

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

It is pleasing to note that the quality seen in recent examinations has been maintained. Many candidates are well prepared for the demands of the paper and these candidates often achieve their potential and beyond. For the core it is more appropriate to prepare candidates for either the nineteenth century questions or those based on the twentieth century. Better answers to the Depth Study usually come from candidates who have been prepared in detail for one Depth Study option.

Many candidates give careful thought to their answers before committing themselves to paper. However, some candidates find it difficult to focus on the question and demonstrate the skill demanded by that question. This is a knowledge-based paper but candidates are expected to be able to demonstrate their understanding of the knowledge acquired in different contexts as demanded by the question.

On this paper the format of each type of question is the same. Part (a) questions, worth 5 marks, require recall and selection of knowledge. Although preferable, it is not necessary to respond in sentences. However, candidates must realise that credit will only be given if the points being made link directly to the question. On occasions it is possible to develop a point being made and extra credit can be gained for this. This type of question is now attracting shorter responses that are clear, concise and to the point. This is the only part of the paper that demands factual recall linked with selection. Candidates are not required to explain. In this year's examination some candidates failed to heed previous recommendations about length and focus, producing over-long, unfocused answers that failed to score highly.

Part (b) questions require explanation of reasons, not just listing or description for which up to 7 marks are available. The explanation offered should be clearly linked to the question so that the Examiner feels that they are reading a script written by a candidate who understands that particular aspect of the syllabus. Too often this year candidates were content to produce answers that were just a list of issues.

Part (c) questions increase the demand on the candidate, who is expected not only to produce explanation but in doing so both support and challenge a hypothesis posed in the question. All too often this second aspect is forgotten, resulting in a one-sided answer which will not gain the highest marks.

A small number of rubric infringements were reported, particularly where candidates answered two questions from **Section B** (Depth Study), but there was little evidence of shortage of time. Centres should ensure that candidates do not put any of their work onto the question paper. All answers should be written in an answer booklet or on answer paper. This should always be clearly labelled and where appropriate, fastened securely. It is not necessary to enclose examination papers with candidates' scripts.

Comments on specific questions

The comments which follow do not imply that a question was answered badly. They are intended to help Centres in improving the preparation of their candidates. Comments are not made on every part of every question written about.

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

There were relatively few answers to this question. Those who had been prepared for this topic were able to define 'nationalism' but others set it in a context of either pre-First World War Balkan nationalism or Nazi Germany. For the latter, answers to parts (b) and (c) were generally not known. For the former, answers to



part **(b)** often concentrated on the social and economic side rather than political or constitutional reform. Answers to part **(c)** were disappointing, often not getting beyond general description of events.

Question 2

Only a small number of candidates answered this question. Surprisingly very few knew that the Zollverein was a customs union. However, many fared much better with part **(b)**, with most able to recall and describe events, giving at least a mark in Level 2. Others showed greater understanding of Schleswig-Holstein, going on to explain, for example, how Bismarck manipulated the situation to favour Prussia. Many were able to identify reasons, other than Bismarck's diplomacy, but the majority failed to develop them into explanation. Few were confident with the idea of diplomacy, a key issue of the period. Some candidates knew the story of the period well but their answer failed to develop the narrative into explanation.

Question 3

In part **(a)** the attack on Harpers Ferry was reasonably well known. Candidates recognised the context of the slave revolt and John Brown's acquisition of martyr status. This was the part best answered by candidates. Answers to part **(b)** tended to be generalised. There was some understanding of the reasons for Southern opposition to the North, but candidates needed to relate these factors more specifically to the impact of Lincoln's election in 1860. As a result, answers rarely attracted above 4 marks for either description or one point fully explained. In the answers to part **(c)** there was a lack of balance in the responses seen. Candidates were unable to show detailed knowledge of the more positive aspects of reconstruction. Superficial points about the freeing of black people and descriptions of changes to the constitution were commonplace. At Level 3, explanations of the activities of carpetbaggers, as well as the persistently poor treatment of black people tended to predominate, so explanations concentrated on continuity rather than change. Few answers gained L4.

Question 4 failed to attract many responses, making meaningful comments difficult.

Question 5

Many candidates produced clear, precise answers which detailed the aims of Lloyd George in answering part **(a)**. It was particularly pleasing to note the number of candidates who referred to the often ignored aim of ensuring that France did not become too powerful. Some candidates confused the aims of the Big Three, with many writing about Wilson and a smaller number, Clemenceau. Some wasted time writing about both Wilson and Clemenceau before getting to Lloyd George. In this approach, Lloyd George was often referred to as 'the man in the middle'. In the context of the question this phrase was meaningless. His specific aims were required. The second part of the question was an opportunity for candidates to specifically concentrate on the how the people of Germany felt about the Treaty. To do this they were expected to say which of the terms horrified them and why this was the case. In the vast majority of instances candidates were able to identify which of the terms caused horror and outrage, including the reduction in armed forces, the loss of industry and 'war guilt'. Some were less successful in explaining why there was outrage as they did not understand the implications of the terms identified for the German people. 'Germany lost all their industry', 'demilitarisation of the Rhineland lost both land and industry' and 'Germany lost the industrial area of the Ruhr', were common errors whilst 'war guilt' and reparations were not always linked. Having said this, there were many candidates who were able to present coherent accounts that showed good understanding, using the source as stimulus, and gaining high marks, although even here some confused inflation and hyperinflation. Part **(c)** aimed at producing a much broader look at the country as a whole, requiring explanation of 'could Germany have got off lightly?' or 'could the treaty be judged as being too harsh in the circumstances of the time?' Here, the better answers took an approach of looking at the Treaty from differing points of view such as those of the countries involved. It was not expected that candidates again go through the terms, but to be selective to produce an argument for and against the hypothesis.

Question 6

There were many sound answers to part **(a)**, detailing events at Munich in 1938. These answers often made links to prior meetings to explain decisions. Many were aware of the participants and those not invited, although a common error was to state that Stalin was present. Surprisingly, a significant minority appeared to be unaware of the Munich Conference and so used the reference in part **(b)** to the Nazi-Soviet Pact to assume that must have been what was signed at Munich. A number ignored the date given in the question to state that it was the Munich Putsch, whilst others thought 'appeasement was signed'. There were many good answers to part **(b)**, where candidates were fully aware that that it was a non-aggression Pact. Many of these candidates were able to put the signing of the Pact in the context of the Munich Agreement, the

operation of appeasement by Britain and France and the growing strength of Germany. Those with more limited understanding thought that the Pact made Germany and Russia allies, whilst in some instances Poland was not even mentioned. In part (c), detail of Hitler's foreign policy was well known, as were other causes of war in 1939, particularly appeasement. What was lacking was the link of Hitler's foreign policy to the outbreak of war resulting in many answers remaining in Level 2 for this side of the argument. Many candidates for this type of question may find it more beneficial to focus on Hitler's foreign policy from 1938 onwards to explain why war broke out. In providing the challenge to the hypothesis candidates rightly go back as far as Versailles but again fail to explain why the issue being written about was a contributing cause of war. On numerous occasions candidates thought Anschluss with Austria and the acquisition of the Sudetenland were examples of lebensraum.

Question 7

Answers to part (a) brought many responses which detailed the events surrounding the Bay of Pigs which easily scored four or five marks. This was also the case with part (b) where the possible reasons were identified and generally well-explained. A number of candidates wrote well about the need to strengthen strategic ties with a new communist state, especially as it was in America's sphere of influence and much was made of the American missiles in Turkey. The good answers made much of the Cold War climate which existed at the time. Some were less thoughtful, suggesting that a reason might well have been to 'provoke the USA into nuclear war'. There were many strong answers to part (c), although they tended to be stronger on the USA rather than the USSR. Some argued that both gained, such as the 'hot line' and 'Nuclear Test Ban Treaty' and this was acceptable as candidates do not have to agree with the hypothesis. The crucial aspect is that they support their stated judgement.

Question 8

This question attracted few candidates. Those who answered it wrote in part (a) about membership rather than role. Many lacked factual detail. They were even less secure about part (b), although there were references to the power of veto and to USA – USSR relations. Some better responses to part (c) concentrated on how the UN was exploited by America and therefore not a success. Others thought a successful outcome was a 'united country'.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

There were many good answers to part (a), showing awareness of the events of the Kapp Putsch, with these descriptions receiving four or five marks. Occasionally this Putsch was confused with the Munich Putsch or there was confusion over the role of the Freikorps. Many answers to (b) were of a very high quality of explanation, with the French and Belgium invasion of the Ruhr, hyperinflation, the printing of money to pay the workers who had gone on strike, social effects and the Munich Putsch featuring strongly. Many were able to link events in the Ruhr to the financial crisis, producing answers worthy of two / three marks within Level 3. There were many one-sided answers to part (c), with candidates able to at least describe economic achievements and in many cases, go on to offer explanations. Many then offered the downside of the economic policies of Stresemann. These candidates had not read the question carefully, as it asked about other achievements of the Stresemann period.

Question 10

Answers to part (a) varied significantly in quality. Many were able to describe the significance of the Law in relation to Hitler's dictatorship, whilst others thought it allowed Hitler to replace Hindenburg. Again in (b), the quality of response varied. Many were able to offer at least three reasons, although on occasions the explanation was spoilt by confusion over the SA and the SS. The weaker responses were content with describing the event, rather than explaining why it happened. In responding to part (c), information regarding the Gestapo and the SS lacked links to effectiveness and was generally highly descriptive of methods used. The vast majority explained the significance of propaganda as a method of control, with further explanation about education and the Hitler Youth adding to the quality of a one-sided response.

Question 11

In answering part **(a)**, a significant minority confused the March 1917 Revolution with the November Revolution or even the Revolution of 1905. Those who were more secure had few problems in scoring highly. In part **(b)** most realised that war, food and land were significant problems and many were able to develop these issues into explanation. Others brought in the return of Lenin and the increasing power of the Bolsheviks and scored well. Answers to **(c)** were often disappointing in relation to Trotsky, with many not making the link to his role with the army. The other side of the argument was much stronger, with the main points well known and in many cases offered in some detail.

Question 12

Many candidates are fully aware of the in-fighting following the death of Lenin and this was used to good effect in answering part **(a)**. Whilst most mentioned Stalin's perceived trickery regarding Lenin's funeral, this aspect did not normally over-shadow other valid points. Whilst the vast majority knew of the Purges and described them in great detail when answering part **(b)**, fewer were able to offer more than a limited explanation of why they were carried out. This explanation usually related to Stalin's insecurity. In part **(c)** many candidates suggested that Stalin could not be a disaster because of the impact of his industrial and agricultural improvements. Whilst explanation was limited, it was often enough to gain marks. Equally, many explained why he was a disaster, often with more conviction than for the other side of the hypothesis.

Question 13

Answers to part **(a)** were often disappointing. Many candidates took the question to be about the consumer boom and wrote accordingly. In most of these answers there was no reference to the stock market. Answers to part **(b)** were stronger, particularly where explanation related to over-production, lack of foreign markets and a saturated home market. Some went further to develop explanation in relation to the plight of farmers. Answers to part **(c)** were particularly strong in relation to the rejection of Hoover and his policies, with many good explanations. Too often the explanation relating to Roosevelt strayed into the introduction of the New Deal, rather than concentrating on his promises as directed by the question.

Question 14

Most responses to part **(a)** were good as candidates were aware of the detail surrounding the closure for all and then the re-opening for some. Most responses to part **(b)** were able to explain the significance of the unconstitutional nature of the New Deal, developing this further by the fact that many judges were Republican. Specific examples were often given to highlight the issues and develop the explanation. Some strong answers were seen for part **(c)**, which developed the idea of failure not just with regard to unemployment but with reference to differing groups and in some cases the short-term nature of the improvement. Less strong was the ability to explain success, which often remained more of a list rather than explanation.

Questions 15 – 17 failed to attract many responses, making meaningful comments difficult.

Question 18

Some good responses to part **(a)** were seen by Examiners. Most were able to describe the violence which erupted, whilst others developed their response by describing the demonstration and the police response. The quality of responses to part **(b)** varied considerably. Those well-prepared were aware of Biko and were able to explain reasons why the Black Consciousness Movement was important. Others linked the movement to youth groups under Mandela. Most were aware of some international opposition and stated this in answer to part **(c)** but many answers remained in Level 2 because they failed to develop 'how effective'.

Question 19 failed to attract many responses, making meaningful comments difficult.

Question 20

Most responses described the United Nations proposals for Palestine in part **(a)**, although Examiners noted that some candidates went further, offering criticism of the proposals. This was unnecessary and wasted time. Many related their answer to part **(b)** to the actions of the British and many good explanations were seen by Examiners. The specific involvement of the Irgun and the Palestinians was less well documented.

Most candidates were strong on the War itself but were often unable to use this knowledge together with knowledge of wider issues to explain why Israel was successful.

Question 21

There were only a limited number of responses to this question. However, these very brief notes may be beneficial. Answers to part **(a)** were mainly descriptions of terrorism applicable to any group rather than a specific focus on Fatah. Again in part **(b)** there was a lack of clear focus on the PLO, with many writing generally about the Arabs. More descriptive than explanatory was the comment from Examiners about answers to part **(c)**. Most were aware of some aspect of superpower involvement but were unable to deal with 'how significant'.

Questions 22 – 24 failed to attract many responses, making meaningful comments difficult.

Question 25

In answering part **(a)**, most candidates were aware of climate, terrain and disease being problems that discouraged colonisation. Disappointingly, there was little about African leaders like Shaka and their followers who were not keen on losing territory and power. There were some very good answers to part **(b)**, with the interest in raw materials, minerals and markets for manufactured goods all being well developed. Some candidates went further, implying that acquisition of colonies brought status. Answers to part **(c)** were more of a list of what happened, without candidates actually addressing the question. Very few mentioned the Berlin Conference.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The general level of performance was very similar to that seen in previous years. Although there are still many candidates who understand exactly what is expected of them, and can interpret, evaluate and use historical sources in ways required by the questions, there was also a number who appeared to be uncertain about what they are expected to do. Some seemed to be unaware of the fact that the main purpose of this paper is to test their ability to use historical sources. Such candidates used most of their answers to show the Examiner how much they knew about the topic. Mention of the sources only appeared towards the end of their answers, usually as an afterthought.

It is crucial that the purpose and nature of this paper is fully explained to candidates and that they have the opportunity to attempt several past papers. What matters is that candidates have the opportunity, whatever the topic, to attempt source-based questions and to become familiar with the demands (in terms of the relevant skills) of the paper. As a minimum, candidates should understand that Examiners want them to answer the questions and that all these questions are about sources. They do not want candidates to spend most of their answers ignoring the sources and writing about the topic. Contextual knowledge is important, but its role in this paper is to enable candidates to interpret, analyse, evaluate and use the sources more effectively. Contextual knowledge should never be put into answers for its own sake.

Some candidates are still writing too much. These candidates would have written better answers if they had spent more time and care thinking about the requirements of the questions and planning their answers, rather than paraphrasing or even copying the sources, or writing at great length about the topic.

Some candidates struggled with questions that required them to compare sources. It is not useful to use most of one's answer to summarise each source in turn. Candidates should, first, study the sources carefully and make rough notes about any agreements or disagreements they can find between the sources. They will then be in a position to start their answer with direct reference to one of these. Their answers should then proceed by comparing the sources, point by point. It is also important to consider how far the sources agree in terms of their overall views. Sometimes sources can, for example, agree on some details, but disagree in their overall points of view.

Some candidates failed to realise when the purpose of a source was being asked about. Instead, they wrote about the message of the source. Usually questions about the message of source will use the word 'message' as in 'What is the message of this source?' However, questions about purpose will be worded in a different way, for example, 'Why was this source published?' Such questions require candidates to explain what the intended impact of the source was on the intended audience, for example, it is reasonable to suggest that Source C in the nineteenth century paper was published to encourage the British people to support the war. If a date is included in the question, for example, 'Why was this source published in August 1914?' then part of the answer needs to be about the events surrounding the date, but used in such a way that it supports what the candidate is suggesting is the purpose of the source.

A surprising number of candidates appeared not to be aware of the requirements of **Question 6**. Candidates are always presented with a hypothesis and are asked to explain how far the sources in the paper provide convincing evidence to support the hypothesis. The question, therefore, is about the sources. Candidates must not ignore the sources and write about the hypothesis purely on the basis of their knowledge of the events. They must also not write about a different hypothesis. Candidates can be sure that there will always be some sources that support the hypothesis and others that do not. They should first explain carefully how some sources support the hypothesis. This needs to be done for each source in turn. They should try and avoid making vague generalisations about groups of sources. When writing about each source they need to explain carefully, by using the content the source, how what it says supports the hypothesis. The same job then needs to be done with the sources that disagree with the hypothesis. Extra marks can be gained by also evaluating some of the sources. For example, a source might appear to support the hypothesis, but a

candidate could argue that it cannot be used in this way because it is unreliable. Judgements about the reliability of sources in answers to earlier questions can be used again in answers to **Questions 6**.

Specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth Century topic

Question 1

A number of candidates struggled with the discipline required to compare sources. Many spent one, or even two pages, summarising the sources and then asserted that they agree or disagree. In comparison questions, candidates need to compare sources point by point. They need to work out what one source says about, for example, whether Britain went to war because of Belgium, and then explain whether or not the other source agrees about this point. Then move to another point. Candidates should also consider and compare the overall view of the sources. Often, sources will agree over some questions of detail, but disagree in their overall view, or vice versa. A reasonable number of candidates were able to find agreements such as Britain using Belgium as an excuse and Britain not making its position clear. Only a few were able to compare the overall views of the two sources.

Question 2

There were many good answers to this question but a significant minority of candidates simply described the cartoon in great detail and then wrote an essay about the Schlieffen Plan. Some of the better candidates failed to distinguish between message and purpose. Possible messages of the cartoon were well explained, for example, the bravery of Belgium standing up to the bullying Germans. Far fewer candidates were able to move on to purpose e.g. to increase support in Britain for the war or to encourage the British government to go to war.

Question 3

There were some very poor answers to this question, with candidates simply paraphrasing, or writing about, the sources, without really addressing the question. In Source D Lloyd George states that if Britain had warned Germany about what it would do if Germany invaded Belgium, subsequent events might have been different. Source E directly rejects this suggestion, while Source F is more ambiguous about the point. A reasonable number of candidates were able to compare Source D with Sources E and/or F along these lines. Such comparisons reached Level 4 in the mark scheme. A few candidates went further and evaluated at least one of the three sources as part of their analysis, for example, Lloyd George was writing in his memoirs some time later and may have been trying to rescue his reputation. It is important for candidates to remember that when they are asked whether one source shows another source to be wrong, it is important to consider whether the sources had a purpose and can be trusted, rather than merely comparing sources for agreements or disagreements.

Question 4

This question was about reliability of the sources and so required the sources to be evaluated. A good number of candidates failed to do this. Some simply accepted uncritically what the sources said. Others misinterpreted Source H as saying that the Germany was innocent, while another group got no further than asserting bias because a source was German or British. In questions such as this one it is important that candidates use their contextual knowledge to consider the possible purpose of the authors. This might lead them to question the reliability of what the sources are saying. Another possible way of approaching this question was to consider what the sources tell us about the authors, for example, the purpose of Source H was to blame Germany, and so the source provides reliable evidence that the British were blaming Germany and wanted to convince others of Germany's guilt. The important point is that these approaches have to be explained through analysis of the sources and a use of contextual knowledge. Reliability, or the lack of it, cannot simply be asserted on the basis of who produced the source.

Question 5

It was disappointing to find a large number of candidates claiming that they were not surprised by this source because they would expect Britain to be ready to go to war and this, according to the candidates, is what the source shows. These candidates completely missed the point of Source I which actually shows that a senior general as late as 2 August 1914 had no idea whether or not Britain was going to war. A small number of

better candidates realised this. Some simply suggested that they found this very odd, but others went on to use their contextual knowledge or cross reference to other sources (for example, Source A says that the decision to send the BEF was not made until 6 August), to argue that they were or were not surprised.

Question 6

Answers to this question were, on the whole, disappointing. A large number ignored the sources or appeared to be testing a different hypothesis to the one given in the question. Even many of those who used the sources and the correct hypothesis failed to explain properly how individual sources agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis. Issues relating to this **Question 6** are developed further in the general comments above.

Option B: Twentieth Century topic

Question 1

This question was answered reasonably well. A few candidates ignored the sources, replaced them with their knowledge of the topic, and wrote a mini-essay about how far the strikers obtained their demands, while others summarised one source, then the other, and finally asserted that they had been, or had not been, successful. Most candidates, however, were able to at least explain which of the demands in Source A appeared to have been conceded. Far fewer candidates went on to explain that some of the demands were left pending (for example, meat sales from commercial shops), others were not achieved (for example, the monument to the workers killed in the riots), while others that were not requested in Source A were granted (for example, the broadcasting of Catholic services). It is not enough for candidates to say that they were, for example, granted revision of the censorship laws - they had to explain that this was an achievement that was not requested in Source A. Altogether, there were four categories: demands that were achieved, demands that were left pending, demands that were not granted, and achievements that were not requested in Source A. It was important that candidates placed each of the demands in one of these categories.

Question 2

A good number of candidates reached Level 4 in the mark scheme and wrote reasonable answers by explaining the differences between Sources C and D as reasons for Source C making Source D surprising. Such answers demonstrated the ability to interpret and compare sources but a little careful thought about the question, and some use of contextual knowledge, would have led to a realisation that Source C does not make D surprising. This is because there is no reason to believe that promises made by Solidarity would have had any impact on the attitudes of the Soviets. A significant minority of candidates made good use of their contextual knowledge, some going back to the Soviet reactions to risings in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, to explain that there is no reason why Source C makes Source D surprising. A few candidates wrote good answers by evaluating the sources e.g. by considering the purpose of Solidarity in Source C or Jaruzelski's purpose in Source D. A few candidates ignored Source C and simply wrote about whether they were surprised by Source D. However, it was encouraging to see the overwhelming majority of candidates attempting to do what the question asked them to do.

Question 3

Only a few candidates gave surface readings of the cartoon. The majority made genuine attempts to interpret its message. Previous reports have made the distinction, particularly with reference to questions about cartoons, between sub-messages and the big messages. The latter refer to the big points that a cartoonist wanted to get across to the audience. The former refer to any incidental messages that can be inferred from a cartoon, usually by focusing on just one part of the cartoon. With questions such as this, candidates should ask themselves 'what is the big point that the cartoonist wants to get across?' Most candidates inferred several sub-messages but failed to get to a big message. Reaching a valid big message involves looking at a cartoon as a whole. The big messages for this cartoon were judged to be (i) the Soviets were using Solidarity as an excuse to impose control on Poland, (ii) the Polish government had to intervene because they were afraid that if they did not the Soviet Union would, and (iii) Solidarity is completely innocent while the Polish government and the Soviet Union were the guilty ones. The sub-messages that most candidates produced were, for example, Russia is helping the Polish government, or the Polish government is attacking Solidarity. These sub-messages are not wrong, but they are incomplete readings of the cartoon. They leave out much that is going on in the cartoon. Candidates should be encouraged to read cartoons as a whole. It was encouraging to see only a few candidates claim that the Soviets were coming to the aid of Solidarity.

Question 4

This question produced better answers than **Question 3**, despite the fact that candidates had to interpret and compare two cartoons. Both cartoons were understood well, with a large majority of candidates managing to write about agreements or disagreements, and a good number doing both. Candidates seemed to find it easier to get to the big messages of these sources than that of Source E. There were some weaker candidates who struggled with the demands of making comparisons and wrote about the sources separately. The very best candidates went beyond the messages of the cartoons and matched the sympathies of the two cartoonists.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. Most candidates interpreted and used Source H well, but a number misinterpreted Source I. This source dismisses Gorbachev as a significant figure, despite his claims at the beginning of the source. Unfortunately, some candidates claimed that both sources say that Gorbachev was significant. Even weaker candidates simply ignored the reference to 'significance' in the question and simply paraphrased both sources and then asserted that they are useful because of the details they contain. Better candidates understood that these two sources differ about Gorbachev's significance and went on to explain that because Source I comes from a later date it is in a better position to make an overall judgement about his significance.

Question 6

Overall, the answers to this question were disappointing. A minority of candidates understood what they were being asked to do, but a surprisingly large number limited their marks by either ignoring the sources and basing their answers on their own knowledge or by paraphrasing sources and then asserting that they did, or did not, support the hypothesis. A number of candidates simply dismissed Sources H and I as irrelevant because they are not about Poland. They missed the fact that both do have a relevance to events in Poland (as well as elsewhere in Eastern Europe). More has been said about this question in the general comments at the beginning of this report because similar weaknesses were found in the answers to both options.



HISTORY

<p>Paper 0470/03 Coursework</p>

The number of Centres using the coursework option in November increased a little but remains small. The overall standard of work was similar to previous years. Centres used appropriate assignments and the marking was generally accurate and at the right standard. The detailed comments on candidates' work explaining why certain marks had been awarded were very useful to the Moderator and Centres are thanked for these. A number of Centres had their marks reduced, although all these adjustments were minor and there remains general agreement over standards. Where marks were reduced, the main reason was a too generous application of valid mark schemes. This usually occurred with borderline answers where candidates were given too much benefit of the doubt. It should be remembered that in coursework candidates are required to produce sustained and convincing performance at a level before an answer can be placed in that level.

Much good work was submitted for Assignment 1, demonstrating the candidates' ability to write good explanations and analyses, and reach and support their own judgements. In work submitted for Assignment 2, most candidates were able to interpret and evaluate historical sources. However, there are some areas where there is room for improvement. In Assignment 1, some candidates are still filling their answers with too much descriptive detail. They should be reminded that when they are asked to write a causal explanation they need to explain how certain factors contributed to the outcome rather than write down everything they know about the topic. Even the better candidates are still struggling with questions about short and long-term causes. The point of these questions is to test whether candidates understand the difference between them. They therefore need to explain how short and long - term causes have different functions and contribute to causing events in different ways. This needs to be explained through the relevant historical events. When asked to compare causes for importance, candidates need to directly compare, analyse and discuss their relative importance. This should be done throughout the answer. Too many candidates write about each cause separately and leave any comparison to a brief and unsatisfactory conclusion. In Assignment 2, some candidates are failing to analyse and evaluate sources in their historical context, while some are reducing their marks by relying too much on context and not using the sources enough in answers to the final question.

However, it is important to remember that these comments refer to a minority of candidates. Most clearly put a lot of thought and hard work into the completion of their coursework, and produced answers of a high standard.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/04
Alternative to Coursework

General comments

As in previous sessions, Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945, was the most popular choice with candidates, but this session, it was overwhelmingly the most popular Depth Study. Both Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941, attracted responses, but in much lower numbers. There were also a few Centres that attempted Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century, and Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians. However, there were too few attempts at Depth Study C: China 1945-c.1990, Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society, and Depth Study H: Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century to make possible any helpful, general comments.

For the most part, the scripts were well set out and the writing sufficiently neat to allow the Examiners to appreciate all that the candidates wished to convey. Examiners reported that they had seen the full range of performances by candidates from the full and informed, well crafted and developed to scripts that were less well informed, brief and very limited in relevant knowledge. Some candidates, despite the instruction on the examination paper requesting scripts be written in dark blue or black ink, wrote in very light blue inks. This made some material difficult to read.

Candidates had some difficulties with Part (a) questions. Examples of these difficulties will be dealt with more thoroughly in the comments on specific questions, but the following general observations were made regularly by Examiners in their reports. For weaker candidates, answers to **Question (a) (i)** were little more than a restatement of the detail of Source A, showing no valid inferences and no real understanding of what the source meant. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, which should offer a balanced argument from evidence in the source, often agreed with the statement in the question and offered supporting evidence, but then proceeded to use evidence of a counter argument as further proof of their original agreement. Many candidates were conscious that the provenance of the sources would be valuable in answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, but provided only 'stock' or incomplete evaluations.

Having made the above comments, it would be wrong to end this part of the report without stating that many of the scripts were of very high quality, and the understanding of the period and the subject matter by many candidates was most pleasing to observe.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945.

As has been previously mentioned, some candidates restated the content of Source A in their answers to **Question (a) (i)**, but many drew valid inferences, supported from the source and were well rewarded. It would also be fair to say that there was confusion in some candidates' minds as to who was accusing whom of 'high treason' and who the 'revolutionaries' were. Most candidates agreed that the Munich Putsch had been a failure (**Question (a) (ii)**) and pointed out the evidence was to be found in the source with phrases such as 'the Nazi Party had been crushed and banned, and Hitler was imprisoned'. Many then went on to use the evidence 'scarcely known', 'leapt into the headlines', 'learnt an important lesson' etc. to confirm that the Putsch had been a failure. There was much more evidence in Source B to show positive outcomes of the Putsch than negative ones. Nevertheless, very good candidates produced balanced and supported arguments. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** most often tried to compare and contrast the content of the sources. Candidates asserted that Source A was Hitler speaking at his trial and so he 'would lie', or 'know the truth' etc. It was rare to find these assertions supported from the source or by contextual knowledge that could verify the assertions. The date of 1924 was often used to say 'it was nearer to the time so less would have been forgotten', or that it was more accurate than Source B written in 1971 as 'much would have been forgotten' or 'more time was available to research the subject'. Source B was often dismissed as coming

from an American and 'Americans had always hated and fought against the Germans'. As can be seen, these evaluations were of the 'stock' variety and/or far from complete.

Although there were many full, perhaps overfull, and accurate answers to **Question (b) (i)**, there were many who did not know who the 'November Criminals' were and many of the answers were guesses. There was also a similar appreciation of Mein Kampf in **Question (b) (ii)** – candidates either knew its context and importance or guessed. Perhaps the most disappointing aspect of answers to this question was that candidates often stated that it was a book written by Hitler whilst in prison, and then said that it contained the 'aims of the Nazi Party and what Hitler would do once he obtained power' or 'Nazi policies for the future'. These candidates failed to elaborate further on the detail of plans, aims etc. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** often scored very highly with full and deep understanding of Hitler's contempt for the Weimar Republic. However, there were also accounts and reasons limited to the fact that Ebert or Stresemann was in power and Hitler was 'jealous' or 'frustrated'. **Question (b) (iv)** on the extent to which Hitler used 'legal means to become Fuhrer' caused problems for many candidates. Whilst there were some full, balanced and informed answers that scored well, other candidates' answers fell into a number of categories. Some clearly did not understand the difference between 'legal' and 'illegal' e.g. naming 'propaganda' as illegal. Others tried to differentiate at the start of their answers but gave up during the answer and listed all events leading to Hitler's appointment as Fuhrer, hoping that the Examiner would decide. A further group decided to omit any comment on 'legal' or 'illegal' and list events. Most, however, agreed that the use of intimidation and Rohm's execution during the Night of the Long Knives were unacceptable.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941.

Most candidates who had prepared for this Depth Study were able to appreciate that Source A demonstrated that industrialisation in the USSR was taking place very quickly, with much achieved with an amateur and inexperienced workforce. Answers to **Question (a) (i)** scored well. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** were very often in agreement that the second Five Year Plan was a failure and quoted evidence of 'shortages, famine, transport and reduction in production' to support the argument. More successful candidates felt that the second Five Year Plan may have been less successful than the first but it was not a complete failure. After all, there had still been a '15 per cent increase in production' and a determination to improve by the 'redrafting in 1934'. Many answers to **Question (a) (iii)** compared and contrasted the content of the sources. Examiners also encountered 'stock' or incomplete evaluation when candidates tried to make an issue of the American in Source A writing many years after his experiences, 'so he would have forgotten some', but at least it was 'closer to the time than the writer of Source B'. Some said the writer of Source B would 'have had longer to research', while others decided that as both the American and British writers came from countries that 'hated communism', they would be 'biased and trying to put Russia down'.

Answers to **Questions (b) (i)** and **(b) (ii)** showed that candidates completely understood the significance of Stakhanovites and Gosplan or they had no knowledge and guessed at their significance. The reason for Stalin's abandonment of Lenin's New Economic Policy was much better known and Examiners reported full and developed answers, well-informed and relevant. Although there were many full and good answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on the extent to which the Soviet people benefited from the Five Year Plans, many tended to write about the benefits of the Five Year Plans to the state rather than to the people. Comments about the huge increases in production and the growing strength of the USSR were common. However, all agreed that there was little improvement in living or working conditions. It was rare to see much written about the actual benefits to the Soviet people in terms of education, health, employment etc. Most candidates felt that living through the Five Year Plans brought very little to the Soviet people.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941.

Many candidates understood that Hoover's speech in Source A was boastful, optimistic, and proud of the American system (American Dream). Candidates scored well in **Question (a) (i)**. However, there was some confusion in answers to **Question (a) (ii)**. Whilst better candidates found evidence in the source to show how effectively American industrial workers were organised in strike action in the early part of the source, and found evidence of the undermining of union organisation by employers, the Supreme Court and the falling membership of unions, many candidates used all the evidence to show effective organisation or ineffective organisation. They were unable to tease out or differentiate evidence to support both sides of the argument. This hinted at a lack of full understanding of the content of Source B. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, often noted the time difference between the two sources and we again had comments like 'Hoover was president at the time and would know', or the author of Source B 'would have had time to research' etc. However, there were many sensible evaluations of Hoover's speech, with comments on the tone and language used as he 'was trying to be elected'. These were supported with quotations from Source A. A

few candidates made observations about the tone and language of the source but failed to quote or indicate the evidence in the source.

Most candidates were able to give at least one example of older industries that were facing problems in the 1920s in answer to **Question (b) (i)**, and many were able to gain full marks by nominating two industries. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** tended to broaden the advantages of mass production in the car industry from the car industry itself to the consumers as well. There were some laudable and full answers to this question. **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons for rapid rise of share prices in the 1920s, caused some candidates problems. There were, of course, some excellent and full answers offering reasons like mass production, cheap prices, ease of purchase, company profits and dividends, 'buying on the margin', bank lending, and 'gold at the end of every share purchase' etc., but many delivered confused or partial answers which did not convince the reader. The biggest problem for candidates in their answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on the extent to which the Wall Street Crash was the cause of the Depression in America was that some saw the Wall Street Crash as the Depression. They described the impact of the Wall Street Crash on individuals and companies and asserted that was the Depression. However, there were many answers that placed the Wall Street Crash in its economic and historic context and showed how it was largely the last symptom of an economic disease that had been developing throughout the 1920s.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990.

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make helpful and relevant comments.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.

Answers to **Question (a) (i)** for this Depth study had more candidates copying out some or all of Source A and presenting it as their answers, than for any other depth study. Candidates must appreciate that this question invites them to draw valid inferences from the source about President de Klerk, and show where, within the source, evidence can be found to support their inferences. Although there were some good, balanced answers to the extent that Source B showed that in 1994 South Africans were willing to work together to make 'one country, one nation', many felt that the evidence in Source B showed that all South Africans were willing to work together. Some even quoted 'thousands of Inkatha members armed with spears and other weapons marched through Johannesburg and an Inkatha group attacked ANC headquarters. Fifty-three people died and it seemed as if South Africa was on the brink of internal war' as evidence of the willingness to work together. These were disappointing answers because they showed that the candidates not only did not understand the source but that their background knowledge was limited. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** scored better as many compared the content of both speeches. Some saw that Source A was by the white President and/or was seen on television but went little further than that. For Source B, candidates noted that the source was taken from Mandela's autobiography, but did not develop their answers much further than asserting that he would be 'right' or 'telling the truth'.

Question (b) (i) on the tribal groups to which Mandela and Buthelezi belonged caused problems. Some candidates correctly named the tribal groups, some could give one group and more thought that this referred to political organisations like the ANC. Very few could list or describe any of the actions taken by P. W. Botha to lessen the impact of apartheid in **Question (b) (ii)**. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** did comment that the blacks would not trust de Klerk after so many years of oppression and a few commented that some whites would not trust him if he was prepared to make concessions to the black community. **Question (b) (iv)** was not well understood, and many did not understand the reference to 'external factors'.

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

Answers to **Question (a) (i)** showed that candidates were able to draw inferences about the controversial nature of Israel's policy in the Middle East, and that the Egyptians thought that Begin's plan had the purpose of dividing Arab countries to the extent that Egypt could not accept any part of the plan that had been proposed. In general, candidates scored well on this question. Many candidates saw that there was a balance of evidence in Source B to answer **Question (a) (ii)**, but weaker candidates found that there was little chance of peace, and did not appreciate the more subtle evidence that Sadat wanted to ignore the Palestinian question for a while and wanted to try to establish contact and some rapport with Israel as a starting point for more friendly relations. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** often compared the content of the two sources, made reference to them both being from the same month and year, and that one source was Egyptian and the other British. Most answers did not go further than the 'stock' or incomplete evaluation. However, some candidates did refer to the tone of the Egyptian source and commented and quoted its rhetoric. These candidates were rewarded fully for their efforts, but those who drew attention to the rhetoric but did not provide evidence in support of their assertion were less well rewarded.

Most candidates were able to supply at least two of the 'occupied territories' and scored well. The use of the oil weapon (**Question (b) (ii)**) was understood and very often described in detail and with considerable command. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** showed sympathy to President Sadat, his dilemmas at home and his inclination to drop the support of the USSR for that of the USA. Answers were full, well informed and impressive. The sympathy for Sadat continued in answers to **Question (b) (iv)** where a great deal of admiration was shown for him as 'the only person in Middle East politics trying to bring a lasting peace to the area' and 'he did not deserve to be assassinated'. Some candidates dealt succinctly with Sadat's motivation. Some concluded that after all his efforts, little was actually achieved except, perhaps, an armed neutrality between Israel and Egypt.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make helpful and relevant comments.

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

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make helpful and relevant comments.