



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

**GCSE (9–1)**

**History A (Explaining the Modern World)**

**J410/14: International Relations: the changing international order 1918-1975**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

**Mark Scheme for Autumn 2021**

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 2021

## 1. 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

<b>DEV</b>	Development
<b>?</b>	Unclear

## 2. 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.

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

1. Outline how the USA and USSR clashed in the 1960s.

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

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically outline how the USA and USSR clashed in the 1960s supported by at least one example e.g.</p> <p><i>The USA and USSR clashed between 1961 and 1962 because Soviet leader Khrushchev believed the new American President Kennedy to be weak and tried to expand Soviet power and influence. In response to Kennedy's backing of a failed invasion of the USSR's ally Cuba, Khrushchev ordered the construction of a wall between capitalist West Berlin and the communist East. He also secretly installed nuclear missiles in Cuba and when these were discovered by the Americans it led to one of the largest crises of the Cold War.</i></p> <p><b>NB: Higher mark for development or more examples</b></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically outline one or more examples of the clash OR provide a <b>framing statement</b> without examples e.g.</p> <p><i>In August 1961 the USSR started construction of a wall between capitalist West Berlin and the communist East, which led to a standoff between Soviet and American forces.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>They clashed because the Russian leader Khrushchev thought that Kennedy – America's new president – was inexperienced and so tried to take advantage of this to expand Soviet influence.</i></p>	<b>2–3</b>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <p>Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.</p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically outline one or more events with little or <b>no reference</b> to how the USA and USSR clashed in the 1960s e.g.</p> <p><i>They clashed because they had different opinions in 1961 and 1962.</i></p> <p><i>There was tension in Europe.</i></p> <p><i>There was a risk of nuclear war.</i></p> <p><i>Neither side wanted to back down.</i></p>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>



2. Explain why the League of Nations was successful in the 1920s.

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

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 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.	Level 5 answers will typically <b>identify at least two reasons</b> why the League of Nations was successful in the 1920s <b>and explain</b> them fully	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 4</b> 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.	Level 4 answers will typically <b>identify at least one reason</b> why the League of Nations was successful in the 1920s <b>and explain</b> it fully	<b>7–8</b>
<b>Level 3</b> 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.	Level 3 answers will typically <b>identify and/or describe one or more</b> reasons why the League of Nations was successful in the 1920s but <b>will not explain</b> fully,	<b>5–6</b>
<b>Level 2</b> 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.	Level 2 answers will typically contain <b>description of events linked</b> to the League of Nations in the 1920s	<b>3–4</b>

<b>Level 1</b> 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.	Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons not specific to why the League was successful in the 1920s	<b>1-2</b>
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on Britain’s policy of appeasing Germany? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of British policy towards Germany between 1937–1939 to support your answer.


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

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full and thoroughly developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a convincing and substantiated judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically address the question through fully developed analysis and <b>evaluation of specific elements of Interpretation A</b>, supported by relevant references to other interpretations or the context of Interpretation A</p> <p><i>In Interpretation A, Niall Ferguson is arguing that Britain’s policy of appeasing Germany was successful in preventing a war over Czechoslovakia and Neville Chamberlain was an effective diplomat.</i></p> <p><i>On one hand Interpretation A is a fair comment because many historians writing in the 1960s would have agreed with Ferguson’s view. They believed that Britain was not economically or militarily powerful enough to fight a war with Hitler in 1938 and the policy of appeasement at Munich bought Britain valuable time to build up its army in order to fight Hitler on more equal terms when war finally did come. These historians believed that Chamberlain was indeed an effective diplomat and so Interpretation A seems a fair comment.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might make reference to the ‘popular majority view’, ‘academic revisionist historians’ or cite specific historians such as Watt; this is not a requirement but should be credited]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Many writers during and immediately after the Second World War would not have believed Interpretation A was a fair comment. They argued that that appeasing Germany made a major war inevitable and that Chamberlain followed a foolish and cowardly policy, since by letting Hitler get away with his plans to expand Germany it led him to become more and more reckless. These writers believed that instead of a triumph, Chamberlain’s diplomacy was a huge blunder and so the arguments in Interpretation A are an unfair comment on Britain’s policy of appeasing Germany.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates may cite the ‘academic counter-revisionist view’, use material such as Cato’s ‘The Guilty men’, or refer to historians such as Parker or Charmley; these are not required but should receive credit.]</i></p> <p>NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported.</p>	<b>21–25</b>
<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a fully supported judgement of the</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically address the question of fairness through valid use of other interpretation(s) or the context of Interpretation A. Answers at this level <b>will not specify the aspect(s) of Interpretation A which they consider fair or unfair.</b></p> <p><i>Interpretation A is saying that appeasement worked.</i></p>	<b>16–20</b>

<p>interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><i>People living at the time would have agreed with this, and so Interpretation A is fair. There were huge fears in Britain of another war breaking out and when Chamberlain was successful at Munich he returned a popular man. People were relieved, and Chamberlain received thousands of messages of support and many MPs applauded his actions.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might make reference to the 'popular majority view', 'academic revisionist historians' or cite specific historians such as Watt; this is not a requirement but should be credited.]</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied, and uses this to make a partially supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically be based on a valid argument about fairness and support this with relevant <b>factual knowledge OR undeveloped references to other interpretations</b> to judge fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>This interpretation is not a fair comment, because I know that appeasement failed. Hitler was simply encouraged that he could get away with making further demands, and went on to invade the rest of the Czechoslovakia in early 1939. When Britain and France did nothing to stop him, he made further claims for land in Poland, which in turn led to the outbreak of the Second World War and the loss of millions of lives. He might have 'prevented a war' in 1939 but caused a much bigger one the following year.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Revisionist historians writing in the 1960s would agree with Niall Ferguson that the British policy of appeasing Germany had its successes.</i></p>	<p><b>11–15</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and limited evaluation of other interpretations studied, and links this to a judgement of the given interpretation in the context of historical events studied to answer the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically describe relevant interpretations without addressing the question of fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>Niall Ferguson is being positive about appeasement. A book called 'The Guilty men' written by Cato said appeasement was a disaster. David Dilks said Chamberlain did a good job with appeasement.</i></p> <p>NB: Cannot be based on a misunderstanding of the given interpretation.</p>	<p><b>6–10</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in terms of the question. Other interpretations may be mentioned but there is no analysis or evaluation of them.</li> <li>The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate understanding of Interpretation A and/OR offer undeveloped/unsupported assertions about fairness</p> <p><i>Interpretation A thinks that Chamberlain was a good diplomat. This is an opinion from the 21<sup>st</sup> century and not from the time. I think that Chamberlain was foolish to trust anything Hitler agreed to do.</i></p> <p>NB: Place in this level answers which seem to show some knowledge of context or other interpretations but have misunderstood interpretation A.</p>	<p><b>1–5</b></p>
<p><b>Level</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

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

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO4 (a, b and c): Analyse individual interpretations and how and why interpretations differ. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	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.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	Level 4 answers will typically explain <b>how AND why</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>one period</b> have disagreed (or agreed) with Interpretation and <b>how or why</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>one other period</b> have disagreed (or agreed) with Interpretation B.e.g  <b>NOTE 1: Marks can be awarded within level for quality of support or addressing specific aspects of Interpretation B rather than the general premise.</b>  <b>NOTE 2: If a candidate explains how and why only one view differs mark at bottom of L5</b>	<b>9-10</b> 
<b>Level 4</b>	Level 4 answers will typically explain <b>how AND why</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>one period</b> have disagreed (or agreed) with Interpretation B.e.g. Alternatively, answers may explain how OR why historians or commentators from two or more periods have disagreed (or agreed)  <b>NOTE: Marks can be awarded within the level for quality of support or addressing specific aspects of Interpretation B rather than the general premise.</b>	<b>7-8</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	Level 3 answers will typically <b>explain how OR why</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>one period</b> have disagreed (or agreed) with Interpretation B.e.g.  <b>Alternatively</b> Level 3 answers may explain valid reasons <b>why</b> historians from one or more periods disagree (or agree) but fail to explain how:	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Level 2 answers will typically <b>identify historian(s) or commentator(s) who have agreed OR disagreed</b> with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why e.g.  <b>Alternatively</b> Level 2 answers will give a basic but correct account of the historiography e.g.	<b>3-4</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions about Interpretation B or give their own critique of it e.g.	<b>1-2</b>

	<b>NB: Award at this level if candidates give their own critique of B (i.e. not the views of other historians). This may well be phrased as 'other historians' but is in fact the candidate's own view using contextual knowledge.</b>	
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>

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

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

**BLANK PAGE**

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

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