

GCSE (9-1)

Examiners' report

HISTORY A
(EXPLAINING THE
MODERN WORLD)

J410

For first teaching in 2016

J410/05 Summer 2018 series

Version 1

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper J410/05 series overview.....	4
Section A overview.....	5
Question 1	5
Question 2	6
Question 3	7
Question 4	8
Section B overview.....	10
Question 5	10
Question 6	10
Question 7	11
Question 8*	12

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. 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 can be downloaded from OCR.

Subject information update

We have amended the Study of the Historic Environment component of OCR GCSE History A (J410) to fix the site studied from June 2019 (Castles) and June 2020 (Urban Environments).

Following consultation with and feedback from teachers, we are changing the way the Study of the Historic Environment will be assessed on GCSE History A. At the moment, the site to be studied changes each year of the qualification. From now on, candidates will study either Kenilworth Castle or an urban environment (South Shields in 2019 and Spitalfields from 2020 onwards).

What this means is that teachers of the Castles option, who are already preparing candidates to be examined on Kenilworth Castle in 2019, will continue to prepare each cohort of candidates for an examination on Kenilworth Castle in all future examination series.

For teachers of the Urban Environments option, they should continue preparing candidates to be examined on South Shields in 2019. For the June 2020 examination, and in future series, teachers should prepare candidates for an examination on Spitalfields.

We hope these changes will make the Historic Environment component of the qualification more straightforward for teachers to plan and teach. The teachers' site packs for Kenilworth and South Shields are already available on the website here: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/qualifications/gcse/gcse-history-a-explaining-the-modern-world-j410-from-2016/planning-and-teaching/> and a site pack for Spitalfields will be available in Spring 2019.

The OCR set site will be reviewed after three years and may be subject to change. Each OCR set site will remain on the specification for a minimum of three years, unless the review process identifies a necessary change. If an OCR set site is to be changed and replaced with a new set site, centres will be notified in September two years prior to the examination being sat.

If you have queries about any aspect of these changes, please contact the History Subject Advisors at history@ocr.org.uk

Paper J410/05 series overview

This was the first examination of the new Specification A Paper 1. The new paper was very different from what has gone before, with a longer time frame for International Relations and also a new section on Historical Controversies. There was also a slightly different focus to the Depth Studies, with the relationship between people and state at the heart of this.

Section A overview

Teachers and candidates are to be congratulated for the thoroughness of their preparation for this new challenge. The overwhelming majority of candidates attempted to answer all of the questions. The range and quality of responses was extremely impressive, particularly in the questions on the Historical Controversies.

Question 1

- 1 Outline the impact of the worldwide economic depression on international relations in Europe in the 1930s. [5]

The majority of candidates found this question accessible and were able to reach Levels 2 or 3, mostly at 3 or 4 marks. Candidates who provided a framing statement which correctly outlined the effects of the depression usually went on to score 4 or 5 marks. The framing statement need not be particularly sophisticated. For example 'overall, the worldwide depression caused international relations to get worse' would have been acceptable. The high scoring candidates mostly made some such comment and then supported this with a relevant example. The most common examples were the erection of international trade barriers which led to rivalry and tension; or the emergence of regimes such as the Nazis in Germany which then went on to disrupt international relations with aggressive policies such as rearmament or the remilitarisation of the Rhineland.

A significant number of candidates did not reach above 3 marks because they did not recognise that the question asked about the effects of the depression on international relations. The most common example of this type of answer was a response which described how the depression led to high unemployment in Germany (sometimes moving on to describe the emergence of the Nazis as a result). These responses were valid effects of the depression, but not outlining the effects of the depression on international relations.

One common misunderstanding was the inclusion of the Manchurian Crisis in many responses. Clearly this was not an example of worsening international relations in Europe.

Advice for Question 1

The key to this question is to construct a statement which effectively and correctly outlines the main trends or impacts asked about, and to support with one or two examples of this trend or impact.

Question 2

2 Explain why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s.

[10]

This question was generally tackled well and candidates scored highly, with a large proportion gaining Level 4 and Level 5 marks (7-10). However, in keeping with the introductory statement, many candidates achieved this by unexpected and in some cases slightly unorthodox routes.

The question was phrased specifically as why the USA got 'more' involved in Vietnam in the 1960s. It was anticipated that most candidates would focus on the situation in Vietnam in the 1960s and describe or explain the escalation in US involvement throughout that decade.

Some candidates did take this approach and were rewarded for explaining how the US was drawn in to Vietnam in the early 1960s to support the Diem regime. Another valid reason why the US got more involved was that the Viet Cong and their North Vietnamese supporters used tactics which proved increasingly difficult to counter and as a result there was an escalation of ground troops and indeed of bombing.

Many candidates took an unexpected approach in that they explained the US involvement in more global terms as part of the wider context of the Cold War. Examiners saw this as a reasonable if unanticipated approach to the question and gave candidates credit. Typical approaches involved the Domino Theory and the US fear of Communism spreading through South Vietnam to Cambodia and Laos. Some candidates took an even wider approach, seeing the US involvement in Vietnam in the wider context of the Cold War as a whole and the policy of Containment in particular. This was also acceptable.

Advice for Question 2

Candidates tended to reach Levels 4 or 5 when two factors were clearly and distinctly separated and in each case candidates explained what was happening and how this led to increased US involvement. In short, where they identified an event which saw as a reason and explained how or why it caused US involvement. However, many responses simply produced a narrative of events and examiners sometimes found it difficult to see where factors were being identified or explained. Candidates should be advised to think in terms of identifying reasons or factors, describing those factors and then explaining specifically why those factors, as opposed to any others, led to increased involvement of the US in Vietnam.

Question 3

3 Study Interpretation A.

Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on the policy of Appeasement? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of Appeasement to support your answer. [25]

The outstanding feature of responses to this question was the generally excellent level of knowledge of the historiography of the issue of Appeasement. The great majority of candidates were extremely well-informed about the various ideas and approaches which historians have brought to the subject. Teachers and candidates should be congratulated on the success with which they have got to grips with this extremely challenging concept.

The question produced a wide range of responses. Most candidates sensibly began their responses by explaining their understanding of Interpretation A. The majority of responses were able to make clear that they understood the main thrust of Interpretation A, that it was anti-Appeasement and critical of Chamberlain.

Once they had achieved this they usually had little difficulty in naming a school of thought or historian(s) which either agreed or disagreed and so conclude that the Interpretation was fair or not. However, many candidates opted to name several schools of thought in this fashion without developing their response by explaining which details of the arguments of the schools of thought would support or contradict the general premise of Interpretation A (that it was critical of Chamberlain and Appeasement). Such responses reached Level 3 and there was a significant proportion of the entry who reached this level. Responses simply correctly named critical or supportive interpretations but did no more than this were marked at the bottom of Level 3. Answers which specified what particular interpretations were agreeing or disagreeing with in Interpretation A were credited higher in the level.

Another way to reach Level 3 was to base responses solely on candidates' own knowledge of the period. There were some examples of this approach and the use of knowledge was usually effective. However, it was more common for candidates to attempt to use other interpretations in the limited way described above, as well as their knowledge, to respond to the question. Such responses still received Level 3.

Candidates who did develop their answers to explain in detail what other interpretations or schools of thought argued as support for their argument were able to reach Level 4. Responses at Level 5 had to engage with the specific details of Interpretation A rather than the general premise of being critical of Appeasement. There were many excellent and imaginative approaches at this level. For example many candidates argued that the Orthodox view would not have supported the contention in Interpretation A that Chamberlain was a flawed character. They rightly pointed out that while the Orthodox view was critical of Appeasement generally, it was on the whole sympathetic to Chamberlain and applauded his motives.

Although most candidates show a good knowledge of the various interpretations of Appeasement, there were numerous candidates who simply recited a list of the various schools of thought and interpretations they had studied but did not relate this knowledge in any meaningful way to the question. Such answers were marked at Level 2 for the most part. Some candidates did not help themselves by referring to particular viewpoints as 'the first interpretation, the second interpretation etc'. Whilst this was presumably a reference to the textbook they had used it was often unclear to examiners exactly which view interpretation they were referring to. In some cases responses were so unclear that they were only given Level 1.

Advice for Question 3

The key advice to candidates is to make clear their understanding of Interpretation A and then make sure they explain the views of opposing or supporting interpretations in order to support their argument about whether they believe the argument(s) contained in Interpretation A to be fair or not. It is not necessary to include every single interpretation candidates have studied into this question and time is better spent on selecting and developing a smaller number of examples than in comprehensive coverage of all views. It is also worth taking time to clearly identify particular schools of thought, ideally by referring to the time period in which they emerged and developed.

Question 4

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. **[20]**

() Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology **[5]**

As with Question 3, examiners commented on the impressive quality of candidates' knowledge of the historiography of the Cold War.

Many candidates took the sensible option, as they did with Question 3, to demonstrate their understanding of Interpretation B. Again, the majority of answers did so very clearly and effectively. The stronger responses tended to conclude this opening paragraph by then stating their intent to explain which aspects of the interpretation would then be challenged.

The strongest responses were able to explain how at least **two** different schools of thought **from different time periods** would have disagreed with Interpretation A, whilst also explaining the reasons why one of those schools disagreed. This proved very challenging and a relatively small number of candidates were able to reach Level 5.

By contrast, many candidates successfully reached Level 4 by correctly identifying two schools of thought and explaining what these schools of thought believed and how it disagreed with Interpretation B.

Similarly, many candidates were able to reach Level 3. This was usually by identifying several schools of thought but only properly explaining one of them to the required standard (two such explanations would have reached Level 4).

A substantial number of candidates were also able to reach Level 3 by explaining why some schools of thought believed what they did. At first sight such approaches might appear to be addressing the question but in fact this was not the case. For example, some candidates correctly pointed out that the US Orthodox Cold War historians would have disagreed with Interpretation B because of the influence of the Red Scare in the late 1940s. While this is a valid point, it merely explains why the Orthodox historians believed what they did. It does not explain why they would have disagreed with the specific views raised in Interpretation B. In addition, this point could be raised in relation to any interpretation of the Cold War. Thus, in order to move beyond Level 3 candidates need to explain how particular interpretations would disagree, as a higher priority than why.

As with Question 3, many candidates who had clearly taken great pains to make sure they knew the various interpretations of the period sometimes struggle to manage their knowledge and use it effectively. Some responses simply listed, often in accurate detail, the various interpretations but these were not related to the question. Most responses of this sort reached Level 2. However, as with Question 3 some responses were so unclear about which interpretations they were referring to that they were only given Level 1.

Another notable type of response was where candidates attempted to set out their own critique of the view rather than addressing the question of why other historians would have disagreed. Such responses were generally given Level 1 as they did not address the question.

Advice for Question 4

As with Question 3, candidates should make clear their understanding of Interpretation B. As with Question 3, it is not necessary to include every single interpretation candidates have studied into this question and time is better spent on selecting and developing a smaller number of examples than in comprehensive coverage of all views. Candidates should select a small number of examples of interpretations which disagree and explain how they disagree (ie what aspects of the topic they disagree with Interpretation B about). Once they achieved this securely, they can then explain why particular schools of thought held these opposing views.

Section B overview

This section was generally tackled well with candidates showing impressive in-depth knowledge of the period. The source question was tackled well and on the whole most candidates were able to produce a supported argument for Question 8. Centres should be congratulated on the performance of their candidates in this section.

Question 5

- 5 Describe **one** way that the International Anti-Apartheid Movement showed its opposition to Apartheid. [2]

A substantial number of candidates struggled with this question. Most were able to refer to international disapproval and economic or sporting sanctions. However, a substantial number missed the reference to international in the question and focused their answer on resistance within South Africa.

Question 6

- 6 Explain the consequences of the Sharpeville Massacre. [10]

This question proved quite challenging and resulted in a wide range of responses. The strongest responses were able to identify two consequences and explain them. Typically this involved focusing on events which followed on from Sharpeville. Examples included the international reaction to Sharpeville and the subsequent imposition of sanctions along with the increasing scale and militancy of African resistance to apartheid. Other common responses included the crackdown carried out by the authorities and the arrest of Mandela and other ANC leaders. Candidates who correctly explained two such examples were given Level 5 while for one such example they reached Level 4.

A substantial number of candidates attempted to tackle the question but didn't either to identify specific consequences or to explain how the events they were describing were consequences of Sharpeville. Typically these responses listed events and identified them as consequences but no more. These general identifications usually reached Level 3.

A substantial number of candidates didn't address the question. Usually this involved a narrative of the events leading up to Sharpeville and the events in Sharpeville itself. These responses generally reached Level 2 but no higher.

Advice for Question 6

Candidates should be advised that Question 2 and Question 6 are structured and marked in similar ways and so they should adopt the same type of approach. In this question candidates tended to reach Levels 4 or 5 when they identified two events or developments and explained how they were consequences of the Sharpeville Massacre. Where candidates simply produced a narrative of events examiners found it difficult to see where reasons were being identified or explained. Candidates should be advised to think in terms of identifying consequences, describing them, and explaining how they were caused by the events at Sharpeville. Another acceptable approach would be to explain the consequences thematically e.g. the political consequences, the economic consequences. While this would have been acceptable no candidates adopted this approach.

Question 7

7 Study Sources A and B. How similar are these sources?

[10]

On the whole, candidates tackled this question well. They seemed to find the sources accessible and were able to make valid inferences about the purpose or message of the sources in order to make a sensible comparison.

The strongest answers were able to show that the two sources had a similar purpose, which was to get change in South Africa in the form of fairer treatment for Africans by highlighting injustice in the case of Source A or pressuring the government in Source B by warning of violence ahead. Such responses gained Level 3.

Many candidates were able to reach Level 2 by identifying the similar attitude of the two sources in that they were both opposed to apartheid. Others correctly pointed out that the central message of the two sources was different even though the attitude to apartheid was similar. These responses reached Level 2.

Some candidates tried to address the question by contrasting small extracts or sections from the two sources. While valid, such responses only reached Level 1.

Advice for Question 7

Candidates should be encouraged to take a staged approach to this question. They can start by comparing the general topic, in this case violence. This would take them to Level 1. From here they should then try to explain the attitude and or the overall message of the sources and whether or not they are similar. In this case the attitudes are similar but the messages are different. Finally they should consider the purpose of each source and explain how the purpose of each is similar. Purpose needs to be explained in terms of the change each source was trying to bring about and how the sources tried to achieve this purpose.

Question 8*

- 8* 'FW de Klerk was the most significant reason that Apartheid ended.' How far do you agree with this view about the collapse of Apartheid? [18]

The aim of this question was for candidates to assess the importance of de Klerk as a reason for the demise of apartheid. On the whole candidates handled this question well. Typically the stronger responses set out why there might be a case for arguing that de Klerk was the most significant reason, citing his various actions and statements correctly and relevantly. They then went on to compare de Klerk's contribution with other factors such as international resistance to apartheid, the role of the ANS and other activists and the state of South Africa's economy. Most such answers reached Level 4 or 5. The very best answers were able to point to the links between the other factors and de Klerk's policies and convincingly argue that de Klerk might not have taken the actions he did without the existence of the other factors.

A substantial number of candidates found it difficult to engage with de Klerk's role and fell back on assertions about his importance or otherwise. However, they were able to make a solid case around the importance of some of the other factors listed above. These responses usually reached Level 3 or Level 4 for the more developed responses.

Many candidates found the task of organising a structured argument difficult and relied on a narrative of the fall of apartheid. Although many such responses were impressive in their detail and accuracy, they did not address the question of the relative importance of different factors. They may have included a range of factors but they did not engage in how these events contributed to the demise of apartheid. These responses mostly received Level 2.

Advice for Question 8

Candidates should be encouraged to take time to think through and plan their response. They should certainly engage with the key factor in the statement, in this case the role of de Klerk, and explain how it helped to end apartheid. They should then consider other factors, one at a time. It is not necessary to provide a narrative of events. They should take another factor and explain the effects of that factor and how these effects helped to end apartheid. They should ideally then take time to explain whether they felt this factor was more or less significant than de Klerk, or perhaps how the effects of this factor combined with the actions of de Klerk. This should be repeated for at least one other factor.

Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

activeresults

Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>



We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the 'Like' or 'Dislike' button you can help us to ensure that our resources work for you. When the email template pops up please add additional comments if you wish and then just click 'Send'. Thank you.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here:

www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest

OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

Our documents are updated over time. Whilst every effort is made to check all documents, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, therefore please use the information on the latest specification at all times. Where changes are made to specifications these will be indicated within the document, there will be a new version number indicated, and a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource please contact us at: resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content:
Square down and Square up: alexwhite/Shutterstock.com

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications:
resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk

Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

www.ocr.org.uk

OCR Customer Contact Centre

General qualifications

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge 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 2018** 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.



Cambridge
Assessment



001