

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

General Comments and Key Messages

Candidates who applied their knowledge and understanding to answering the set question performed better than those who focused more generally on the topic. A greater understanding that historical events are interlinked would have benefited some candidates. An awareness of the difference between description / narrative and explanation would also have improved answers. Those candidates who were able to demonstrate the skill of turning a relevant point into an explained response, achieved better marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

Most answers to part (a) recognised that Mazzini founded the ‘Young Italy’ movement, with some stating its purpose of a united Italian republic. Answers lacked detail regarding the control exercised by Austria. Some answers to part (b) recognised the limitations of Mazzini, such as not being well known inside Italy, only appealing to intellectuals and generally a lack of nationalism. The best answers commented on French intervention. Most answers to part (c) made reference to Garibaldi and his ‘thousand’ Red Shirts. Better ones turned this into explanation. Garibaldi’s exploits and other reasons for unification were missing from some responses.

Question 2

There were many strong answers to part (a), with candidates showing a sound knowledge of the Missouri Compromise. The issue over Maine and the Mason-Dixon Line were omitted from the less strong responses to part (b). Some confusion existed between the ‘new compromise’ of 1850 and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill of 1854. More on the acquisition of the Mexican territories would have improved some responses. Candidates needed to develop a more thorough level of knowledge about the causes of the Civil War beyond that of slavery in part (c).

Question 3

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

Question 4

Part (a) demanded the understanding of historical terminology so as to make clear what the Entente Cordiale meant to the two countries involved. As the name suggests it was a ‘friendly agreement’ between countries, not an alliance. Many answers reflected this, often using regions of Africa to exemplify understanding. Others were convinced, incorrectly, that it was a militarily binding agreement. A minority of answers missed the date in the question, indicating that as well as involving Britain and France, it also involved Russia. Many responses to part (b) showed a good understanding of the period 1908-9 with the actions of Austria, the response of the Serbs and the links of these two with Germany and Russia respectively. Once this took place, explanation of the events followed. Those candidates who confused the period of the question with that of 1912-13 found that while the participants were similar, events had moved on, making explanations irrelevant. There were some high quality answers to part (c) where explained reasons why Germany might be accused of starting the war were offset against explanation of other reasons why war broke out. Events increasing tension in the years up to 1914 played an important part in these answers. Less strong answers were still two-sided, focusing more on the more immediate causes of war which often related to the

assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and how this affected other countries. Some answers needed more thorough explanations, rather than relying on basic description.

Question 5

There were many excellent responses to part **(a)**, showing a good understanding of Wilson's motives at Versailles. The 'Fourteen Points' were often the basis of these answers. Some candidates included information about Clemenceau and Lloyd George which lacked relevance. There were many excellent responses to **(b)**, explaining reasons for French harshness. These explanations were clear, concise and focused. Other answers would have benefited from a clear deployment of reason and explanation. These answers were characterised by the identified reason being linked to an inappropriate explanation. Weaker answers concentrated too much on the terms of the Treaty. Others included detail relating to leaders of other countries, which was not required by the question. Good answers to **(c)** showed an understanding of the effectiveness of the Treaty of Versailles on Germany compared to the effectiveness of the other treaties on the countries to which these treaties applied, in the period up to 1923. When referring to other treaties the most well-known were those of St. Germain and Sèvres. Additionally, the Treaty of Trianon featured strongly in some answers. In some instances candidates needed to read the question more carefully. These candidates produced answers which generally related just to the terms. Here 'effectiveness' was needed to be considered.

Question 6

In part **(a)** the duties of the council of the League of Nations were sometimes confused with those of the Assembly, whilst the Refugees Commission did little more than 'deal with refugees', in a number of responses. As with all **(a)** questions, detail is required. Some responses to **(b)** were good, with the impact of the USA not being a member well explained. Some answers gave details of 'why the USA was not a member. This was not an answer to the question. Understanding of the absence of Germany and Russia was also explained. Other answers needed to take note of the question which asked about 'leadership'. These answers focused more on general weaknesses such as the lack of an army, rather than on leadership. In part **(c)** answers were much more informative on the ways that the League was successful, particularly in the 1920s. These aspects were often developed into explanation of 'why successful'. When the lack of success was dealt with, the answers became more descriptive of the events of the 1930s. The best responses featured thoroughly explained, well-balanced arguments.

Question 7

Candidates who performed well on part **(a)** demonstrated good understanding of the demands of the question and the period to which the question related. Words such as 'shock', 'concern', 'surprise', and 'impact' were used to describe US reaction, followed by a sentence about what the reaction was referring to. Here, answers kept to US reaction, particularly in relation to the Bay of Pigs incident. Some answers included comments relating to communism, missiles and threats to America. This was outside the scope of the question and resulted in the same information being used to answer the next part. Here, in **(b)**, answers showed understanding of the significance of a communist base so close to the USA. The development of additional explanations achieved high marks. Part **(c)** brought many good answers containing explained arguments on both sides of the debate. Other answers were stronger in relation to the view that the Soviet Union was humiliated and these responses needed to develop explained arguments about Soviet gains to present a more balanced argument.

Question 8

Many answers to **(a)** contained numerous details of Nagy's proposed changes. Perhaps the most well-known was the wish to leave the Warsaw Pact. A small number of answers erroneously contained detail about Czechoslovakia. For **(b)**, many good responses contained detail to explain the failure of the Prague Spring. Others needed to move from identification of reasons to explained reasons in order to achieve higher marks. In part **(c)**, information about Solidarity was often known in great detail, with lengthy description of events and activities, together with the explanation of strengths. Those gaining higher marks were able to use this information to explain the impact of the Solidarity Movement on the collapse of Soviet control in Eastern Europe. Many answers were good at explaining alternative arguments such as the role of Gorbachev but were one-sided in approach due to the limited explanation about Solidarity.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Many answers to part (a) were excellent, containing detailed knowledge of the Spartacist uprising and how it was dealt with. Some answers were less strong on identifying where the uprisings took place. Most answers to part (b) concentrated on events in 1923 in explaining why the Weimar Republic was in crisis. These answers contained much relevant detail, enabling the development of explanation of at least two reasons and, in the better answers, four or five. Most explanations related to economics and reparations, although the best answers provided more than passing reference to political instability. In answer to (c) there were many excellent detailed arguments relating to both sides of the debate. Others needed to develop the identification of reasons into explanations for high marks. In most answers economic recovery, foreign relations and cultural development were identified. They needed to be explained in terms of their impact in bringing stability, or not, as the case may be.

Question 10

Most answers to (a) indicated some sort of agreement with the Nazis together with, often unnamed, church officials making protests. Other than this, knowledge appeared limited. To try to provide a fuller response, some candidates wrote about Nazi actions. This did not gain credit. The better responses to (b) identified different groups such as Jews, homosexuals and the mentally handicapped, explaining the reasons why each of these was persecuted. Most included reference to the view that Aryans were considered superior. Less strong responses were limited to the identification of minority groups with one explanation for persecution which was often ‘because they were not Aryan’. In (c), many responses provided clear, detailed explanation to both sides of the argument, showing the effectiveness of different methods of control. Less strong answers considered mass media to be the same as propaganda. Others provided too much of ‘how’ methods were used rather than a consideration of their success in controlling the German people.

Question 11

Careful thought was given by many candidates before writing the answer to part (a). Emphasis was put on Trotsky’s mistakes, as required by the question, the most popular being Trotsky’s belief that Stalin would give him the correct date of Lenin’s funeral. Some answers were longer than required. These included Stalin’s qualities, which were not an answer to the question. There were many answers to part (b) where two, three or four explanations developed the benefit of the purges. Others responses neglected to address the question adequately, as they described the purges, rather than explaining their benefits. Many responses to part (c) showed an ability to provide detailed explanation of how Stalin’s rule was a benefit to the Soviet Union. Particularly well-developed was detail relating to the modernisation of industry and agriculture. Less successful were unable to produce a balanced answer, being weak on the explanation as to why Stalin’s rule could be considered a disaster. The points in relation to this aspect were more descriptive than explanatory.

Question 12

Most answers to part (a) included the idea that Stalin wanted machinery to be used and more food produced. The economic aspects of introducing collectivisation were often missed, as was the idea of increasing control. The better answers to part (b) showed an awareness of the needs of the Soviet Union at the time, allowing explanation of reasons to be integrated within this wider understanding. Other answers were limited to a much narrower approach of lack of food or the objections made by the kulaks. Many answers to part (c) were very good, with well explained arguments for both sides of the debate. In many instances, effectiveness was supported by the use of statistics. Other answers needed to move from descriptive to explanatory mode, particularly in relation to the lack of effectiveness, to improve the balance of the response.

Question 13

In answer to **(a)**, there were many full answers showing numerous difficulties faced by American agriculture at that time. A small number of candidates included 'dust bowls' which relates to the 1930s. Answers to part **(b)** showed good knowledge of the reasons why some industries failed to prosper from the economic boom. The better answers provided sound explanation of what was happening to account for this lack of prosperity. Less strong responses remained descriptive or in some instances matched a valid reason with an invalid explanation. Many answers to part **(c)** were of high quality. In these responses, knowledge of government policy was explained - as were other reasons, giving a feeling of balance to the answer. Other answers were often more strong on the other reasons than they were on government policy.

Question 14

Most answers to **(a)** indicated that many American banks failed or that whilst not failing, many people did not trust them. The point regarding failure was, on occasions, supported by statistics. Sometimes the question itself was not adequately addressed, with answers concentrating on the causes of the banking industry's problems, rather than the impact of the Crash. Beyond the idea that it was unexpected, many answers to part **(b)** were lacking relevant detail. Better answers concentrated on the stock market and the idea that prices always went up but further development of reasons was often needed. Part **(c)** brought many good responses, showing an ability to offer explanations for both sides of the argument. Other responses, whilst showing good knowledge, were weaker in their explanation in relation to Roosevelt.

Questions 15 to 21

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

Question 22

Most answers to part **(a)** contained reference to the fact that moving goods by canal was slow and that the weather contributed to this slowness. Answers needed a more thorough development of the problems to gain higher marks. Most answers to part **(b)** were descriptive, relating to the broad gauge and the building of the line from London to Bristol. Candidates needed to develop more about the contribution Brunel made to the development of railways beyond these two points. In **(c)** the focus of the majority of answers related to the positive social impact of railways. Better responses showed awareness of the less favourable social impact and produced balanced answers through the consideration of economic impact.

Questions 23-25

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

General Comments and Key Messages

Many candidates displayed an in-depth factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study topics for which they had been prepared. They used their knowledge effectively in writing well-developed explanations and arguments for their chosen questions. Most candidates managed the time available well, and were able to answer all the required questions. A small number of candidates misunderstood the rubric, and rather than answering three questions, they answered three part questions only. Some candidates would have benefited from reading the questions more carefully to ensure that they were actually answering the particular question set. Any dates included in the questions needed to be carefully noted so that responses remained relevant.

The detailed factual knowledge shown by candidates enabled many to achieve highly on part **(a)** questions, which require factual recall and description. As well as date parameters, some candidates needed to take greater notice of the focus of questions and to be more selective with the knowledge deployed in order to meet the demands of particular questions. Although many very good answers were seen, there were also some narrative approaches to answering part **(b)** and **(c)** questions; these candidates had the historical knowledge required to answer these questions effectively and, as in the better responses seen, needed to demonstrate their understanding by explaining factors, rather than just describing them.

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

- (a) Some candidates were able to highlight the comparative size of empires before the First World War, focusing upon the rivalry between Britain, France and Germany. An awareness of colonial rivalry was also demonstrated through description of the Moroccan Crises. Some candidates found it difficult to describe the colonial rivalry which existed among the Great Powers before the First World War.
- (b) Some candidates explained that the Triple Entente was formed as a counterweight to the Triple Alliance and as a reaction to the growing power of Germany. A number of candidates described the various members of the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance, rather than answering the question as set. A number of candidates confused the membership of each, and in doing so, weakened their answers.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained clearly the desire of Austria-Hungary to crush Serbia, and how this led to war, and also explained how Russia's support for Serbia led to war. A number of candidates wrote at some length about the events of 28 June 1914 and the assassination of Archduke Franz-Ferdinand; these responses tended to be narrative in nature and did not focus upon explaining how these events caused war.

Question 5

- (a) Many candidates wrote clearly focused answers to this question, stating that the Saar was to be administered by the League of Nations for 15 years, that France was to have the use of the Saar's coalfields during this time, and that there would be a plebiscite held to decide the future of the

Saar. With reference to the Rhineland, most were able to state that the Rhineland was demilitarised, and to demonstrate an understanding of the implications of this. A number of candidates wrote lengthy responses on all the terms of the peace settlement, when the question asked specifically about the Saar and the Rhineland. A small number of candidates confused the word 'Saar' with the word 'Tsar', and wrote answers about the actions of the Russian Tsar during the First World War.

- (b) Some candidates explained clearly that Germany was unhappy with being forced to accept responsibility for the war because this meant that they were now liable to pay damages for the war, and also that Germany felt blame for the war should be shared by all the countries involved. Better responses included explanation for part (b) questions; others stated reasons but did not develop these reasons into explanations.
- (c) This question asked specifically about Lloyd George, and whether he achieved his aims at the Paris Peace Conference. Effective answers to this question set out Lloyd George's aims clearly, and then explained whether or not each aim was achieved, with clear factual support. Some candidates wrote at length about the aims of Clemenceau and Woodrow Wilson, and then added that Lloyd George was the middle ground between them; these responses would have been improved by a greater focus on the question. Candidates needed to clearly match Lloyd George's aims to his achievements and lack of achievements to give an effective response to the question.

Question 6

- (a) Effective responses to this question gave a clear definition of collective security, stating that member states of the League would work together to counter aggression, and then describing how this would work in practice through moral condemnation, economic sanctions and military action. Candidates are expected to know what collective security was and how it worked; some were not aware of this concept. Others believed that collective security related to the Big Three drawing up the Treaty of Versailles.
- (b) The focus of this question was upon why the American decision not to join the League was a great blow to the organisation. There were many well explained answers to this question, detailing the effect of the American decision on the use of economic sanctions, and the fact that Britain and France became reluctant leaders of the League, with all the repercussions this brought. A number of candidates wrote at some length about why America decided not to join the League, which was not the focus of this particular question.
- (c) This question had a particular focus – the impact of the Depression and events in Manchuria upon the League. There were some well-argued and clearly focused responses to this question, explaining the role of the Depression in bringing extreme political parties to power, and how these parties believed in aggressive foreign policies, thus undermining the principles of the League. Explanations related to Manchuria focused on the inability of the League to react quickly to the crisis and the actions of Japan, one of the leading members of the League. A number of candidates simply described in considerable detail the events of the Depression and the situation in Manchuria, without mentioning the impact on the League. Candidates should ensure that they read the question carefully, and be aware that part (c) answers require explanations, rather than lengthy descriptions of events.

Question 7

- (a) There were a number of clear descriptions in response to this question, with focus on the discussion of possible border changes and the discussion surrounding the London Poles and Lublin Poles. Some candidates missed the words 'in relation to Poland, at the Yalta Conference' in the question, and wrote about a range of matters that were discussed at both Yalta and Potsdam.
- (b) Many candidates were able to identify reasons why tensions increased at Potsdam, such as the nature of the relationship between Truman and Stalin, disagreements over the action to be taken with Germany and Truman's revelations about the American atomic bomb. Better responses developed these identifications into explanations of why these factors increased tensions between the USSR and the Western Allies. A clear understanding of events at both Yalta and Potsdam, and the differences between them characterised better answers. Other candidates appeared unable to differentiate between the two conferences.

- (c) Some candidates wrote clearly developed explanations demonstrating how both the USA and the USSR could be held responsible for starting the Cold War. Points explained included the USSR's failure to allow free elections in Eastern European countries, the Berlin Blockade, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, and the USA's development of the atomic bomb. A number of candidates, who were able to identify these points, would have improved their responses by developing them into clear explanations. An awareness of when the Cold War started would have benefitted others; events such as the Korean War, the building of the Berlin Wall, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Vietnam War cannot be construed as being part of the beginning of the Cold War. Events up to and including 1949 were given credit in this question.

Question 8

- (a) Candidates showed detailed and relevant knowledge of the Tet Offensive, with a number of candidates achieving full marks. A small number of candidates believed that the Tet Offensive was an attack by the Americans on the Vietcong.
- (b) Some candidates gave effective and well developed explanations of why American methods were unsuccessful. These included explanations of methods such as the use of chemical weapons, Operation Rolling Thunder and the use of Search and Destroy tactics. Many candidates were able to identify and describe the various methods used by the Americans, but needed to go on and develop this to explain why such methods were unsuccessful in defeating the Vietcong. Some wrote answers based solely on the use of guerrilla tactics by the Vietcong, which lacked relevance.
- (c) There were some very well-explained responses to this question. Candidates explained effectively the psychological impact on American troops of Vietcong guerrilla tactics, and how this led to US withdrawal from Vietnam. Explanations relating to public opinion focused upon the televised war showing American atrocities, and upon the amount of money being spent. Some candidates described at length American atrocities and Vietcong guerrilla tactics, without explaining why this brought about the US withdrawal from Vietnam.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) There were some detailed descriptions of the economic challenges facing the Weimar Republic when it was established, such as the loss of territories like Alsace-Lorraine, with its rich deposits of iron ore, the loss of income from the Saar coalfields, unemployment and the expense of the war, meaning that Germany was close to bankruptcy. A number of candidates described challenges generally facing the Weimar Republic, rather than focusing on the economic challenges as stipulated in the question. As this question asked specifically about economic challenges when Weimar was established, events such as the occupation of the Ruhr are beyond the required time period.
- (b) Effective responses to this question focused clearly upon the various political views in Germany and formulated explanations of why they opposed the new Weimar government. There were many well developed explanations relating to the Left's desire for a communist-style government, the Right's desire for a strong one-party government, and the association of the Weimar Republic with the Treaty of Versailles and the ensuing problems. A small number of candidates seemed to be unaware of the meaning of the term 'political opposition'.
- (c) There were a number of clearly developed and well-explained answers to this question. The explanation of recovery centred mainly upon economic recovery based on Stresemann's actions and also on aid from America, and the acceptance of Germany into the international community again. Lack of recovery was explained through a consideration of the plight of farmers in the 1920s, and the events following the Wall Street Crash in the USA, and the ensuing recall of American loans from Germany. Some candidates showed a detailed knowledge of the factors demonstrating recovery or lack of recovery, but listed these points rather than explaining them.

Question 10

- (a) This question was answered well, with candidates demonstrating a detailed knowledge of the education system in schools in Nazi Germany, with specific references to the subjects taught and

also to the Nazi beliefs and values system being imparted to young people. A small number of candidates wrote answers based on the Hitler Youth, rather than on education in schools.

- (b) Some candidates produced clearly explained responses, demonstrating a developed understanding of the Nazi desire to ensure young Germans were prepared for their roles as adults in the Nazi regime, and to ensure Nazi control over young people through indoctrination. A number of candidates wrote lengthy descriptions of the activities undertaken by members of the Hitler Youth, without answering the question of why membership of the Hitler Youth was encouraged. Some also wrote in detail about the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates, also with no focus on the actual question.
- (c) Many candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of how far life improved for workers in Nazi Germany up to 1939. Explanations of improvement focused on the removal of unemployment, and the Beauty of Labour and Strength through Joy programmes. Explanations of the lack of improvement focused on the banning of trade unions and the lack of consumer goods. A small number of candidates focused on Germans generally, including schoolchildren, rather than focusing upon workers.

Question 11

- (a) Responses to this question varied greatly. A number of candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the Kornilov affair, and achieved higher marks. Others had difficulty in recalling details, other than a general point about the weakness of the Provisional Government.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify several reasons why Lenin was important to the seizure of power, such as his leadership qualities, his skills as an inspirational speaker and his ability to keep control of the Party. Better candidates developed these identifications into explanations.
- (c) Some candidates formulated clear explanations focused upon the Provisional Government's continuation of the war, and its failure to deal with the land problem. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained the appeal of the Bolsheviks, with focus upon Lenin's April Theses. Some candidates wrote generalised responses to this question, stating only that the Provisional Government could not deal with problems. More indication of what these problems were would have improved such responses.

Question 12

- (a) A number of candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the problems faced by Soviet agriculture before collectivisation, with description focused upon the inefficiencies caused by the size of farms, the shortages of food, the kulaks and also the ideological objections to the New Economic Policy. A small number of candidates confused the features of the New Economic Policy, War Communism and collectivisation.
- (b) Effective responses to this question clearly explained the resistance of the kulaks and also the desire of peasants to retain their independence. A number of candidates wrote lengthy descriptions of collectivisation, but did not actually explain why Stalin found it difficult to introduce this policy.
- (c) A number of candidates focused their answers clearly on Soviet people and how far they benefitted from Stalin's economic plans. Such responses focused upon the bonuses available for meeting targets and the investment in training schemes. The lack of benefits was explained through a consideration of the very harsh discipline imposed on workers, and also the low living standards, with few consumer goods and shortages of food. A number of candidates wrote very detailed answers describing Stalin's economic policies. These answers would have been improved by explanation of their impact on Soviet people.

Question 13

- (a) Many candidates described accurately Henry Ford's organisation of motor car production, detailing exactly how the assembly line worked. A small number of candidates focused their answers on the motor car generally and how it changed people's lives, rather than focusing upon the specific requirements of the question.

- (b) There were some highly effective responses to this question, with clearly explained arguments based around the immediacy of sports commentary, the rapid increase in the number of radio stations available and the availability of hire purchase to help people to purchase radios. A small number of candidates wrote briefly about radios being easy to buy and then wrote at length about other goods being easy to buy due to mass production. The consideration of the production of other goods was not relevant to this particular question.
- (c) Explanations of those who did not benefit from the boom tended to be clearer than explanations of those who did benefit. Consideration of those who did benefit was often generalised in nature, stating briefly that certain people were able to get jobs easily; this point needed to be developed for higher marks. Consideration of those who did not benefit was usually more developed. Clear explanations centred on the lack of benefits for black Americans, farmers and workers in the older industries. A small number of candidates confused the 'boom' with the 'bust' in America, and therefore wrote answers which lacked relevance.

Question 14

- (a) Responses to this question varied greatly. There were a number of clearly focused answers, focused specifically on the organisation of the motion picture industry, and demonstrating detailed knowledge of this topic. Other responses struggled to demonstrate an awareness of the organisation of this industry; these responses often stated only that people liked going to the cinema.
- (b) There were a number of effective responses to this question, with clear explanations of disapproval based on religious beliefs, conservative values and morality. A number of candidates focused their answers solely upon young people's behaviour, with detailed descriptions primarily of the behaviour of the flappers. Such answers needed to consider why people disapproved of such behaviour, as required by the question.
- (c) Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of both prohibition and intolerance, constructing clear explanations of the impact of both on 1920s American society. The impact of prohibition was explained through a consideration of gang warfare, crime and corruption, and intolerance through a consideration of the Red Scare, the Sacco and Vanzetti case and the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. Some candidates wrote answers that were mostly narrative in approach; these candidates had the knowledge necessary to construct clear explanations, and would have benefited from using this knowledge more effectively.

Questions 15 to 25

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

General Comments and Key Messages

A significant majority of answers to this year's questions reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and put the great deal of information they possessed to good use in the part **(a)** questions which reward recall and description. Many candidates answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach, and they grasped, correctly, that explanation is not required for these questions.

The best answers to part **(b)** and **(c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene', or which include information lacking in relevance. Candidates were able to gain some credit for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but the highest marks were awarded to answers which went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the exact demands of the question.

It is encouraging to note that a significant number of responses to part **(c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation), but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Candidates should try to avoid repeating points already made in the essay and instead explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Better responses achieved this. Some conclusions confined themselves to just asserting 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument is stronger than the other.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - Core Content

Questions 1-3

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

Question 4

Answers to part **(a)** tended to include general points about the growth of the British navy and the signing of an agreement with France, rather than more specific details about Britain's preparations for war. Credit was given for the building of dreadnoughts, the tactical development of the BEF and Territorial Army, and the military negotiations which grew out of the Entente Cordiale. There was some confusion in part **(b)** when candidates mixed up the details of the 1905 and 1911 Moroccan crises; answers did explain why the Kaiser was angry about French interests in Morocco and the tension which ensued after he was forced to back down at the Algeciras Conference. Part **(c)** attracted some good knowledge of the assassination at Sarajevo and Austria's ultimatum. Some answers were, however, unbalanced, because details of alternative causes of the First World War were only dealt with in a superficial manner.

Question 5

This was a popular question. There were many good answers to part (a) which was not about Germany's land losses, but about alternative efforts to limit the power of Germany. Answers concentrated on specific examples of disarmament and reparations, gaining high marks. In part (b), the reasons why Lloyd George argued with Clemenceau and Wilson was the focus of the question. The best responses referred to disagreements with France over the harsh treatment of Germany, and Lloyd George's clash with Wilson over specific elements of the Fourteen Points, such as self-determination. When each of these identified points were explained, it was possible to award higher marks. In other responses, candidates narrated the aims of the Big Three, rather than focussing on the demands of the question. Part (c) proved challenging to some candidates, and some answers appeared to be answering the question 'how fair was the Treaty of Versailles?' rather than the question set; nevertheless, some good responses were seen. Some wrote about the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and the impact that it had on Germany in the 1920s. Coverage could have included evidence to show how justified the treaties were, such as the perceived need to reduce the future threat to peace from Germany on the one hand, and how reasonable was it to punish Germany harshly, on the other. Credit was given for material from the other peace treaties signed with Germany's allies.

Question 6

In part (a) there were some sound descriptions of the difficulties Britain and France faced as the leaders of the League. Good answers focused on the absence of the USA, how the First World War weakened Britain and France and their consequent reluctance to use military power to deal with conflict. Candidates seemed well prepared for part (b), and they were able to show why the USA, as well as Germany and the USSR, did not join the League, either through their own choice or because they weren't invited. Some took this a stage further and commented in detail about the domestic situation in each country which resulted in their absence. In part (c), there was evidence of good knowledge of the Abyssinian crisis and there were many creditable attempts to show how it led to the demise of the League. Explanations needed to include specific details of alternative factors; better responses avoided just writing a narrative list of the League's weaknesses, and were able to link each point as to why the League eventually failed.

Question 7

Candidates knew the more obvious points about the problems which arose at the Potsdam conference in part (a), such as the clash between Truman and Stalin. A significant number of answers to part (b) were general descriptions of Soviet expansion into Europe. Two or three valid developed points about the Soviet Union wanting to expand communism, to have more control over its neighbours and its search for security, would have secured very high marks. Part (c) answers sometimes lacked balance; it was important to read the question carefully and limit responses to the impact of Western policies on Soviet expansion. Which policies had more success than others and why? Better candidates were able to balance the effects of the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and the Berlin Airlift, avoiding narrative accounts of events. In an attempt to maintain balance, some were able to explain why the West failed because the Soviet Union maintained its grip on much of Eastern Europe.

Question 8

It was rare to see a poor answer to part (a); most candidates included details such as the stopping of free movement, divided families, how people were denied access to the opportunities in West Berlin and the dangers of trying to cross the Wall without permission. Part (b), in contrast, could have been better answered, with more extensive contextual knowledge. Credit was given for developing points such as the government underestimating the political threat which Solidarity posed, the charismatic leadership of Lech Walesa, the support he gained from the Catholic Church and the ambivalent attitude of the Soviet Union. Some responses to part (c) would have benefitted from greater balance; although candidates recounted in detail how Gorbachev's reforms undermined Soviet control in Eastern Europe, arguments about the low standard of living were too generalised – specific examples about high food prices (such as meat), poor housing and the lack of luxury goods (compared with the West) were needed to support the explanation.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

In part (a) some answers featured descriptions of the SA which were limited in scope; others met the demands of the question by concentrating on ‘activities’. Candidates needed to be secure about specific details when asked to explain the rise of Hitler to the position of Chancellor in 1933, as required by part (b). In some answers there was a lack of balance as candidates concentrated on the ways the Nazis exploited the Depression, linking propaganda and votes to promises to help alleviate the worst effects of unemployment. To gain higher marks, an understanding of the political crisis and subsequent negotiations relating to Hindenburg, Papen and Schleicher were required, as they are central to the offer made to Hitler to become Chancellor. This latter aspect appeared less well known. In contrast, part (c) was well answered, as there was good understanding of the impact of the Reichstag Fire, balanced by explanations of the Enabling Law and the Night of the Long Knives, in consolidating Hitler’s hold on power.

Question 10

Part (a) posed few problems and there was good knowledge of the Night of the Long Knives. It was also rare to see poor answers to part (b); the ‘importance’ of propaganda was usually defined in terms of ‘impact’, which was a sound approach. Most candidates avoided lengthy narratives about ‘how’ the Nazis spread propaganda, and were able to relate their ideas to the specific explanation demanded by the question. Many candidates were able to apply relevant knowledge to both sides of the part (c) question and this resulted in high marks. The effective activities of the police state were used as evidence of oppression, while explanation of the ‘opposition’ such as church leaders, Edelweiss Pirates and the Navajos Gang gave these answers balance.

Question 11

Candidates knew a great deal about the nature of peasant life in part (a). Answers to part (b) would have benefited from being fuller and from containing more specific knowledge. The question was looking for a precise explanation of the problems caused by revolutionaries amongst the industrialised and rural working class by the Russo-Japanese War and the 1905 Revolution. Answers to part (c) revealed some knowledge of the Dumas, the policies pursued by Stolypin, and the increased prosperity of, for example, the Kulaks.

Question 12

Many good answers to this question were seen. There was secure knowledge of the Great Terror in part (a), and the importance of the Purges in part (b). Stalin’s insecurities and sense of personal threat were well known, although sometimes they lacked detail about ‘Old Bolsheviks’, army generals, show trials and specific individuals. Part (c) answers were often effectively argued, if unbalanced, with sound analysis of the cult of the personality against a background of poor living and working conditions. Answers encompassing the latter tended to be more superficial.

Question 13

Part (a) was well answered. Many candidates could correctly identify social effects such as unemployment, Hoovervilles, soup kitchens, loss of farms and savings. Responses to part (b) required an analysis of structural difficulties in the economy such as weak demand for agricultural products or the output from traditional industries. Explanations of the Wall Street Crash were not required. For part (c), answers focused on Roosevelt’s appeal and tended to be one-sided. Successful responses maintain a balanced approach to part(c) questions such as this; in this case, specific knowledge of the impact of Hoover’s treatment of the Bonus Marchers on his reputation before the 1932 election was required.

Question 14

Part (a) was generally very well answered, with details of the Emergency Banking Act, the four day closure and offer of government grants to restore confidence. The successes of the NIRA were less well known in part (b); two developed explanations of the importance of the PWA, and of the NRA, including how they helped the recovery, would have improved many responses. Answers to part (c) focused on the Republicans’ insistence on ‘rugged individualism’ and ‘laissez-faire’, rather than on the Supreme Court or the views of radical leaders. This limited the credit awarded, as the ‘other side of the argument’ was not addressed in such answers.

Questions 15–19

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

Question 20

The problems of Jewish migration and the violent nature of the clash between Palestinian Arabs and Jews attracted some strong responses in part **(a)**. Similarly, candidates were able to explain in some detail the problems faced by Britain in Palestine in part **(b)**. Better answers analysed the impact of the Second World War on Britain, the violence of the Irgun campaign and the pressure on the British government to change its policy towards Holocaust survivors and hand the problem over to the UN. In part **(c)**, candidates applied their knowledge of Jewish determination to create a homeland on the one hand, and explained the relative weakness of the Arabs (when compared to Israel's military strength) on the other, to gain high marks.

Question 21

There were some impressive answers to part **(a)**, with evidence of detailed knowledge of Nasser's actions immediately prior to the outbreak of war in 1967. Part **(b)** revealed good understanding of the reasons for the attack on Israel in 1973; developed answers explained Sadat's motives, the issue of occupied territories and land lost in 1967, and the timing of the attacks at the start of a Jewish religious festival. Two valid fully explained factors were given by many candidates. Part **(c)** gave many candidates the opportunity to use their knowledge of Israel's military superiority and a range of alternative arguments, to explain its survival in the period 1956–73. The latter point included support from the US, and Arab mistakes and lack of co-ordination. Developed explanations in support of, and in challenge to the statement, attracted high marks. The best responses went further, and included an evaluation and explanation of 'how far' it was military superiority compared to other factors.

Questions 22–25

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

General Comments and Key Messages

The overwhelming majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option. The general standard of answers was high. Strengths included: detailed knowledge used to effectively analyse sources, detailed comparison of sources, and interpreting cartoons. A number of candidates spent much time paraphrasing or describing sources before addressing the question in a few lines at the end of their answers. Candidates should try and consider the purpose of sources carefully. Working out the purpose of a source can lead to good answers in several different types of questions. It was also surprising to see so many candidates writing one-sided answers to **Question 6**. Better candidates were able to explain how some sources supported the hypothesis and how other sources disagreed with it.

Candidates should try to read and interpret sources as a whole. When they are asked to interpret sources they should try to avoid basing their answers on just one aspect of a source. They should ask themselves 'what is the overall point of view of the author or cartoonist?' This is just as important with written sources as it is with cartoons. Also, it is vital that candidates read questions carefully and think about what a question is asking them to do. Although many candidates managed to interpret the sources and approach the questions appropriately, others neglected to address the actual question asked. Answers to comparison questions need to be based on comparisons, questions asking whether candidates are surprised by a source, or whether they believe a source, must produce a clear answer to this – 'yes', or 'no'. They should then use the rest of their answer to support this. Answers to questions about why a source was published should explain how their analysis of the source can be used as an explanation of publication.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

There were many good detailed answers that found agreements and disagreements of detail. For example, both sources say that Cavaignac delayed but they disagree over how effective the regular army was. Some candidates managed read the overall messages of the two sources – that the rioters did not really stand a chance of success.

Question 2

In answering this type of question it is important to compare the usefulness of the two sources about the same thing. For example, an answer that says Source C is more useful because it tells us about what the barricades were like, while Source D tells us about the nature of the fighting, are not real comparisons. Better answers based their comparisons on inferences from the sources e.g. the level of organisation. The best answers were based on a consideration of the type of source and focused particularly on the possible purpose of the artist of Source D e.g. to create a particular impression of the revolutionaries.

Question 3

Answers to questions asking why a source was published need to contain three elements. They need to explain why the source was published when it was. This requires some explanation of the context - in the case of this source, the July Days. They also need to explain the message of the source. Finally, they need to bring these two elements together and explain the purpose of the German liberal newspaper in publishing this article at that particular time. Purpose needs to involve impact on the intended audience e.g. to discourage such extreme revolutionary behaviour in Germany. Some candidates only explained the context and didn't interpret the message of the article, while others interpreted the article but neglected to go on to explain its purpose. It is important that candidates make clear that what they write in their answers is being

offered as a reason for publication. Although some candidates explained context, message or purpose, they didn't explain that these were reasons for publication.

Question 4

The way to address a question such as this is to first compare the sources for similarities or differences. A significant difference, for example, is that Source G suggests that the revolutionaries were not efficient, but Source F says there were. Candidates then need to ask themselves whether this difference makes Source F surprising. This can be approached by evaluating Source G (do we trust the labourer speaking at his trial), or by evaluating Source F. It is important that candidates realise that this type of question does require at least one of the sources to be evaluated. However, it is also important to remember that the purpose of the evaluation is to pass judgement on Source F. Although many candidates based their answers on differences or similarities between the sources, they would have improved their responses by providing evaluation.

Question 5

A number of candidates rejected Source H because it was written by a member of the National Guard who would want to discredit the revolutionaries. Better answers either used specific knowledge to check the content of the source or considered the language and tone of the source.

Question 6

The two aspects of a good answer to this question are (i) clear explanations of how particular sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis, and (ii) keeping the focus of the answer on the given hypothesis. Candidates should be aware of the fact that there will always be some sources that support the hypothesis and some that disagree with it and should avoid the tendency, seen in some answers, to only explain how sources support the hypothesis. It is not necessary to write at length about each source. What matters more is the directness and quality of the explanation and the following is typical of some of the better approaches to this question which were seen: 'Source B supports the view that the rising had no chance of success. It actually says "The June insurrection never had much chance of success." It goes on to explain that this was because it was not planned and had no proper leadership.' It is important that candidates understand what is involved in producing a good answer to this question since it carries the highest mark tariff on the paper. A small number of candidates were unable to achieve good marks because they neglected to use any of the sources in their answers.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to explain one or more ways in which the two sources agreed e.g. they both say that the West did not want an agreement with the Soviet Union and they both say that many supporters of the Soviet Union were shocked by the Pact. The best answers also contained at least one example of a disagreement e.g. Source A claims that the Communists thought the Pact was a wise move, while Source B says that many disagreed with this. While agreements can simply be identified e.g. 'they both say the Pact gave Russia time', disagreements need to be explained more carefully e.g. 'Source A says that Communists were not able to discuss the Pact but Source B shows that they did discuss it.' It would not be enough to simply say 'They disagree over whether they could discuss the Pact.' There were some less successful answers where candidates summarised both sources without doing any matching of agreements or disagreements. There were also answers in which candidates paraphrased the sources at length before comparing them. The best answers were clearly based on some time spent analysing the sources first and they began the comparison straight away. This often led them to the big messages of the two sources – Source A says the pact was good, while Source B is against the Pact but recognises its advantages.

Question 2

The best answers interpreted the point of view demonstrated in both cartoons instead of describing them or reading them literally. Both of the cartoonists had a point of view about the Pact – a critical one, and the best answers explained this. Many answers compared sub-messages of the two cartoons e.g. that Germany and Russia are acting together in both cartoons. Weaker responses missed the opportunity to compare the cartoons. The question asks candidates to compare, and no matter how good an interpretation of the cartoons an answer gives, some direct comparison is required in order to access higher marks.

Question 3

This question was generally well answered, although few achieved the very highest marks. Most candidates achieved good marks by using their knowledge of the period or by cross-referencing to other sources in the paper to explain why certain things Molotov says can or cannot be trusted. The important elements of these answers were (i) clearly identifying a particular claim by Molotov, and (ii) checking this claim against specific knowledge that is not in Source E or against a clear cross-reference in another source. Weaker answers tended to identify particular claims in Source E but then just asserted that they were correct or wrong. Those who achieved the highest marks focused on, and explained, Molotov's purpose in making this speech e.g. to persuade members of the Supreme Soviet to support the Pact when their natural instinct as Communists would be to oppose any agreement with Hitler.

Question 4

In questions such as this one it is crucial that candidates explain whether or not they are surprised by Source F. A number of candidates produced good analyses and comparisons of both sources but did not then say whether they found F surprising or not. A good way of answering these types of questions is to state whether you are surprised or not at the beginning of the answer, and then use the rest of the answer to explain why. The next step is to identify a difference or agreement between the two sources. In this case, it is a difference – in Source F, Stalin is claiming to have tricked Hitler, while in Source G Hitler thinks he is tricking Stalin. Candidates then need to use their knowledge of the period to explain whether they are surprised by this difference. The best answers explained that Source G does not make Source F surprising because knowledge of both Hitler and Stalin tells us that Source G actually confirms what Source F says and that both sources are perfectly in line with what we know about the aims and plans of the two men. Many candidates did not get this far. Instead, they noted the difference between the two sources and then explained how this made Source F surprising. A number of less successful answers only wrote about Source F. It is important to remember that the starting point of answering questions such as this one is to compare the sources for agreements or disagreements.

Question 5

Answers to questions asking why a source was published need to contain three elements. They need to explain why the source was published when it was. This requires some explanation of the context. In this source, it is the signing of the Pact. They also need to explain the message of the source. Finally, they need to bring these two elements together and explain the purpose of the Poles in publishing this message at that particular time. Purpose needs to involve impact on the intended audience. In the case of this cartoon it would be perfectly reasonable to explain the purpose as warning Poles of the danger from Russia or asking for help from Britain and France. Some candidates only explained the context and neglected to interpret the message of the cartoon, while others interpreted the cartoon but didn't then go on to explain its purpose. It is important that candidates make clear that what they write in their answers is being offered as a reason for publication. Although some candidates explained context, message or purpose, they didn't explain that these were reasons for publication.

Question 6

The two aspects of a good answer to this question are (i) clear explanations of how particular sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis, and (ii) keeping the focus of the answer on the given hypothesis. Candidates should be aware of the fact that there will always be some sources that support the hypothesis and some that disagree with it and should avoid the tendency, seen in some answers, to only explain how sources support the hypothesis. It is not necessary to write at length about each source. What matters more is the directness and quality of the explanation. The following is typical of some of the better approaches to this question which were seen: 'Source B supports the claim that Russia got more from the Pact. This is because it says that Russia gained because it postponed any German attack and gave Russia time to prepare properly for the attack.' It is important that candidates understand what is involved in producing a good answer to this question since it carries the highest mark tariff on the paper. A small number of candidates were unable to achieve good marks because they neglected to use any of the sources in their answers.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

General Comments and Key Messages

The overwhelming majority of answers were on the twentieth-century option. The sources on this option posed few comprehension problems, which meant that almost all candidates were able to answer all six questions in a positive manner. Whilst the sources were interpreted effectively by most candidates, it was rarer to see answers which based their arguments (when the question invited it) on an evaluation of the source or sources in context. Similarly, though most candidates understood the messages of the cartoons, more needed to tease out the cartoonists' opinions about the events depicted.

The fundamental key message is that candidates should answer the question as set. If the question asks for a comparison of sources, then marks will be awarded for the identification of similarities and differences; just repeating what each source says is not the correct approach. If a question asks why a source was produced at a particular time, then reasons for its production are rewarded; just describing or even interpreting the source will gain little credit unless a reason is given. Answers that achieve a proper focus on the questions will be more concise than those that do not; length in an answer is no virtue in itself, it is relevance that counts.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

The two sources contained plenty of surface similarities and differences. Most candidates were able to identify some of these. The big difference between the two sources, however, was the greater sympathy towards Frederick William demonstrated in Source B. Better candidates were able to identify and use this difference of author's opinions in their answers.

Question 2

Questions asking why a source was produced at a certain time always invite at least three types of reason: those based on context (what was going on at that time), those based on message (what the author was trying to say to the audience), and those based on purpose (what behavioural outcome the author intended to produce from the audience). The given source produced examples of all these and the most developed answers used elements of all three types to explain Frederick William's purpose in the context of March 1848.

Question 3

Most answers based their comparisons of the two sources on the face-value information contained within them – for example, that they both showed scenes of violence. Many responses would have been improved by the inclusion of both the messages that were implicit in both illustrations, and the artists' opinions that lay behind the messages.

Question 4

When a question asks candidates to judge which of two sources is the more useful, candidates need to understand that their decision has to be based on a criterion common to both sources. This could at its most basic be that one gives more information than the other. In this question, the 'insider'/outsider' nature of the two sources could have produced an argument that Source F was more useful as the author had more privileged access to information. What candidates should avoid is the answer which in effect only uses one

source by seizing on something that is one source and not the other and declaring it the more useful because of that.

Question 5

This question was generally well answered. The difference between the two sources was clear, the historical context was known, and most candidates could therefore explain why they were not surprised, by reference to what had happened between 1848 and 1849.

Question 6

There are two characteristics of successful answers to **Question 6**. They know how to use the sources to either support or question the hypothesis, and they keep a consistent focus on the hypothesis. Using the sources means illustrating how the source content relates to the hypothesis. Keeping a consistent focus means using the hypothesis that the question has given, and not straying onto other issues. It is also worth keeping in mind that the sources will always offer evidence both for and against the hypothesis, so an answer that deals with only one side will earn limited credit. Most answers did manage to find some evidence in the sources on both sides of the hypothesis, but others did not, including a small number who wrote about the hypothesis with no reference to the sources at all.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

The sources provided many agreements and disagreements. Most candidates were able to locate some of each, though the similarities were slightly more obvious than the differences. The best comparisons detected a difference of opinion between the authors about Chamberlain, with Source B clearly less sympathetic.

This was one of the questions on the paper where some candidates would have benefited from focusing immediately on the specific demands of the question. In comparison questions simply repeating separately what each source says is not comparing. A comparison is a direct match of the content of the two sources to show a similarity or a difference, and better responses managed to do this.

Question 2

This question was answered well. It was possible to interpret Source C in two different ways – either that it showed Chamberlain succeeding or failing – and either interpretation was permissible. Almost all candidates were able to interpret Source C, but Source D seemed more challenging, with many taking it as showing Chamberlain preserving peace. It was actually possible to compare the two cartoons on that basis; that they both showed Chamberlain trying to maintain peace, though this missed the real point of Source D. Better answers moved beyond comparisons of these sub-messages to engage with the opinions of the cartoonists. Chamberlain was clearly represented more positively in Source C, even if the answer finally concluded that the cartoonist was condemning Chamberlain for his recklessness. This opened the way for comparisons suggesting that Chamberlain was seen as a hero in Source C but a villain in Source D (though there was also an additional element of stupidity in Chamberlain in Source D which many noticed), or alternatively stating that Chamberlain was being criticised in both cartoons.

Question 3

This question produced a range of answers (including many very good ones), generated by how candidates responded to Source F. There was a critical difference between seeing Source F as a depiction of how Britain was behaving, or alternatively as a condemnation of how Britain was behaving. The added dimension of being able to detect the cartoonist's opinion was essential in providing a properly explained answer. For those who saw Source F as merely reporting that Britain was ignoring the Czech Crisis, the almost inevitable conclusion was that Source E did not disprove it, it agreed with it. A few answers, operating at a similar level, found something in Source E to disprove Source F – typically the idea that Chamberlain did care, he just wanted to avoid war, whereas in Source F he did not care at all. Most surprising were the answers that interpreted Source F correctly, as a criticism of Chamberlain for his ignorance of the true significance of the Czech Crisis, yet still concluded that Source E proved Source F wrong because of the difference between them. Obviously, in context, Source E could not prove Source F wrong, because Source F was right! But to appreciate this it was necessary both to understand the cartoonist's attitude and what actually happened in 1938-9. Many answers could argue this, and the very best could add another dimension entirely to the

argument by looking at Chamberlain's purpose in Source E. By perceiving Source E as an attempt to reassure the British public at the height of the Czech Crisis, rather than as an objective statement of Chamberlain's beliefs, it was possible to argue that Source E could not prove Source F wrong because it was not sufficiently reliable to do so.

Question 4

This question posed problems for those candidates who saw it as a report on what happened after the Munich meeting, rather than before. In asking whether you could trust this source, the question was about Chamberlain's reception in Parliament the day before the Munich meeting. Hindsight about what happened subsequently would make no difference to whether this source could be trusted or not. The real issue was how credible was Parliament's reaction to Chamberlain's news? The best answers saw this and suggested either that it was not all that credible since it was well known that Chamberlain had many critics, or that it was credible since there is plenty of evidence that people in Britain were genuinely delighted to be saved from the prospect of another war. Some answers dealt only with the provenance of the source to reach their conclusions. There was plenty to work with – Channon was an eye-witness, he was a member of the government, he was a Conservative, all of which could be argued to make him more reliable or less reliable. Finally, a few answers noted the 'over the top' language of the source to cast doubt on its reliability.

Question 5

Questions asking why a source was produced at a certain time always invite at least three types of reason: those based on context (what was going on at that time), those based on message (what the author was trying to say to the audience), and those based on purpose (what behavioural outcome the author intended to produce from the audience). Taking each of these in turn, the context was not entirely straightforward. Some answers suggested that the reason it was published was because of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Given that it was a Soviet cartoon, and showed the Nazis in an unflattering light, this was not very plausible. The context clearly predated the Pact, relating to earlier developments in 1939. Similarly, messages had to be plausible, both in relation to context and to provenance – they had to be something the Soviets would want to say prior to the Nazi-Soviet Pact, perhaps to condemn the British/France policy of appeasement. Finally, the possible purposes could only relate to the Soviet audience, perhaps to prepare the population for war. Examples of all these were commonly seen, but as suggested above, unless answers made sense in context, candidates struggled.

In some responses the question was not addressed directly. There were some answers that contained no reason for the source's publication. These answers would often include accurate information about the events of the time, or a satisfactory interpretation of the cartoon. Clearly, these candidates could have given a valid reason, but simply omitted to do so. This is an issue of technique in answering this kind of question, and is straightforward to address. The approach often seen in better responses, which started 'This source was published in 1939 because...' would have improved many responses. Candidates who started their answers in some other way often forgot to return to the point.

Question 6

There are two characteristics of successful answers to **Question 6**. They know how to use the sources to either support or question the hypothesis, and they keep a consistent focus on the hypothesis. Using the sources means illustrating how the source content relates to the hypothesis. Keeping a consistent focus means using the hypothesis that the question has given, and not straying onto other issues. Some answers wanted to test whether the sources were for or against appeasement – not the same thing. It is also worth keeping in mind that the sources will always offer evidence both for and against the hypothesis, so an answer that deals with only one side will earn limited credit. Most answers did manage to find some evidence in the sources on both sides of the hypothesis, but others struggled, including a small number who wrote about the hypothesis with no reference to the sources at all. Some of this set of sources were straightforward to use, as expressed in responses – 'Source A says Munich was a triumph for Chamberlain, so it shows he was successful, but Source B says Hitler regarded his promise not to go to war with Britain as "worthless" so that shows he was unsuccessful.' Others needed more explanation, such as Source E, where the source content on its own does not show success or failure.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

General Comments and Key Messages

The overwhelming majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option. The general standard of answers was high. Strengths included: detailed knowledge used to effectively analyse sources, detailed comparison of sources, and interpreting cartoons. A number of candidates spent much time paraphrasing or describing sources before addressing the question in a few lines at the end of their answers. Candidates should try and consider the purpose of sources carefully. Working out the purpose of a source can lead to good answers in several different types of questions. It was also surprising to see so many candidates writing one-sided answers to **Question 6**. Better candidates were able to explain how some sources supported the hypothesis and how other sources disagreed with it.

Candidates should try to read and interpret sources as a whole. When they are asked to interpret sources they should try to avoid basing their answers on just one aspect of a source. They should ask themselves ‘what is the overall point of view of the author or cartoonist?’ This is just as important with written sources as it is with cartoons. Also, it is vital that candidates read questions carefully and think about what a question is asking them to do. Although many candidates managed to interpret the sources and approach the questions appropriately, others neglected to address the actual question asked. Answers to comparison questions need to be based on comparisons, questions asking whether candidates are surprised by a source, or whether they believe a source, must produce a clear answer to this – ‘yes’, or ‘no’. They should then use the rest of their answer to support this. Answers to questions about why a source was published should explain how their analysis of the source can be used as an explanation of publication.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

There were a number of agreements and disagreements of detail between Sources A and B and many candidates managed to find at least some of these. The best candidates focused on the overall difference – that Source A suggests the working classes were more important, while Source B suggests that it was the middle classes who mattered more.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to explain that the cartoonist’s message is that the revolutions were threatening the existence of the ruling regimes. These answers were supported by good use of the detail in the cartoon. Fewer candidates tried to explain whether or not the cartoonist approved of what was happening. A small number of candidates described the cartoon instead of interpreting it, limiting the marks which could be awarded.

Question 3

There are good content reasons for why Source E does and does not make Source D surprising. For example, Source E shows the people supporting the revolution but Source D shows that many people acted against the revolution. Some candidates pointed out that there is no reason why Source E should make Source D surprising because they are about different places and situations. Use of contextual knowledge turned these answers into very good responses. Some candidates focused on the provenance and purpose of one of both of the sources.

Question 4

This question requires candidates to both compare the sources and to evaluate them. A number of candidates were able to evaluate the sources separately but they then needed to explain which one they trusted more through comparison. There was some good use of the provenance and purpose of the sources, and the candidates' contextual knowledge, to evaluate the sources individually. Some candidates made weaker use of the provenance and simply claimed the sources were biased.

Question 5

Questions such as this one that ask candidates to explain why a source was published at a particular time require three elements. They need to explain why the source was published when it was. This requires some explanation of the context - in the case of this source, events in Germany in 1848. They also need to explain the message of the source. Finally, they need to bring these two elements together and explain the purpose of publishing this cartoon in Germany at that particular time. Purpose needs to involve impact on the intended audience e.g. to discourage such extreme revolutionary behaviour in Germany by warning that any Parliament set up will be a disaster. Some candidates only explained the context and didn't interpret the message of the article, while others interpreted the article but neglected to go on to explain its purpose. It is important that candidates make clear that what they write in their answers is being offered as a reason for publication. Some candidates explained context, message or purpose, they didn't explain that these were reasons for publication.

Question 6

The two aspects of a good answer to this question are (i) clear explanations of how particular sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis, and (ii) keeping the focus of the answer on the given hypothesis. Candidates should be aware of the fact that there will always be some sources that support the hypothesis and some that disagree with it and should avoid the tendency, seen in some answers, to only explain how sources support the hypothesis. It is not necessary to write at length about each source. What matters more is the directness and quality of the explanation. The following is typical of some of the better approaches to this question which were seen: 'Source D does not support the view that the revolutions were a real threat to the social system. This is because it tells us that many people in France did not want to overturn the social system. When they became aware of what was happening in Paris they marched there to stop the violent events. They regarded the revolutionaries in Paris as "barbarians". While many of the people outside Paris were determined to defend the social system because they had a lot to lose, there was not much danger of it being overthrown.' It is important that candidates understand what is involved in producing a good answer to this question. It carries the highest mark tariff on the paper. A number of candidates were unable to achieve good marks because they neglected to use any of the sources in their answers.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

The sources provided many agreements and disagreements. Most candidates were able to locate some of each, although the differences were rather more obvious than the similarities. Most candidates, for example, were able to explain the agreements about providing Germany with a grievance, Germany being too strong after Versailles and the peacemakers wanting a better Europe. The best answers read the sources as a whole and looked for an overall point of view – Source A says that the treaty was not responsible for the Second World War, while Source B claims it was. A number of candidates lost time by paraphrasing each source in detail before comparing them.

Question 2

The best answers were based on an understanding of the points of view of the two cartoonists. They are both criticising the Treaty of Versailles and the peacemakers. Some candidates thought the '1940 class' in Source C referred to Germany and this made it difficult for them to interpret the cartoon effectively. As is often seen with comparison questions, a number of candidates interpreted both cartoons perfectly well but then needed to go on and compare them. However, this question was answered well overall and a good number of candidates achieved higher marks.

Question 3

There were many good answers that demonstrated an understanding of what the cartoon was saying about the fate of Czechoslovakia. However, the best candidates realised that the cartoonist is criticising British policy over Czechoslovakia. When using cartoons candidates should always be encouraged to consider the point of view of the cartoonist. Most political cartoons are not simply analysing situations - they are usually making an important point.

Question 4

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates produced a good analysis of the source but neglected to state whether they were surprised or not. In answering this type of question, candidates are advised to first state whether they are surprised or not, and then explain their reasons. The best answers were based on contextual knowledge and understanding and explained a lack of surprise about the fact that Hitler is justifying sending troops into Austria. He was speaking on the day that German troops were sent in. Slightly less successful answers, again based on contextual knowledge, explained how Hitler was lying in parts of the interview. A number of candidates, whose responses identified what they were or were not surprised by, would have benefited from producing an adequate explanation.

Question 5

This question also produced a wide range of answers. The best candidates realised that there were good reasons for Lloyd George to both agree and disagree with the cartoon. In Source G he says that there will be another war because of the number of small German speaking states that have been separated from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. The cartoonist also shows that war was likely. However, the reason for war given by the cartoonist is different. He points to the 'spineless leaders of democracy' and their failures in the 1930s. Some candidates only got as far as the agreement over the likelihood of war.

Question 6

The two aspects of a good answer to this question are (i) clear explanations of how particular sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis, and (ii) keeping the focus of the answer on the given hypothesis. Candidates should be aware of the fact that there will always be some sources that support the hypothesis and some that disagree with it and should avoid the tendency, seen in some answers, to only explain how sources support the hypothesis. It is not necessary to write at length about each source. What matters more is the directness and quality of the explanation. The following is typical of some of the better approaches to this question which were seen: 'Source E does not support the idea that the Second World War was caused by the Treaty of Versailles because it says that British appeasement was the problem. It criticises the way that Britain let Germany take Czechoslovakia. It was this policy of appeasement that encouraged Hitler to take more and more and which led to the war in 1939.' It is important that candidates understand what is involved in producing a good answer to this question since it carries the highest mark tariff on the paper. A number of candidates were unable to achieve good marks because they neglected to use any of the sources in their answers.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

The number of entries for the coursework option in this examination session was very close to that seen in November 2013. The November 2014 examination session was the last one for the present version of IGCSE History coursework. The pattern of this year's coursework was similar to that of previous years. All of the assignments were appropriate. Many Centres used the Board-approved assignments, while a small number constructed some very interesting ones of their own, some of which were based on aspects of local history.

Most of the marking had been completed carefully and there were many detailed and useful annotations to the candidates' work, which helped Moderators greatly. Small adjustments were made to the marks of number of Centres. This was usually on Assignment 1.

Comments on Specific Questions

Assignment 1

Adjustments to marks were most often made where the candidates' analysis was not of sufficient depth to merit the marks awarded. Some candidates needed to focus more on aspects of questions such as 'how far', and on comparing the relative importance of causal factors all the way through their answers, rather than just in conclusions. Better responses contained such features, and much very good work was seen. As in previous examination sessions, essay titles, rather than structured questions, produced the most successful work.

Assignment 2

There was much good source analysis and evaluation in Assignment 2. Many candidates displayed good understanding and skills in the use of historical sources.

It is important to remember that the coursework requirements change for 2015. Candidates will be expected to submit just one piece of work assessing the significance of an event, individual or development. The use of sources is not required. Questions need to encourage candidates to focus on assessing significance. Questions should be left open to allow candidates to use their own criteria for assessing significance. It is expected that the best answers will assess significance from several perspectives, using different criteria.

Detailed guidance on all aspects of the new coursework requirements can be found in the Coursework Training Handbook produced by Cambridge International Examinations. This is essential reading.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–45 remains the most popular choice for candidates. There were also many candidates opting to prepare for Depth Studies B: Russia, 1905–1941 and C: The USA, 1919–1941. There were some attempts at other Depth Studies but the numbers choosing them were very much smaller.

Candidates' handwriting and presentation were legible and well set out in the majority of scripts. Rubric errors were present but infrequent, and only a minority of candidates appeared to have time management issues.

There were some excellent examples of high quality responses by candidates that demonstrated a succinct writing style coupled with a good grasp of the relevant skills, knowledge and understanding required for high performance in the examination. **Question (aiii)** proved challenging for some candidates. There were few examples of the highest level response where candidates evaluate which source they think is more useful. This can be achieved by testing the reliability of the sources' language, tone, provenance or purpose, or by cross-referencing details of the sources against each other or contextual knowledge. The arguments made must have source evidence and explanation to achieve this. Attempts at evaluations tended to be undeveloped and focused on incomplete assertions about the sources' provenance (author and date); for example, 'Source A was made at the time so must be trustworthy' or 'Source B was published by the Republican Party which would make the source biased'.

When answering the source-based questions for **Question (a)**, candidates should take note of the focus of the question, so as to make sure the inferences and details used are relevant.

When answering **Question (b)**, candidates should describe factors for **(bii)** and explain reasons for **(biii)**. Furthermore, **(biv)** responses should be balanced and developed with specific examples for higher marks to be awarded.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945

Question (ai): Candidates were generally able to make lots of supported inferences about Heydrich from Source A such as 'he was a capable man' supported by 'Hitler had promoted him to Colonel in the SS'. Some responses focused on repeating source material only and this resulted in low marks. **Question (aii):** A good number of candidates were able to explain how concentration camps changed during the years referred to in Source B. Valid changes included the way concentration camps became fewer in number, the changes in rules towards punishments and the different types of prisoners that were sent there. A small number of candidates inferred from the source elements that remained the same such as the fact that the SS still ran the camps and that many prisoners still died. **Question (aiii):** There were some very good responses in Level 3 where candidates had used the content from the sources to compare their usefulness. The best answers here developed an argument and explained why one source was more useful than the other. The highest marks were rarely achieved due to attempted evaluations remaining undeveloped.

Question (bi): Candidates were generally well prepared for this. Most cited the power of Hitler to make laws without consulting the Reichstag or the President. A few went further, saying the Enabling Act gave Hitler the powers of a dictator and the law was only supposed to last for four years. Many candidates achieved one of the two marks available. **Question (bii):** Some candidates were able to describe a variety of ways in which the Nazis changed workers' organisations. Most commonly cited were the banning of trade unions, the setting up of the German Labour Front under Ley and the creation of organisations such as Strength Through Joy and the Beauty of Labour movement. A few candidates focused incorrectly on the workers,

rather than the organisations or described how the economy impacted on the lives of workers in Nazi Germany. **Question (biii):** Candidates generally responded well to this question and the best answers were able to give multiple reasons as to why the Night of the Long Knives happened. Many explained how Hitler and the German Army feared Rohm's second revolution or the fact that his 2.5 million strong SA were unruly. A few candidates mentioned how the Night of the Long Knives also happened due to rivalry against Rohm from Himmler's SS. A small number of candidates mistook the Night of the Long Knives for the Night of Broken Glass, even though the question gave the date of 1934. **Question (biv):** Candidates generally attempted balanced responses, although some would have benefited from good examples of how anti-semitism was used to gain support. Valid examples included how the Nazis blamed the Jews for the loss of the First World War and the subsequent 'stab in the back' myth, the promotion of the Bolshevik-Jew in propaganda and the use of the Nuremberg Laws, amongst others. The question was very open so could have included examples from pre-1933 and post-1933. Candidates fared much better when examining alternative reasons for the growth of Nazi support such as the Depression, the policy of rearming, the Nazi economic 'miracle' and the use of effective propaganda.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Question (ai): Successful candidates made inferences about the disappointment felt by many that the Provisional Government did not end the war and its failure to provide basic necessities to live and fight with. **Question (aii):** Candidates mainly gave responses which focused on the fact that 'desertion' suggested that soldiers were supporting the revolutionaries. More candidates could have made an inference that soldiers were often not in support of the revolutionaries, using detail such as 'the root of mischief was the revolutionaries in Petrograd'. **Question (aiii):** Candidates mainly provided assertions and undeveloped evaluations, particularly focusing on the fact that a soldier from the time had written Source A and an eyewitness had given the account in Source B. Better responses were sometimes developed, although source references could have been stronger. There were few developed evaluations of the reliability of the sources found in candidate responses.

Question (bi): A good number of responses were able to name the workers, soldiers or sailors as groups of people who voted for members of the Petrograd Soviet. Some, mistakenly, named peasants and other responses incorrectly made reference to the political parties that sat in the Soviet. **Question (bii):** Candidates gave mixed responses to this question. There were lots of valid comments about the protests and the role of the Bolsheviks, particularly the fact that Kerensky ordered the arrests of Bolshevik leaders which led to Lenin fleeing to Finland. A few candidates confused the July Days with the Kornilov Coup. **Question (biii):** Candidates were able to demonstrate a good knowledge of the many factors which led to the overthrow of Tsar Nicholas II. Most commonly cited were his decision to take command of the Russian Army on the Eastern Front, the political problems caused by the Tsarina and her reliance upon the unpopular Rasputin, as well as socio-economic factors such as the food shortages and the ever present land issue for the peasants. This question was generally well-answered. **Question (biv):** Candidates found it difficult to give a truly balanced response to this question, with unbalanced answers favouring other factors for the cause of the destruction of the Provisional Government such as the desire to end the war, food shortages and the land issue, often being repeated from (biii). Some responses examined some relevant examples of Bolshevik agitation, including the use of Lenin's slogans from his April Theses, Bolshevik control over the Petrograd Soviet and Trotsky's command over the Red Guard, as well as the Bolshevik's propaganda success after the failed Kornilov Coup.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Question (ai): Candidates were able to find some valid inferences from Source A and support them with relevant detail. Candidates correctly inferred that the Republicans opposed the New Deal and saw it as a threat to personal liberty – 'harass people'. Many responses achieved the highest marks, although a small number of candidates received less credit by simply repeating source material. **Question (aii):** This proved to be relatively straightforward for candidates. A majority of responses used source details to give a balanced response. Answers most commonly made references to the ruling of Alphabet Agencies as 'unconstitutional', as evidence that the Supreme Court opposed Roosevelt and quoted the 'legalizing of trade unions' and the 'Social Security Act' to give a counter-argument. **Question (aiii):** Candidates who gave evaluations generally focused on the attribution and provenance of the sources, citing the lack of reliability of Source A's Republican Party election publication and Source B's American authorship, achieved modest marks. There were a good number of better responses that used very relevant content from both sources to create a well thought out argument about usefulness.

Question (bi): A majority of responses successfully identified at least one major radical critic of the New Deal, most commonly Huey Long. A few candidates confused first names and surnames or cited less well-known critics. **Question (bii):** Some candidates would have benefitted from being able to give depth to their descriptions about the ways in which the Social Security Act helped the American people. The most commonly given evidence was about pensions for over 65s and support for widows. Also acceptable would have been reference to the fact that the unemployment scheme was contributory but did not cover agricultural workers or domestic staff. **Question (biii):** This question proved challenging for some candidates, although a few were able to explain different reasons for the persistence of unemployment despite the New Deal. Candidates most commonly referred to the fact that the agencies were temporary in nature and the budget was cut in 1937 which led to an increase in unemployment. A number of candidates also explained how a lack of confidence from the consumer and the employers led to a lack of investment in new businesses. **Question (biv):** Candidates were very successful at demonstrating in-depth knowledge about the successes of the TVA and then countering the argument by examining the relative successes of other Alphabet Agencies such as the AAA, NRA and PWA, as well as other New Deal policies including the Social Security Act, Wagner Act and Emergency Banking Act. Many responses were very strong, with a few giving a fully balanced argument for higher marks.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

This Depth Study was chosen by a small number of candidates. On the whole, in **Question (aiii)**, candidates were able to find one or two inferences from Source A about landlords after the Civil War, though a few misinterpretations were given. Likewise, some candidates were able to give a balanced response for **Question (aii)** to show that peasants dealt severely with landlords on the one hand with quotes such as 'severe punishment', and also not severely with quotes such as 'let off lightly'. Most candidates, however, tended to be one-sided with their evidence. **Question (aiii)** comprised mainly reasonable responses, though some of these were well argued and achieved good marks.

Question (bi) proved difficult for some and many found the definition of a collective farm challenging. Candidates also struggled on **Question (bii)**, many missing the question out and others citing little more than the development of heavy industry as a description of the first Five Year Plan. Candidates could have developed their descriptions by giving examples of the heavy industries such as coal, steel and chemicals, and also mentioning the financial and technical support given from the USSR. Similarly, **Question (biii)** saw few well-developed responses from candidates, with some offering no response. Valid reasons for the 'constructive criticism' of the Chinese Communist government could have included the need for improved relations between intellectuals, party cadres and experts, or to flush out dissidents. **Question (biv)** was attempted by very few candidates and often answers were generalised, off topic or underdeveloped.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

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

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

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

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

This Depth Study was chosen by a small number of candidates. **Question (ai)** was generally well answered by most candidates, who were able to make valid inferences about Manchester in the 1830s, such as it was heavily populated, polluted or full of heavy industry supported by relevant source details. **Question (aii)** was also well answered. Candidates were able to find balance in the source to support the view that factory work was both easy ('all the hard work is done by the steam engine') and not easy ('excessively tedious and unpleasant'). Most candidates achieved higher marks on this question. **Question (aiii)** responses were mainly assertions and undeveloped evaluations.

Question (bi) saw some candidates just giving cotton as an answer, which was incorrect. Some valid responses were given such as coal, iron, steel and transport, as well as shipbuilding in one instance. Only a few candidates achieved maximum marks on this question. **Question (bii)** saw some responses where candidates described multiple factors which made Manchester a centre for industry such as its climate, geographical location near the coast and proximity to raw materials. However, some responses gave only one reason. **Question (biii)** saw many underdeveloped explanations which resulted in modest marks. Among the valid reasons given in stronger responses were better pay, forced migration from rural areas due to enclosure, and the decline of the domestic industries. **Question (biv)** saw candidates giving some

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0470 History November 2014
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

balanced responses, some of which would have been improved by better knowledge of the various acts of Parliament which could have been cited such as the Factory Acts, especially that of 1833, and the Public Health Acts, especially that of 1848.

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42

Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

Depth Study C (The USA, 1919-1941) was the most frequent choice of candidates in this session, with Depth Study A (Germany, 1918-1945) also very popular. A smaller number of responses were seen on Depth Study B (Russia, 1905-1941), and there were too few answers on other options to make comment worthwhile.

Scripts were, in the main, legible and written in good English. Many candidates allocated their time wisely in relation to the number of questions and their marks. **Section B** answers frequently demonstrated the grasp of secure historical knowledge and the majority of candidates tackled **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)** in line with the criteria. **Question (a)(iii)** could have been more effectively addressed by a number of candidates who provided generalisations on reliability. These responses would have been improved if they had been substantiated with specific reference to the sources in relation to the issue presented in the question.

Close attention should be paid to the specific focus of a question and any set dates to ensure fully relevant answers. Candidates should allocate time appropriate to each question and its mark tariff, particularly to ensure that the final question is addressed.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

- (a) (i) Many candidates made valid inferences from Source A about the condition of Germany at the end of the First World War and supported them with specific detail from the source on the evident political turmoil, the move from autocracy to democracy and the seeking of peace, all in so brief a time. Such responses attained higher marks. Some candidates paraphrased the source without any inference being made.
- (ii) Most responses focused securely on how far the support of workers was important to the new Weimar government in aiding Ebert to become its President. Contrasting this with his almost immediate pact with the army and then later the Freikorps to betray that support and deal violently with the workers, ensured balanced assessments which gained good marks.
- (iii) Candidates who concentrated on the issues raised in the sources made an informed and supported choice on the sources' utility in an assessment of the early years of the Republic. That Source A focused on political change and peace-making, whilst Source B put it into a wider social and military context, was appreciated in such responses. More candidates could have made use of the dates indicated in both sources, or supported cross-reference between the sources on the significance of socialism.
- (b) (i) The Kiel Mutiny appeared to be known by only a small number of candidates and this question was frequently not attempted.
- (ii) The majority of candidates were on more secure ground with the Spartacist Revolt, as the leaders and their fate at the hands of the Freikorps were well known. A smaller number appreciated the location of it in Berlin and the occupation of newspaper and government offices.
- (iii) All candidates had knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and secure responses deployed this to support explicit reasons for bitterness. Many excellent answers were seen. In less successful attempts, candidates appeared carried away in detailing the terms, rather than in providing the necessary focus on reasons for bitterness.

- (iv) Secure responses to this question were those which appreciated that focus needed to be on the specific period of 1923 to 1929, and that both economic and political aspects of stability needed to be assessed. How well Stresemann's government dealt with hyperinflation, resolved the occupation of the Ruhr and the benefits of the Dawes' Plan were considered by almost all candidates to restore some stability in the economy. A small number then went on to consider and support political issues evident in Germany such as the decline of extremism and the relative stability of the coalition governments. These issues balanced against the uneven nature of economic recovery, the fragility of reliance on American loans and, despite the failure of the Munich Putsch, the continued hostility of the right wing to a Weimar government dependant on coalitions, were considered in good responses. A number of candidates spent time detailing international events or artistic developments which lacked relevance to the domestic focus of the question.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

- (a) (i) All candidates drew and supported the valid inference that prisoners in gulags suffered from hunger. Better responses made a second inference such as that violence was used to drive them to work despite their physical condition.
- (ii) Almost all candidates saw the balance in this source and some went beyond quotes to explain why the Five-Year Plans could be judged a success but not sufficiently so to achieve Stalin's ambitions.
- (iii) There were some good responses to this question which had concentrated on the broader focus of 'Stalin's Russia' and compared the progress indicated in Source B with the repression highlighted in the first source. Less effective responses summarised their earlier answers or focused on generalities about 'reliability', which limited the credit which could be given.
- (b) (i) While some candidates just paraphrased the term 'Socialism in one country', others explained its meaning for Russia as defined by Stalin.
- (ii) How the Cult of Personality was encouraged by propaganda in its various forms to present Stalin as the father of his people was developed well by some candidates. They considered aspects such as his picture being everywhere, songs, radio broadcasts and even the naming of streets in Stalin's honour. Less assured responses were those unsure of the meaning of the phrase - they described methods of repression, rather than encouragement.
- (iii) Most candidates were able to give some reasons for the greater success in modernising industry than in agriculture, such as the relative ease of control in factories and the greater urgency of its development, whilst there was resistance in the countryside to collectivisation from kulaks. Some candidates weakened their responses by considering only industry or agriculture.
- (iv) This was a question where the focus on 'change' was essential to sound answers so that the importance of terror could be judged against other factors in its attainment. Broad aspects of change - political, economic and social – were considered in the best responses, and the use of terror was compared to propaganda, the people's commitment to communism and their benefits from improving healthcare, education and housing, to reach a reasoned conclusion on their relative importance. Less effective answers considered only aspects of terror, often unlinked to 'change'.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

- (a) (i) Candidates drew valid inferences and supported them from the source on Andrew Mellon and there were many excellent answers to this question. A small number of candidates spent too long on detailing their own knowledge of the Republican views: excellent although this often was, it was not necessary in answer to this question and would have been better deployed in answer to (b)(iv).
- (ii) Good answers made use of the source's content to assess the degree to which foreign factors influenced America's economic problems in comparison to internal issues such as over-speculation and how far 'voluntary cooperation' and Hoover's optimism would have been sufficient to avoid, or even added to, the economic problems. A judgment on how far the source appears to focus on the foreign factors was then made in the best responses which clearly merited higher marks.
- (iii) Most responses made sound use of the sources' content to focus on government attitudes towards the economy although, as in other topics, they tended not extend this to make cross-references

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0470 History November 2014
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

between the sources on, for example, the degree of similarity between the views of Mellon and Hoover and the importance of their positions in the government. Less effective responses concentrated on generalities about bias which could not gain high marks.

- (b) (i) ‘Buying on the margin’ was identified correctly by the majority of candidates as referring to the purchase of stocks on borrowed funds from banks in the expectation of a rise in profit. Other candidates mistook this for purchasing goods on hire purchase.
- (ii) There were some excellent responses to this question from candidates able to consider the specific events on the stock market between the set dates. A smaller number did not fare as well, as they had only hazy awareness that the market collapsed.
- (iii) The majority of candidates focused on reasons for Roosevelt’s promise of a New Deal, such as the severity of the economic problems, the inadequacies of Republican policies, the urgent need to restore confidence in the banking system and the importance of electioneering. As a result there were many strong answers to this question.
- (iv) Secure responses to this question displayed knowledge of what, exactly, Hoover’s policies were, so that they could then assess their merits in lessening the impact of the Depression. Without this, some candidates were able to make only general points on Republican attitudes. A small number of answers appreciated that the final date of the question was 1933, so Roosevelt’s accession to power and his immediate actions in the 100 Days, especially in dealing with the banking crisis, were very relevant.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43

Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

Depth Study A (Germany, 1918-1945) was the most frequent choice of candidates in this session, followed by Depth Study C (The USA, 1919-1941), and Depth Study F (Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994), which attracted similar numbers of candidates. Depth Study B (Russia, 1905-1941) was the fourth most popular topic, whilst there were too few answers on other options to make comment worthwhile.

Scripts were, in the main, legible and written in good English. Many candidates allocated their time wisely in relation to the number of questions and their marks. **Section B** answers frequently demonstrated the grasp of secure historical knowledge and the majority of candidates tackled **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)** in line with the criteria. **Question (a)(iii)** could have been more effectively addressed by a number of candidates who provided generalisations on reliability. These responses would have been improved if they had been substantiated with specific reference to the sources in relation to the issue presented in the question.

Close attention should be paid to the specific focus of a question and any set dates to ensure fully relevant answers. Candidates should allocate time appropriate to each question and its mark tariff, particularly to ensure that the final question is addressed.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

- (a) (i) Most candidates made valid inferences from Source A about the Hitler Youth and supported them with specific detail from the source on the evident enjoyable activities and the camaraderie fostered, with possible future benefit to the Nazi state. Such responses attained higher marks.
- (ii) Here too there were many sound responses seeing the success in recruitment numbers, opportunity for indoctrination and military training, then comparing this with some members' limited grasp of Nazi teachings and the resentment of the hours having to be spent in the organisation by those teenagers who had jobs. These responses reached a valid judgement on success. Some astute responses also appreciated that making membership compulsory in 1939 might indicate that enthusiasm was not entirely heartfelt.
- (iii) Candidates who concentrated on the issues raised in the sources made an informed and supported choice on the sources' utility in an assessment of the Hitler Youth. A smaller number appreciated that the focus of the question was broader than this, as it was on 'young people' in general. They took the opportunity to consider those indicated in Source B who were working from the age of fourteen and the 0.17 million left out of the compulsory membership and compared this with the rosy image presented in Source A of unified, carefree youth. The best responses added cross-references on 'fellowship' and the shift in emphasis to military training in Source B, perhaps drawing on the 'strong, healthy bodies' of Source A.
- (b) (i) The opportunity for subsidised leisure activities such as theatre, sport and educational courses, or even holidays and cheap travel which were offered by 'Strength through Joy', were known by a number of candidates. Some less successful candidates just considered employment in general.
- (ii) All candidates were aware of the home responsibilities of women which were encouraged by the Nazis and most appreciated that this was linked to the issue of 'employment' which was reduced as a result, as well as the focus on providing jobs for men in the early years of the Third Reich. The

best answers went on to consider the change in policy brought about by the need for munitions workers in the course of the war.

- (iii) Many good responses were seen on this question from candidates who considered a range of reasons for the limited opposition to Nazi rule. Candidates had knowledge of the significance of the repressive Nazi organisations such as the Gestapo and SS, as well as the role of propaganda, economic improvements and patriotic feeling during the war in limiting opposition. Some furthered this by indicating the complete suppression of other political parties, denying any opportunity for complaint.
- (iv) The most secure responses to this question were those from candidates who ensured focus covered the specific period of 1933 to 1945 in assessing the aims of the Nazi government. Such candidates appreciated that whilst the foundations were clearly laid earlier, there were shifts in aims during the specified period: in particular, that victory in the war became a priority. A small number did consider the persecution of other minorities, as well as the shift from persecution to genocide during the war, despite the costs, in support of their judgement. The majority made very general points on the persecution of the Jews and then compared this with equally general comment on the aims of overturning the Treaty of Versailles and strengthening of the German economy, yet neglected to carry this forward to consider the war years. As a result this was usually the least successful response on this topic.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

- (a) (i) Most candidates were able to draw and support valid inferences on the condition of Russia in 1921 as so desperate that a change of policy was deemed by Lenin as essential to economic recovery.
 - (ii) Candidates saw the balance in this source between the necessity of winning the civil war against what could be seen as the unnecessary suffering this caused to the peasantry and the military costs of dealing with rebellions, and thus gained sound marks on this question.
 - (iii) This question was often addressed less successfully as candidates considered only generalised points on the 'reliability' of the sources, rather than comparing the content on the issue of war communism. As a result, only low marks could be awarded for such answers.
- (b) (i) That Lenin was suspicious of Stalin was known by almost all candidates, although more could have elaborated on this to indicate the concern about Stalin's powers as the Secretary General, leading Lenin to advise that he should be removed from the position, as well as pointing to the danger of a split with Trotsky.
 - (ii) The majority of candidates correctly linked Stalin with 'socialism in one country' and Trotsky with 'world revolution', although a smaller number supported this with description of what exactly these policies would entail or the leaders' reasons for their adoption.
 - (iii) All answers focused on Stalin's reasons for abandoning the New Economic Policy, such as his dislike of its capitalist nature and desire to establish his grip on power and the economy. A number of candidates indicated awareness of further reasons such as the need to develop the economy, to support defence and catch up with the industrialisation of the West.
 - (iv) Most responses to this question were brief and offered only general reasons for different perceptions of Trotsky and Stalin, and few considered what the 'struggle for leadership' actually involved. As a result, this proved to be the least successful answer for those candidates. That Stalin tricked Trotsky over Lenin's funeral was known but his developing power base and machinations with those such as Zinoviev and Kamenev was considered by only a small number of candidates, as were such issues as the suspicions of Trotsky as a former Menshevik.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

- (a) (i) Almost all candidates gained sound marks as they drew valid inferences, and supported them from the source, on investors as speculators in search of quick profits lulled into false confidence by the economic development in previous years. A smaller number also saw that these 'gamblers' were faced with ruin by the end of 1929 and could not understand their position as showing they had been gullible.

- (ii) Many responses made good use of the source's content to assess the degree to which President Hoover was worried about the possible consequences of the Wall Street Crash for both business and workers as he had initiated new construction projects and measures of cooperation. This was then compared with his positive attitude - that this would be only a short-term downturn in the economy which voluntary works would remedy and that pessimism was 'unnecessary' - to reach a balanced conclusion on the degree to which he was fearful of the outcome of the Crash.
- (iii) As on some other topics, this question was often addressed less successfully as candidates considered only generalised points on the 'reliability' of the sources and, as a result, only limited credit could be awarded. Candidates who appreciated that the question had the broader focus on the economic situation, rather than just the Wall Street Crash, were able to make use of the content of the sources to assess the rapid shift from the prosperity that had lasted for eight years to September 1929 to potential disaster by the end of the year, as indicating the fragile base for confidence in the economy. Cross-reference contrasting the collapse of investors' confidence in Source A with that of the President, despite both sources being in December 1929, was made by a small number of candidates.
- (b) (i) Projects such as road-building and the Hoover Dam were known by some candidates. Others did not attempt this question.
- (ii) All candidates had some knowledge of who the Bonus Marchers were and some had extensive knowledge of their main reason for protest. In some cases this was not supplemented by focus on the specific demands of the question which was to identify what happened to them in Washington. Some good answers did concentrate on this correct focus and considered the Marchers' camps outside the White House, the reactions of Congress and the Senate, and the President's deployment of troops to disperse the protestors using tanks, teargas and burning of the tents, leading to some deaths and huge publicity.
- (iii) A range of reasons for the limited effect of President Hoover's policies was evident in many responses. Almost all candidates appreciated that his Republican stance limited the amount of measures he was willing to undertake, and that the severity of the Depression was not fully appreciated. Some went further to consider reasons such as the raising of tariffs being counterproductive and that lowering taxes did not stimulate demand when confidence was so low.
- (iv) The best responses to this question demonstrated a secure grasp of a range of consequences of the Wall Street Crash and linked them to the issue of 'despair'. The depth of unemployment, evictions, the lack of social relief, the collapse of many banks and hesitant measures taken by Hoover's government were added to the direct effects on some investors as major aspects producing despair for many, as well as the huge loss of confidence. This was balanced against the fact that the wealthy and middle class did not suffer as much as others and that there were longer-standing weaknesses in both agriculture and some industries, whilst the 1932 Presidential victory of Roosevelt could be argued as a major positive result as the New Deal offered hope.

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

- (a) (i) All candidates were able to draw the inference that President Truman's priority was his electoral base in America and the majority did support this with specific detail from the source to gain high marks.
- (ii) Most candidates saw this source's consideration of the outside powers' self-interests in oil supplies and the avoidance of war being balanced by concrete efforts to resolve the Middle Eastern countries' problems. Better responses made the point that the source only specified American concrete actions in this regard but the majority of responses were secure.
- (iii) Some candidates wrote generalisations on reliability without specific support from the sources' content and thus limited the marks which could be achieved, no matter how long the answers. Evaluation of the content of the sources is essential to judge utility and gain higher marks, and here the contrast could have been drawn between what seemed to be almost Truman's isolationism in Source A and the major activity of the 1970s.
- (b) (i) Although most candidates correctly identified Hamas as a radical group opposed to Arafat after 1982, they did not know of another such as Hezbollah.

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0470 History November 2014
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

- (ii) The majority of candidates were able to describe some of the terrorist actions of the PLO, such as at the 1972 Olympics, and the best answers went further to consider more positive means of drawing the world's attention, through diplomacy and Arafat's effect on the United Nations.
- (iii) A range of reasons for Arab states not always supporting the Palestinians was developed well by a number of candidates and most had some grasp of the self-interest of states such as Jordan and Lebanon in avoiding retaliation from Israel.
- (iv) Almost all candidates appreciated the need for balanced answers to this question and compared the ongoing social and economic difficulties of the Palestinians with the degree of improvement brought about by the aid of the UN, and gaining a degree of self-rule in Gaza and the West Bank. A deeper and fuller range of evidence would have improved some responses.