

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

Key Messages

- Careful reading of the question will ensure clarity of demand and result in a more clearly focused response.
- Questions requiring description were often done well, while the answers to other questions needed to contain more explanation and evaluation.
- Answers to part **(c)** questions required a greater focus on the demands of the question. It is important that, in addition to relevant detail, the answer demonstrates historical understanding of the event, issue, cause or effect.

General Comments

A majority of candidates were able to use sound knowledge of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. It was clear that many candidates communicated detail clearly and accurately. This approach is particularly useful for part **(a)** questions where short, descriptive answers of probably no more than a paragraph in length allow the emphasis to be on the recalling of accurate details, rather than explanation.

However, parts **(b)** and **(c)** demand explanation. Few marks are awarded for narrative or 'setting the scene'. Candidates who score highly are able to keep to the point, apply their knowledge to the precise requirements of the question, and develop each of the identified factors fully. In part **(c)**, the mark scheme rewards those who argue both for and against the focus of the question, and reach a valid judgement. This judgement should go beyond repeating what has already been stated, by addressing 'how far' or 'to what extent'.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A (Core Content)

Question 1

In answer to **(a)** candidates were able to describe two or three aspects of the revolution in France during 1848. The points made included the issue over Reform Banquets, the setting up of barricades and the abdication of Louis Philippe. A small number of candidates took the opportunity to mention the dismissal of Guizot. Answers to **(b)** lacked the detailed explanation required in a quality answer, being more descriptive about general points such as the demands of different classes of the population. More issues specific to France were required to improve the quality of answers. In **(c)** most responses required greater detail of the different European revolutions. Where different revolutions were highlighted, similarities emerged but more candidates could have included the differences as well. Less successful responses concentrated more on descriptions of poor conditions in general.

Question 2

In **(a)** responses showed knowledge of some aspects of the Treaty of Olmutz including the dissolving of the Erfurt Union and the restoration of the Bund. Weaker answers were characterised by a lack of knowledge in relation to this important aspect of the period. Answers to **(b)** showed some awareness of French neutrality and the role of Italy. When Schleswig-Holstein was mentioned its importance was sometimes missing. In **(c)**, some candidates were able to identify some aspects of France's role. Others needed to develop this identification into explanation. Where this development did take place, answers would have benefited from greater balance - the explanation of Bismarck's role would have improved many responses.

Question 3

For **(a)** many candidates were able to describe the Dred Scott case using detailed, accurate knowledge. In **(b)**, many candidates showed good knowledge of events at Harper's Ferry, including the role of John Brown. The better answers put these events into context, allowing the answer to develop into an explanation of significance. In **(c)** many very good responses showed consistent, balanced explanation of both sides of the argument. This resulted in well-argued, relevant answers with a clear focus on the question. Less strong responses lacked the explanatory understanding, being more descriptive of the impact of the Civil War.

Question 4

In **(a)** most candidates were able to identify that there was a naval arms race, with the better answers developing the race idea between Britain and Germany over the 'Dreadnought' programme. Weaker answers concentrated more on a vague general overview of an arms build-up across Europe. The best answers looked at the wider issue, as required by the question. This brought into the answer detail about Germany developing their modern steel works to produce ammunition and weaponry and Britain creating the British Expeditionary Force. A number of candidates incorrectly stated that Germany built the first Dreadnought. Some answers to **(b)** were detailed and focused, with sound explanation as to why events in 1908 increased tension between the Great Powers, particularly Austria and Russia. Other answers would have benefitted from better knowledge of the topic and they tended to feature a description of the alliance system or generalities about the Balkans. Among the answers to **(c)** were those in which candidates struggled - characterised by description of the differing alliances. For some, the question gave an opportunity to describe events from 1905 which had increased tension. The better responses showed a clear focus on the question, with consideration being given to a number of causes of war, including the Alliance System. This approach gave balance to the answers and reflected the candidates' sound understanding of the period and the capability to explain factors in context.

Question 5

In **(a)** most candidates were able to identify two or three weaknesses exhibited by, in the main, Britain, with the idea of self-interest being the point most often made. Less successful answers were often lengthy and lacking focus on the question, offering generalities from the period between the wars. Some of these concentrated on the League, rather than Britain and France. Better candidates thought more carefully about the question and this approach offered a variety of weaknesses ranging from the reluctance to commit armed forces and financial aid following the war, to aspects of self-interest in relation specifically to Manchuria and Abyssinia. The better answers to **(b)** focused clearly on the question, taking note of the words 'setting-up'. These answers were then able to develop a number of reasons including the absence of important countries and how the League might cope without a standing army. Others neglected to answer the question as set, introducing events from the 1930s and only very general material. Again in **(c)**, some candidates didn't answer the question as set, writing about Manchuria and Abyssinia. Only after they had tackled these two aspects of the 1930s, did anything from the 1920s appear in the answer. Comment about success could have been fuller and more explained by some. Less successful answers combined the failures of the 1930s with humanitarian efforts, missing the 'peacekeeping' of the question. The best answers focused fully on the 1920s, explaining the different successes of the League. In some of these answers, the explanation of failure could have been better developed.

Question 6

Many candidates in answering **(a)** were able to identify a number of factual points relating to both the Saar and the Rhineland. In these answers it was made clear to which event the points being made were associated. Less strong answers concentrated more on the Rhineland than on the Saar. Some were unable to identify anything about the Saar and combined it with the Rhineland and had German troops marching into both areas. At all levels much time was spent unnecessarily on detail about the Treaty which lacked relevance. The best answers to **(b)** identified and explained a number of reasons as to why Hitler wanted Anschluss. These ranged from it being his birth place, Austria's economic value to Germany and on to the destruction of the Treaty. This approach allowed a wide view of the question asked through relevant explanation of factors. Other answers were more limited in their explanation, a requisite of the highest level. There were also misconceptions which existed across the ability range, the most common being that 'Germany wanted to re-unite with Austria, as it had been taken away by the Treaty of Versailles', followed by the idea that Austria was heavily populated by Germans seemingly displaced by the Treaty. Some responses to **(c)** were excellent, with detailed argument on either side of the debate. Other responses showed a high level of awareness of Hitler's foreign policy but needed to turn these into explanations as to

why it increased tension and led Europe towards war. On the other side, it was clear that candidates knew that the League of Nations, appeasement and the Treaty of Versailles had a bearing on the question but again often needed to develop the points made into explanation.

Question 7

In **(a)**, those candidates who had knowledge of the events in 1945 in relation to Poland had little difficulty in giving a number of identifications, including reference to sphere of influence, Lublin Poles, Soviet military occupation and rigged elections. Some were aware of the proposed boundary changes. Other answers lacked much of this detail. Some responses to **(b)** showed good understanding of the period and in particular the difference which surfaced at Potsdam. Less successful answers neglected to keep within the date confines of the question, producing material that could not be credited. There were numerous excellent responses to **(c)**, where candidates were well-informed about both the Marshall Plan and the Berlin Blockade. Less strong answers, whilst showing good knowledge, would have been improved by turning this into explanation.

Question 8

Often the answer to **(a)** was very general, referring to completing paperwork and dealing with disputes. The best part of the answers to **(b)** related to the veto - where often the comment was developed, although some better answers did refer to the lack of a standing army. For **(c)** there was much good description, particularly of the Congo. When explanation was attempted it was limited to the Congo being re-united and the Communists being defeated in South Korea.

Section B (Depth Studies)

Question 9

A number of candidates showed good knowledge in relation to **(a)**. Others needed to develop an awareness of the early days of the Nazi Party. Most were stronger on more general aspects such as the personal qualities of Hitler, than the specific role he played at that time. Less successful answers concentrated on the early 1930s period, rather than the period up to 1921 as required by the question. Good answers to **(b)** explained the significance of the fear of communism, the harassment by the SA and the importance of order and discipline to the success of the Nazis. Less strong answers were more descriptive and general in nature, citing Hitler's oratory skills and the use of military rallies. Some answers missed the date given in the question. In **(c)**, many candidates had enough knowledge of several key factors to give an overview of the period covered by the question. In the better answers this knowledge was developed into explanation of the significance of the Reichstag Fire, the Emergency Powers, the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives. Other answers would have benefited from a greater awareness of chronology and specific detail of the various events, together with an understanding of how these events linked.

Question 10

There were many responses to **(a)** which showed good factual knowledge in relation to concentration camps. These scored highly. Others created a link to extermination camps and in these instances were less successful as their responses were less focused. In **(b)**, many candidates were able to describe the work of Goebbels in organising various types of propaganda. Often the propaganda itself was described in great detail. Better answers took careful note of the question, selected three or four aspects of the work of Goebbels and explained the importance of each in relation to Hitler. For **(c)** there were numerous responses that showed a high quality of explanation and evaluation in relation to both sides of the argument. The arguments in this approach were well supported by relevant examples. Some answers were unbalanced, with their strengths being in relation to the threats to Hitler's control. In these instances greater thought as to how it could be argued Hitler might have had total control was required. Some of these answers needed to develop more explanation and balance.

Question 11

In the responses to **(a)**, there were many correct examples of factual recall. In the main these related to the causes of social discontent in early twentieth century Russia. In some instances answers were more informed about rural conditions than those in the towns and factories. Most candidates were able, in **(b)**, to identify or describe reasons for the Tsar's survival. The main areas mentioned included the October Manifesto and the loyalty of the troops. In the better answers these two aspects were developed into explanation. Even some the better answers could have displayed a greater understanding of how the Tsar

was able to split opposition and why this was beneficial. In **(c)**, many candidates were able to identify military defeat, Rasputin and food shortages as factors in the downfall of the Tsar, with better responses showing some understanding of these within a context. Answers would have been more impressive if knowledge and understanding of the impact of the winter of 1916-17 had been more widely included, producing a more balanced approach.

Question 12

In **(a)**, some answers would have been improved by more specific detail about the Petrograd Soviet. Some were limited to a 'workers' council'. For **(b)**, most were aware of how the Kornilov Affair helped the Bolsheviks but only the very best developed explanation in other aspects. Some responses to **(c)** gave good explanation of how well the Bolsheviks dealt with peace and land, providing a strong but unbalanced answer. Only the very best responses took the opportunity to explain that, on reflection, it might be more appropriate to argue that in terms of the bread problem, the Bolsheviks were less successful.

Question 13

There were many excellent responses to **(a)**. Most aspects of treatment were included in answers, with the Jim Crow Laws and the activities of the Ku Klux Klan particularly well documented. In a small number of instances, comments were more general, such as 'they were beaten-up'. Some erroneously suggested they were 'slaves'. Some responses to **(b)** were excellent, with detailed explanation for the surge in popularity of the Ku Klux Klan. Others needed to move from a description of the Klan's activities into explanatory mode in relation to popularity, so as to meet the requirements of the question. In **(c)** many responses concentrated on the role and activities of some women which was often very detailed. Better responses took the next step, which was to consider change. On some occasions a description of 'how' it changed was produced. This was often more descriptive than explanatory.

Question 14

Many good, detailed responses were seen in relation to **(a)**. In **(b)**, most were aware of the Emergency Banking Relief Act and what this did. The best candidates developed this awareness further by making the link between the closure of all banks and the need for confidence in the banking system if the economy was to recover. Weaker answers needed to be stronger in terms of showing an awareness of the need for this confidence. In response to **(c)**, there were many detailed explanations on either side of the debate. In some instances there was an imbalance, with the strength of argument being in relation to success. Others needed to develop more thoroughly explained answers, rather than just description. For a few candidates, answers did not move beyond a description of the New Deal itself.

Questions 15-25

There were too few responses to these questions to make meaningful comments.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

Key Messages

Part (a) questions require candidates to demonstrate their factual knowledge to describe historical events. Part (b) and part (c) questions require candidates to use their factual knowledge to construct explanations.

Candidates do need to read the specific details of each question carefully to ensure that they deploy their factual knowledge effectively in answering the actual question set. This requires candidates to focus upon the dates and the specific aspects of historical events given in questions. This will help candidates to ensure the knowledge they use in their answers is relevant to the particular question asked.

General Comments

Many candidates deployed their factual knowledge effectively in writing well-developed explanations and arguments for their chosen questions. They demonstrated a detailed knowledge of their chosen Core and Depth Study. The majority of candidates managed the time available well, and were able to answer all the required questions. A very small number of candidates completed only two questions, rather than the three required. There were a small number of other rubric errors, mainly due to candidates answering one Core question and two Depth Study questions, rather than the two Core questions and one Depth Study required.

Parts (b) and (c) of the questions require understanding and explanation. Many candidates used their factual knowledge very effectively in their answers to part (b) of questions. In part (c) of questions, candidates demonstrated detailed factual knowledge and some used this knowledge to construct clear explanations. Some candidates used their knowledge to describe events and identify reasons. They need to use their factual knowledge to explain and analyse events in their answers to part (c) questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

The following comments are intended to help Centres in the preparation of their candidates.

Section A (Core Content)

Questions 1 to 3

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates displayed detailed knowledge of how the Schlieffen Plan was intended to work. Most answers focused upon the intention to defeat France first and the perception that Russia would be slow to mobilise.
- (b) A number of candidates constructed clearly developed explanations of how the Moroccan Crisis of 1905-6 increased tension between the Great Powers. Explanations focused upon the roles of the German Kaiser, the French and the British in increasing tension. A significant number of candidates focused their answers upon the Second Moroccan Crisis in 1911. Candidates need to ensure they look carefully at the dates given in a question so they can focus their response upon the relevant historical event.
- (c) Candidates explained clearly how the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand caused the First World War. They developed their answers by explaining other reasons for the war, such as the

arms race and the alliance system. A number of candidates adopted a purely narrative approach to this question, and wrote at great length about the actual events of the assassination, rather than how the assassination contributed to the outbreak of war.

Question 5

- (a) Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the ways in which the Treaty of Versailles affected the German economy. Answers mainly focused upon the effect of reparations, the loss of territories important to Germany's industry, such as Upper Silesia, and the reduction in the armed forces, leading to unemployment. A significant number of candidates wrote a detailed list of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles without any focus upon the effects on the German economy.
- (b) Effective answers to this question explained that Wilson was disappointed with the peace settlement because he felt it was too harsh and because he had to compromise on his Fourteen Points. A considerable number of candidates wrote a list of the aims of Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyd-George, rather than explaining why Wilson was disappointed with the settlement.
- (c) Candidates used their knowledge effectively here to construct well developed explanations of why the Treaty of Versailles was both reasonable and unreasonable in the circumstances of the time. Candidates argued that the Treaty was reasonable given the scale of damage in France and Belgium and the desire at the time to punish the country held responsible for the war – Germany. Arguments also focused upon the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and candidates argued clearly that the Germans had been much harsher on the Russians. This argument was clearly supported with details from the Treaty of Versailles and the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Some candidates wrote a list of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. These candidates had a detailed factual knowledge of the Treaty and needed to use this knowledge to construct explanations in response to the question set.

Question 6

- (a) There were many concise and focused responses to this question. Candidates described how the League of Nations hoped to prevent future wars by stating they could use moral condemnation and economic sanctions, detailing that nations were encouraged to co-operate with each other through business and trade, and that countries were encouraged to disarm. The idea of collective security was also described.
- (b) Candidates' answers to this question often displayed a clear understanding of why the League had successes in the 1920s. Candidates explained the use of a plebiscite in Upper Silesia and the acceptance of the League's ruling in this area and in the case of the Aaland Islands. Candidates also explained the desire for peace after World War One meant that countries were determined to make the League work. There were a significant number of answers where candidates focused upon the failures of the League and the 1930s. Candidates need to ensure that they pay careful attention to the exact wording of the question. This question clearly asked about reasons for League success in the 1920s and therefore explanations of failure in the 1920s and material related to the 1930s lack relevance.
- (c) Explanations focused upon the Depression being responsible for the rise of extreme political parties, for nations being more concerned about their own problems than worldwide issues, and the reluctance of nations to use economic sanctions during a time of Depression. There were also many effective explanations of other reasons for the destruction of the League, such as the lack of a standing army, the absence of the USA from the League, the Manchurian Crisis and the Abyssinian Crisis.

Question 7

- (a) Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the USA's tactics in Vietnam. Points described included the use of saturation bombing, search and destroy tactics, and the use of chemical weapons such as Agent Orange and Napalm. A small number of candidates wrote about the tactics of the Vietcong, rather than the tactics of the USA.
- (b) Effective answers to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the tactics used by the Vietcong and how these tactics destroyed the morale of the American soldiers. Answers also focused on the significance of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the support of the local people for the

Vietcong and the fact that the USA deployed inexperienced soldiers. Most candidates were able to construct two well-developed explanations.

- (c) Some candidates were able to explain the significance of the My Lai massacre in causing American withdrawal from Vietnam. They focused their explanations on the media coverage of this event and how shocked American citizens were at the killing of innocent women and children. Other reasons for American withdrawal were also clearly explained. Other reasons included the cost of the war, the number of American casualties, the Tet Offensive and the growing belief that the war could not be won. Some candidates wrote in very general terms about the My Lai massacre. These candidates would have benefitted from demonstrating that they knew the events of My Lai and its significance in the USA's decision to withdraw from Vietnam.

Question 8

- (a) A small number of candidates showed a detailed knowledge of the work of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the UNO. They detailed the General Assembly's role in the election of Security Council members and decisions about the admission of new members, and also the role in financial issues. Candidates also detailed the sanctions the Security Council could initiate. Many candidates wrote about the structure of the General Assembly and the Security Council, detailing the numbers of members and how they voted, rather than writing about their work. Candidates answering on this topic should be able to differentiate between how the General Assembly and the Security Council are structured and the actual work they do.
- (b) Many candidates demonstrated a detailed understanding of why the UNO was involved in the Congo between 1960 and 1963. Their answers focused on Tshombe and his role in Katanga province, and on Lumumba's request to the UNO for assistance.
- (c) Some candidates explained clearly that the UNO had an important role in the Korean War, detailing how the UNO had taken firm action and that this had ensured that communism had not taken a hold of South Korea. Their answers then explained that ultimately the UNO had not succeeded in meeting its aim to bring democracy to all of Korea. A number of candidates wrote a detailed narrative about the events of the Korean War. For part (c) questions candidates need to explain and analyse.

Section B (Depth Studies)

Question 9

- (a) Some candidates showed a clear understanding of the development of the Nazi Party from 1924 to 1928, detailing the lifting of the ban on the Nazi Party, the establishment of the Hitler Youth, the setting up of the SS, the involvement of Goebbels in Nazi propaganda and the decision by the Nazi Party to use legal means to gain power and their subsequent participation in Reichstag elections. Candidates must ensure they read the question very carefully and take note of any dates given. Many answers focused on the events of the Munich Putsch of 1923, which is clearly outside the time scope of the question.
- (b) There were a number of answers with developed explanations of the loss of faith in parliamentary democracy, the impact of the Depression and the use of propaganda. Some candidates focused their answers solely upon the success of the Weimar Republic before 1929; these answers were not relevant to this particular question.
- (c) Candidates were able to explain that the Reichstag Fire was used by Hitler to frighten German people into believing that there could be an imminent communist uprising, which meant that Hindenburg signed the Decree for the Protection of the People and the State. Some candidates developed their explanation further by linking this to the eventual passing of the Enabling Act. The Night of the Long Knives was also clearly explained, with reference made to the removal of Hitler's rivals. Some candidates wrote a narrative of the events of the Reichstag Fire and the Night of the Long Knives without explaining how these events helped Hitler to consolidate his power.

Question 10

- (a) Candidates were able to write detailed descriptions of the influence of the Nazis on schools in Germany. Answers detailed the subjects taught and why, the increase in the amount of curriculum time devoted to Physical Education, the enforcing of teachers' membership of the Nazi Teachers' League and the rewriting of textbooks to promote the Nazi view of history. Some candidates wrote in very general terms about changes to the curriculum and some wrote only about the Hitler Youth. This question required candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of Nazi influence on schools.
- (b) Clear explanations focused on the Nazi desire to ensure young people were prepared for adult roles, their understanding that children were the future of Germany and therefore would ensure the continuation of the Nazi regime and their determination to control the young people of Germany and thus ensure their loyalty.
- (c) Candidates demonstrated their clear understanding of ways in which Nazi youth policies were unsuccessful by explaining the activities of groups such as the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates and how these groups demonstrated that Nazi control of young people was not total. Some candidates were also able to demonstrate the success of Nazi youth policies, by explaining that vast numbers of young people joined the Hitler Youth and enjoyed the activities provided, and also by explaining the success of Nazi control of the school curriculum. A number of candidates described the activities of the Hitler Youth without actually explaining whether these were successful or not.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates wrote detailed accounts of the struggle for power between Trotsky and Stalin. Answers focused upon Stalin tricking Trotsky into failing to attend Lenin's funeral, the suppression of Lenin's Last Testament, Stalin's use of his position as General Secretary and Stalin's manoeuvring of Zinoviev and Kamenev against Trotsky.
- (b) Effective answers explained Stalin's use of the murder of Kirov as an excuse to initiate the purging of the Communist Party and its importance in demonstrating that Stalin would not tolerate criticism of his policies. A number of candidates wrote in very general terms only. These candidates could have improved their responses by demonstrating a greater knowledge of the details surrounding the murder of Kirov and why it was so significant.
- (c) Candidates developed explanations of how Stalin controlled the Soviet Union through the use of propaganda, the state control of education, the media, arts and sciences, his attacks on the Russian Orthodox Church and through the use of purges and the secret police. Candidates argued that control was not complete by detailing resistance to collectivisation, and also argued that the very fact Stalin felt he had to carry out the purges showed his control was not complete. Some candidates gave detailed narratives of how the collectivisation and industrialisation policies of Stalin were carried out; these narratives needed to be developed into explanations relating to Stalin's control or lack of control of the Soviet Union.

Question 12

- (a) Descriptions focused on the role of the kulaks, the use of traditional farming methods and the NEP. A significant number of candidates gave just one point, stating that farms were very small and inefficient. These candidates would have benefited from demonstrating a greater knowledge of how agriculture was organised during the period from 1905 to 1941, and the various changes that took place.
- (b) Explanations focused mainly on the removal of independence from the peasants. The inherent unfairness of the system of collectivisation was also explained as a reason for resistance. Some candidates wrote very lengthy descriptions of how collectivisation worked in practice; the question asked why there was resistance to collectivisation.
- (c) Explanations of the misery created by Stalin's industrialisation policy included the appalling living conditions in the towns, the falling value of workers' wages, the punishments given to workers and the fact that workers actually died on some construction projects. Candidates also explained that

Stalin's industrialisation had positive effects; these included the increased production in areas such as oil, coal and steel, the system of awards and bonuses for workers and the development of the USSR into one of the world's great industrial powers. Candidates answering on this topic would be well served by knowledge of the details of both positive and negative effects of Stalin's industrialisation policies; some candidates were able to write about this in general terms only.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates displayed detailed knowledge of the increasing prosperity of American industry in the 1920s. Answers focused on the use of the assembly line to mass produce goods cheaply, the production of automobiles stimulating the many other industries and the growth of the construction industry and how this encouraged the growth of dependent industries such as bricks and tiles. A small number of candidates wrote only that industry grew and made more money. In this question, knowing the details relating to particular industries would have improved some answers.
- (b) Candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of the reasons why American agriculture declined in the 1920s. Answers included developed explanations of over-production, tariffs, competition from Canada and the effects of mechanisation. It is essential that candidates focus on the dates given in questions. This question stated 'in the 1920s' and some candidates wrote about the 1930s.
- (c) Candidates used their contextual knowledge well to write developed explanations of Republican policies, demonstrating a clear understanding of how crucial policies of laissez-faire, low taxation and tariffs on foreign imports were to the economic boom of the 1920s. Other reasons for the economic boom were also clearly explained; these included explanations of hire purchase, mass production techniques and advertising. Some candidates wrote a list of Republican government policies and a list of other reasons for the economic boom. Part (c) questions require candidates to explain and analyse factors.

Question 14

- (a) Answers described speculation and buying on the margin, the number of investors and the number of shares being traded. Some candidates wrote in very general terms only, stating that people bought a lot of shares.
- (b) Explanations focused clearly on Hoover's failings as a president, including his perceived uncaring attitude, his promises about prosperity returning and his treatment of the Bonus Marchers. Candidates also developed explanations about the appeal of Roosevelt, with his promises of a New Deal and active government.
- (c) Effective answers developed explanations of over-production and its effects on American industries and then explained other reasons for the end of the economic boom such as the problems on the stock market, the unequal distribution of wealth and the effects of Republican policies. A minority of candidates wrote at some length about the reasons causing the economic boom, rather than the reasons why it ended.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates used their contextual knowledge effectively to write detailed descriptions of relations between China and the USSR from 1945 to 1953, describing Russian aid to China, Mao's attendance at Stalin's seventieth birthday celebrations, the 1950 treaty between them and also various points of dispute. Some candidates wrote about relations before 1945 and/or after 1953; the question states very clearly 'from 1945 to 1953'.
- (b) Explanations focused here upon the relationship between Mao and Khrushchev, Khrushchev's desire for improving relations with the West, the differing interpretations of communism and the refusal of the USSR to help China militarily. Some candidates wrote at length about the relations between China and the USSR during the era of Stalin.
- (c) Candidates were able to give well-developed explanations of the problems between China and Tibet before 1980. Some candidates also developed explanations focused upon the relationship between China and India, and China and Taiwan. A number of candidates clearly understood the relationship between China and Tibet only. Successful responses featured a good knowledge of

the relations of China with Tibet and also other neighbouring countries such as Mongolia, Taiwan, Vietnam and India.

Question 16

- (a) A number of candidates wrote descriptions of the struggle between Mao and Liu Shaoqi, and also detailed the role of Lin Biao in supporting Mao in the power struggle between 1962 and 1965. Others wrote about the power struggle between the nationalists and the communists during the 1940s and the events of the Cultural Revolution; these lacked relevance to this question. It is essential that candidates focus their answers on the time span given in the question.
- (b) Effective answers gave developed explanations of the need for increased mechanisation, the need to increase production to counter the decrease in economic growth and the need to support the large Chinese population. A number of candidates wrote general statements only, stating that China needed to improve. Part (b) answers always require explanations of reasons.
- (c) Candidates used their knowledge effectively to construct explanations of the chaos in China under Mao's leadership, focusing on the effects of the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution in particular. Candidates also explained that there were positive outcomes from Mao's leadership, such as communications had improved, some industries had increased production and that a strong central government had been established. A number of candidates identified events that had caused chaos such as the Great Leap Forward, the Cultural Revolution and repeated famines; they needed to develop these points into explanations.

Questions 17 to 25

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

Key Messages and General Comments

There were many good responses to the questions on this paper with evidence of secure knowledge and understanding, underpinned by clarity of communication and accurate recall of historical details. It was encouraging to note that a significant majority of candidates were able to score highly on **part (a)** questions, providing short, descriptive answers, rather than explanation. It is worth emphasising that these opening questions should be answered with brevity and precision as over-lengthy answers will consume time which might be reserved for the higher-tariff questions.

The best answers to **parts (b) and (c)** questions focused on explanation and selecting information to meet the exact demands of the question set. Lower marks were gained by those candidates who confined themselves to just identifying causal factors, while more credit was given for developing each identified factor more fully, within the context of the question.

In **part (c)**, it was encouraging to read answers which argued and explained points both for and against the proposition offered in the question, followed by a good conclusion which contained an evaluation of 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Candidates should avoid descriptive narrative in **parts (b) and (c)** questions as only limited credit can only be given for answers of this nature.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A (Core Content)

Questions 1 to 3

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 4

Good answers to **part (a)** identified the members of the Triple Entente and focused on its origin as a friendly agreement which sought to settle colonial disputes; it then evolved into a counterweight to the Triple Alliance. **Part (b)** could have been better answered, as a number of candidates overlooked that Turkey was the object of the Balkan League's attacks, mistakenly thinking that the First Balkan War was connected to the assassination in Sarajevo. There was a tendency in **part (c)** to produce generalised answers relating to German militarism (e.g. naval rivalry), colonial disputes, the alliance system and Austro-Serbian tension. Specific explanation of each of these points would have helped candidates to achieve higher marks.

Question 5

This question produced many responses. Answers to **part (a)** which went beyond general points such as 'It was meant to keep the peace' or 'It was an aim of the League', to then include more precise details about members working together against aggressors through economic or military sanctions or through moral condemnation, scored well. There were some good answers to **part (b)**, with the best of them developing reasons relating to membership, lack of military strength, slowness of decision making and the problems caused by British and French dominance of the League. In **part (c)** responses would have been stronger if there had been more detailed coverage of both successful and unsuccessful disputes, explaining in each case why the League achieved its aims or not. Those parts of answers which included material on the 1930s could gain no credit from this material since the stated period was the 1920s.

Question 6

Part (a) answers attracted good marks as credit was given for who signed the Munich Agreement in 1938 and for references to the Sudetenland cessation. Some candidates wrote about 'peace in our time' as if it was a specific part of the Agreement. Stronger responses to **part (b)** focused on why it was important that Stalin should buy time to build up his military strength and why the Pact led to the outbreak of war. In the latter case, it was necessary to link the division of Poland by Hitler and Stalin to British and French guarantees of Polish independence. Less successful answers lost focus in describing the terms of the Pact in detail but not linking to 'importance' as defined in the question. In **part (c)** there was evidence of good knowledge of the consequences of appeasement, although it is important to explain both positive and negative aspects of the policy before arriving at a reasoned judgement. Some candidates attempted to explain why appeasement was followed rather than concentrating on how far the policy was a disaster.

Question 7

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**, although there was some confusion between the terms of Yalta (not asked for on the question paper) and Potsdam. There were some generalised answers to **part (b)**. Many candidates knew about the expansion of the Red army and the fear of the spread of Communism against the background of the Cold War. Better answers dealt with Yalta - which defined a Soviet sphere of influence, why Stalin wanted a 'buffer' zone, and made specific references to the creation of Soviet satellite states such as Poland, up to 1946. There were many strong responses to **part (c)**, covering details of the Marshall Plan and linking them to 'tension' as stipulated in the question. Those candidates who struggled to keep to the dates 1947-49 or who could not go beyond a narrative of events, found it difficult to attain the highest marks. While the inclusion of the takeover of Poland lay outside the parameters of this question, it was appropriate to draw on Czechoslovakia, Cominform, Comecon and events in Berlin leading to the creation of NATO.

Question 8

Part (a) could have been done better by a number of candidates who attempted it. Candidates were given credit for US support for Diem, the sending of 'advisers' and interventionist policies such as the Strategic Hamlet Programme. Answers to **part (b)** sometimes featured a narrative about US strategy versus guerrilla warfare. Better candidates were able to concentrate on why the tactics used by Vietcong were 'effective', making them the focus of their answers. **Part (c)** answers included good explanations of the reasons for US withdrawal; responses could have been better still if candidates had taken the important step of linking information about media coverage and protest to why pressure then increased on the Presidency to end the US involvement in Vietnam. Weaker responses often featured unbalanced answers since candidates appeared to find it more difficult to construct arguments around the costs of US involvement or the impact of the Tet Offensive.

Section B (Depth Studies)

Question 9

A majority of candidates scored well on **part (a)**. **Part (b)** gave an opportunity to explain why political groups opposed the Weimar republic. Most responses were confined to the Spartacists, although references to right-wing opposition, such as the Kaiser's supporters or the Nazis, would have served equally well. The key was to explain why they disliked Weimar so much, rather than to describe who they were and what they stood for. Answers to **part (c)** were often well argued, with good analyses of Weimar's successes and failures. While many concentrated on the 1920s, the question contained no date limits so material taken from the early 1930s was just as appropriate. Some candidates achieved high marks by attempting a judgement about how far Weimar had enjoyed relative success or failure.

Question 10

In **part (a)** candidates demonstrated secure knowledge of the role of women in Nazi Germany, although there were fewer detailed explanations of the reasons behind the Nazi Four Year Plan (**part b**). Most answers dealt very briefly with the need to prepare for war by stock piling raw materials and boosting heavy industry. Higher marks would have been achieved with explanations of the importance of autarky and of boosting agriculture. Descriptive answers to **part (c)** could not achieve the high marks. The best answers were able to explain opposition to the Nazis amongst, say, Jews and also workers, thereby producing a balanced answer.

Question 11

Candidates knew many aspects of the answer, usually by reference to promises of 'Peace, Land and Bread' in **part (a)**. **Part (b)** was well answered because many focused on the April Theses, the July days, Kornilov and the responses of the Bolsheviks. For **part (c)**, higher marks were attained by answers which drew on aspects of Lenin's astuteness, ability to adapt policies to changing circumstances or aspects of his work which were more, or less, successful. There were some good arguments which credited other Bolshevik leaders, such as Trotsky, with the foundations for Lenin's success as a leader. Some candidates provided only general descriptions of Lenin's rule.

Question 12

Part (a) produced some good answers. Candidates were rewarded for material on the exploitation of the illusion of democracy by Stalin, and the way the Supreme Soviet only met for two weeks a year - enabling Stalin greater powers via the Praesidium. The ways in which the Constitution gave Stalin total power was the starting point for developed responses. It was rare to read poor answers to **part (b)** and there was a great deal of sound knowledge related to Stalin's paranoia and the perceived threat from individuals in the Party such as Zinoviev and Kamenev. **Part (c)** specifically related only to Stalin's secret police and the use of propaganda, with a focus on control. Many reached a reasonable level with explanations of the work of the NKVD on the one hand, and the 'cult of personality'. Generalised comments about people's fear of being taken away and killed were commonplace and could not score high marks.

Question 13

This was the more popular USA question and **part (a)** was answered well, with candidates demonstrating good knowledge and understanding of a range of benefits such as increased employment, the stimulus to other industries, the affordability of cars and the changes to lifestyle and leisure time. However, **part (b)** proved more challenging to some because candidates did not always focus on the importance of the First World War in generating an economic boom and instead sought to describe or explain other factors contributing to the boom of the 1920s. More able candidates were able to explain how the war led to the US taking over Europe's markets, and the boost to US industrial production. Good answers to **part (c)** explained the problems caused by competition from Canadian farmers, the drop in European demand and the effects of the tariff system. Weaker responses tended to focus, in general terms, on overproduction or featured a narrative of the 1930s dustbowl, despite the question being limited to the 1920s.

Question 14

In answering **part (a)**, candidates were aware of the difficulties Roosevelt experienced with the Supreme Court and understood how he was intending to deal with it, although higher marks would have been awarded for knowledge of specific actions. There was good understanding of **part (b)**, with explanations of the concerns of the business community regarding higher taxes, union activity and the perceived desirability of 'rugged individualism'. **Part (c)** attracted good marks for balanced answers focusing on those who did and did not benefit from the New Deal. Greater depth was shown on the work of agencies to create employment and support farmers; knowledge of the ways the New Deal did not always benefit black Americans and women tended to lack depth.

Questions 15 to 19

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 20

Candidates clearly knew a great deal of detail about the proposal for a national homeland for Jews, the persecution experienced by Jews in Germany, the demand for a homeland, Zionism, the UN Partition Plan and Jewish terrorism in **part (a)**. The more obvious reasons for Arab objections to the UN Partition Plan (**part b**) were known, such as the perceived inequalities in land distribution, the question of Jerusalem and the division of the Arab state. **Part (c)** saw many secure responses and effective, balanced arguments about Arab weaknesses, such as their weak and divided leadership, and Israeli strengths, such as their will to survive, US support and the ability of their armed forces.

Question 21

This was attempted by fewer candidates. **Part (a)** produced generalised points which relied on the photograph, and there were aspects of both **parts (b) and (c)** which could have been improved. There were opportunities to explain the military benefits of National Service, and more candidates could have touched on its social, cultural and educational importance (**part b**). **In part (c)**, answers tended to be generalised and would have been improved by specific references to the different views of Israelis towards the issue of how to deal with the Palestinians. The views of the Labour Party, Likud and more extreme groups would have provided a range of balanced explanations.

Question 22 – 25

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comments.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

Key Messages and General Comments

Most candidates attempted the twentieth-century option, with a small number answering the nineteenth-century questions. The general comments that follow apply equally to both options.

The overall standard of answers remained very high. Candidates did generally well on questions that required them to compare sources and on questions asking about the message and purpose of sources. There was room for improvement on questions requiring evaluation. Many candidates looked for the overall or 'big' message of sources and avoided getting bogged down in details. 'Are you surprised?' questions were also answered well, with candidates making good use of their contextual knowledge. However, in answers to the nineteenth century **Question 4**, and the twentieth century **Question 3**, many candidates neglected to evaluate the sources. When candidates are asked whether one source proves that another is wrong or whether it can be trusted, evaluation is required. An effective way of doing this is to explain the possible purpose of a source in its historical context e.g. Ulbricht's purpose in Source E. Candidates should avoid making simple and general assertions about types of sources e.g. autobiographies cannot be trusted because they are always self-serving. Instead, they should use the content, the provenance and context of sources to explain purpose.

The best answers were often the shortest. Candidates need to think about their answers and decide what they are going to write before they write anything. This will enable them to directly address the question in their first sentence e.g. 'I am surprised by this source because'. The rest of the answer can then be used to support the opening statement. Such an approach will help prevent candidates writing generally about the sources without addressing the issue in the question.

Question 6 produced many good answers, with candidates scoring some very high marks. What made these answers so good was the quality of explanation. If a candidate decides that a particular source supports the statement in **Question 6**, it is crucial that they then take some care in carefully explaining how it supports the statement. This will not necessarily involve a quotation from a source but it will contain some direct reference to the message of the source e.g. 'Source G does not support the statement that the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia because of pressure from other Eastern European countries. This is because the cartoon makes clear that the Soviets invaded because they were worried that ideas in Czechoslovakia about freedom might creep into the Soviet Union. They invaded to kill off these ideas before they could do this.' Of course, it is also important that candidates explain how some sources support the given statement and how others disagree with it. This is always done best by focusing on one source at a time.

Comments on Specific questions

Nineteenth-century Option

Question 1

The answers that reached the top level in the markscheme were those that read the sources as a whole and explained that the sources fundamentally disagree - Source A argues that the myth of Garibaldi is important, while Source B argues that what really matters is what Garibaldi actually did. Most candidates were able to reach the middle levels of the markscheme by identifying agreements and/or disagreements of detail e.g. both sources claim that Garibaldi had military successes. A few candidates summarised both sources but did not make any direct comparison.

Question 2

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to at least explain that the cartoon shows Garibaldi freeing Sicily, while others went on to explain the full message, including Garibaldi, Sicily and the Bourbons (or Naples) in the story. This is a 'purpose' question and to reach the top levels of the markscheme candidates needed to suggest a valid reason for publication e.g. to encourage the British people to support Garibaldi, and to place their answers in the context of 1860. Some candidates reached a lower level in the mark scheme because they explained the 1860 context but did not explain the message or purpose of the cartoon.

Question 3

Most candidates reached a reasonable or high level in answering this question. Some expressed surprise at the letter because Cavour wanted Italian unification, while others cross-referenced to other sources to check statements within Source D. To reach the top level candidates needed to use their knowledge of Cavour to explain why he was worried by Garibaldi's actions e.g. an attack on Rome might lead to the French declaring war.

Question 4

Weaker answers focused on the provenance of the sources and claimed e.g. that diaries are always reliable. Most candidates, however, were able to compare what the two sources say about Garibaldi's popularity. The best answers were based on the understanding that one source does not prove whether another is wrong simply because it agrees or disagrees with it. These answers compared the sources and then used evaluation of at least one source to resolve the issue.

Question 5

This cartoon was understood by most candidates. They were able to identify both Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel and explain the point the cartoon is making about Garibaldi's readiness to help Victor Emmanuel and the cause of Italian unification. The best candidates also explained the meaning of Garibaldi's reference to 'try a little gunpowder'.

Question 6

This question was generally answered well. Candidates found it easier to find examples of Garibaldi being a hero, and most were also able to find at least one source that disagreed with this.

Twentieth-Century Option

Question 1

Most candidates achieved a reasonable mark because they were able to at least find some agreements of detail between the two sources e.g. they both say that the Soviets were slow to act and they both say that the crisis had been developing for some months. The sources do not disagree on points of detail but a few candidates spent some time trying to find disagreements. The top level in the markscheme was reached by going beyond points of detail, reading each of the sources as a whole, and explaining that they place blame for the crisis in different places. Source A blames the Soviet Union, while Source B blames the hardliners in Czechoslovakia or the Warsaw Pact. Candidates who answered this question well did not summarise each source. They read through the sources and made matches between the two sources before they wrote anything. They were then in a position to focus their answers on either identifying the agreements, or on explaining the overall disagreement.

Question 2

There was a wide range of answers to this question. The best answers were those where candidates had focused on the big message of the cartoon. Candidates will help themselves work out 'big messages' of cartoons if they ask themselves about the cartoonist's point of view. In this cartoon the cartoonist is criticising the Cold War. The details in the cartoon about the USA and the USSR claiming they are winning while they are both falling apart are designed to show how absurd the Cold War is. Credit was given to answers that fell short of the big message but did explain that both countries thought they were winning as

they were falling apart. Less successful answers dealt with the USA and the USSR separately or thought that the USA was winning.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to score a reasonable mark by comparing Sources D and E and explaining ways in which they agree and/or disagree. The highest marks were reserved for candidates who realised that evaluation of the sources was required. Although finding agreements or disagreements between the two sources helps with reaching a judgement about whether Source E makes Source D trustworthy, it is also necessary to evaluate them. Some candidates did this by checking claims made in the sources against evidence in other sources or against their own contextual knowledge. Others did it by considering the possible purpose of Dubcek and Ulbricht. It is important that candidates do actually reach a conclusion about whether they think that Source E makes Source D trustworthy. Some did all the hard work by comparing and evaluating the sources but would have improved answers by reaching a clear conclusion.

Question 4

There were some excellent answers to this question, with some candidates explaining that there was no reason to be surprised by Source F because it was sent by hard-line communists in Czechoslovakia and they were opposed to the changes being introduced by Dubcek. Other candidates cross-referenced to Source B where the letter is mentioned and used this as a reason for not being surprised. Another approach, which earned high marks, was to explain that the fact that the letter was kept secret is surprising because the Soviets could have used it as an excuse for invading Czechoslovakia. A large number of candidates were surprised by the source. Their answers were usually based on the argument that the letter is opposing reforms which the Czech people welcomed. This is a reasonable line of argument and was improved when candidates used evidence to show that the reforms were popular in Czechoslovakia.

Question 5

To answer this question well, candidates needed to understand the point of view of both artists. They are both condemning the Soviet Union. A reasonable number of candidates understood this and some were even able to go further and explain that they are condemning them for different reasons. Source G is simply condemning communism and the USSR, but Source H is condemning the actions of the Soviet Union because they are going against true communism. Less successful answers focused more on factual information in both sources such as the fact that the Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia. Some candidates explained both sources but would have benefitted further by comparing them.

Question 6

Some candidates were able to increase their overall mark considerably by answering this question well. The crucial elements of a good answer to this question are: the realisation that some sources support the statement, while others disagree with it; clear explanation of how some sources support the statement; and clear explanation of how other sources disagree with the statement. The explanation needs to be about individual sources, with clear reference to what the message of the source is. Other candidates achieved low marks because they ignored the sources completely or wrote about them very generally in groups. There was also a tendency for some candidates to decide whether they agreed with the statement and then to only use those sources that agreed with their point of view.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

Key Messages and General Comments

Plenty of good work was produced on this paper, particularly with regard to the comprehension, interpretation and comparison of source content. Some candidates could have achieved more highly by a better approach to answering some of the questions, for example, **Question 6**, which carries the largest number of marks, most of which can be earned through a methodical use of the sources. Some candidates did not use the given sources at all in their answers. Although some excellent evaluation was seen, candidates' ability to evaluate sources effectively could also be improved. Those who were able to develop explanations about why the author of a particular source would be saying these particular things at that particular time did better in their attempts to evaluate than those who provided generalisations about source provenance.

Some candidates would have benefited from deploying the time available to them in the examination more effectively. Addressing the question more directly, and with greater focus, would help with this. Summarising the content of the source(s) to be used in a question at the beginning of an answer is not required. A reasonable way to approach responses would be for candidates to start each answer with a direct reflection of the wording of the question. Thus if asked '*Are you surprised by Source X?*' candidates could start with '*I am (am not) surprised by Source X because*'. This would help candidates to concentrate on what exactly they should be responding to.

Comments on Specific Questions

Nineteenth-Century Option

There were too few responses to this option for any meaningful comments to be made.

Twentieth-Century Option

A notable strength of the scripts was the contextual knowledge displayed in the answers. Where this was used effectively, for example in judging the reliability of the sources in **Question 3** or in explaining in **Question 1** whether or not people would have been surprised, the quality of answers was considerably enhanced. Although it is the case that nowhere in this paper knowledge alone is the issue, there are occasions where candidates appear to display knowledge without focussing on the question asked. In **Question 6**, for example, a good number of candidates answered on whether or not the Soviet Union was to blame for the Hungarian crisis, rather than on whether the sources provided convincing evidence on the issue.

Question 1

This was a question asking candidates whether people in countries controlled by the Soviet Union would have been surprised by Khrushchev making a speech in 1956 attacking Stalin. The factor determining the quality of the answer was the nature of the reason given for being surprised or not. Candidates who used specific contextual knowledge performed the best. Those that relied on more general comments – e.g. *I am surprised because it's one Communist attacking another* – earned some credit, but fell short based on the question rubric which asked for explanations using the source and knowledge. This left two valid arguments. First there were those who suggested people would not be surprised because they would know well, from personal experience, what Stalin was like, and would give some examples of Stalin's tyranny. This was valid, but it missed the bigger point – made by better candidates, that it was nonetheless surprising that Khrushchev would be prepared to admit this tyranny. Answers that showed why this was surprising, using contextual knowledge of the nature of the Soviet regime, and more particularly of why it was surprising that

Khrushchev would signal some relaxation of control to the Eastern Europe satellite states, provided the most persuasive explanations.

Question 2

The quality of interpretation of the two cartoons was good, with almost all candidates able to make sense of Source B and only a slightly smaller number understanding Source C. Where weaker candidates struggled was in finding meaningful points of comparison between the two. For a proper comparison to be made, a common criterion between the two sources has to be used. It was not, then, valid to say *e.g. The cartoons are different because in Source B Khrushchev is trying to keep Eastern Europe under control but in Source C the UNO is criticising Britain, France and Israel for their roles in the Suez crisis*. This is just to state what the two cartoons are illustrating. A common criterion could, for example, be how the Soviet Union is behaving in the two sources. So, *e.g. I think the cartoons are similar because in both Khrushchev is behaving like a bully* would be a valid comparison. Since the wording of the question invited identification both of similarities and differences (*How similar?*), higher marks were achieved by those who covered both, rather than just similarity or difference. The best comparisons, however, were those that used what might be called the 'Big Message' of each cartoon (i.e. the main point that each cartoonist was seeking to make) as the basis for the comparison. There was a fundamental difference in what the sources were suggesting about the nature of Soviet power. In Source B Khrushchev is losing control of the satellite states, but in Source C, because of the distraction of the Suez crisis, Khrushchev can maintain control.

Question 3

In asking about proof, this question explicitly demanded evaluation of the sources. A significant number of answers were able to provide it. There were clear contradictions between Sources D and E. For weaker candidates, assuming they could identify valid differences between the two sources, these differences were themselves evidence of the unreliability of Source E. A slightly more sophisticated reading of the sources did allow some candidates to claim that there was no essential contradiction, *e.g. I do not think Source D proves Source E is unreliable because Khrushchev did have a respect for sovereignty as Nagy was no longer speaking for the Communist Party*. However, the real point at issue was whether or not you could believe either source. Slightly different strategies for evaluation were used on the two sources. For Source D, Khrushchev's purpose in representing the Soviet Union as unthreatening and peace-loving needed to be explained in the context of the Soviet Union's difficult relationship with Yugoslavia. In other words, you cannot really trust what he said because he was just trying to reassure Tito of his good intentions. In Source E, most candidates moved from noting that Khrushchev's memoirs would almost certainly be self-serving, and would obviously try and shift the blame onto Nagy, into using their contextual knowledge to show the falsity of what Khrushchev was saying about Nagy and the Hungarians. Once the evaluation of either/both source(s) had been done, a conclusion could be reached about proof. The essential point about the success of these evaluations, however, was that they were more than simple comments about source provenance – they were developed explanations of source reliability using contextual knowledge to reveal how authors' purposes affect their reliability.

Question 4

Answers to this question varied in quality. Some candidates saw the sources as just factual information; the 'more useful' source was therefore the source that gave the 'most' or 'best' information. Answers dealing with only one source, regardless of assertions of 'most' useful, didn't properly address the question – they were simply showing how one source was useful. Answers using both sources as information, and explaining why one source was regarded as 'more' and the other as 'less' useful, gained a reasonable level of credit. However, genuine considerations of the issue of source utility needed to move beyond this. More successful candidates appreciated that the nature of the two sources made a difference. Source G was public, readily available, factual, whilst Source F had been kept secret for thirty years, and must surely contain material that gives insights into the decision-making process that were never intended for public view. The best candidates asked the fundamental question where utility is concerned – what evidential purpose would historians have for these sources? Their utility depends entirely on the question the historian is seeking to answer.

Question 5

The question asked why a cartoon was published in 1956. This wording requires candidates to give reasons. Answers that provide no reasons – no matter how well, for example, the cartoon is interpreted – cannot score high marks. Some answers to this question would have benefited from a more consistent focus. This is not to say that candidates often neglected to give a reason, but rather that the reasoning could have formed a larger proportion of the answer. Many candidates described and interpreted the cartoon, described the context of the time (all with no reason given), and perhaps only at the end of the answer, added *e.g. So the reason why this cartoon was published in 1956 was that this was the year the Russians crushed the Hungarian Rising*. Some candidates appeared to assume that all the writing about the cartoon would be taken as a reason. Answers on this type of question would benefit from clearer appreciation of the kinds of things that can count as reasons, typically the context (it was written then because of what was going on at the time), the message (it was written then to say something to the audience), or the purpose (it was written then to produce a certain impact on the audience). Putting these notions together can often produce the most effective reasoning, explaining why someone would want to say these things at that particular time.

Question 6

Although some excellent responses were seen, other answers would have been improved by a greater appreciation that this is a question about the sources as evidence when applied to the given hypothesis, rather than just the hypothesis itself. Some answers neglect the sources and write about the events covered by the hypothesis. The sources will always contain evidence both in support of and casting doubt on the hypothesis, so if candidates write answers covering only one side of the argument, they should be aware that they are limiting the mark they can attain. This year, the hypothesis was that the Soviet Union was to blame for the 1956 crisis in Hungary, and many candidates agreed with this wholeheartedly, rather than looking at both sides. Answers must use the source content to argue support or doubt. This does not require a direct quote but it does mean that they need to show how the source relates to the hypothesis, *e.g. Source C suggests the Soviet Union was to blame because it shows Khrushchev using force to repress the Hungarians. But it also suggests that the UNO was to blame because it shows that it ignored the Hungarian Crisis whilst condemning Britain and France for their involvement in Suez, which allowed the USSR to repress the Hungarians undisturbed*. The best answers often simply worked through each of the sources in turn, indicating how each supported or cast doubt. In contrast, weaker answers went through all the sources, summarising what they said, and only at the end of the answer making an assertion, *e.g. Therefore, I think that more sources show that the Soviet Union was to blame than other factors such as the Hungarians*. This approach does not show how individual sources can be used as evidence. It should be added that just rejecting a source as irrelevant is not the same as arguing doubt. For example, with Source D it could be said validly that it suggests the Soviet Union was not to blame because it claims that they believed in peaceful co-existence and would not willingly invade another country, but it would not be enough to say (as some candidates did) that it proves the Soviet Union was not to blame because it says nothing about Hungary.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

Key Messages and General Comments

In overall terms the standard of answers continues to be encouraging and candidates are responding well to the demands of the paper. The understanding of the context of the sources was good and there was considerable evidence of background knowledge being used to help answer the questions being asked. All but a few candidates responded well to the precise details in the questions. For example, on the twentieth-century option **Question 2** the issue of surprise was addressed by many in their opening sentence; this is a strategy that works well. Candidates were better at interpreting and comparing sources, rather than evaluating them. Those who attempted to evaluate the sources with generalisations about source type did not score highly. Candidates need to go beyond accepting or rejecting sources at face value, or at the level of undeveloped provenance.

While many candidates did very well in response to **Question 6**, there were still some whose final mark was lower than it could have been as the sources were not used as the basis of their answer. Similarly, those who grouped the sources together and made general comments about the statement did not achieve as highly as they might, as they did not engage with the content of each source. Candidates need to use the sources to both support and disagree with the given statement and they can be sure that the sources provided will always enable them to do both, and consequently write a balanced answer.

Comments on Specific questions

Nineteenth-Century Option

Too few responses were seen for any meaningful comments to be made.

Twentieth-Century Option

Question 1

This question asked candidates to compare two sources and assess the level of agreement between them. Candidates needed to identify points of agreement and disagreement and illustrate these with content from both sources. Most candidates were able to explain the agreements well. For example, many responses explained that both sources agree Dubcek wanted to reform communism, not abandon it altogether. One point of disagreement centred on Dubcek's aims. In Source A he is certain about his intention to moderately reform communism, whereas in B this is less clear and he is referred to as being 'far from sure where to go'. Candidates must make sure that they explain points of disagreement, rather than simply describing differences between the sources. The highest marks were reserved for candidates who realised that as far as the overall big messages of the two sources were concerned, there is only an agreement – that both sources are critical of Dubcek and his actions, in particular his inability to judge the Soviets' response.

Question 2

This question focused on two written sources, the first, Source C, described a meeting in January 1968 and the second, Source D, was a letter from July of the same year. The question asked whether Source C makes Source D surprising. Many candidates were able to gain a reasonable mark by referring to details in the sources to explain surprise or lack of surprise. For example, many cited the 'gloomy faces' and Dubcek's realisation that he is not 'getting through to them' in C as reason for a lack of surprise at the Soviet hostility shown in D. A large majority of candidates were able to recognise that the time difference between C and D was a crucial element in the answer, but relied only on assertions that something must have happened during the intermittent six months to alter the Soviets' attitude. The best answers used accurate contextual knowledge of the period between the sources to explain the differences between them and consequently

concluded that there was no reason to be surprised. It is pleasing to note that with very few exceptions, candidates all actually answered the question as set, and clearly stated whether C makes D surprising or not.

Question 3

In this question candidates were required to compare the messages of two cartoons. Consequently, candidates who only compared surface details or undeveloped provenance did not score highly. Encouragingly, very few candidates neglected to address the question, and clear attempts at comparisons were made in all but a few responses. The interpretation of the sources in some instances could have been better. While many candidates were able to compare valid sub-messages, fewer could compare the overall big messages – that attempts at reform had been met with repression by the Soviets. Many candidates also compared the sources for differences, regardless of whether this was valid or not. A few responses commented on the fact that both cartoons were British, but they would have been improved by developing this further. Consideration of the likely British attitudes towards events in Eastern Europe at this time could have led candidates to the similarity in the cartoonists' attitude; that is that they both approve of the Czechoslovakian reforms and/or disapprove of the Soviet repression.

Question 4

Questions such as this that ask why a source was produced require three explanatory elements in the response. Firstly it is necessary to consider the context in which the source was produced. Secondly, the message that the author was trying to get across must be understood and thirdly, the purpose the author had in relaying his message must be examined. With this in mind, there were some very encouraging responses to this question. Context only answers gave good detail about events preceding the Soviet invasion in August - some even recognised the importance of the Soviet manoeuvres on the Czechoslovakian border, but responses at this level did not engage with or interpret the cartoon. Many candidates, however, were able to go on to develop the big message of the cartoon; that the Soviets were preparing to attack Czechoslovakia whilst hiding their true intentions. A smaller number then were able to use their contextual knowledge and understanding to interpret the cartoon and work out the purpose behind its publication. The cartoonist was critical of the Soviets' obvious intentions and therefore wanted to create anti-Soviet feeling.

Question 5

Here, most candidates were able at least to compare the two sources and reach a conclusion about whether one was lying based on disagreements between them. Answers below this level tended to concentrate on the provenance of the sources, and candidates generally rejected source I without further development by stating the view that a Soviet news agency would be bound to lie. Some candidates made good use of their contextual knowledge, the information contained in the other sources or the background information. They used this as a point of cross reference and were able to conclude whether I was lying or not. While this approach worked well, those candidates who looked to the purpose of the sources in context and concluded that source I was lying were able to access the higher marks. These responses showed a clear understanding of relevant events and used this to explain that the statement made by the Soviet news agency was mostly likely to be untrue, and produced in order to justify their invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Question 6

Overall this was answered well and many candidates achieved good marks on this question by carefully explaining how some sources provide convincing evidence that the reforms in Czechoslovakia were a threat to Communism, and how others disagree with the claim. Candidates found it more straightforward to explain the sources that provide evidence that the Czechoslovakian reforms were a threat, rather than those that do not. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Candidates should avoid grouping the sources together and making assertions about them as a group; this rarely works well. Answers need not include a summary of the source, nor should they involve generalisations about source type. More candidates would access the marks available for evaluation if they were to include genuine evaluation based on the source content, rather than simple statements involving undeveloped provenance.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key Messages and General Comments

The overall quality of work was excellent. The coursework schemes were well organised, with centres sending the Moderator clear explanations of the schemes, copies of the questions and the sources used by candidates, and the appropriate sample of candidates' work. The marking of Assignment 2 was very accurate. Sometimes the marking of Assignment 1 was a little less accurate - for reasons explained below. Some centres had their marks moderated, although in nearly every case the adjustments were relatively small.

Assignment 1

This assignment should give candidates opportunities to show that they can explain, analyse, and reach and support judgements about historical events, developments and individuals. If the assignment is structured into a number of questions, there should be a question at the end that requires candidates to reach and support their own judgements. This question should be given more marks than the other questions. If a single essay title is used then this must require a judgement e.g. 'How far did people in Germany benefit from Nazi rule?' In responding to questions like this, it is important that candidates address the central issue all the way through their answers. The best answers are those for which the candidate has planned the answer and knows before writing the final draft what the argument is going to be. They can then state this at the beginning, and use the rest of the answer to provide support through analysis and argument. Some candidates, who explained different points of view, but did not give their own view until a brief conclusion at the end, were over-rewarded. This was often the reason why the Moderator made some adjustments to the marks awarded by some Centres.

Some of the assignments were based on the board-approved sample from CIE. There were also some interesting Centre-devised ones e.g. about New Zealand and its nuclear-free policy, and the impact of the development of railways in nineteenth-century Britain.

Assignment 2

Many Centres used the board-approved assignments from CIE. Nearly all the marking was accurate and contained useful annotations showing where and why marks had been awarded. There were a few interesting assignments on various other topics which had been constructed by Centres. If Centres are devising their own assignments, they should ensure that a range of source skills are tested.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

When attempting source-based questions, candidates should use details from the sources to illustrate their answers. While contextual knowledge can give background to the answers, contextual knowledge must not be used as a substitute for source detail.

When attempting knowledge-based questions, candidates should restrict themselves to the question that has been asked and should illustrate any assertions with examples and details. Candidates also need to take note of any date restrictions in the questions.

General Comments

As with previous seasons of examinations, candidates overwhelmingly selected Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945. Some chose Depth Study B: Russia 1905-1941 and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941. A small number of candidates attempted Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century and a few attempted the questions set for Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society. For the rest of the Depth Studies, there were too few responses from which to draw useful and helpful comments.

Most candidates set out their scripts well and wrote clearly so that their thoughts were accessible to the Examiners.

Comments on specific questions will follow, but the practice of not using source detail when answering Part (a) questions continues to hamper some candidates. It is vital that candidates show where they can find evidence in Source A to support their valid inferences and that they use evidence from Source B to provide support for their balanced answers. It is also important that source detail is used effectively when deciding which of the two sources (**Question (a) (iii)**) is more useful.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

In answers to **Question (a) (i)**, candidates drew valid inferences from Source A and most related them, as required in the question, to the Weimar Republic. Weaker candidates often made comments about Operation Consul and sometimes managed to make the connection with the Weimar Republic. Many candidates appeared to enjoy the task of deciding whether the information contained in Source B showed how far the Communists were a threat to the Weimar Republic between 1918 and 1924 (**Question (a) (ii)**). Less successful candidates answered with some balance of source detail and listed detail of threatening actions against right-wing successes. Stronger candidates used the information to offer balanced and argued answers. Although there were some balanced and sophisticated answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, these mostly concentrated on the content of the sources to demonstrate which of the two sources was more useful as evidence about right-wing extremists. Weaker candidates sometimes confused left-wing extremists with right-wing extremists. Better responses featured attempts to evaluate the sources by cross reference. Given the clear references to the Freikorps and violence in both sources, more of these responses might have been expected. Some incomplete attempts at evaluation by the provenance of the sources tended to make statements such as 'It was from a British book so it would be against Germany' and 'It was from a communist history so would support that side'.

Many candidates performed well on **Question (b) (i)** and knew of the Kaiser's abdication and exile in the Netherlands. Some candidates had him fleeing to countries as far apart as Poland and Argentina, while one candidate had him 'flying off, never to be seen again'. Many candidates knew of the powers given to the President of the Weimar Republic, especially those of Article 48 and emergency powers. Some very impressive responses advised of the complete set of powers available to the President. Most candidates managed to avoid, in answers to **Question (b) (iii)**, describing hyperinflation when the question required an explanation of hyperinflation in Germany in 1923. Good detail was provided with the explanations, although more needed to consider the development from inflation to hyperinflation through the loss of confidence in currency, the future, the government etc. **Question (b) (iv)** produced varied responses. Some candidates listed the social events and then the political events of the 1920s but needed to pay more attention to the prompt in the question of 'change'. Others wrote of Stresemann's successes in international affairs, missing the prompt in the question of 'in Germany'. Stronger candidates realised that the question referred to the whole of the 1920s and that the key word was 'change'. These candidates wove impressive arguments that flowed between social and political changes and often showed how both elements had connections. These latter candidates scored well. Candidates should appreciate that **Question (b) (iv)** has the highest mark tariff of all questions on the paper and the time to answer it effectively must be created.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Most candidates were able to score well on **Question (a) (i)** when asked to draw valid inferences from Source A about Lenin, although there was a clear division among candidates over Lenin's decision to reduce Politburo meetings to three hours. Some felt that Lenin was being selfish, weak and uncooperative, while others believed he was being shrewd, untrusting of his colleagues and unwilling to give up the reins of power. Naturally, there was also overlap between these views. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** did not achieve the same success, as some candidates neglected to argue and find evidence to offer balance about the extent of the similarity of Stalin and Trotsky's ideas. Some answers to **Question (a) (iii)** did not develop beyond simple and incomplete tests for reliability or a repetition of much that had been written in answer to the previous two questions. However, there were many examples of candidates contrasting and comparing source detail to make their decisions, and these answers achieved higher marks than incomplete tests for reliability.

Question (b) (i), asking 'What was Pravda?', produced many correct and full identifications, as well as some guesses of 'secret police', 'people who opposed the Bolsheviks' etc. The answers to **Question (b) (ii)**, requiring a description of the Kronstadt Mutiny, 1921, were full, graphic and informed. Candidates scored very well here. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)**, asking why Trotsky lost the struggle for the leadership of the USSR, were also full and informed, and often cogently argued. Less successful responses concentrated more on Trotsky's shortcomings than on Stalin's skills. Weaker candidates missed the date restraint in **Question (b) (iv)** of '1934' and wrote beyond that date. Whilst there were some answers of merit and command of the subject matter, other answers would have benefited from a greater awareness of how Stalin continued to establish his power. A few candidates did not understand the question and wrote largely about changes undertaken during the Five-Year Plans and during collectivisation.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Candidates successfully drew valid inferences for Source A about the economic boom of the 1920s. Candidates found that the source had evidence of all classes being 'better off' but that progress and outcomes were different for each group. There were many good one-sided answers to **Question (a) (ii)** that went beyond mere repetition of source detail to argue the case that prosperity was the result of government policies. Better candidates offered a balanced answer and showed that private enterprise and higher wages were also important. Many answers to **Question (a) (iii)** attempted evaluation of the sources to decide which was the more useful as evidence about the US economy in the 1920s. Some of these were incomplete, candidates missing the possibility of using cross-referencing between the sources regarding business and affected classes.

Most candidates were able to give two traditional industries that declined in the 1920s and scored well for **Question (b) (i)**. Again, many performed well and knew of the difficulties of agriculture in the 1920s. Descriptions were full and accurate, although a few candidates missed the restraint in the question of 'the 1920s' and wrote of other periods as well. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** asked for reasons for the rapid development of the automobile industry. Whilst all knew of the impact of the assembly line, other reasons were many, varied and, sometimes, lacking relevance to the question asked. Most mentioned cost, impact on other industries, ability to pay, and to get credit and loans. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were also well informed, with comments made about many groups of workers who had benefited from the developments of the 1920s. There were many who achieved a good balance by nominating share croppers, some

immigrants, native and black Americans as examples of those who did not benefit. Those candidates, who nominated women as an example, usually wrote about them both benefiting and disadvantaged, with examples to illustrate the arguments.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

Too few responses were seen to make general and useful comments.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

A small number of candidates attempted questions set for this Depth Study. They performed better on Part (a) questions than they did on Part (b) questions. Although candidates could draw valid inferences from Source A about South Africa in 1948 (**Question (a) (i)**), and could mount at least a one-sided argument from the detail of Source B about the extent to which the National Party had support for its policy of apartheid (**Question (a) (ii)**), they found **Question (a) (iii)** more challenging. Some responses would have been improved by more effective evaluation and fuller consideration of the sources' comparative usefulness. Answers to Part (b) questions were limited, with the major events of the period 1940-1959 not well known.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994

Too few responses were seen to make general and useful comments.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

The candidates who attempted **Question (a) (i)** were able to draw some inferences about the steel industry from the diagram in Source A. Some of these inferences were limited by the candidates' preference to write about the height of the blocks in the given years shown in the diagram. Candidates would have benefited from taking into account the scale of the production figures given on the left hand side of the diagram. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** found evidence in Source B to show that Bessemer was a failure. It was rare to find any qualification of the assertion supported from the source. Equally, candidates' answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, about the comparative utility of the sources as evidence about iron and steel production in the nineteenth century, needed more development. The better responses to this question got as far as finding detail in both sources to compare and contrast.

Some candidates understood that they had to name an English city associated with steel making and an English area that was important for coal mining in the nineteenth century. Some appeared to guess. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** were better, with candidates listing a number of problems in the coal industry. However, some were very much centred on the problems for women and children in the mines. Answers to why there was an increased demand for iron and steel in the nineteenth century were competent and interesting. Candidates knew there was a need to support a growing factory and railway industry, although ship building could have been mentioned. Several candidates wrote that there was a need 'for the sewage pipes of growing towns'. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, on the comparative importance of the development of the iron and steel industry against the coal industry in the nineteenth century, brought an almost universal view that both industries depended upon one another and that advances in one industry often caused developments in the other. Answers tended to be general assertions and could have been improved by more detail and examples.

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century

Too few responses were seen to make general and useful comments.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

When attempting source-based questions, candidates should use details from the sources to illustrate their answers. While contextual knowledge can give background to the answers, contextual knowledge should not be used as a substitute for source detail.

When attempting knowledge-based questions, candidates should address directly the question that has been asked and they should illustrate any assertions with examples and details. Candidates also need to take note of any date restrictions in the questions.

General Comments

As with previous sessions of examinations, candidates overwhelmingly selected Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945. Some chose Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941 and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941. A small number chose Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990, and a few selected Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society. Attempts to answer questions set for other Depth Studies were few too few in number to make useful and general observations.

Most candidates set out their scripts well and wrote clearly so that their thoughts were accessible to the Examiners.

Comments on specific questions will follow, but the practice of not using source detail when answering Part (a) questions continues to hamper some candidates. It is vital that candidates show where they can find evidence in Source A to support their valid inferences and that they use the evidence in Source B to provide support for balanced answers. It is also important that source detail is used effectively when deciding which of the two sources (**Question (a) (iii)**) is more useful.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the military purposes of the Hitler Youth, and views about the Treaty of Versailles (**Question (a) (i)**). It was unusual, however, to find inferences regarding the structure and control of the camps. Many candidates were able to draw up lists from the evidence in Source B showing Nazi successes and failures in controlling German people. Whilst many of these gained good marks, it was a pleasure to encounter those candidates who argued a balanced case for **Question (a) (ii)**. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** on the comparative utility of the sources as evidence about what it was like to live in Germany, were sometimes a re-statement of the detail given in the previous two answers. There were examples of both incomplete evaluation which could not score highly, and cross-reference between the sources, as both mentioned the Hitler Youth.

Some candidates found Part (b) questions challenging. There were examples of candidates who knew much detail to answer and argue, but others would have benefited from knowing more about the 'New Plan' (**Question (b) (i)**) which was introduced by Schacht to overcome the balance of payments crisis of 1934. Candidates hinted at the need for autarky but more could have mentioned government controls on the importation of goods where priority was given to re-armament materials. There were some strong and detailed answers to **Questions (b) (ii) and (iii)**, with good detail and explanation, but weaker candidates missed the date limitations in (ii) of 'by 1935' and in (iii) of 'from 1936'. These candidates sometimes used the same subject matter to answer both questions. Better candidates separated the two questions, respected the date restrictions, and used relevant and appropriate detail to respond to the questions. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** sometimes needed more balance as candidates asserted that 'things changed after the war started'. Better answers considered a comparison of pre-war conditions and conditions during the war. The best responses were able to show that some things changed/intensified after the war had

started, while other things remained the same – comments were made that in the early part of the war, the German people noticed little domestic change, while later in the war there was an intensification of propaganda, control and ‘women returning to work in factories’.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Most candidates were able to identify valid inferences from Source A about conditions during the Russian Civil War and they supported them from the source. However, the overwhelming and often repeated inference drawn was that conditions were ‘awful’, with only rare comment on other inferences about fuel, weather, White defeat, crime and waste of resources. Candidates showed in their answers to **Question (a) (ii)** that there was a balance available in the source to show both the unforgiving and compassionate nature of the Bolsheviks. Most candidates performed well here. Candidates answered **Question (a) (iii)** about the sources’ comparative utility by contrasting the content of the sources. Only a small number thought that the sources both supported the view that conditions were severe and the needs of the time meant hard decisions and harsh discipline were necessary. Where these answers were supported by source detail, their valid cross references were awarded with high marks.

Most candidates were able to identify the Red Terror in their answers to **Question (b) (i)**. Some of the candidates offered graphic detail. Descriptions of the main features of War Communism were often full in answers to **Question (b) (ii)**. A small number of candidates either forgot to mention grain being confiscated from the peasants or omitted comments about the control of industry and workers. The general view was that the subject material offered by candidates was impressive. Candidates were not so secure in their answers to **Question (b) (iii)** regarding Trotsky’s importance to the Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War. Most were able to say that he was an outstanding commander but more could have developed their reasons beyond that. Some were distracted by his being ‘an old Menshevik’ and that he had negotiated the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Candidates need to concentrate their answers on the question that has been asked. Similar hesitance was also noted in answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, where comments on the failure or otherwise of Lenin’s New Economic Policy were often brief and did not show a clarity of understanding. Candidates must appreciate that **Question (b) (iv)** has the highest mark tariff of all the questions for each Depth Study. Those candidates who had appreciated the importance of this question scored well by arguing that the NEP encouraged greater production of grain, that famine was disappearing, small factories were opening, and Nepmen were trading and more goods were becoming available. They contrasted these facts with an argument that the system upset the Party by its seeming capitalism, that it did not affect major industries that remained under government control and thus, did not improve production in heavy industry. Candidates who answered like this performed well and their answers showed command of the subject matter.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A which had a number of laws from Alabama, North Carolina and Missouri in the period 1919-1941. Indeed, the laws created longer answers than usual with outraged comments on injustice. From Source B (**Question (a) (ii)**), candidates were able to find evidence of Garvey’s effectiveness in protecting black people and quoted from the source. Some candidates struggled to support a counter view of Garvey and either did not try to mount an argument or appeared not to understand Garvey’s comments on the Ku Klux Klan or his relationship with it. Candidates used the content of Source A more than the content of Source B in their answers to **Question (a) (iii)** on the sources’ comparative utility as evidence of discrimination in the USA in the 1920s. There were also some answers which did not mention the source detail and which tried to compare the sources’ reliability. These attempts were incomplete and would have benefited from better support.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** showed that many candidates knew what NAACP stood for in both words and aims. There were many answers to **Question (b) (ii)** that showed candidates had knowledge of restrictions on Asians and southern Europeans, and a number had good knowledge of percentages and dates of the different acts that limited immigration in the 1920s. In some ways answers to **Question (b) (iii)** could have been better. Most were able to explain the ‘inferior race’ theory as a reason, ‘because they had been slaves’. More needed to be able to place this in a historical context of legal protection and the politics of the Southern states. Those who developed their answers beyond the ‘inferior race’ reason performed well. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were varied. Less successful candidates did not appreciate that the question asked for opportunities and freedom for white Americans only and they tended to focus their generalised comments on all Americans. More focused answers showed that they knew about voting rights for women and the freedom given by car and leisure pursuits. Economic aspects of old industries and the social contrast between city and country women could have been considered by more candidates.

Depth Study D: China 1945-c.1990

Answers to **Question (a) (i)** showed that candidates found valid inferences about the Great Leap Forward, largely focused on how foreigners had treated China in the nineteenth century and asserted that the Leap was a means to re-establish China in an equitable position. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** had candidates using the same source material to argue whether Mao's industrial goals were achievable e.g. 'that they wanted to believe in miracles. Their hopes overcame caution as enthusiasm triumphed over reason' was understood by some candidates to indicate that goals were achievable because the Chinese people supported Mao, while others understood the quotation to show that the goals were unrealistic. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were usually of comparison and contrast of the sources' content. Many candidates missed the opportunity to evaluate the sources by cross referencing comments about the Great Leap Forward.

Candidates' answers to **Questions (b) (i)** and **(b) (ii)** demonstrated a good knowledge of backyard furnaces and the progress that had been made in the status of women in China. Equally, the reasons behind the failure of the Great Leap Forward (**Question (b) (iii)**) were well known and well explained. Some candidates struggled to identify many of the problems faced by the Chinese Communist Government in 1949. Land and war damage were often exploited in these answers to **Question (b) (iv)**. Nevertheless, there were some comprehensive answers reflecting on social, medical, educational and economic issues and advances and candidates compared these to little progress in the political realm, lack of industrial development - despite Soviet help, and the lack of human rights. Some candidates missed the restriction of the year 1958 and went on to write beyond the terms of the question.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

There were too few responses to make useful or general observations.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians: 1945-c.1994

There were too few responses to make useful or general observations.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

Answers to **Question (a) (i)** had candidates drawing valid inferences from Source A. Some answers would have been improved by candidates using the information in the attribution that the source was a picture 'after a mining disaster'. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, which asked about the extent to which Source B showed miners were well housed, had some candidates asserting and supporting that they were well housed, while other disagreed. Balanced answers, in which both sides of the argument were supported by source detail, were rare. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** made general comments about the usefulness or otherwise of pictorial sources as evidence. These responses did not achieve high marks.

Some candidates were able to identify the Davy safety lamp and describe its function. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** were general comments about work at mines and would have benefited from a clear nineteenth-century focus. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons for the rapid expansion of the coal industry in the nineteenth century, were usually founded upon the development of steam engines and of the railways. A few candidates developed their arguments to include the demands of an increasing population and need for domestic heating. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were general in nature and looked at the dangers of working in nineteenth century factories. A small number of candidates found some balance by naming the benefits of regular pay, housing etc.

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century

There were too few responses to make useful or general observations.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43

Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

When attempting source-based questions, candidates should use details from the sources to illustrate their answers. While contextual knowledge can give background to the answers, contextual knowledge should not be used as a substitute for source detail.

When attempting knowledge-based questions, candidates should address directly the question that has been asked and they should illustrate any assertions with examples and details. Candidates also need to take note of any date restrictions in the questions.

General Comments

Depth Studies C (The USA, 1919-1941) and F (Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994) were the most popular topics, with a slightly smaller number of candidates on Depth Study A (Germany, 1918-1945) and B (Russia, 1905-1941). There were too few responses on other topics to make meaningful comments.

Scripts were written in excellent English and many displayed secure historical knowledge in **Section B** answers. While the majority of candidates appreciated the need to support answers to **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)** directly from the appropriate sources, some of those tackling **Question (a)(iii)** appeared to find this question more of a challenge.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

- (a) (i)** Candidates made valid inferences and supported them directly from Source A on the message of the Nazi Party being nationalistic and opposing the existing government. That their aim in using homes, jobs and 'the end of exploitation' in this leaflet was to win working-class support was not always identified.
- (ii)** Rather than just quoting, most candidates deployed material from Source B to the specified issue of Nazi success by 1930. Some impressive, well-reasoned and balanced answers were seen to this question and fully merited high marks. These answers had brought together all the aspects of success, such as the Party's organisation and tailored approach to social groups aiding finance and support, and reached a reasoned judgement by then making a contrast with the continuing financial problems, failure to appeal to urban workers and relative weakness in elections.
- (iii)** Candidates who did well on this question were those deploying both content from the sources and their own knowledge of the period to reach a reasoned judgment of the utility of the sources. At the top level candidates took the opportunity to cross-refer, for example on propaganda being in both sources, or the deliberate targeting of the working-class in Source A not appearing to have succeeded in Source B. Less effective were responses that tended to restate much of the material used in **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)**, and these would have benefited from grasping that the precise focus of this question had shifted to 'methods' rather than aims. General points (no matter how long) on bias and hindsight indicating reliability gained only limited marks.
- (b) (i)** Proportional representation was precisely defined by many candidates, although a number made incorrect guesses.
- (ii)** Most candidates did point to the Nazis' disapproval of cultural developments in Weimar Germany, such as women's increasing freedom, the influence of black American music and the looser morals

indicated by Berlin nightlife. Only a small number considered the Nazis' swift adoption of developments, such as advertising, as indicating their approval.

- (iii) Secure knowledge of reasons for the support of Nazi views on race was displayed by many candidates and some widened the issue of Aryan supremacy to include consideration of prejudice against gypsies and Slavs, as well as Jews. Other reasons, such as the Churches' attitude, the effectiveness of Nazi propaganda and the long-standing nature of racial attitudes, were also addressed.
- (iv) This was a question where appreciation of the dates set and 'increase in support' were essential to ensure precise focus. Earlier and immediate issues were relevant but 1933 was the terminal date so that, for example, the Night of the Long Knives or Nuremberg Laws, were not relevant. Effective answers were those that contrasted the fear of communism in groups such as industrialists and the Nazis' own fears of communist electoral support, as well as the exploitation of the Reichstag Fire in the 1933 election, as factors in increasing support for the Nazis. The best answers balanced this against other issues, such as economic problems, effective propaganda, the weaknesses of other political parties and Nazi skill in leading to the Emergency Government of 1933 and the Enabling Act, to reach a considered judgment.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

- (a) (i) Most candidates made valid inferences on workers being exploited and repressed and those who supported this with specific quotations from the source gained high marks.
- (ii) Many were less secure in considering whether there was an atmosphere of respect in the first meeting of the Duma, and often points needed to be explained and supported. Some candidates struggled to achieve a genuine balance in their responses. Effective answers were those from candidates who explained how far respect was indicated by contrasting the nobility's enthusiastic support with the deputies' silence and the Tsar's attitude, even whilst calling them 'the best people', in asserting his autocracy.
- (iii) Sound responses focused clearly on the issue of Tsarist Russia and supported this from both sources. The best answers made cross-reference between the sources' evidence of control at all levels and supported this from their own knowledge to reach a reasoned judgement. 'Biased' alone could gain only limited marks.
- (b) (i) Father Gapon was correctly identified by all candidates and most were able to describe his role in the events of Bloody Sunday.
- (ii) The impact of the Russo-Japanese War on the people of Russia was given general consideration by most candidates as weakening their morale and leading to shortages. More candidates could have carried this further to link with the 1905 Revolution. A small number of candidates wrote about the events of the war itself without explicitly relating this to the focus of the question.
- (iii) Almost all candidates indicated the significance of the return of troops as a factor in ending the revolution and many also considered other reasons such as the concessions in the October Manifesto and the importance of the nobility and the Okhrana.
- (iv) Those with knowledge of the October Manifesto were usually best equipped to deal with how the Tsar undermined the Duma and used the Okhrana, as well as Stolypin's 'necktie', to deal with critics and strengthen the Tsar's control. Candidates who then contrasted this with the degree to which reforms were inadequate and the weaknesses of the court and government, were able to reach argued conclusions on the security of Tsarist power by 1914.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

- (a) (i) All candidates drew valid inferences on bankers, although more could have linked this explicitly to banking, and a few did not support the inferences with direct source content.
- (ii) There were excellent answers to this question, with an explicit and balanced explanation, given specific support from the source, on the issue of change brought by the New Deal. Other responses tended to quote the source rather than consider words such as 'improved', 'restored'

and 'took over' as indicating change, whilst 'traditional', 'little help for women and minority groups' as well as 'intended' and 'compromise' could be seen as no or limited change.

- (iii) Sound answers considered material from the sources on the extent of President Roosevelt's achievements and their radical nature, as well as his passionate criticism of bankers' responsibility for America's problems, to judge him as an effective speaker who followed up words with action and extended the control of government. The best answers were those which made, and supported, cross-reference on his relations with banking and effect on public opinion. As in other Depth Studies a number of candidates did not appreciate the required shift to the focus on President Roosevelt and tended to quote the sources, thus, at most, making only implicit points, whilst some pursued 'reliability' without the substance required to do so.
- (b)(i) Whilst some struggled with what FERA was, others correctly identified it as set up in 1933 with the immediate purpose of supplementing states' efforts to provide emergency relief such as soup kitchens, blankets and short-term employment for the desperate.
- (ii) Most candidates were able to identify some aspects of the work of the Public Works Administration and a number gave specific examples of its spending of over \$6 billion 'priming the pump' in co-operative projects with private firms to build schools, hospitals, dams and roads of longstanding benefit to the infrastructure of America. A small number confused it with the Civil Works Administration.
- (iii) There were some excellent answers to this question, with the necessary specific focus on the issues given immediate attention in the 'Hundred Days', in particular the need to rescue the banking system from its crisis. Other more general reasons were considered by most candidates such as Roosevelt having 'emergency powers' granted which enabled him to take action over the urgent problems and the need to restore confidence promised in his election campaign.
- (iv) Some good knowledge of the benefits brought by the New Deal to agricultural areas and workers was shown and most candidates ensured some balance by contrasting agriculture and industry. Other answers were vague and brief so that only a low mark could be achieved.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994

- (a)(i) Valid inferences on the Israelis were drawn and supported well by a large majority of candidates. A number of responses would have been improved by the inclusion of this essential support. A small number of candidates had missed the focus on Israelis and had concentrated on the population of Lebanon.
- (ii) There were excellent answers to this question, with an explicit and balanced explanation given specific support from the source on how far the Israeli invasion was welcomed and by whom. The only aspect which was not considered by many was that the 'Christian allies' of Israel were a group in Lebanon.
- (iii) Some sound answers were seen that gave an explained and supported assessment of the value of the two sources in direct relation to the issue of the Israeli invasion, although more candidates could have made cross-references, for example on the scale of the violence or the Palestinians as the initial target. Some candidates focused, often at great length, on general aspects of 'reliability' rather than assessment of the utility of the sources. Such answers cannot gain high marks.
- (b)(i) Although some candidates gave correct answers on what the Knesset is, others guessed at Palestinian refugees or Shiite opposition.
- (ii) Better known and developed were aspects of President Sadat's visit to Israel. These gained good marks, although they were largely on his motives and the outcome rather than specifics on the visit itself – such as his addressing of the Knesset.
- (iii) Reasons for the invasion of the Lebanon were often well developed and almost all candidates appreciated why the PLO was the primary target. A small number focused on description of the invasion rather than on reasons for it, which limited marks they could achieve.

- (iv) Candidates with a secure grasp of detail provided balanced assessments of the failures and successes for Israel of the invasion of Lebanon. Others needed to provide more detail on the wider outcome of the conflict.