

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

General Comments and Key Messages

A majority of candidates were able to use sound knowledge of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. 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.

Parts (b) and (c) require a demonstration of understanding, rather than lengthy description. They also demand explanation. Limited credit is awarded for narrative or 'setting the scene'. Candidates who performed strongly were 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), candidates need to 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) most were aware that Kossuth wanted independence for Hungary and that he was an inspiring leader. Some answers went further, stating that Kossuth declared Hungary an independent republic of which he was president. Weaker answers contained little beyond Kossuth being a 'leading figure in the revolution. Most answers to (b) concentrated on the social issues which brought about Louis Philippe's downfall. More could have been written about the King himself or the political issues he faced. The emphasis in responses to (c) in relation to the respective contribution of Liberalism and Nationalism was on descriptions of the two concepts, rather than their application to particular states or regions.

Question 2

In answering (a), candidates were aware of Austria's direct control over Lombardy and Venetia and its influence over Parma, Modena and Tuscany. The Quadrilateral was less well known. There were occasional references to marriage alliances but these often needed development into explanation. Many answers to (b) were aware that Mazzini founded 'Young Italy', although not why it had been formed. His role as a publicist for the Italian cause was less-well known. The foundation of the Roman Republic was mentioned in some answers but these tended to be descriptive rather than explaining the importance in fighting for a united Italy. Answers to (c) were limited in relation to the success of the Piedmont military campaigns being more descriptive of the conflicts.

Question 3

The limited number of responses to this question prevents useful comment.

Question 4

Many answers to (a) were able to identify the aims of the Weltpolitik policy. Ideas of becoming a world power, creating pride and aggression and achieving a large Empire to boost trade were all mentioned. Less strong answers were often confined to the idea of a 'place in the sun'. In answer to (b), the best answers introduced both disputes into the answer explain why each separately increased European tension. Less successful answers were often aware that there were two disputes but often didn't differentiate the detail. Weaker answers identified issues, such as a 'gun boat was sent'. These answers would have been improved

by explaining why this, and other actions, increased European tension. In **(c)** the actions of Austria-Hungary were sometimes limited to the reaction to the assassination of Franz Ferdinand and the support given to them by Germany. Understanding of the actions of Serbia was often less strong, with little comment being seen on links with Russia or Serbia's emergence as a powerful state. Some candidate followed their comments on Austria-Hungary and Serbia by giving a number of other reasons as to why broke out. This was not part of the question.

Question 5

In answering **(a)** most candidates showed awareness that the Treaty of St Germain dealt with Austria. Where there was clarity of thinking, the answers were very good with, in some instances, candidates being able to identify land that was taken away from Austria and which countries benefited from this. Others were more confident in identifying the terms reducing Austria's military strength. The banning of a union between Austria and Germany was a valid feature of many responses. Some, incorrectly, thought the Treaty also dealt with Germany, producing detail more relevant to the Treaty of Versailles. In answer to **(b)** there were many responses that produced two clear explanations of why the expectations of Wilson and Clemenceau differed, addressing the question as set. Well explained and understood were the reasons for the harsh attitude of Clemenceau compared to the more detached view of Wilson. Less strong answers struggled to take full account of the demands of the question. In these instances the answer was more a list of demands of each of the named persons, lacking the more detailed comparison and explanation provided by the better responses. Answers to **(c)**, almost without exception, showed awareness of what was meant by 'War Guilt', but in some instances would have been improved by developing this into an explanation as to why this clause caused German bitterness. Attempts to explain tended to be along the lines of 'they did not start the war'. This does not constitute an explanation and as a result many responses were unbalanced. Explanation of other causes of bitterness was much better, showing good understanding and an ability to explain 'why' within the context of the time. Sometimes candidates amended the question wording from 'bitterness' to 'unfair'. Candidates need to answer the question as set.

Question 6

There were many responses to **(a)** that set out specifically what happened in Guernica. These usually divided into three sections – what action Hitler took, how he delivered his action and what the impact was. In most instances the first two aspects allowed for clear factual information to be given, whilst the third aspect became generalised with comments such as 'all was destroyed'. There were many excellent responses to **(b)**, explaining why Hitler wanted to re-militarise the Rhineland. Others needed to move away from description and narrative to focus more effectively on explanation. Examples of this approach included 'He wanted to break the Treaty of Versailles' and 'He wanted to test how France might respond to his aggression'. These are perfectly acceptable basic responses but candidates need to understand that to achieve higher marks requires a demonstration of understanding. Many candidates in answering **(c)** were able to explain the benefits of the Nazi-Soviet Pact to Stalin and Hitler, although the issue of 'more advantageous' could have been addressed more. Answers were usually logically organised. Some candidates needed to focus more on the clarity of the issues. An example of this relates to 'having to fight a war on two fronts'. This was often stated but the understanding of what it meant could be weak and confused. Similarly, the relevance of Poland needed greater understanding.

Question 7

Most candidates indicated in answer to **(a)** that the 38th Parallel was the line of latitude that separated North Korea from South Korea. Many did not go any further, despite the link in the question to the Korean War. Some candidates described aspects of the war that had no link to the frontier. Better answers introduced the link between Capitalism and Communism (America and the Soviets), indicated it was intended to be a temporary border and that it remained the boundary when the Korean War ended. For **(b)**, those candidates who had mentioned Capitalism and Communism in answer to **(a)** saw the relevance of the US policy of containment, developing this into explanation. The best answers included sound explanation relating to the belief that Kim Il-Sung believed that Korea was not high priority for the US. High quality responses to **(c)** often made the judgement that America was more successful in Korea. The quality came from how this decision could be justified. This revolved around the achievement of American forces, under the banner of the UN, not allowing South Korea to become Communist compared to Vietnam which fell to the Communists. In addition, neighbouring Laos and Cambodia fell to Communism. Thus the US policy of containment had failed. Weaker answers were more descriptive, lacking the link to what constituted success or explained why America had been successful or unsuccessful, i.e. dealing with causation rather than outcomes.

Question 8

Most candidates in answer to **(a)** were aware of aspects of Saddam Hussein's treatment of his own people, although references to particular groups, e.g. the Marsh Arabs, were less frequent. Reference was made to purges and repression. In **(b)** most were able to identify two or three reasons for the invasion of Kuwait. These identifications tended to be either historical or relate to oil and trade. Candidates need to develop even basic identification into explanation so that the higher marks can be accessed. The better answers did this, particularly in relation to oil but also by making links to the impact of the war with Iran. Some of the responses to **(c)** were excellent, with detailed explanation of the impact of the First Gulf War which both challenged and supported the question hypothesis. Other answers needed to be more developed, more thoroughly explained, balanced arguments in order to achieve better marks. Some of these answers were characterised by weak, generalised points about the impact on the Iraqi people.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Most answers to **(a)** indicated a high level of awareness of the conditions facing soldiers in the First World War trenches. On occasions this awareness encouraged excessive and unnecessarily long answers. In some instances answers identified the methods used, and impact of, military attacks. This was an invalid approach to the question. On other occasions reference was made by candidates to 'suffering illness and disease'. This type of comment was rather vague. Many excellent responses to **(b)** contained detailed explanation on a wide-ranging number of reasons, including the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and the failure to break through enemy lines. Some responses consisted mainly of 'they built trenches to give protection'. Answers to **(c)** generally made reference to the use of tanks and gas but by a number would have been improved by considering effectiveness in attempting to break the stalemate. Better answers considered a much wider range of new technologies which included, in addition to tanks and gas, aircraft, flame throwers and heavy artillery. These answers explained the effectiveness of the technology. The vast majority of answers included the machine gun as new technology despite a much larger, heavier and ineffective version being in existence for some time. It is important that candidates realise that this type of gun was now looked at in a new way and that it was redesigned with a new use, as a defensive weapon, causing heavy casualties in relation to trench warfare.

Question 10

The limited number of responses to this question prevents useful comment.

Question 11

The date given in **(a)** was crucial in relation to valid answers. A small number of candidates wrote about threats from specific extreme political groups such as the Spartacists, the hatred of the Weimar Republic and the impact of the Treaty of Versailles. All these aspects lacked validity. A greater number of answers could have mentioned the flu epidemic or the shortage of food. In the better answers, issues relating to the loss of the family bread winner, the impact of unemployment and the abdication of the Kaiser were more often identified as relevant. For **(b)** there were many examples which contained at least two valid explanations as to why the Spartacist uprising failed. These included the ruthlessness of the Freikorps. Weaker answers were characterised by a tendency to generalised comment rather than development of explanation. Candidates need to realise it is important to read the question carefully. In a number of instances answers were about the aims of the Spartacists or descriptions of events. In answer to **(c)** there were many high quality answers containing detailed explanation on either side of the debate. Throughout the very best answers the candidates used wide-ranging explanation to support one side of the view about Stresemann, whilst at the same time explaining why they could not support the opposing view. Other answers lacked clarity of approach. These answers were characterised by reasons being presented without any indication as to which side was being supported. These answers often showed a lack of specific knowledge of the Dawes and Young Plans and almost invariably described, rather than explained, the impact of the cultural revival.

Question 12

In **(a)** most candidates were familiar with the education policies of the Nazis and identified relevant points, including the reasons for teaching various subjects and indoctrination. A number of less successful answers went into detail regarding the Hitler Youth. There were many excellent responses to **(b)**, which contained explanation of at least two reasons why the Hitler Youth was important to the Nazis. Indoctrination was seen as an important aspect, as was the access to basic military training. Other answers concentrated more on

identification and description. These answers often showed a good awareness of what went on needed to go on and explain why the Hitler Youth was an important part of life. The better answers to **(c)** were explanatory, rather than descriptive. In these answers, candidates not only identified the benefits of Nazi rule but explained why what was being offered was beneficial. Weaker answers were highly descriptive of the roles of women and lacked relevant knowledge about industrial workers.

Question 13

Many of the responses to **(a)** identified numerous aspects of the Tsar's rule. In the responses to **(b)** there were many which contained at least two explanations of the state of Russia following Bloody Sunday, and thus gaining full marks. Other responses achieved good marks by explaining specifically the impact of Bloody Sunday, a more narrow view of the question. Where this approach was taken, description of the events of Bloody Sunday was often unnecessarily long. Many responses to **(c)** showed an ability to construct explanations on both sides of the argument, although evaluation and analysis was not always seen. Less successful answers were characterised by a tendency to generalised comment and were less well supported by explanation. The weakest answers occurred where candidates neglected to address the question as set, providing much of their answer from after 1914.

Question 14

In **(a)** much use was made of the slogans associated with Lenin to answer the question. Better answers mentioned his charismatic leadership and the growing strength of the Bolsheviks. The best answers to **(b)** provided at least two explained reasons. Often these related to the failure to end the war and the land issue. Some answers, in producing more than two explanations, mentioned food shortages, with the best answers explaining the issue of the Provisional Government existing alongside the Petrograd Soviet. Weaker responses lacked understanding and strength of explanation, being characterised by the identification and description of the main issues. In **(c)**, the significance of War Communism was well known by many candidates who were able to explain the advantages it gave to the Bolsheviks. Other important reasons were also well known, particularly the weaknesses of the Whites. In the best answers, the strength of explanation and evaluation resulted in a balanced, occasionally sophisticated argument. Weaker answers showed a high level of knowledge of the factual detail but needed to develop this into explanation.

Question 15

In answering **(a)** many candidates successfully used the concept of speculation to explain how shares were bought on the American stock exchange. Some responses to **(b)** were excellent, with detailed explanations of why the economy was affected by issues such as bank closures, increasing bankruptcies and high unemployment. Some responses would have benefited from reading the question more carefully – these answers being focused more on why the Wall Street Crash occurred. In these instances answers mainly just identified some of the issues. Many answers to **(c)** were heavily one-sided, being mainly 'Hoover was the do nothing President' when in fact there are a number of measures that could have been explained. Roosevelt's actions were better known and developed into explanation. In some instances the time period covered by the question was missed, with Roosevelt being explained in terms of what he achieved once he was elected. Some candidates were unclear about what constituted arguments for and against the question hypothesis. In this question, Hoover could be present on both sides of the argument.

Question 16

There were responses to **(a)** showing specific factual detail about the National Recovery Administration. In these answers codes of practice, minimum wages and minimum prices were identified as aspects of the role of the Administration. Sometimes answers lacked this specific detail, being more generalised and vague about the role. A number of answers to **(b)** would have been improved by more detailed explanation, as they were limited to the idea that Long was opposed to the New Deal because 'it did not go far enough'. The better responses developed issues relating to wealth, taxation and benefits into explanation, thus showing a good understanding of why the New Deal was opposed by Long. There were answers to **(c)** that showed an ability to construct a balanced argument with some being able to make a valid evaluation and judgement. Success was often seen in terms of the help given to the poor, the unemployed and to the morale of the people. Failure was seen in terms of the inability to remove unemployment and give help to farmers and black Americans. Weaker responses showed a sound knowledge of the topic but needed to demonstrate the difference between description and explanation.

Questions 17 and 18

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

Question 19

In answer to **(a)** there were many knowledgeable examples of the Population Registration Act, particularly with regard to the criteria used to classify race. Weaker answers were often limited to the fact that the act related to apartheid. In response to **(b)** candidates' main understanding of the reasons for the Bantu Education Act was the creation of a permanent underclass of cheap and unskilled labour. Whilst it is assumed that candidates knew that the legislation was another manifestation of the apartheid system, this particular factor was rarely mentioned nor developed in responses. In **(c)** candidates' knowledge of government measures to destroy and deter opposition was good. Some answers needed to go on and explain the relevance of their knowledge in relation to the question.

Question 20

Total Onslaught in **(a)** was identified in relation to Botha's belief that South Africa was under attack from both within and without but in the majority of responses this was linked to the black population and little else. In **(b)** the focus in candidates' responses to the increase in violence in the mid-1980s was on the activities of the ANC. Candidates knew of the ANC's call to make apartheid unworkable and the country ungovernable; some had knowledge of the role of Zimbabwe in providing the ANC with a base from which to attack white rule. In **(c)** candidates were more convincing in their explanations of de Klerk's contribution to the ending of minority rule. Achieving a settlement, despite extremism amongst both the white and black populations, was emphasised. In general, candidates wrote more about de Klerk than Mandela, whose role in seeking reconciliation between different ethnic groups was often identified but not explained.

Questions 21 and 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

General Comments and Key Messages

A majority of candidates were able to use sound knowledge of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. 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.

Parts (b) and (c) require a demonstration of understanding, rather than lengthy description. They also demand explanation. Limited credit is awarded for narrative or 'setting the scene'. Candidates who performed strongly were 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), candidates need to 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'.

There were a small number of rubric errors this year. Where rubric errors occurred this was usually due to candidates not completing the requisite number of questions, rather than attempting too many questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

The following comments do not imply that a question was answered badly. They 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) A number of responses described in detail German actions in Morocco in 1905, emphasising points related to the Kaiser's visit to Tangiers and his speech. Some answers would have benefited from greater focus on the question set, with candidates writing at considerable length about French and British actions which increased European tensions; the question asked specifically about German actions.
- (b) Most candidates were able to give at least one explanation of why Germany started the naval race. Answers usually focused on Germany's desire to challenge Britain's navy. Some candidates also explained that Germany wanted to protect its empire. A few candidates wrote about the arms race generally, rather than focusing on the naval race.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained the part played by the Bosnian Crisis in causing the First World War, detailing Serbia's desire for revenge on Austria, the humiliation of Russia by Germany and Germany's increasing commitment to Austria. Effective answers then explained the part played by the Balkan Wars, emphasising the growing threat Serbia posed to Austria, and Russia's growing determination to support Serbia. Some candidates wrote answers about the causes of the First World War generally and therefore included some irrelevant material.

Question 5

- (a) There were a number of clearly focused answers to this question. Candidates stated that the Treaty of Trianon was with Hungary, and detailed terms such as the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, payment of reparations, reductions in the army and land losses. A number of candidates erroneously stated that the Treaty of Trianon was made with Germany, and then gave details of the Treaty of Versailles.
- (b) Some candidates constructed clear explanations of why there was discussion about the status of Danzig at the Paris Peace Conference, with focus on Poland needing a sea port and the concern that the population of Danzig was mainly German. A number of responses focused on other areas such as the Rhineland and the Ruhr; such answers were not relevant to this question.
- (c) Candidates demonstrated extensive knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and some were able to use this knowledge effectively to explain why the terms of Versailles were surprising. Explanations were focused on it being surprising that reparations were so high, that Germany was left militarily vulnerable and that Germany had to accept the War Guilt Clause. Effective answers then explained that the terms of Treaty of Versailles were not surprising given the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the desire of the Allies to punish Germany. Less effective responses gave lists of the terms of Versailles without explaining why they were or were not surprising.

Question 6

- (a) Answers to this question focused on Hitler gaining the rich coalfields of the Saar, the reintegration of Saar Germans back into Germany, the vote of confidence in Hitler and the return of the Saar being a propaganda success for Hitler. A number of candidates wrote about the remilitarisation of the Rhineland in response to this question.
- (b) Many candidates were able to give one explanation focused on Japan's invasion of Manchuria. A small number of candidates were able to offer a second explanation, focused on Japan and the Anti-Comintern Pact or Japan's increasing militarism. Some candidates focused their answers on the actions of the League of Nations until 1937 but these responses needed make some reference as to why Japan was a threat to world peace by this date.
- (c) There were many well-argued responses to this question, with detailed explanations on both sides of the debate. Explanations in agreement with the hypothesis in the question focused on appeasement putting too much trust in Hitler, allowing Hitler to break international agreements and encouraging Hitler to make ever greater demands. Disagreement with the hypothesis focused mainly on Britain and France not being ready for another war and the belief that the Treaty of Versailles had probably been too harsh on Germany. A number of candidates listed a variety of arguments on both sides; these needed to be developed into explanations of whether or not appeasement was justifiable.

Question 7

- (a) Candidates displayed detailed knowledge of the Bay of Pigs invasion, including points about the number of anti-Castro exiles involved in the invasion, the number of Cuban troops waiting for the invasion, and the outcomes such as the failure of supporting airstrikes and the killing or capture of most of the men in the invasion forces. A very small number of candidates focused their answers on the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis, rather than the Bay of Pigs invasion.
- (b) Effective answers to this question gave explanations focused on the economic losses faced by the USA and the spread of communist ideas so close to the USA. A number of candidates wrote answers focused entirely upon the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis; this question asked specifically about the Cuban Revolution and why it was seen as a threat to the USA.
- (c) There were some well-argued and well-developed responses to this question. Such answers focused clearly on the success and failure of the US policy of containment, and gave carefully constructed comparative explanations relating to Korea and Cuba. A number of candidates gave a clear explanation relating to either Korea or Cuba; this needed to be developed with a comparative explanation of both countries. There were a number of responses that only described events in Korea and/or Cuba; such responses lacked focus on whether or not the US policy of containment was successful.

Question 8

- (a) A small number of responses focused clearly on the response of the western allies to the building of the Berlin Wall, detailing a variety of points such as Kennedy's statement that a wall was better than a war, the outrage expressed in West Germany and the opportunity for the west to use this event for propaganda purposes. A number of candidates wrote about the Berlin Blockade rather than the building of the Berlin Wall.
- (b) Many candidates were able to give one clear explanation of why the Communists built the Berlin Wall; this usually related to the number of highly skilled workers leaving East Germany. A number of candidates were able to give a second explanation, focused on the undermining of communism. Some candidates wrote explanations focused on reasons why the Berlin Blockade occurred; these explanations were not relevant to the question.
- (c) Some candidates gave detailed comparative explanations of Soviet reaction to events in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. These focused primarily on the different Soviet reactions to the leaders of the two countries, and the similarity in Soviet reactions as both countries were invaded. A number of candidates wrote detailed narrative answers of events in Hungary and Czechoslovakia which would have been improved by some focus on the Soviet reaction to those events.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan, stating points such as the planned route of the German attack, the percentage of German troops to be deployed in the attack on France, and the aim of the plan being to avoid fighting a war on two fronts.
- (b) Some candidates explained clearly the reasons why trenches were constructed on the Western Front, with emphasis primarily on the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and on armies needing to recover their strength. A significant number of candidates wrote in some depth about conditions in the trenches, rather than explaining why both sides constructed trenches.
- (c) Some candidates constructed effective answers to this question, explaining both the actions of the French and other factors such as the resistance of the Belgians and the prompt arrival of the BEF. Explanations of other factors tended to be stronger than those explaining the actions of the French. A small number of candidates simply described the Schlieffen Plan, with no real focus on why it failed.

Question 10

- (a) Many candidates were able to specify that the naval blockade of Germany meant that many people died from malnutrition, and that daily rations decreased. Fewer candidates were able to detail the variety of other ways in which the naval blockade had an impact on Germany, such as the lack of nitrates for production of fertilisers and explosives, the lack of fodder for animals, and the diminishing support of the German people for the war effort.
- (b) Some candidates were able to give a clear explanation relating to the view that Turkey was one of Germany's weaker allies. A few candidates developed a second explanation, detailing the British desire to help their ally Russia.
- (c) There were some well-developed responses to this question, with clear explanations of the effectiveness of the Turkish defences on one side of the argument, and other factors such as the use of out of date maps, the severe climactic conditions, and sickness and disease ravaging the British forces on the other side of the argument. Less effective responses gave just one explanation, usually focusing on the spread of disease and sickness only.

Question 11

- (a) Most candidates answering this question were able to give four relevant points of factual detail. Less effective answers missed the dates given in the question, and focused their answers on

Hitler's trial and the later effects of the trial. Candidates need to read the whole question and take note of any dates given when formulating their answers.

- (b) This question asked candidates to explain why Hitler thought the Munich Putsch would be successful. Effective answers argued clearly that Hitler based his belief on the unpopularity of the Weimar government at that time and his confidence that the German people would support him. A number of candidates based their answers on the actual successes and failures of the Munich Putsch, rather than why Hitler thought it would be successful.
- (c) A number of candidates gave well-developed explanations on both sides of the argument. Explanations of the violence of the SA centred primarily on their disruption of opponents' political meetings and the impression of discipline and order they gave to the German people. On the other side of the argument explanations focused on the effects of the Great Depression, the fear of communism and the role of Hindenburg and von Papen. Some candidates only described the violence of the SA, without explaining why this contributed to Hitler becoming Chancellor in 1933. There were a number of candidates who wrote about events after Hitler became Chancellor, most commonly the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act. These two events are relevant to Hitler's consolidation of power, rather than being reasons why he became Chancellor.

Question 12

- (a) Candidates were able to identify the role of the SS in destroying opposition to the Nazis, in implementing Nazi racial policies and in running the concentration camps. A small number of candidates also stated that it was the Death's Head units of the SS who had the responsibility for running the concentration camps. A number of candidates wrote solely about the SA in response to this question.
- (b) Effective answers to this question gave focused explanations of persecution being used to preserve the purity of the Aryan German race, of the belief that some people such as those with disabling conditions and diseases took too much money out of the German economy and yet contributed little, and the belief that Jews were trying to undermine the German state. Other responses described the nature of the persecution, detailing the atrocities in the concentration camps; such answers would have benefited from a focus on explaining why the persecution took place.
- (c) There were many well-developed responses to this question. Candidates explained acceptance of the Nazi regime through an examination of the benefits gained from the Nazi regime, such as jobs. Candidates also explained that the German people accepted the regime because they had no choice and were simply too scared to oppose the regime. On the other side of the argument, explanations focused on the opposition of the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing movement. Some candidates listed reasons for acceptance such as jobs, the Strength through Joy programme and fear, and listed opposition such as the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates; these points needed to be developed into explanations.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates who attempted this question stated that sailors on the 'Potemkin' had killed some officers and that the firing squad had refused to obey orders. Most candidates attempting this question wrote in generalised terms, stating there were problems but giving no specific elaboration on this point.
- (b) Most candidates who answered this question were able to give one clear explanation; this most commonly focused on the need for more food for the cities. There were a variety of different reasons given, such as the need to restore loyalty to the Tsar, the need to modernise farming methods and Stolypin's 'carrot and stick' idea; better responses developed these reasons into explanations.
- (c) A number of candidates were able to construct clear explanations focused on the reliance of the Tsarina on advice from Rasputin on one side of the argument, and on the food shortages and the large number of war casualties on the other side. Some candidates described the involvement of Russia in the First World War, without actually explaining why this led to the abdication of the Tsar.

Question 14

- (a) This question was answered effectively on the whole. Candidates detailed Trotsky's arrogance and aloofness, his lack of respect for other people's opinions, the way in which he offended senior party members, and his belief that he would surely succeed Lenin, meaning that he did not cultivate a wide support base. A few candidates answered the question as if it asked for Stalin's strengths, rather than focusing on Trotsky's weaknesses.
- (b) Some candidates explained clearly that Stalin was only one possible contender for the leadership, and thus it would take time to get rid of any possible rivals before he could become the undisputed leader. Some candidates were able to give a second explanation; where second explanations were given, they were usually focused on Trotsky being viewed as Lenin's natural successor. Some candidates clearly had the factual knowledge to formulate effective answers to this question, but described events rather than explaining why it took until 1929 for Stalin to become the undisputed leader of the USSR.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained in considerable depth the fear of the secret police, the fear of being imprisoned in labour camps, and the effect of the purges. On the other side of the argument, answers detailed the development of the cult of personality through the use of propaganda. Some answers to this question were generalised in nature.

Question 15

- (a) This question was answered well, with clear focus on stating what the Jazz Age was. Points detailed included that the Jazz Age was the name given to 1920s America, that it was the time of the flappers, that it was when jazz music became nationally popular and that it was a time when nightclubs and dance music became increasingly popular.
- (b) Explanations here focused upon the arrival of 'talkie' films, the growth of cinema celebrities, the increase in leisure time and people having more disposable income. A number of candidates described cinema in 1920s America, giving details of the famous film stars and their films; these descriptions needed to be linked explicitly to explanations of why this made cinema increasingly popular.
- (c) Explanations of the Red Scare as an example of intolerance were focused primarily on American attitudes towards eastern European immigrants and on the Sacco and Vanzetti case. On the other side of the argument, clearly constructed explanations were given of the Ku Klux Klan and the Monkey Trial. While there were many effective answers to this question, some candidates wrote lengthy descriptions rather than explaining with focus on the question set.

Question 16

- (a) Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of Roosevelt's actions in helping industry in his first hundred days in office. Points stated by candidates focused on the formation of the PWA, the setting up of the NRA, government money being given to fund the building of public facilities such as schools and hospitals, and actions taken to deal with problems in banking. A few candidates wrote about Roosevelt's actions generally during his first hundred days, rather than focusing on those actions relevant to helping industry.
- (b) Effective answers explained the importance of Roosevelt's radio broadcasts with reference to the need to restore the nation's confidence, Roosevelt's desire to inform the nation about his plans for the future of America, and the opportunity to gain the support of the American people for the New Deal. Some candidates described the content of the radio broadcasts, rather than explaining why they were important.
- (c) This question asked candidates to explain whether the limited success of the New Deal was due to Roosevelt trying to do too much. There were some effective explanations focused on Roosevelt interfering too much in industry, and the over-complicated nature of the New Deal with its multitude of codes and regulations. On the other side of the argument, candidates argued clearly that the New Deal had limited success because Roosevelt did not do enough to help certain groups in

American society, such as black Americans and the very poorest people, and this was why the New Deal had limited success. In some cases, candidates described the details of various alphabet agencies, without explaining the given focus of the question.

Questions 17 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

General Comments and Key Messages

A majority of candidates were able to use sound knowledge of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. 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.

Parts (b) and (c) require a demonstration of understanding, rather than lengthy description. They also demand explanation. Limited credit is awarded for narrative or 'setting the scene'. Candidates who performed strongly were 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), candidates need to 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

Questions 1 to 3

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

Question 4

It was rare to see a poor answer to **part (a)**; most candidates knew the names of the two major alliance systems and, in some cases, the member countries. In **part (b)**, many could identify the attitude of Austria-Hungary towards Serbia but more candidates could have developed their answers into a full explanation of its importance in international affairs. This could have included the dangers of Austria's relationship Germany and the quarrel with Russia over the Balkans. **Part (c)** responses tended to be generalised comments about Britain's treaty to protect Belgium's neutrality and these answers were often unbalanced. Alternative explanations, such as Britain's anger over the naval race or its commitment to France and the Triple Entente, featured in better responses.

Question 5

In **part (a)** many candidates were aware that Turkey was forced to pay reparations and demilitarise. Further specific knowledge would have improved many responses. Answers to **part (b)** were better, responses including Lloyd George's fears of German resentment and his aim to resume trade links; greater development would have improved some answers. The same is true of **part (c)** answers in which Wilson and Clemenceau's attitudes to the terms were correctly identified; these answers would have benefited from the inclusion of explanation. The best responses were able, for example, to say why Wilson was pleased by the creation of the League of Nations or why Clemenceau was dissatisfied with the reparations figure.

Question 6

Responses to **part (a)** demonstrated secure knowledge of Hitler's actions in breaking the Treaty of Versailles, although some answers strayed beyond 1935. Some candidates struggled with **part (b)** because they only included general points about Hitler trying out his new army or Luftwaffe in Spain, when precise details were required. Candidates performed more strongly on **part (c)** and presented a range of arguments about the benefits and disadvantages of appeasement. More candidates could have gone on to thoroughly analyse the 'how far' element of the question.

Question 7

Part (a) answers saw credit awarded for the division of Vietnam along the 17th Parallel, for the fact that Ho Chi Minh's government was recognised in the North, while Diem's government was accepted in the South, and for stating that independence from France had been gained. In **Part (b)** better responses were able to explain the Domino Theory in detail, as well as refer to specific issues such as the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The question posed in **part (c)** allowed candidates to select Cold War incidents across the period and explain the success or failure of containment. Some responses balanced both aspects and explained why, for example, Korea could be regarded as a partial success. These responses achieved good marks.

Question 8

There were a number of confident responses to this question. Oil became the focus of **part (a)** answers which described the involvement of the western powers in the Iran-Iraq war; candidates referred to the west supplying the Iraqi military and the presence of US warships in the Gulf. Candidates knew a great deal about the rule of the Shah (**part (b)**) and why it provoked opposition. The best responses noted the unpopularity of the Shah for his association with western powers and for his wealth, luxury and corruption. Quality answers to **part (c)** predominated; students displayed good knowledge of this topic and were able to apply it effectively. There were many balanced and analytical responses explaining whether Iraq had suffered more than Iran as a result of their war; generally, analysis of Saddam Hussein's regime was the stronger area of the two.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

The best answers to **part (a)** made references to the opposing armies trying to outflank each other, as both sides moved towards the sea. For the British this meant securing Ypres and then the ports of Dunkirk and Calais in order to protect supplies of equipment and reinforcements. Candidates showed good understanding in **part (b)** of the importance of the Battle of Verdun, as a symbol of French pride and linking it to the advancement of the timetable for the Battle of the Somme. **Part (c)**, however, indicated that candidates had less secure knowledge of the changes made to the Schlieffen Plan by the German commanders. Some answers were unbalanced, and focussed on the intervention of the BEF and on the attacks made by the French on the Marne as 'other factors' which caused the failure of the German war plan.

Question 10

The limited number of responses to this question prevents useful comment.

Question 11

Many detailed answers to **part (a)** were seen, and candidates were able to identify a range of reasons for the lack of Nazi Party success before 1930 in **part (b)**. These usually focussed on the apparent prosperity of the Weimar Republic after 1924; some responses would have benefited from fuller explanation. It was important to link Weimar's recovery with the lack of appeal of extremism, and show why one led to the other. Lack of precise knowledge about the relevance of the election of 5 March 1933 in **part (c)** meant that some answers were unbalanced. They tended to rely on 'other factors' such as the Reichstag Fire and the Night of the Long Knives to explain Hitler's dictatorship. Better responses were aware that The 5 March 1933 election gave the Nazis control over the police, media and state governments, along with the ability to intimidate opponents despite not having outright power in the Reichstag.

Question 12

Part (a) was well done by those who attempted it, with detailed knowledge of Nazi election promises. Many knew that this related to creating a 'Greater Germany', destroying the Treaty of Versailles and remedying the Depression. **Part (b)** knowledge of Nazi youth policies tended to be generalised and drifted into narratives about how the lives of young people changed. More precision was needed to show why it was important to create loyal young Nazis, and why this was going to be of benefit to the regime in terms of impact. For **part (c)** stronger responses were characterised by evidence of planning and organising, a clear line of argument, offering precise explanations of why the Nazis benefited workers on the one hand or made them worse off on the other.

Question 13

Part (a): Some candidates were unsure about the reforms of the Provisional Government of 1917 in Russia. The best answers included the disbanding of the secret police, the granting of personal freedoms and the planning of elections for a Constituent Assembly. It seemed that candidates were more confident in **part (b)** when explaining the unpopularity of the Provisional Government. The best responses linked the demands for 'Peace, Land and Bread' to the unpopularity of the Government. **Part (c)** attracted some good answers, characterised by attempts to balance Bolshevik strengths with the weaknesses of the Whites.

Question 14

This produced some sound answers. Candidates were able to describe the effects of collectivisation in **part (a)**, with detailed narratives about the fate of the Kulaks. The reasons behind the first Five-Year Plans were often correctly identified in **part (b)** but not fully explained. It was important here to link, for example, Stalin's focus on heavy industry with the need for the USSR to protect itself against foreign threats. Some **Part (c)** responses would have benefited from greater detail, attracting generalised information about hardships endured instead of precise reasoning. Good answers balanced the discipline of factory life with social benefits such as education and medicine.

Question 15

In **part (a)** candidates were able to provide some detail about the social and economic benefits of car ownership. **Part (b)** proved more challenging. The best responses related to Republican policies in the 1920s such as a belief in laissez-faire, low taxation and import tariffs. **Part (c)** appeared more straightforward for candidates, with responses about the impact of racial discrimination on the one hand, balanced by the problems faced by poor farmers on the other. Fewer answers successfully evaluated by explaining which was more significant.

Question 16 to 20

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

Question 21

Answers to **part (a)** focussed on the British government's plans for Palestine after 1945. Candidates correctly described that it proposed one state shared by Arabs and Jews, and that Britain would continue to rule it as non-partitioned state with the hope that it would be independent within ten years. Opportunities to score highly in **part (b)** were sometimes missed as answers needed to focus precisely on the reasons why partition was recommended. **Part (c)** produced better responses, including Truman's attitude in favour of partition, assessed against 'other factors' such as Britain's post-World War Two debts and the problems faced by its troops in Palestine.

Question 22

Candidates were secure in their understanding of the Camp David agreement of 1978 (**part (a)**). The best answers to **part (b)** explained Israel's actions towards young Palestinians and why this brought international sympathy (including within the USA) for the PLO cause. Candidates who did well in **part (c)** understood both sides of the argument, explaining not only the opposition to the peace process from Hamas, but also a range of alternative factors. These included the building of Jewish settlements in occupied territories, Israel's refusal to recognise Palestine's right to independence and lack of leadership from both the UN and USA. Balanced approaches of this kind, which went beyond merely identifying factors to fully explaining them, gained good marks.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

General Comments and Key Messages

The main focus of the paper is using historical sources in their historical context. Candidates need to be able to use their contextual knowledge and understanding to interpret, evaluate and use the sources. Contextual knowledge is important but it has a secondary function – to inform candidates' use of the sources. All of the questions are primarily about the sources, as should be candidates' answers. Contextual knowledge should only be included in an answer if it is being used to explain and support a point being made about the sources. It should not be included for its own sake.

The best answers were produced by candidates who used the sources as sources of evidence, rather than as blocks of information. A source includes its content and its provenance, for example who wrote/drew/published it, when and under what circumstances. The role of the person or organisation responsible for the source should be used to consider the purpose of the source. Better responses took this into account, using sources as sources of evidence, rather than just as information. Adopting this approach meant that when asked to assess the usefulness of a source, these responses were able to consider its context, message and purpose, rather than just what it said.

All of the cartoons that are used in these papers are political cartoons, with a political point to make. In other words, the cartoonist has a point of view. When candidates are asked to interpret cartoons, it is important that they try and focus on the point of view of the cartoonist. For example, the cartoonist of Sources E and F disapproves of the actions of the Soviet Union. It is possible to interpret these cartoons reasonably well without getting to the point of view, for example the satellites in Source E are attracted by the Marshall Plan but Molotov is not going to let them benefit from it. However, better answers were the ones in which candidates were able to explain clearly the point of view of the cartoonist.

It is important that candidates understand that **Question 6** is about the sources. Candidates need to explain whether the sources support the hypothesis given in the question. Better responses tended to examine individual sources separately. Trying to write about sources in groups sometimes led to vague assertions and little being said about individual sources. The best answers were those that used the content of a source to explain how it supported or disagreed with the hypothesis. Candidates should avoid writing a general essay about the topic that makes little or no specific use of individual sources.

Candidates need to deploy their source skills to answer the actual questions set. The best answers were often those that directly addressed the question in the opening sentence. Thus a question that asks candidates to explain whether or not they are surprised by a source should state in the first sentence whether they are or are not surprised and then begin to explain why. Alternatively, a question that asks candidates to explain why a source was published at a certain time should begin with 'This source was published in March 1946 because'. This approach does require a certain amount of thinking through and planning the answer before writing it down. In other words, it is important that candidates know what the answer is going to be before they start writing it. Those candidates who appeared to rush into their answers before knowing what they were going to write often produced weaker answers. These answers sometimes included lengthy summaries of sources or detailed descriptions of the historical context, while often neglecting to directly address the question.

However, many candidates were able to interpret, analyse and evaluate the sources in valid and interesting ways. The majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option but a significant number attempted the nineteenth century questions. Nearly all candidates appeared to find the sources and questions in both options accessible and there was a wide range of interesting answers. Most candidates answered all six questions, although on Option B some did not attempt **Question 5** and a small number of candidates wrote such lengthy answers to the earlier questions that they appeared not to have left enough

time to attempt **Questions 5** and **6** properly. Some candidates attempted **Question 6** first. This is not a good idea because the understanding of the sources acquired while answering **Questions 1–5** is very useful when attempting **Question 6**. However, when answering the earlier questions, it helps if candidates are familiar with **Question 6**. This will allow them to make brief preparatory notes about which sources agree, and which disagree, with the hypothesis in **Question 6**.

Comments on Specific Questions

19th Century Option

Question 1

To perform well on this question, it was necessary to compare the two sources point by point, for example they both say that Queen Isabella lost the throne and that the French blundered, while they disagree over the date that Leopold's acceptance reached Paris. The best answers looked at the sources as a whole and were able to compare the big messages of the two sources about responsibility for the Franco-Prussian War – Source A is arguing that Bismarck did not plan it and that the French blundered into it, while Source B claims that Bismarck did plan the war but the French also blundered into it. Some candidates summarised both sources and made assertions about agreements and disagreements but neglected to clearly identify them.

Question 2

Candidates struggled to get as far as purpose in context for this question. A good number of candidates managed to interpret valid sub-messages of the cartoon, for example about the relationship between Prussia and France. The best answers showed an understanding that the cartoonist is criticising Bismarck. However, the question is about purpose and to reach the top levels, candidates needed to go on and explain the intended impact on the audience.

Question 3

When examining cartoons it is important that candidates consider the point of view of the cartoonists. These two cartoonists have something to say about who was to blame for the outbreak of war between France and Germany. Source D blames both France and Germany, while Source E blames just Germany. Many candidates managed to suggest valid interpretations of the cartoons, for example in Source D France and Germany are ready to go to war, but they did not get as far as the issue of blame and the view of the cartoonists. Weaker answers simply compared the provenance of the sources.

Question 4

Many candidates answered this question on the basis of whether the two sources agree. There are both agreements and disagreements. They both suggest that Bismarck thought that a war with France was inevitable. However, Source F suggests that France was the aggressor and that Bismarck was not particularly keen on war, while Source G suggests that Bismarck did want war. Better answers went further and used the provenance of the sources to evaluate them, for example Source G comes from Bismarck's memoirs where he was trying to create the myth that he had planned German unification from the beginning.

Question 5

This question produced a range of answers. Some candidates based their answers on everyday empathy, for example it is surprising that France was willing to allow Germany to unite, grow strong and thus pose a threat to France. Better answers cross-referenced to other sources to find reasons for being surprised or not surprised by France's reaction in Source H. The best answers made appropriate use of contextual knowledge of relations between France and Germany and the international situation at this time. Some candidates analysed the sources well but did not state whether they were surprised. It is always best to engage with the question in the opening sentence of an answer. The most successful answers immediately stated whether they were surprised or not and then explained why.

Question 6

To perform well on this question candidates needed to explain how some sources supported the statement that Bismarck was responsible for the Franco-Prussian War, while others disagreed with it. Some candidates managed to do this but others only supported one side of the debate, thus limiting the credit they could receive. It is important that there is some explanation of how a source supports or disagrees with the statement, for example, 'Source D does not support this statement. It shows that France was just as keen on war as Germany, with the French telling Britain to let them get on with the war.' Explanations such as this are always stronger than unsupported assertions about sources.

20th Century Option

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. Nearly all candidates were able to explain agreements between Sources A and B, for example the USSR was worried about security, Germany was a problem, the USA did not want Germany to become communist and the USSR wanted Germany to remain weak. A good number of candidates also explained valid ways in which the sources disagreed, for example Source A says the Cold War was inevitable, while Source B says it was not, and Source A claims the Soviets controlled countries in Eastern Europe, while Source B states that they controlled their own internal affairs. The best answers were from candidates who read the sources as a whole and compared their big messages – in A Stalin was to blame for the Cold War, while in B it was the West (or the USA).

A small number of candidates wrote about the two sources separately. This nearly always makes it difficult to make proper comparisons. This type of question should be answered by matching points - by finding something one source says and then stating what the other source says about the same thing.

Question 2

This is a purpose question which requires candidates to explain both the historical context and the purpose of the source. The best answers explained the context of Churchill's speech, as well as the message and purpose of the cartoon. Most candidates were able to explain at least the general context of the Cold War and many knew about Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' speech in Fulton, Missouri in March 1946 (the same date as the cartoon). A reasonable number were able to go further and explain how the cartoon shows disapproval of Churchill. Better answers referred to the fact that Hitler is shown as Churchill's 'Predecessor' and explained that the cartoonist was claiming that Churchill was as much a threat to the Soviet people as the Nazis had been. The best answers focused on the purpose of the cartoon. This involves using the fact that the cartoon was produced in a Soviet magazine and was aimed at an audience in Russia to, for example, justify Soviet actions in Eastern Europe to the Russian people.

Some candidates wrote about the context or analysed the message and purpose of the cartoon but neglected to use any of this as a reason for the publication of the cartoon in 1946. These candidates could have avoided this by beginning their answers by directly addressing the question, for example, 'This source was published in March 1946 because'.

Question 3

This question produced a wide range of answers. Source D is a speech by Wallace arguing for a friendlier and more co-operative policy towards the Soviet Union. He also claims that Truman agreed that his government was not 'anti-Russian'. The candidates were also told that Wallace was sacked by Truman and stood against him in the Presidential election (they were not expected to know any more about Wallace than what they had been told). All of this gave candidates plenty to be surprised or not surprised about. Good answers focused on the various claims being made by Wallace and used their knowledge of the political context, and of Truman and his policies, to explain why they were, or were not, surprised. The best answers added to this by making use of the fact that Wallace was a member of Truman's government or his sacking or the fact that he stood in the Presidential election against Truman. Less strong answers tended to write in a general way about the Cold War without focusing on Truman's policies.

Question 4

Political cartoons reflect the point of view of the cartoonists. Both Sources E and F display disapproval with Soviet actions. Candidates who explained that this disapproval was the main thing these two cartoons have in common, performed well. Less successful answers compared the provenance or the sub-messages of the cartoons, for example the Soviet Union wants to control Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union was worried by, or opposed to, the Marshall Plan. Weaker answers were those where each cartoon was analysed separately with no, or only a very weak, comparison being attempted.

Question 5

This questions asked candidates to assess how useful Source G is as a source of evidence about the Cold War. It was essential to focus on 'usefulness'. The candidates who did this produced a range of interesting answers. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that although the broadcast by Moscow Radio is obviously biased, it is useful to historians because it shows how the Soviets wanted others to see the situation. Less successful responses tended to accept the Soviet account uncritically as a truthful account of life in Eastern Europe. In the middle were candidates who realised the broadcast was propaganda and could not be trusted. On the basis of this they rejected the source. Candidates should always try to suggest ways in which sources could be useful rather than rejecting them as having no use.

Question 6

Many candidates performed strongly on this question by carefully explaining how some sources support, and others disagree, with the statement that the USSR was to blame for growing tensions after the Second World War. Other candidates struggled in various ways. Some candidates ignored the sources and wrote essays about the causes of the Cold War. Others identified which sources supported and/or disagreed with the statement but would have improved their answers by explaining how they did this. Others only used sources that said something about the USSR's role and appeared to regard sources that placed the blame elsewhere, for example Source C, as irrelevant. Better responses used the sources and provided clear explanations of how sources supported or opposed the statement, for example, 'Source F clearly supports the statement because it claims that Stalin is plotting to enforce Soviet control in countries such as Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary and even France. This would obviously upset the USA and increase tensions between it and the USSR.'

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

General Comments and Key Messages

The most important key message is that candidates should always attempt to answer the particular question that is asked. If a question asks why a source was published, then the answer must contain a reason. If a question asks 'How similar?' then the answer must contain comparisons. Candidates can help to ensure that answers are focused and relevant by starting with the command words used in the question – 'This source is useful because', 'This source was published because', and 'Source A is similar to Source B because', for example.

Another key message is that **Question 6** is very important; it carries more marks than any other question, and answering it effectively is essential to performing well on the paper overall. A number of candidates answered without reference to the sources; in effect, they wrote an essay about the given hypothesis, rather than using the sources as evidence to test it. The question asks how far the sources can be used as evidence – the question is about the sources, rather than about the events comprised within the hypothesis.

There were many strong scripts that showed excellent comprehension of the sources, knowledge of the context, and highly developed skills of interpretation and evaluation. The best candidates demonstrated effective knowledge and understanding, but there seems to have been real development in the sophistication of source analysis offered by these candidates. The scripts of weaker candidates did not show the same level of insight, but nonetheless they generally consisted of positive responses to questions which had been properly understood. It remains a rarity to see a script where answers indicate lack of comprehension of questions or sources, though, as mentioned above, issues of how best to go about answering the questions still affect the responses of some candidates.

Comments on Specific Questions

19th Century Option

The number of candidates choosing this option was small, and the quality of answers was weaker than on the 20th century option. Many candidates obviously possessed a good level of knowledge about Bismarck, but sometimes seemed more concerned with demonstrating this knowledge than with answering the questions as set. Preconceptions about Bismarck sometimes influenced readings of the sources, so that some answers appeared to be based on what candidates expected the sources to say, rather than on what they actually said.

Question 1

In comparison questions such as this, sources will contain points of detail that will be the same, and other details that contradict. Finding examples of both agreements and disagreements is the mark of a good answer, but the best answers will also perceive something in the overall messages of the two sources that can be matched or mismatched. So, for example, the two sources agreed that there was a meeting of the Prussian Crown Council in February 1866 – a point of detail. But Source A gave the impression about Bismarck that he planned everything from the start, whereas Source B suggests that he merely took opportunities as they arose – a difference in the authors' overall opinions about Bismarck's approach. Most candidates could find details to match, but many would have been improved by perceiving the higher-level difference. A factor that led to some confusion was that both sources dealt with the issue of if and when Bismarck wanted war. It was important to compare like with like on this. Source B says that in the summer of 1865 Bismarck did not want war. Whilst Source A agrees that Bismarck was indeed trying to avoid war at that time, the idea that both sources indicate that Bismarck wanted to avoid war at any time is not a genuine agreement.

Question 2

When asked about the utility of a source as evidence, some candidates tended to conclude that the source was useful as information. They accepted what it said at face value, or alternatively they found it 'not useful' on the basis that there is some information about the given topic (here, Bismarck) that the source does not tell you. This is a valid way of responding, but it overlooks important considerations. First, there are things you can tell from a source, even though it does not state them – these are inferences. So Source C stated that in 1862 Bismarck said that he would take the first opportunity to declare war on Austria – this is information. But it also indicates to us that Bismarck was a planner rather than just an opportunist – this is an inference, and a good number of answers spotted it. Another consideration should be the reliability of what the source says. At a basic level the provenance on its own might suggest that the information should be treated with caution. Candidates noted that the source was not even published until 1886, and was a second-hand report of what Bismarck had said to someone other than the author. At a proper evaluation level, one might have doubted whether it was likely that Bismarck would have revealed plans for war, and for German unification, to a foreign politician, when, had these plans been real, it would have been much better to keep them secret.

Question 3

Some candidates found it hard to compare the content of the two sources in such a way as to cast light on the issue of whether or not Bismarck was being deceptive in Source D. The basic contrast between the two sources was that in Source D Bismarck suggests that Austria and Prussia should work together, whilst in Source E he plans war against Austria. A number of candidates spotted this and took it as proof that Bismarck was indeed lying in Source D. Others, though, appeared confused by the context, or by the subtleties of what Bismarck was saying, particularly in Source D.

Question 4

Almost all valid responses to this question provided a reason based on context, and this was usually the Austro-Prussian War. Many answers described what was going on in the cartoon, but without perceiving any message that the cartoonist might have had, for example, about Prussian power in Germany. The French provenance of the source passed unnoticed, though this would have provided clues about the cartoonist's purposes in drawing the cartoon, and clues to reasons for its publication based on purpose.

Question 5

The key to answering this question was to spot what might have been regarded as surprising – that a Prussian Liberal was speaking in favour of Bismarck. Although some candidates achieved this, a greater understanding of the context would have enabled more of them to spot this. Some provided assertions about what the source said which lacked development – generally a variation of the idea that it was very surprising to find Germans not liking Bismarck when you think of how successful he was. Another possible route to judging the issue of surprise would have been to compare the source content with what other sources showed, and a few responses did adopt this approach.

Question 6

Although strong responses were seen, others neglected to use the sources, and were mainly essays about the hypothesis. Most managed to use a few sources, sometimes on both sides of the hypothesis, although preconceptions about Bismarck also played a part. Some candidates started with an assumption – usually that he wanted unification from the start – and then found sources to match. The difficulties which had arisen in using the sources on other questions, for example in comparing the content of Sources A and B in **Question 1**, affected how those sources were used in this question too.

20th Century Option

This option attracted the majority of candidates, and produced a full spread of quality of answers. Scripts were characterised by a sound grasp of the context, and, amongst stronger candidates, by an impressive level of ability in the evaluation of written sources. A relative weakness was in the interpretation of pictorial sources. For example, in **Question 3**, a number of candidates struggled to give valid explanations of what the cartoonists were depicting.

Question 1

The two sources contained numerous points of similarity/agreement, and very few candidates were unable to spot at least a few of these. There were fewer disagreements, and some missed them altogether, even though there were some straightforward ones, such as the contradiction over the dates on which the new currency was announced. Care was needed on matching for disagreement as there were issues on which it was important to take the source as a whole, rather than relying on a single aspect of it. For example, some suggested that Source A said the USA wanted a united Germany (Byrnes said he wanted it), but a divided Germany in Source B. However, this is attempting to match US policy at different times, and taking the sources as a whole there can be no doubt that eventually the US wanted a divided Germany. There were similar problematic attempts on the issue of who breached Potsdam agreements – answers claiming that it was the US in Source A but the USSR in Source B founded on the fact that Source B also states that the US broke them. The best answers looked beyond the matching of source details to consider the sources as a whole, and compared the opinions of the two authors on the issue of who was to blame for the breakdown of relations. This was clear in Source B where it blamed Stalin's errors, but was slightly less obvious in Source A, though many candidates were able to recognise that it held the Allies responsible.

Question 2

For successful answers to questions that ask about surprise in this way, candidates need to identify exactly what it is that they regard as surprising (or not), and to explain why it is surprising (or not). Additionally, where two sources are involved, the question will want candidates to judge the extent of their surprise on only one of the sources, whilst the other is to be used as part of the explanation of whether they are surprised or not. This question asked about whether Source D was surprising; it was not advisable to base an answer on whether Source C was surprising. For most candidates, Source D was surprising because it seemed to contradict what Source C said. This was usually that Source C indicated that the US would stay in Berlin, but Source D indicated they should withdraw. This was fine, but better candidates looked for ways in which this basic comparison could be further developed. The next move was to question whether the contradiction really was surprising, given the provenance of the two sources. There was more than two months' difference in the dates of publication, spanning the implementation of the Blockade and the start of the Airlift. Many argued that circumstances might have changed in that time, and that this explained the differences between the sources. Others used contextual knowledge to judge whether the difference was surprising.

Question 3

The first challenge in this question was to interpret the two sources. Whilst many could do this, others stumbled on one or both of the cartoons, suggesting, for example, that Source E was about the pre-war situation and showed the Allies working to appease Hitler, or that Source F showed that Stalin was trying to defuse a nuclear bomb that the Allies had dropped on Berlin. Once one of the cartoons was misinterpreted, meaningful comparisons became impossible. However, given that both cartoons were understood, there still remained the challenge of comparing them. These comparisons fell into two categories: sub-messages, and cartoonists' opinions. In the first category, candidates noted, for example, that the cartoons agreed that tensions between East and West were high, or that Germany was still a focus for disagreement; some of these comparisons would have been improved by engaging with the opinions of the cartoonists about the events. The second category could itself be sub-divided. There were candidates who could see that the cartoonists were critical of different people, but their answers were not quite as developed as those that applied this insight to the situation in Germany. The best answers, then, pointed out that the cartoonists were blaming different people for the crisis over Germany/Berlin.

Question 4

The general level of answers on this question was impressive. There were those who would have benefited from some level of engagement with utility - most of these candidates answered on reliability instead. Whilst reliability can be a factor in judging utility, the focus of the answer must remain on how the source can be used as evidence. Although many candidates agreed that the source was useful because of the information it provided (i.e. at face value), this was very often modified to indicate that what was really valuable was that the source gave the Soviet point of view about events – an important perception, even if the source was still believed. There were also many who rejected the utility of the source on very similar grounds – that it was untrustworthy because it was the Soviet view. Properly developed through analysis of Sokolovsky's probable purpose or by cross-reference to check the accuracy of the source, rather than relying merely on its provenance, these answers made a lot of sense. Nonetheless, they still needed to consider how the source might be useful, even though it was unreliable. The best answers, and there were a good number of them,

understood that the real value of the source was as evidence of what the Soviets wanted people to believe about the crisis.

Question 5

This question, too, concerned interpretation of a cartoon, and although almost all candidates understood that it was about the Berlin Blockade, illustrating Soviet attempts to thwart the Airlift, the real messages of the cartoon eluded some. It did not, for example, show that the Soviets were succeeding, or indeed could succeed. This did not, though, prevent candidates from giving valid reasons for publication based on context – that it was published because of the Berlin crisis. But miscomprehension would close off answers based on message; that is, on what the cartoonist wanted to get across to the audience about the Blockade. Here it would be necessary to understand that the cartoonist was showing its lack of success. The best understanding of message was to see that the cartoonist was saying that no matter what the Soviets tried, they would fail to stop the Airlift. The strongest answers perceived a purpose behind the message – a reason for publication based on an impact that the cartoonist sought to have on the audience, such as boosting morale, or raising support for the Airlift.

Question 6

Although the great majority of candidates answered this question effectively, an increase in the number of candidates answering without any reference to the sources was noticeable. Not using the sources limits the credit available for answers, since the question asks about the sources as evidence to test the given hypothesis. Some candidates did not focus arguments on the hypothesis as given, but instead appeared to be answering on an alternative hypothesis. The hypothesis was not on who was to blame for the crisis over Germany/Berlin, but rather on whether Soviet actions were justified. These two notions are closely related, but they are not the same, and in particular they would require the sources to be used in slightly different ways. Indeed, the matter of how the sources are used is central to answering **Question 6** effectively. Candidates need to identify elements of the content of the source that either support or question the hypothesis. There is no particular need to quote, but the essential skill is in demonstrating exactly how the source relates to the hypothesis. In these questions, there will be opportunities within the given sources both to support and to question the hypothesis, so candidates should never be content to explore one side only.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

General Comments and Key Questions

Most candidates responded well to the demands of the paper. The majority of candidates answered the questions on the twentieth-century option. The understanding of the context of the sources was good and there was considerable evidence of background knowledge being used appropriately to help answer the questions being asked. Candidates were better at interpreting and comparing sources, rather than evaluating them. Those who attempted to evaluate the sources with generalisations about source type limited the credit they could receive by adopting this approach. Candidates need to go beyond accepting or rejecting sources at face value, or at the level of undeveloped provenance.

Most candidates responded well to the precise details in the questions. For example, on **Question 3** in the 20th century option, the issue of surprise was addressed by many in their opening sentence. This is a strategy that generally works well. Some candidates, however, did not address the question as set. For instance, on **Question 2** in the 20th century option, some responses gave a perfectly valid interpretation of the cartoon, but at no point made any reference to the issue of utility. Answers that contain good analyses of the sources, but which do not actually answer the particular question set and reach a conclusion, do not achieve the highest marks available.

While many candidates did very well in response to **Question 6**, there were still some whose answers could have been improved by using the sources as the basis of their answer. Similarly, those who grouped the sources together and made general comments about the statement would have benefited from some engagement with the content of each source. Candidates need to use the sources to both support and disagree with the given statement. The sources provided will enable them to do both and consequently write a balanced answer.

Comments on Specific Questions

19th Century Option

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

20th Century Option

Question 1

There was a wide range of answers to this question which asked candidates to compare two sources and assess the level of agreement between them. The best responses identified points of agreement and disagreement and illustrated these with content from both sources. Weaker answers summarised the sources without making specific comparisons. The agreements were easier to spot than the disagreements and many candidates were able to explain the former well. For example, many responses explained that both sources agree that the Marshall Plan would benefit the US and/or that Stalin rejected the Plan. One point of disagreement centred on why the Soviets did not accept the Plan. In A, the Plan is anti-Soviet and the American government clearly does not want the Russians involved and therefore gives them little choice but to refuse it. In B, the emphasis is placed on Stalin and it is his suspicions about American motives that lead to his rejection of the Plan. Candidates need to explain points of disagreement, rather than simply describe differences between the sources, in other words disagreements must be about the same thing. Candidates who compared the overall 'big messages' of the sources - that is that in A the Marshall Plan was for the benefit of the US, while in B it benefitted Europe most or was for the benefit of both Europe and the US, performed very well.

Question 2

With the exception of candidates who did not address the issue of utility at any point during their responses and consequently could not achieve high marks, this question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge and understanding to interpret the cartoon and argue that its sub-messages, or overall big message - that the Marshall Plan was a device to exploit Europe, render it useful. Many responses were developed further still, and commented on the fact that the cartoon was published in Eastern Europe. This information was then used as the basis of a contextual evaluation that led to either a rejection of the source due to its bias or use as a propaganda tool, or an acceptance of the evidence as a clear example of the Communist view of the Marshall Plan. Both arguments were equally valid. The very best answers drew on contextual knowledge and recognised that the source is useful evidence, not just of the Soviet viewpoint, but also of Soviet actions at that time. In other words, the cartoon is useful because of its purpose; it shows us that the Soviets were trying to persuade people in Eastern Europe that the Marshall Plan was for the US good only and that therefore they should reject it.

Question 3

Candidates were asked to consider two conflicting written sources and conclude whether the content of one made them surprised by the other. Here, the evaluation of the sources could have been better. Many responses recognised that the provenance of the two sources was a crucial element in the answer, but some answers would have benefited from going further than stating that one being Soviet and the other American, or written by Truman, had led to their lack of surprise. Those candidates that were able to make a developed use of the provenance provided very strong responses. Candidates at this level used the purpose of each source in the context of the time as the basis of their reasoning for not being surprised.

While most candidates clearly stated whether or not one source made the other surprising, a small number were unable to address this vital element of the question and consequently limited the marks they could achieve. It is often a helpful strategy to begin an answer by using the key words from the question in order to help avoid an omission of this kind.

Question 4

In this question candidates were required to compare the messages of two cartoons. Consequently, candidates who compared surface details or undeveloped provenance only struggled to write strong responses. Very few candidates neglected to address the question, and clear attempts at comparisons were made in all but a few responses. Both cartoons share a similar message – that the Marshall Plan was good for Europe. Many candidates were able to interpret both cartoons in this way, and thereby provide a very good answer. The best responses were achieved by candidates who recognised that there were also differences in the cartoons. For example, in one there is opposition to the Marshall Plan in the US, and in the other, the cartoonist is critical of Stalin for having refused the Plan.

Question 5

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 tended to include information about the Cold War in general terms. Better answers at this level centred on more precise details about the Marshall Plan and some even focused on the significance of events in Greece and Turkey. What was common in all the context only answers was that they did not engage with the words of Vyshinsky's speech, nor consider his purpose in making it. Many candidates however, were able to go on to develop their answer, interpreting the big message of the speech; that Vyshinsky was critical of the Marshall Plan because it would bring about US control, divide Europe and/or make Europe capitalist. A smaller number then were able to use their contextual knowledge and understanding to interpret the cartoon and work out the purpose of Vyshinsky's words; he was aiming to turn opinion against the Marshall Plan.

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 Marshall Plan was designed to benefit the US, while others say the benefit lay elsewhere, most often in Europe. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Some candidates would have improved their responses by making it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. Candidates should avoid grouping the sources together and making assertions about them as a group; this rarely works well and results in fewer marks being awarded. Answers need not include a summary of the source, nor should they involve generalisations about source type. Many candidates would benefit if they were to include genuine evaluation based on the source content, rather than simple statements involving undeveloped provenance.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

This year was the first year that coursework based on the new regulations was assessed. The focus has to be on assessing significance. The majority of Centres set suitable questions which enabled many candidates to produce sophisticated assessments of significance, with little time lost on description or narrative. The best answers focused on supporting judgements about significance in every paragraph. In many of the strong responses seen, candidates assessed significance from different perspectives and used a range of criteria. They also showed an understanding that individuals can be significant through their failures as well as their successes, and made good use of ideas such as long-term and short-term, 'turning point' and 'false dawn'.

Comments on Specific Questions

Most Centres set appropriate titles. Titles that guided candidates to assess significance in terms of a single outcome worked least well. Title such as 'Assess the significance of x as a factor in y 's rise to power' or 'How far were misjudgements by x the most significant cause of the downfall of x ?' led candidates into writing causation answers, with the focus on a range of possible causes of the named outcome, rather than on assessing the significance of the chosen person or development. Too much of the material in these answers was taken up with analysis of the other causal factors. In addition, titles such as these narrowed the scope of answers. Better assessments of significance used a variety of perspectives for example long term, short term, political, economic and so on. When titles named the outcome candidates were left with little scope to consider significance in a variety of different ways.

The other type of title which worked less well was that which asked candidates to explain the significance of a factor, for example 'Explain the significance of x '. The problem with this type of title is that it required candidates to explain significance instead of assessing it. The key is to make an assessment of significance and the title needs to encourage this. A wording such as 'Assess the significance of (or 'How significant was') x ' will provide candidates with a clearer prompt to what they have to do. A title such as 'How significant was the Versailles settlement in shaping the history of the Weimar Republic?' would be more effective as 'How significant was the Versailles settlement for Germany?' This is more open and provides candidates with much more scope. It is a good idea to include 'significant' or 'significance' in the title. This will help to focus the candidate's attention on the concept. However, there are exceptions, for example 'How far was the New Deal a turning point in US history up to 1941?' worked very well. Other titles that worked well included:

How significant was the Gallipoli campaign?

Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany in the period 1929–1939.

How significant was the Night of the Long Knives?

Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch.

All of these titles are open, provide candidates with much scope to use a range of criteria, investigate significance in a variety of ways and to take their answers in different directions. More advice on the setting of coursework questions, and on the concept of significance, can be found in the *Teachers' Coursework Handbook*.

Most of the coursework was carefully marked with the generic mark scheme being used accurately and appropriately. Much of the work was annotated in detail and moderators found both the detailed on-going

marginal comments and the summative judgements very helpful. Most of these were focused on the concept of significance and on the mark scheme. There was much accurate use of the mark scheme. However, it was not unusual for small adjustments to be applied. For exceptional work, moderators would expect to find every paragraph focusing on assessment of significance with complex and sophisticated judgements being formed using a range of perspectives. This was not always the case and moderators did make adjustments to marks in this part of the mark range.

Nearly all candidates kept to the 2000 word limit and attempted to focus on assessment of significance. The best answers began by summarising their conclusions about significance and then set about justifying them. These responses also made clear the different criteria or the different perspectives that would be used to assess significance. The weakest answers started with lengthy descriptions of the background and some gave mini-biographies of individuals. They then described the event or the actions of an individual, rather than focussing on significance. Many of these candidates would have benefited from a greater understanding that explicit assessment of significance is required. Another feature of less successful answers was the tendency to attempt to assess the significance of an individual or event by trying to compare it with other individuals or events. This tended to take the focus of the answer away from the named individual or event. Better responses seemed to recognise that it was possible to assess the significance of an event or individual without comparing it with others. Better responses explained significance well but the best answers went further and assessed it. A good way to assess significance is to make use of counter-arguments. The best answers were also able to explain how judgements about significance are provisional and are dependent on the criteria used to reach these judgements. This extra complexity was achieved in different ways. Some candidates asked different questions about the significance of their event, development or individual, while others took into account long and short-term significance. In some answers, use of concepts such as 'turning point' and 'false dawn' proved to be effective. In others, examinations of iconic significance worked very well.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken for the alternative to coursework paper. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45 was the most widely answered followed by Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-41 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41. There were some attempts at Depth Study A and very few candidates chose to attempt Depth Studies E, F or G.

Good responses showed some planning in their work to help the candidate select a wide range of material that was relevant to their answer. This enabled them to produce a balanced, well supported answer. Stronger responses provided well-balanced explanations which directly addressed the question set. The very best answers gave well supported and sustained arguments but more of these could have given supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers either were of a narrative style or did not address the actual question set. Some candidates simply displayed knowledge about a given topic, whether it was relevant to the question or not. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. The other key point for candidates is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a depth and range of detailed knowledge, rather than just an outline, to support arguments. There were some rubric errors, the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in a number of Depth Studies.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918

Most of the small number of candidates that selected this Depth Study answered **Question 1**. Most would have benefited from going beyond giving a brief narrative of the entry in 1917 of the USA into the war. Responses were mainly descriptive, but some examined a number of different aspects such as the sinking of the Lusitania, the importance of the Zimmermann Telegram and the continued impact of the U-boat campaign on US merchant shipping. A few candidates were also able to balance their response by examining the importance of other factors such as the British naval blockade, the surrender of the Russian forces and indeed the late arrival of US forces to the Western Front.

There were too few responses to **Question 2** for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates, with varying levels of quality demonstrated. **Question 3** saw many candidates providing narrative-style responses. Many focused their answer on Hitler's appointment as Chancellor, rather than Hitler becoming dictator, and although his appointment as Chancellor is relevant to this, it led many candidates to give generalised responses. Stronger responses examined the importance of the economic crisis by examining and assessing the impact it had on the rise of extremism due to high unemployment and the growing fear of communist revolution that drove many of the middle-classes and wealthy industrialists to support a Nazi alternative. This was balanced with the assessment of other factors such as the use of Nazi propaganda, the use of terror, the exploitation of the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive ones, often outside of the chronological parameters of the question.

Question 4 was one that candidates tended to struggle with. A number of responses would have been improved by mentioning the Hitler Youth or by giving details of how this organisation was used to indoctrinate young people in Nazi Germany. Some candidates were able to describe the changes to the Nazi School curriculum to good effect. Most candidates gave stronger responses to the significance of other factors enabling Nazi control, such as the use of the SA, the SS and the Gestapo, and some examined the fact that

there were opposition youth groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates, to argue that the control of young people was limited. More candidates needed to explain in greater factual depth to achieve higher level responses.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study. There were some stronger responses for **Question 5**, where candidates analysed the importance of the NEP to the Russian people by explaining how the policy overcame the extremities of the period of War Communism during the Russian Civil War. Typically, the stronger answers examined the temporary reintroduction of small-scale capitalism, the extension of electrification in Russia and the ending of grain requisitioning. This was then balanced by examining the fact that many people saw the creation of Nepmen and the growing wealth of the Kulaks as a betrayal of communist ideals. Less successful responses tended to be generalised descriptions that demonstrated little understanding of what the NEP and War Communism actually were, and so lacked detailed contextual knowledge.

Question 6 saw mixed responses. Some candidates who struggled to understand the meaning of the term 'Cult of Personality' and gave responses which did not link to the question. Some candidates were, however, able to give detailed explanations of many different aspects of the 'Cult of Personality', most commonly the use of propaganda, school indoctrination, portraits, photographs and the renaming of streets, squares and towns after Stalin. Many also included the use of the NVKD in monitoring elements of the media. This was balanced well with explanations about the importance of other methods used by Stalin to establish his rule. The system of gulags, the use of fear and terror, the Great Purges and the use of rewards and medals, as well as the creation of the Five - Year Plans and collectivisation.

Depth Study D: USA 1919-1941

This proved to be a popular Depth Study, with more answers on **Question 7** than **Question 8**. **Question 7** produced some very strong responses in which candidates explained the significance of various aspects of mass production, sometimes in excellent detail and beyond just the obvious aspect of the motor industry. This was then balanced well with explanations of other factors that led to prosperity, such as the USA's abundant natural resources, Republican policies, buying 'on the margin', hire-purchase, advertising and speculation. A few of the strongest responses also challenged the fact that the prosperity was 'real' by examining the different groups such as farmers, Black Americans and Native Americans, who did not share in the economic boom of the 1920s.

Question 8 was attempted by fewer candidates and was generally less strong in terms of quality. More candidates needed to mention in detail the work of the AAA, RA and FSA, and some were not able to then balance their response by examining other policies associated with the New Deal and their importance, such as the agencies that dealt with poverty, unemployment, pensions, trade union representation and businesses. Responses were often descriptive and lacking in factual depth.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930-c. 1990

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

Depth Study F: South Africa, c. 1940-c. 1994

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken for the alternative to coursework paper. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45 was the most widely answered followed by Depth Study D: USA, 1919-41 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41. There were a good number of attempts at Depth Study A and very few candidates chose to attempt Depth Studies E, F or G.

Good responses showed some planning in their work to help the candidate select a wide range of material that was relevant to their answer. This enabled them to produce a balanced, well supported answer. Stronger responses provided well-balanced explanations which directly addressed the question set. The very best answers gave well supported and sustained arguments but more of these could have given supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers either were of a narrative style or did not address the actual question set. Some candidates simply displayed knowledge about a given topic, whether it was relevant to the question or not. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. The other key point for candidates is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a depth and range of detailed knowledge, rather than just an outline, to support arguments. There were some rubric errors, the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in a number of Depth Studies.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918

There were a number of responses to both questions. **Question 1** required candidates to focus on the Gallipoli Campaign of 1915. There were some strong responses where candidates assessed the significance of the campaign in depth and were able to use detailed contextual knowledge to explain the impact it had on the outcome of the First World War, with a particular focus often on the negative consequences. This was then balanced well with other factors that were considered more significant such as the naval blockade of Germany or the failure of the Schlieffen Plan. Weaker responses were often one-sided or lacked sufficient depth of knowledge.

Question 2 was, in general, less well answered. Candidates would have benefited from greater knowledge of the various forms of aircraft during the First World War and some cited incorrect examples about air warfare which were more relevant to the Second World War, rather than the First World War. Stronger responses were able to examine the importance of planes for reconnaissance and the use of Gotha bombers in the German bombing campaign, as well as the impact of Zeppelins and balloons for spotting troop movements and artillery positions. The best answers countered their arguments by examining the importance of other forms of warfare during the First World War such as the War at Sea and the new technological developments used in the trenches such as gas weapons and tanks.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates in near equal numbers, with varying levels of quality demonstrated. **Question 3** was the better answered of the two. Many candidates were able to offer some relevant examples of the use of the SA by the Nazis such as the Munich Putsch, during the Depression and after the events of the Reichstag Fire. The strongest answers were able to balance this with an assessment of the significance of other factors that developed the Nazi Party up to 1934 such as Hitler's significance (Mein Kampf, speeches etc.), the propaganda machine of Goebbels and the weakness of other political parties in Weimar Germany. Less successful answers tended to focus more on the Nazi rise to power, rather than the focus of the question which was the development of the Nazi Party itself.

Question 4 could have been better answered. Some candidates were able to give descriptive answers only about the role of women in Nazi Germany, without focusing on their importance under the Nazis. Valid examples were often cited about Nazi marriage loans, varying employment policies and the awarding of the Mother's Cross (though often factually incorrect) but answers tended to be a narrative about women in Nazi Germany, rather than an explanation of their importance to the Nazis. Stronger responses were able to provide balance and examine other factors that were important under the Nazis such as youth policy, racial policy, propaganda and solving the unemployment problem caused by the Depression.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study but **Question 5** was the most popular choice out of the two. There were some stronger responses to **Question 5** where candidates analysed the importance of Bolshevik agitation in the fall of the Provisional Government. Relevant examples cited included the impact of Lenin's April Theses, the influence of Lenin and Trotsky, Bolshevik policies and their support for 'Peace, Bread, Land', the July Days' demonstrations and their growing influence in the Petrograd Soviet, especially amongst workers and some soldiers. The best answers also assessed the fact that some Bolshevik agitation was counter-productive, particularly the resulting arrests after the July Days, and then examined other factors that led to the downfall of the Provisional Government such as the continuation of the war and its effects on the Russian people, the failure to address the land issue, the impact of Dual Power, Kerensky's failed June Offensive and the Kornilov Affair. Some candidates attempted to reach conclusions about the most important factor but neglected to sustain their argument for a higher level response.

A small number of candidates attempted **Question 6** and the responses were often narratives about collectivisation that contained little contextual knowledge. A few candidates were able to provide balanced responses by examining the significance of other factors that helped modernise the Soviet economy such as the Five-Year Plans and Stalin's policy of Socialism in One Country, but these answers would have been improved by greater development, less description and more focus on addressing significance.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-1941

This was a popular Depth Study, with a roughly equal number of candidates attempting both **Question 7** and **Question 8**. **Question 7** produced a number of weak responses. Knowledge of the KKK was generally lacking and generalised, and only a few responses attempted to balance their answers by examining the significance of other factors during the 1920s. Some candidates did provide stronger responses when they assessed the significance of Prohibition, the Red Scare, religious intolerance or the economic boom, and were able to demonstrate good contextual knowledge and provide relevant explanations. Candidates need to consider the impact of the KKK not just on Black Americans but on other groups - Catholics, immigrants, their support for Prohibition and their significance in local and state governments and law enforcement agencies, as well as the fact that their actions and policies led to the strengthening of the NAACP and Garvey's UNIA.

Question 8 was answered more comprehensively than **Question 7** and strong responses were able to go into detail about the importance of the policies and agencies set up by Roosevelt in his first 'Hundred Days' in 1933. Many candidates were able to explain in some detail the importance of agencies such as the AAA, the CCC, the FERA, the PWA and the TVA, and explain the initial importance of the Emergency Banking Act and the impact of Roosevelt's 'fireside chats'. This was then balanced with explanations of the failures of some of these agencies in dealing with the consequences of the Crash in the long term, and an assessment of the importance of the 'Second New Deal' and the Second World War as more important factors. Some answers would have benefited from more contextual knowledge of the New Deal policies and a better chronological grasp of when the different agencies and policies were set up.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930-c. 1990

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

Depth Study F: South Africa, c. 1940-c. 1994

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43

Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken in this format for the alternative to coursework. Depth Study B: Germany, 1919-45 was the most widely answered, followed by the USA, Russia and the Israelis and Palestinians options. Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 was also attempted by some candidates but few answered on the China and South Africa options.

Good responses showed some planning in their work to help the candidate select a wide range of material that was relevant to their answer. This enabled them to produce a balanced, well supported answer. Stronger responses provided well-balanced explanations which directly addressed the question set. The very best answers gave well supported and sustained arguments but more of these could have given supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers either were of a narrative style or did not address the actual question set. Some candidates simply displayed knowledge about a given topic, whether it was relevant to the question or not. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. The other key point for candidates is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a depth and range of detailed knowledge, rather than just an outline, to support arguments. There were some rubric errors, the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in a number of Depth Studies.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918

A small number of candidates answered on this Depth Study and most of them answered **Question 1**. Candidates would have benefited from going beyond a basic outline of how submarines either attacked ships or sank *The Lusitania*. Given that the key focus was the importance of submarines to the war at sea, relatively few candidates mentioned other aspects of the war at sea such as the Battle of Jutland, the British naval blockade of Germany or the convoy system.

Question 2 could have been better answered, with description of Germany in 1920s being the most common approach, even though this lacked relevance to the question.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-1945

In **Question 3** some candidates wrote an account of Germany up to 1929 without linking to the specific question asked. Stronger answers did try to show how the problems of reparations caused Germany difficulties, for example reparations and the occupation of Ruhr, but many chronicled the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and then neglected to show that other factors were not related to the Treaty such as the Spartacist Uprising, which came before it. A better understanding of chronology would have helped a number of candidates. An opposing argument - that some problems caused by the Treaty were overcome by Stresemann – could also have been used by candidates.

Question 4 responses demonstrated that the majority of candidates had a clear idea of what happened in the Night of the Long Knives. More of them needed to develop its significance in securing Hitler's control, rather than providing largely narrative accounts of events. Stronger responses saw candidates refer to other factors in helping Hitler secure control, although they also tended to be descriptions and struggled to relate to how they secured control for Hitler.

Depth Study C: Russia 1905-1941

Question 5 was slightly more popular than **Question 6**. In **Question 5**, good candidates had a sound understanding of the actions of the Provisional Government that led them to losing support. Stronger

responses linked this to the specific question by comparing it to the Kornilov Affair itself. Some even went as far as looking at Bolshevik actions in general as a contrast to the Kornilov Affair. Less successful responses either struggled to explain significance of Kornilov Affair, had problems with the chronology of events in 1917 or had difficulty with details of the events themselves.

In answers to **Question 6** candidates had an understanding of the purges, and would have benefited from more detailed knowledge to support their arguments. Stronger candidates were able to develop their arguments with factual support; the opposing arguments were less well covered. Stronger answers referred to the Cult of Personality but few went further than this area. The idea of the Russian people being supportive (and therefore under his control more easily) of Stalin through his policy of rewards for outstanding work, for example Stakhanov, were omissions.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-1941

This was a popular Depth Study, with more answers on **Question 7** than **Question 8**. In **Question 7** candidates fell into two distinct categories. Stronger answers showed a good knowledge of the period and a link between discrimination against Black Americans and intolerance. These stronger answers went on to show discrimination against other groups and assess their significance to society. Some went as far as looking at society in general in 1920s America and then assessed the relative importance of each area to the question set. Weaker answers would have been improved by detailed knowledge of the period. Some provided narratives of 1920s America without directly addressing the question set.

The candidates who answered **Question 8** were well versed with closure of the banks by Roosevelt and by his Emergency Banking Act. Other consequences of the Wall Street Crash were either mentioned only briefly or missed out, making it difficult for candidates to give a balanced response to this question. Some candidates focused their answers on the causes of the Crash rather than its consequences.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930-c. 1990

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

Depth Study F: South Africa, c. 1940-c. 1994

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A number of candidates were prepared for this Depth Study. In **Question 13** candidates struggled to go beyond the work of the UN in this period and often could only support their answer with brief knowledge. Some stronger candidates were able to highlight other significant factors for the Palestinians, such as the role of the PLO, in this period. Detailed knowledge of the work of the UN over the whole period would have improved a number of responses.

Question 14 was better answered than **Question 13**, as candidates had reasonable knowledge of the events of 1967 and 1973. Stronger answers were able to show how the Arab world was not united at these times and some were able to contrast it with other factors, including the support of the USA for Israel, as well as Israeli actions themselves. Weaker answers described events not just in 1967 and 1973 but also in 1947 and 1956, which lacked relevance to this question.