paragraphs that were related to the relations between Israel and the Palestinians, for example political, geographical and religious relations.

At the top end of the mark range, candidates used the Oslo Accords at the start of each paragraph before comparing it to two other time periods/events in each paragraph. Successful responses were able to compare throughout the paragraph (this was a greater turning point than x because while x achieved this, y achieved this) and then concluded at the end of the paragraph whether the Oslo Accords or another event was the greatest turning point. The best conclusions assessed each theme in turn to reach a sustained judgement. The majority of candidates attempted this synthesis but it was more often than not a thematic list.

At the lower end of the mark range, candidates wrote about three time periods in total, either chronologically or as factors. Some candidates also neglected the fact that the question was on the Oslo Accords.

Furthermore, centres should be aware that this style of question is not designed to assess whether two events were similar or not; it is about assessing which is the greatest turning point. Candidates should be encouraged, for this type of question, to come to a sustained judgement about the importance of the event in the question in relation to others; not whether it was similar to them. This was more prevalent this series than either in 2022 or pre-Covid. Finally, candidates who did not cover the whole time period were not able to reach the higher levels.

Exemplar 2

2. Overall, the Oslo Accords were not the most important turning point in relations between Israel and Palestinians. Importance shall be qualified by how important an event was in the political (and diplomatic), ~~self~~^{territorial} and geographical (and demographic) relationships between the Palestinians and Israelis. Certainly, the Accords were important diplomatically, as they represented ~~constituted~~ an Israeli recognition of the Palestinians, as an entity, but militarily and geographically the talks were not entirely significant. Rather, the most important

turning point was the 1967 war, which led to the ~~geographic~~^{political} and geographical relationship between the Palestinians and Israelis changing drastically.

Politically speaking, the Oslo Accords were an important turning point as they represented the first instance of a peace talk where the Israelis represented recognised the Palestinians (represented by Arafat or the PLO) as a political entity. Before the talks Oslo, the Israelis conducted negotiations with the Palestinians through a proxy state such as the ~~the~~ in the 1978 Camp David talks or the 1989 Sharm el Sheikh Peace Plan. This, thus new precedent led to further direct negotiation between the Israelis and Palestinians, as seen in the 2000 Camp David talks and the 2002 Arab Peace Plan. However, the Oslo Accords were not the most important politically, as they were merely a continuation of the need for an international solution to the

Israeli-Palestinian conflict that was created by the 1967 War. Israel's seizure of all of Palestine in the 1967 war ~~was~~ ^{has} ~~changed~~ ^{fundamentally} changed the nature of political relations between the Israelis and Palestinians, as the Palestinians ~~do~~ ^{no} ~~not~~ ^{longer} ~~had~~ ^{had} any land, before then they had resided in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. This removal of a Palestinian land ~~because~~ ^{because} it

so that any resolutions to the ~~issue~~ ^{issue} Palestinian issue had to be carried out internationally, as the Palestinians had no state to speak of. Certainly, pre-1967 the Palestinians had political representation as seen in the 1932 Sanction of the Istiqal party in the 1935 Sanction of the Arab Higher Committee, but post-1967 they had to look to other states to facilitate ~~the~~ ^a solution. ~~Further~~ ^{Further}, Israeli seizure of the West Bank and Gaza ~~Israeli~~ ^{Israeli} seizure of the West Bank and Gaza intensified the conflict between them and Palestinians, as 1.5 million Palestinians became ~~care~~ ^{care} under the control of Israel. This led to events such as the 1987 1st Intifada and the 2000 2nd Intifada where Palestinians who were ~~under~~ ^{under} the control of Israel ~~used~~ ^{used} ~~domestic~~ ^{domestic} protest against the government that had been ~~suicidal~~ ^{suicidal}. The political relationship between Israel and Palestinians became one of state rivalry to one of occupation following 1967. ~~Further~~ ^{Further}, the 1967 ~~Overall~~ ^{Overall}, the 1993 Oslo Accords were ^{politically} ~~important~~ ^{important} as they set a precedent of Israeli recognition of Palestinian peace delegates, but they ~~did~~ ^{did} not set the precedent of ~~interaction~~ ^{interaction}

international law needed to resolve the Palestinian issue now did they change the ^{political} relationship between the Palestinians and Israelis. Rather, it was the 1967 war, which created the need for international intervention and made Israel ~~the occupy~~ the Palestinians into ~~citizens of the Israel~~ the relationship

between Palestinians and Israel into one of a state with citizens.

Geographically, the Oslo Accords ~~did not~~ change ~~the~~ were not ^{significant} important on the relationship between the Israelis and the Palestinians. The talks themselves did not discuss the issue of settlements in the West Bank or Gaza and did not amount to any change in the Israeli control over ~~state~~ the region of Palestine. However, the consequences of the accords namely the 1995 assassination of Yitzhak Rabin led to the rise of a ^{far} right Likud government in Israel, which led to a 96% increase in the rate of settlement building in the West Bank under Netanyahu. This served to worsen the relationship between the Israelis and Palestinians and contributed to the outbreak of the 2nd Intifada in 2000. The Oslo Accords ~~did~~ not change the geographical relationship between the Israelis and Palestinians. Rather, the 1967 war had a more significant impact on the ~~set~~ geographical relationship between the Israelis and Palestinians. Before ~~the war~~ ~~Israelis and Palestinians sought~~ ~~over land~~ ~~was~~ ~~had~~ their own land, Israel had occupied 79% of Palestine ~~before~~ the 1948 war and ~~in~~ ~~before~~ the

war, the relationship between Israelis and Palestinians was ~~one of~~ ^{one} where the Palestinians opposed Israeli land seizure as

seen in the 1936 Arab Revolt, which was done in response to Arab fears concerning Israeli immigration, particularly the wave from 1922-36 where 300,000 Jewish immigrants entered Palestine. The 1948 war reversed this situation with Israel getting 79% of Palestine, but the Palestinians still had control over the West Bank and Gaza. It was only in the 1967 war where Israel seized 100% of Palestine that the geographical relationship between Israel and Palestine was fundamentally changed, as Israel had control over the entire region. Further, the war resulted in demographic shifts such as the addition of 1.5 million Palestinians to the population of 2.5 million Israelis. The subsequent diaspora of Palestine also led to Israel taking more action against Palestinians in other states, as they led incursions into Israel, this is best seen in the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon which was due to remove the PLO from the region. Finally, the 1967 war created the issue of Israeli settlements in the West Bank and Gaza, which became a key point of contention in Israeli-Palestinian relations sparking the 1987 Intifada and being the subject of many discussions such as the 1988 Camp David 1978. Camp David Peace talks. Additionally, the war reversed the issue of Palestine's right to return, which became a key issue of dispute in Peace talks as seen in others in

Key reason for the failure of the 2000 Camp David Peace talks. Overall, the Oslo Accords were not entirely dependent on the long-standing relationship between the Palestinians and Israelis. Rather, it was the 1967 war which fundamentally changed the relationship through Israeli seizure of the entire region.

The impact of the Oslo Accords on the religious relationship between the Israelis and Palestinians was not too great. The talks did not adequately cover the religious issues between the Palestinians and Israelis, namely the question of control over religious sites in Jerusalem. Certainly, it did nothing to stop religious tensions between Palestinians and Israelis seen in the outbreak of the 2nd Intifada in 2000 when Ariel Sharon visited the Temple Mount. Certainly, religious tensions were added to the relationship between Israelis and Palestinians throughout the period, as seen in the 1929 Hebron wall incident and the rise of the various religiously radical groups on both sides of the conflict such as Irigun and Hamas. However, the religious relationship between Israel and Palestinians was damaged fundamentally in 1967 when Israel gained control over Jerusalem. Before the war, Palestinians have still

2. control over religious sites in Jerusalem, as they had been occupied by the Jordan in 1948. However, the seizure of these sites in 1967

added another religious dimension to the conflict. This can be seen in the formation of HAMAS in the 1970s, with support of the creation of Israel by Islamic fundamentalist groups such as Al Qaeda. This question of control over religious sites can be seen in the 2000 Camp David talks which were derailed by Israeli occupation of the Temple Mount and can also be seen in the rise of HAMAS to leadership of the Palestinian Authority in 2006. Certainly 1967 acted to intensify religious tensions in the relationship between Israel and Palestinians.

7. Overall, the Oslo Accords were not the most important turning point in the relationship between the Palestinians and Israel. Politically, it was the 1967 war which was the most significant. Politically the Accords were important as they marked the first time Israel directly acknowledged relations with Palestine, but the 1967 war was important in creating the need for an international solution and arbitration of disputes. Geographically and politically and geographically and intensify religious 1967 was more important due to Israel's seizure of the territory of Palestine creating tensions of settlements and control over religious sites.

Exemplar 2 was marked at the top of Level 5. There is clear comparison and evaluation of at least three examples, and they are compared to the Oslo Accords. There are also good end of paragraph judgements and conclusion. The comparison between turning points could have been more developed in places to reach Level 6, and the conclusion should have covered all of the themes mentioned.

Question 3*

3* To what extent did the nature of Arabism change in the period from 1908 to 2011?

[25]

This was answered by a number of candidates. Following the trend of previous series, the majority of candidates approached the question thematically, using, for example, political Arabism, geography and land as their themes. Others focused on opposition to the great powers, Zionism and ethnic divides. Either route was fine, though an overreliance on Nasser as an example (and not adopting a broad approach) did hinder some candidates as they were unable to reach good levels of synthesis.

At the top end of the mark range, candidates assessed three or four time periods within each paragraph, evaluating the level of change in each area. Finally, responses in the top level contained interim assessments (or end of paragraph judgements) before writing a developed conclusion which contained a clear response to the question.

At the lower end of the mark range candidates approached their response either chronologically or were unable to compare time periods within thematic paragraphs. The latter was common, when candidates realised they had to write thematically, but then listed the time periods without comparing the level of change.

Assessment for learning



Successful responses grouped two time periods when Arabism changed and two time periods when there was continuity in each paragraph. This was often using the word “similarly” to signpost and then explained the level of change/continuity. Answers that were less strong did not develop the response and simply used the word.

Exemplar 3

3	<p> The nature of Arabism and Pan-Arabism in the Middle East throughout the period of 1908-2011 has remained focused on confronting Great Powers and opposing Zionism, however throughout the period key changing events such as the creation of the state of Israel and the rise of Nasserism have changed the nature of Pan Arabism. Nasser focussed Arabism on opposing Great Powers at all costs, and the stage establishment of the state of Israel united the Arab states under opposition to the state in a way they were not previously united, therefore ^{however} the nature of Arabism did not change throughout the period as its essence remained confronting Great Powers and Israel. </p>
---	---

	<p> One way Arabism remained constant in the Middle East from 1908-2011 was in their opposition to Great Powers. Opposing British and French colonial rule in the mandate period shows that for example in the 1925 Great Syrian revolt, showing how Arabism was focussed on ^{confronting} opposing French rule. Furthermore opposing Britain through the nationalisation of the Suez canal in 1956 also, and ^{and} further shows how Arabism was focussed on taking back control from Great Powers. Furthermore the 1973 </p>
--	---

oil Embargo shows how Arab Pan-Arabism confronted Great Powers in their involvement in the region and shows Arab demands to be heard. All three examples show how Arabs united under confronting Great powers across the time period. In the Great Syrian revolt, Druze, Alawites and Sunni Arabs united under the pretence of ending ~~French~~ French occupation, ~~like~~ like wise Arab states across the region were united in Nasser's blatant opposition of both British colonial control over the Suez Canal and ~~the~~ the region's economic resources. ~~However~~ ~~the~~ oil embargo similarly the oil Embargo united Arab ~~state~~ oil

states in their ~~oppose~~ demand to be heard by the USA. The oil embargo however differs from the other two events as it is unique in its weaponisation of oil ~~as~~ against the West, and the use of oil as a bargaining chip, as opposed to the Syrian Revolt in 1925 and nationalisation of the canal which were aimed to gain control and autonomy from Britain and France. This therefore shows that even as the influence of ~~Great~~ Great powers in the region declines and the Arab states nationalise their resources such as the canal and oil through OPEC, opposing Great powers still remains ~~constant~~ a constant factor

in uniting Arabs, and therefore show that ~~as~~ the nature of Arabism did not change.

However despite this Arabism does indeed change ~~but~~ ~~it~~ after the rise of Nasserism ~~on~~ as ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ Arabism becomes more radical. Before Nasserism Arabism was much more moderate as seen through Sharif Hussein's willingness to negotiate with Britain and ~~for~~ for example the McMahon

Hussein correspondence, and ~~the Hashemite~~ ~~monarchy~~ in 1915, after the rise of Nasser we see a change in Arabism and Nasser's confrontation of Great Powers for example Nasser's refusal to sign the Baghdad Pact in 1953 ~~and~~ ~~was~~. Furthermore ~~after~~ ^{towards} ~~Nasserism~~ the end of Nasserism in the ~~late~~ ~~1960's~~ we see a move towards more moderate Arabism once again as seen through ~~the~~ ~~rise~~ ~~of~~ ~~Saudi~~ ~~influence~~ and ~~their~~ ~~a~~ ~~close~~ ~~relationship~~ the states once again uniting under an Arabism remains radical and in ~~confronting~~ ~~opposing~~ Great Powers as shown in opposition ~~of~~ ~~to~~ the Iraq war ~~of~~ in 2003. Before Nasserism, ~~as~~ and under the Hashemite monarchy Arab states were far more likely to negotiate with Great Powers as seen with Abdullah in Jordan and Faisal in Iraq. However ~~it~~ a major turning point for

There is the rise of Nasser's influence as we see Arab states move away from Great powers and unite under their opposition, for example Jordan in solidarity with Egypt also refused to join the pact against Communism. We further see the influence of Nasser's new radical form of

In 2007 show how religious divides influenced developments in the region. All three conflicts influenced the political developments within Iraq. Sectarian violence in Palestine caused Britain to lose control of the region and forced them to end their mandate causing a power vacuum where Israel were able to take control. Likewise during the Lebanese civil war ~~was~~ the ~~new~~ relationship between conflicts between Muslims and Maronite militias known as Phalangie led to the downfall of the French placed constitution in which Maronite Christians held presidency allowed Syria to take

control. Furthermore in Iraq sectarian division dictated the new constitution and when elections were held in 2005 ~~the~~ people voted on sectarian lines meaning the Shia majority won. This therefore shows how religious sectarian violence

		within countries greatly impacted the political of the and of the region. Show
		Like wise ethnic divides also influenced the region Ethnic divides not also however led the to internal violence within 1st states conflict with states for example, Armenian minority in Turkey were persecuted as they did not fit the mold of Turkish nationalism. Like wise Saddam persecuted Kurds in his Anfal Campaign in 1986 and tried to Arabize the Kurds as they did not fit his Arab mold. the Further more in P. Israel Jews were Palestinian Arabs under the occupation of Israel also saw conflict

		To conclude Religion held more significance in the development of the Middle East.
--	--	--

Exemplar 3 was marked Level 5. There is clear comparison and evaluation of at least three examples, and change/continuity is assessed. This is also a good example of the AfL point mentioned above. This response could have been more definitive in its argument and, on occasion, not argued chronologically.

Question 4*

4* 'Religion has had a greater impact than ethnicity on developments in the Middle East in the period from 1908 to 2011.' How far do you agree?

[25]

This was the least popular question on the examination paper. Most candidates split their response and wrote one paragraph on religion and one on ethnicity. This hindered their response as they were unable to come to a sustained judgement. The most successful responses adopted a thematic approach surrounding developments in the Middle East (such as political, economic, relations with foreign powers) and compared religion and ethnicity in each paragraph to come to a judgement on each theme.

At the top end of the mark range, candidates assessed two examples where religion had an impact and compared them to two ethnicity examples, within each paragraph, evaluating the level of change in each area. Finally, responses in the top level contained interim assessments (or end of paragraph judgements) before writing a developed conclusion which contained a clear response to the question.

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

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

Access to Scripts

For the June 2023 series, Exams Officers will be able to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts' for all of our General Qualifications including Entry Level, GCSE and AS/A Level. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

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

OCR Professional Development

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

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

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

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

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

Active Results

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

[Find out more](#).

Need to get in touch?

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

Call us on
01223 553998

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

For more information visit

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

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **facebook.com/ocrexams**

 **twitter.com/ocrexams**

 **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**

 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**

 **youtube.com/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

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



I like this



I dislike this

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



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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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