

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Candidates should read the questions very carefully in order to give themselves the opportunity to write focused, balanced and relevant answers. Any given dates in a question should be closely noted to help ensure that answers include only relevant material.

Part **(a)** questions require recall and description. Part **(b)** questions require recall and explanation, and part **(c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis. In part **(c)** questions the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond repeating what has already been stated in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important', 'how successful' or 'to what extent', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

Many candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the actual question set. Parts **(b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but were unable to develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In part **(c)** answers candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers. Candidates need to ensure that they use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make; some candidates set out a clear argument and then needed to support this argument with relevant factual knowledge.

There were a number of rubric errors but on the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with the majority completing the paper. A small number of candidates wrote over one page in response to a part **(a)** question; this appeared to impact upon the time then available to answer the remaining questions on the paper.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Question 1

- (a)** There were some detailed responses to this question, with candidates identifying the difficulties relating to minorities, the discontent of the people regarding Magyar being the official language, taxation and the members of the Hungarian Diet being mostly Magyar. Some candidates answered this question in very general terms only; points made need to be specific to the era and country given in the question.
- (b)** Explanations given in response to this question focused primarily on liberal beliefs that the new Pope shared their ideas for Italian independence. Candidates were able to identify a number of relevant points; these points needed to be developed into explanations.
- (c)** Responses to this question focused mainly on the success of the 1848 revolution in France in extending the franchise and creating the National Workshops; explanations of failure were focused

upon the discontent of certain groups with having to pay taxes to fund the National Workshop scheme, when they themselves received no benefit from the scheme. A number of candidates described the events of the actual revolution, rather than analysing its success and failure.

Question 2

- (a) Some candidates identified that Charles Albert's decision gave the Austrians time to organise reinforcements and that the people of Lombardy did not give the expected support to Charles Albert. A significant number of candidates wrote about Charles Albert's actions generally, rather than specifically about him delaying the invasion of Lombardy.
- (b) Explanations were focused mainly upon the importance of the relationship in agreeing the Treaty of Plombières. Some candidates identified a number of relevant points, including that Napoleon agreed to help Piedmont if it were attacked by Austria; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations by more candidates. A small number of candidates described who Cavour was, rather than focusing their answers on the question.
- (c) There were some effective answers to this question, with candidates explaining the importance of Mazzini in terms of the Young Italy movement and his appeal to the intellectuals in Italy, and the importance of Garibaldi with his expedition to Sicily and his liberation of Palermo. In better responses candidates developed points made into explanations. Some candidates wrote lengthy descriptions of Garibaldi's campaigns; these descriptions needed to be developed into explanations linking them to their importance in moving Italy towards unification.

Question 3

- (a) Some candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of John Brown's contribution to the abolitionist cause, giving a number of concisely expressed and relevant points, mainly centred on the events at Harper's Ferry. A small number of candidates wrote in general terms only, stating that John Brown was an abolitionist; this was mentioned in the question.
- (b) A number of candidates were able to identify that Lincoln was known for his anti-slavery views and that he was not on the ballot in the South. Both of these points were developed into explanations by a small number of candidates. Further identifications focused upon Lincoln having promised to raise tariffs and philosophical differences between Lincoln and the South.
- (c) There were some clear explanations of agreement with the statement in the question, focused upon the South's economic need to keep slavery and the North feeling that slavery was morally wrong. Overall explanations in agreement with the statement were stronger than those in disagreement. Some candidates explained that issues relating to trade also contributed to the outbreak of the Civil War; other candidates identified such points.

Question 4

- (a) A number of candidates gave clearly focused responses to this question, detailing points such as the size of Germany's army and navy, its developing empire and its industrial strength. The question clearly asked about Germany before 1914; some candidates gave details relating to Germany during the years of Nazi rule from 1933.
- (b) There were a number of clear explanations given, relating to Russia's rivalry with Austria-Hungary and also to Russia having the largest army. A number of responses gave detailed descriptions of Russia and its army and alliances; these responses would have been improved by reference to how these contributed to increasing tension between the Great Powers. Some responses focused on tension after 1914, which is not relevant to this particular question.
- (c) Most candidates were able to identify several relevant points on each side of the argument, such as the Kaiser sending a gunboat to Agadir, the humiliation of the Kaiser at the Algeiras Conference, the Kaiser testing the Entente Cordiale, German support for Austria in the Balkans and Russian support for Serbia. These identifications needed to be developed into explanations.

Question 5

- (a) There were many effective answers to this question, with candidates giving clear and focused details of the punishment given to Austria in the peace settlements of 1919–20. These usually focused upon limitations placed on the army, details of land losses and union between Austria and Germany being forbidden.
- (b) A number of candidates gave one clear explanation focused on Wilson’s desire to ensure world peace in the future. Most candidates were able to identify a number of reasons why Wilson wanted a ‘league of nations’; these identified points needed to be developed into explanations. Some candidates wrote at considerable length about the actions of the League of the Nations in the 1920s and the 1930s, which is not relevant to this particular question.
- (c) There were some effective answers to this question, with clear explanations given on both sides of the argument. Arguments in agreement with the statement in the question were focused primarily upon the failure of the Treaty of Sèvres, the creation of minority groups in new states and the long term effect of the Treaty of Versailles in contributing to the outbreak of World War Two. Arguments in disagreement with the hypothesis in the question focused mainly upon France feeling more secure and the creation of the League of Nations. A significant number of candidates wrote at some length about the terms of the various treaties forming the peace settlement of 1919–1920, without addressing the idea of failure.

Question 6

- (a) Many candidates were able to give at least one relevant point in response to this question, usually detailing that Lebensraum meant ‘living space’ and that it involved expansion eastwards. A number of candidates wrote about Hitler’s Greater Germany policy rather than Lebensraum.
- (b) There were some clear explanations given in response to this question, detailing that Hitler had taken Germany out of the League of Nations in 1933 so Hitler did not have to abide by their rules, and explaining that he viewed the League as weak as they had failed to stop the aggression of Japan and Italy. Some responses were focused on Chamberlain’s actions rather than on the League of Nations’ own policies. A number of candidates described at length Hitler’s actions in invading various countries, without closely addressing the question.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained carefully that Hitler’s aggression meant that he invaded and occupied a number of different countries and that eventually war was the only way to stop him. On the other side of the argument explanations focused upon appeasement giving Hitler the confidence to continue with his aggressive foreign policy, and appeasement alienating the USSR. A number of candidates wrote at great length about the rationale for the policy of appeasement, rather than focusing upon the issue in the question. The question asked specifically about Hitler’s aggression and appeasement and their responsibility for war in 1939.

Question 7

- (a) Most responses to this question gave at least two relevant points, focused upon Soviet tanks and troops being sent into Hungary. Some responses also detailed what happened to Rakosi and Nagy. Some responses were generalised in nature; questions such as this one require a focused and specific response.
- (b) Answers were focused on the Berlin Wall being a symbol of division between East and West, it dividing families and also being a violation of agreements between East and West. Some responses developed these points into explanations. A number of responses were focused on the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Airlift; this was not relevant to the question.
- (c) Some responses explained clearly that Solidarity showed that a united people could resist a Communist government, and then proceeded to link this to the decline of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe. On the other side of the argument, the withdrawal of Red army support and Gorbachev’s policies of perestroika and glasnost were explained. A significant number of candidates demonstrated that they had a detailed knowledge of Solidarity in Poland, and of Gorbachev’s policies of perestroika and glasnost; they described these in great detail. Better responses developed this knowledge to demonstrate an understanding of how these factors were responsible for the decline of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe.

Question 8

- (a) Relevant points made included Saddam Hussein's involvement with the Ba'ath Party, his involvement in assassination attempts and the support he gave to Bakr. Some responses focused solely upon Saddam Hussein's career after July 1968, which was not relevant to this question. Some candidates wrote generalised answers only, with no specific details given.
- (b) Responses identified that Saddam Hussein took eleven years to remove Bakr because he did not wish to appear as having presidential ambitions too soon, that he wanted to maintain Bakr's dignity and that he needed time to remove all those who could be a threat to him. Only a few responses developed these points into explanations; where identified points were expanded, it was usually with more description. It is essential that candidates develop identified points into explanations that are carefully focused on the question.
- (c) Effective responses to this question explained the importance of the personality cult in Saddam Hussein's consolidation of his dictatorship, detailing the exhibition about his life, the statues and paintings of him all over Iraq, and the positive portrayal of him in the media. On the other side of the argument, the use of terror and Saddam Hussein's modernisation programme were explained. A significant number of responses gave a variety of identified points only; development of these points into explanations would improve such answers.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Candidates were able to identify a number of benefits Britain gained from its naval blockade of Germany, including the adverse effects on Germany's armaments industry, Germany struggling to feed her population, German morale decreasing and British morale increasing. Some responses gave just one relevant point about the effects of the blockade on Germany's ability to feed her population and then wrote more generally about the war.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify relevant points, such as Britain being able to maintain control of the North Sea and being able to continue with the blockade of the north German coast. These identifications were developed into explanations in strong responses. A number of candidates wrote in general terms only, saying the Battle of Jutland was important because ships were lost at sea.
- (c) It was clear that some candidates had a detailed knowledge of the convoy system and other methods of dealing with the U-boat threat, such as Q ships and mines. These methods were described in detail. Candidates needed to develop their answers by explaining exactly the reasons why each method was or was not effective in tackling the U-boat threat.

Question 10

- (a) There were some concise and focused responses to this question, detailing the attack on the 'Lusitania', the Zimmerman Telegram and American public opinion. In some instances, the question was answered in very general terms only; candidates are expected to know the reasons why America decided to enter the war.
- (b) Some candidates were able to give one clear explanation focused upon the offensive being launched as one final attempt by Germany to win the war. Others gave a number of identified points, such as the impending arrival of the Americans to help the Allies, the problems at home in Germany and the failure of the submarine campaign to knock Britain out of the war.
- (c) A small number of candidates explained the significance of the Kiel Mutiny in ensuring the abdication of the Kaiser, and then proceeded to explain the suffering of the German people during World War One as another reason why the Kaiser had to abdicate. Most candidates who answered this question were able to identify some relevant points, such as the food shortages in Germany, the abdication being the only way to prevent civil war in Germany and the abdication being a condition for peace. Some candidates appeared to be unaware of the details relating to the Kiel Mutiny.

Question 11

- (a) There were a number of effective answers to this question, with relevant points such as the desire to overthrow Ebert's moderate government, to have a revolution like the Russian Revolution and to have the working classes controlling society. Some candidates focused their answers upon the events of the Spartacist uprising rather than detailing what the Spartacists wanted to achieve.
- (b) Candidates on the whole knew what proportional representation was and were able to describe it. Some candidates identified that proportional representation led to many coalition governments and allowed extremist parties to be represented in the Reichstag. A small number of candidates gave one or two clear explanations of why proportional representation was a weakness, usually focused on the number of coalition governments and the inherent problems this caused, and the platform given to extremist parties.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained the cultural achievements of the Weimar Republic with reference to the lifting of censorship and the development of expressionism, meaning there was freedom to develop new ideas in a variety of areas. On the other side of the argument, explanations were given of economic achievements such as the ending of hyperinflation and the introduction of a new currency, and the negotiation of the Dawes Plan. Explanation also focused on Germany being accepted back into the international community. On the whole, explanations of achievements other than cultural were more developed; some candidates gave detailed explanations of economic achievements and only identified that there were new developments in art and the theatre, for example.

Question 12

- (a) Effective answers to this question detailed the work of the police in contributing to Nazi control through the tapping of telephones, the interception of mail and a network of informers, which all helped to find those who were disloyal to the Nazi regime. With reference to the courts, relevant points included judges and magistrates being biased as they had taken an oath of loyalty to Hitler, the setting up of the People's Court to try enemies of the state, and the punishments meted out by the courts. Some candidates did not take note of the word 'and' in the question, and only wrote about the police or the courts rather than both, as directed by the question.
- (b) There were some clearly focused responses to this question, with explanations of mass rallies being a propaganda opportunity, a way of encouraging loyalty and support for the Nazi regime and a way of reinforcing the personality cult of Hitler. Some candidates described what happened at the rallies, rather than explaining why the Nazis organised them
- (c) A number of candidates wrote effective responses to this question, detailing Hitler's control through propaganda, censorship, the Hitler Youth, education and fear. Some also detailed positive control through the use of Strength through Joy and the Beauty of Labour. Lack of total control was explained through a consideration of the activities of people in the church like Cardinal Galen and Pastor Niemöller, and the attitude of young people within groups such as the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates. Many candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the methods of control used by Hitler and the Nazis, and also of the opposition which meant that Hitler did not have total control. This knowledge needed to be used to construct focused explanations, rather than writing a narrative.

Question 13

- (a) Relevant points given in response to this question included peasant uprisings and the killing of landlords, details of various strikes, the Potemkin Mutiny and university candidates staging a walkout.
- (b) A number of candidates identified that Stolypin was important because he used the 'carrot and stick' approach, and because he introduced reforms to help improve the lives of peasants. These identifications needed to be developed into explanations of why this meant Stolypin was important to the Tsarist regime.

- (c) There was evidence that some candidates had a detailed knowledge of reasons for the collapse of Tsarist rule in 1917. Explanations of the loss of support from the armed forces focused upon the Tsar's failure as commander-in-chief of the army, soldiers refusing to obey orders and soldiers shooting their own officers. Other factors were also explained clearly, such as the actions of the Tsarina, the role of Rasputin, the effects of strikes on the economy and the food shortages throughout the country. Some candidates used their knowledge to describe events, for example, writing at some length about Rasputin's relationship with the Tsarina, without explaining why this was important in the collapse of Tsarist rule in 1917.

Question 14

- (a) Relevant points made included the decision of the Provisional Government to continue the war, the failure to solve the food shortages, the failure to carry out land reform and the problems ensuing as a result of the Kerensky Offensive. Some responses were generalised in nature, with no reference made to the specific criticisms made of the Provisional Government by its opponents.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify that many leading Bolsheviks had already been arrested and that Lenin thought his own life was in danger. A small number of candidates developed these identifications into explanations. A number of candidates wrote about events from October 1917; these were not relevant to this question.
- (c) There were some highly effective responses to this question, with clear explanations given of the disunity amongst the Whites, their lack of discipline and the White generals failing to co-ordinate their attacks. Disagreement with the statement in the question focused upon the Reds having control of the railways and the large industrial centres, and the skill of Trotsky as commander of the Red Army. Some candidates gave a response based on only one side of the argument; for stronger answers, candidates must ensure that they consider both sides of the argument.

Question 15

- (a) Relevant points given included that investors' shares became worthless, that investors went bankrupt and that investors lost confidence in the American economy. Some responses focused on the consequences of the Wall Street Crash generally, rather than specifically for individual investors, as asked in the question. A few candidates described the Wall Street Crash in detail, without a clear focus on the actual question.
- (b) A number of candidates were able to give at least one explanation in response to this question. Explanations were focused upon Roosevelt travelling during his election campaign to meet ordinary people and to share with them his ideas for a new deal, and the contrast between Roosevelt and Hoover, with the perception of Hoover as being uncaring. Most candidates were able to give at least two valid identifications, usually identifying that people thought Hoover did not care about them and that Roosevelt inspired confidence with his ideas.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained that limited export markets caused problems because American producers were left with goods they could not sell, and on the other side of the argument, gave explanations of the unequal distribution of wealth and the low incomes of many Americans. A number of candidates wrote about the weaknesses of the American economy after the Wall Street Crash, when the question asked about the weaknesses prior to the Wall Street Crash.

Question 16

- (a) Relevant points made included the use of dams to control flooding and to help irrigate the land, the planting of trees to improve soil and the production of cheap electricity. Most candidates were able to give at least two relevant points.
- (b) Responses to this question included relevant identifications such as the perception that Roosevelt was behaving as a dictator, that his policies were unconstitutional and that the Supreme Court had the ultimate power to block any measures introduced by Roosevelt. A few candidates developed one of these identifications into an explanation. Some candidates described opposition to Roosevelt's New Deal generally, rather than explaining why Roosevelt was unable to deal effectively with the Supreme Court's opposition to the New Deal.

- (c) Effective answers to this question explained that racial discrimination was not ended by the New Deal, focusing on segregation still occurring, and the failure to pass an anti-lynching law. On the other side of the argument, explanations were focused upon the failure of the New Deal to end unemployment, inequality in the workplace for women and the poverty still experienced by so many people, especially in rural America. Most candidates attempting this question were able to give at least two valid identifications; these needed to be developed into explanations.

Questions 17 to 19

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

Question 20

- (a) Relevant points made in response to this question included the Black Consciousness Movement wanting people to be proud of black history and culture, and encouraging people to break free from apartheid. A number of candidates appeared to be unsure of the details of the aims of the Black Consciousness Movement.
- (b) Some candidates demonstrated an awareness that Oliver Tambo established ANC offices in foreign countries and that he played a role in keeping the ANC together during the later years of apartheid. These points were identified rather than explained. Some candidates wrote in general terms only, stating that Oliver Tambo helped the ANC.
- (c) Some candidates were able to identify relevant points in response to this question, citing that the ANC called on people to make South Africa ungovernable, that government buildings were attacked, and they also identified the role of MK in the violence of the 1980s and the early 1990s. Some answers were very general in nature and did not refer to specific historical events.

Question 21

- (a) Responses to this question included relevant points such as Nasser gaining complete control of the Suez Canal, the removal of the blockade of the Tiran Straits and Nasser's prestige increasing. Some candidates were able to answer the question in general terms only.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify various activities of the Palestine Liberation Organisation between 1967 and 1976 that caused tension, such as the hijacking of an Israeli passenger plane in 1968 and the attack on Israeli athletes at the 1972 Munich Olympics. In stronger answers, these identifications were developed into explanations.
- (c) Responses included the identification of examples of superpower involvement in conflict in the Middle East, such as the USA replacing Israeli tanks in the Yom Kippur War, the USSR giving financial aid to Egypt, and the Arab states using the weapon of oil to influence the actions of the USA. Some successful responses were seen; others needed to develop these identifications into explanations.

Question 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

Candidates should read the questions very carefully in order to give themselves the opportunity to write focused, balanced and relevant answers. Any given dates in a question should be closely noted to help ensure that answers include only relevant material.

Good answers were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. These candidates were able to use their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answer to their chosen questions. Less successful responses, whilst demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to use the knowledge effectively to answer the question set.

There were very few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

General comments

Part (a) questions demand recall, so answers should focus on specific detail or information. Explanation is not required, and many responses seemed to grasp this.

Parts (b) and (c) questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events, rather than using a narrative approach or long introductions which 'set the scene'. Part (b) saw many good, explanatory responses, and Part (c) produced many good responses which contained detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Other responses needed to develop thoroughly explained/more detailed arguments. To achieve most credit candidates must argue both for and against the focus of the question in order to reach a valid conclusion. Successful conclusions included analysis and addressed "how far" or "to what extent". Less successful conclusions tended to rely on summarising the reasons already included in their essay.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2 and 3

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

Question 4

- (a) This question requires recall and description and, therefore, can be a short answer for full marks. Candidates gained credit for naming Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy and identifying that benefits of the Triple Alliance included that they had security from each other and that Germany was a powerful ally for Austria– Hungary and Italy. Weaker responses included generalisations rather than specific details and/or confused the Triple Alliance with the Triple Entente.
- (b) Successful responses to this question explained why the Kaiser became involved in Morocco, showing a thorough understanding of the Kaiser's motives. These responses usually included the desire of the Kaiser to extend his North African Empire and the fact that he was testing the 1904

Entente Cordiale. Weaker responses included a narrative of events of the 1905 and/or 1911 Moroccan Crises, with little or no explanation of why the Kaiser became involved in Morocco.

- (c) There were some well-developed responses to this question, with candidates demonstrating a clear and detailed understanding of the reasons why war broke out in 1914. Effective responses to this question understood the Schlieffen Plan and how the very existence of the plan showed that Germany had highlighted France and Russia as potential enemies. They also appreciated the 'knock on effect' it had on other countries when war broke out. For example, Germany's invasion of Belgium led to Britain entering the war to defend Belgium's neutrality, as promised in the 1839 Treaty of London. Candidates producing strong responses then went on to explain other reasons why war broke out, usually including the impact of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the rival alliance systems and the war plans of France. Less successful responses, despite showing a sound knowledge of the causes of World War I, tended to write them as a list of reasons, rather than explaining why they led to war.

Question 5

- (a) This question required recall and description and, therefore, could be a short answer for full marks. Many candidates achieved full marks in two short sentences by stating that a plebiscite was a referendum or vote and it determined which country would govern a disputed area. A good example was the Saar, which was to be administered by the League of Nations for 15 years before a plebiscite was held. The Saar was the most popular example given but it was pleasing that some candidates mentioned that Denmark received North Schleswig after a plebiscite. Some candidates produced a very long answer, which is not required in an answer to part (a). Often the maximum marks were gained in the first few lines but some continued for nearly a side, writing about other aspects of the peace settlement which were not relevant to the plebiscites. This took time away from parts (b) and (c) which require explanation. Candidates also need to look carefully at the question for dates. The plebiscite for Austria did not fall into 1919–20 and was not part of the peace settlement. A number of candidates did not know what a plebiscite was and either gave no response or gave a long account of the treaties in general.
- (b) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates, who kept to the focus of the question. The focus of this question was why Lloyd George was generally satisfied with the peace treaties. Some candidates just provided the aims of Lloyd George or discussed why he was not satisfied with the peace treaties. However, candidates needed to provide two well-explained reasons for his satisfaction. Most successful candidates explained Lloyd George's satisfaction with the dominance of the Royal Navy as a result of the reductions in the German navy depriving Germany of most of its fleet. Many candidates explained Lloyd George's pleasure, as a result of being able to moderate Clemenceau's demands over reparations and, as a result, allow Britain to continue trading with Germany. Although most candidates took their examples from the Treaty of Versailles, a small number took aspects of the treaties with Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria to explain Lloyd George's satisfaction. These responses often explained Lloyd George's satisfaction at gaining Turkish provinces in the Middle East.
- (c) To achieve high marks in this question, candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer explaining that the 'diktat' and other aspects of the Treaty of Versailles were the main reasons for German bitterness. A small number of candidates, despite understanding other reasons why the Germans were bitter over the Treaty of Versailles, including the war guilt clause and reparations, did not understand the meaning of the term 'diktat' which limited the credit they could receive. There were, however, many very good responses which explained the bitterness caused by the lack of negotiation allowed at the peace conference, followed by detailed explanations of the bitterness caused by the terms involving reparations, military limitations, war guilt and the loss of colonies. Explanations of the 'diktat' and other aspects led to some strong answers which then allowed candidates to form a judgement.

Question 6

- (a) Some candidates had a very good understanding of the Anglo-German Naval Agreement signed in 1935. They wrote that the agreement allowed Germany to break the Treaty of Versailles, as Germany was allowed to build submarines and could increase her fleet up to 35% the size of Britain's, and that the terms of the agreement angered the French. A small minority of candidates did not know the terms of the agreement and did not attempt the question, whilst others wrote generally about military rearmament with no specific link to the navy.

- (b) This question was not fully understood by some candidates, who limited their answers to why some countries were dissatisfied with the treaties in the 1920s with no reference at all to the 1930s. Most successful responses usually used Germany and Hitler as an example of dissatisfaction in the 1930s, highlighting disarmament as a reason, that by the 1933 World Disarmament Conference most countries still had not disarmed. In addition Hitler considered that his vision of a Greater Germany was restricted by the Treaty of Versailles as he wanted to regain lost territory and unite with Austria. A common misconception was that he wanted to re-unite with Austria. Some candidates gained credit for explaining why Italy remained dissatisfied by the 1930s.
- (b) There were some well-developed responses to this question and many candidates performed strongly by showing a good understanding of both sides of the argument. Responses that explained that Chamberlain was wrong to sign the Munich Agreement of 1938 usually gave at least two explanations, including that the signing of the Munich Agreement led to the loss of support of the USSR and the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, and the fact that it was felt morally wrong to allow Hitler to go unchallenged and abandon Czechoslovakia. Explanations on the other side of the argument often included explanations related to the fear of another war, that Chamberlain feared communism more than Nazism, and the fact that it was felt that Britain was not yet prepared to fight another war, especially as it was uncertain as to whether the USA or Commonwealth countries would give their support. Weaker responses spent much time describing Chamberlain's meetings with Hitler, rather than explaining whether Chamberlain was correct to sign the agreement.

Question 7

- (a) This question was answered well by many candidates, although some responses confused what was agreed at Yalta with what was decided at Potsdam in July 1945. Less successful responses also focused on disagreements between the allies, rather than what decisions were made about Germany. It is important to read the question carefully, as the focus of the question is on decisions about Germany and not disputes between the allies. Simple factual statements were all that were needed to answer this question, including factors such as the division of Germany into four sectors, each controlled by one of the main allied powers, Berlin being divided into four parts and leading Nazis to be hunted down and tried as war criminals.
- (b) Responses to this question varied significantly in quality, with the strongest responses identifying and explaining why the wartime unity of the allies was beginning to break down by the time of the Yalta Conference of February 1945. Successful responses explained the on-going ideological differences of Communism and Capitalism, the growing lack of trust as the war against Germany was drawing to an end, the failure of the Americans and British to open up a second front (Operation Overlord) as quickly as Stalin wanted and the growing sphere of influence that the USSR was creating in Eastern Europe. A common misconception was to confuse the Yalta conference with Potsdam.
- (c) There were some well-developed answers to this question, with candidates explaining both how the Berlin Crisis of 1948–1949 and other factors, such as the increasing threat of the USSR's influence in Europe, led to the formation of NATO. The key to these explanations was being able to establish the purpose behind the formation of NATO as an organisation that recognised the need of the Western Powers to work together to combat the increasing threat posed by the USSR and Communism. Weaker responses tended to be characterised by descriptive accounts, usually of the Berlin Blockade and Airlift and/or the expansion of the USSR's influence in Eastern Europe, without explaining why these events caused the formation of NATO as an organisation for collective security for the western powers. A small number of candidates confused the Berlin Crisis of 1948–49 with the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961.

Question 8

- (a) There were many clear and concise responses to this question. Strong responses included four key features of the quarantine of Cuba imposed by the USA in October 1962. Most knew that it was a blockade imposed by the USA to prevent USSR ships carrying missiles from entering Cuba. Some candidates mentioned why the term 'quarantine', rather than blockade was used. Other candidates appeared not to have heard of the term and left the question blank, whilst others misunderstood the term and thought that it was linked to trade sanctions. A small minority of candidates wrote lengthy answers about the events of the crisis, with minimal reference to the quarantine.

- (b) This question was very well answered and the majority of candidates were able to explain two reasons why America's policy of containment was a failure in Vietnam. Reasons explained included, America's inability to combat guerrilla warfare, America's ineffective tactics and the expansion of communism to South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Responses which focussed on reasons why the communist Vietcong were popular in the south, including the failure of the strategic hamlets initiative and corruption of the South Vietnamese government also gained credit. There was also a clear understanding of events such as My Lai and their impact on American domestic public opinion. All of these reasons were acceptable provided that they were linked the reason to the failure of containment.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Most candidates were able to identify ways in which the approach of the USA to containment in Korea and Cuba were a success or failure. Many candidates understood the nature of the different successes, including that South Korea was kept free of communism and the USSR removed their missiles on Cuba. In less successful responses candidates found it more difficult to explain either or both with relevant contextual knowledge. Weaker responses also included lengthy descriptions of events in Korea and/or Cuba, with no reference to the success or failure of containing communism. A number of candidates attempted to compare both conflicts throughout their answer which often affected the structure of the essay and became more of a list and led to confusion. Stronger responses dealt with the USA's approach to containment with each situation separately and then made a comparative conclusion. Good responses were able to explain the positive results of the USA and United Nations working together in Korea. They explained that their approach was successful because the spread of communism into South Korea had been prevented and the domino effect, which the Americans feared, did not happen, therefore pressure was taken off Formosa and Japan. These strong responses then went on to evaluate the success of the American approach to containment when dealing with Cuba, often including the failure in The Bay of Pigs.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

- (a) There were many candidates who gained very high marks for this question as a result of their good understanding of the Spartacists Uprising and its impact on the German Republic. Good responses included the fact that the Spartacists attempted to overthrow democracy, they seized the newspaper offices in Berlin, they organised a general strike and were defeated by the Freikorps, who were fighting on the side of the Weimar Government.
- (b) The majority of the candidates showed a good understanding of why the Freikorps were important in the early years of the Weimar Republic. Good responses explained two reasons, firstly the role played by the Freikorps in defending the Weimar Government by defeating the Spartacists and the general strikes in the Ruhr, Rhineland and Saxony; secondly, by explaining that as well as defending the Weimar Republic, they attempted to overthrow the Government in the Kapp Putsch and failed.
- (b) The number of good responses revealed that this question had been clearly understood. Many very good responses contained detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Strong responses explained the economic recovery of Germany after 1923, including how Stresemann ended inflation by replacing the temporary currency with the Reichsmark and the impact of the Dawes Plan. There was excellent use of statistics to support the economic recovery. These responses then went on to give a balanced argument by explaining other achievements of Weimar Germany, including cultural revival, political stability and the improvement in international relations. In their analysis, good responses explained the limitations of the American loans and how the Wall Street Crash negated the economic achievements prior to 1929. Weaker responses included too much narrative on the events of the 1923 Ruhr Crisis and/or tended to list the other achievements rather than explain their impact.

Question 12

- (a) This question was particularly well-answered. Some responses focussed on the opportunity the games provided to promote Nazi propaganda and to demonstrate how organised Nazi Germany was. Others considered how technologically advanced the Nazis were, noting the use of modern lighting and television cameras. Answers which included that Goebbels could demonstrate the extent of the Nazi recovery from depression or the downplaying of the anti-Semitic messages during the Olympics also gained marks. A small number of candidates did not show specific knowledge of the Berlin Olympics and wrote generally about the work of Goebbels.
- (b) Answers to this question were variable in quality, with weaker responses focusing on 'how' the Nazis controlled the hearts and minds of young people, rather than 'why', which was the focus of the question. These responses often included long narratives of Nazi education policies and/or the activities of the Hitler Youth and League of German Maidens, with no reference to why they were set up. Most candidates were able to identify reasons why he wanted to control the hearts and minds of young people, the most common ones being to indoctrinate the young and to produce young fit men for the army. Candidates needed to provide two well-explained reasons; most candidates were able to identify reasons and then explain one reason, which most frequently was the purpose of indoctrination, in terms of ensuring the longevity of the Nazi regime and Hitler's plan for the Third Reich to last 1000 years. Others developed the point regarding loyalty, in order to ensure future soldiers for the army or mothers producing Aryan children. A number of candidates also focused on the importance of reducing opposition to the regime and considered how young people could be manipulated to instil loyalty and spy on, or report those that opposed the regime, including their own parents.
- (c) Effective answers to this question used examples from the mass media and culture to explain control and then to balance their argument, explained how the secret police controlled the German people. It must be stressed that the key word in the question was "control". Weaker responses included lots of description of the different types of media, most commonly newspapers and the distribution of cheap radios, but needed to explain how these methods of propaganda and censorship controlled the population through indoctrination and brainwashing by ensuring that only Nazi ideas and policies were promoted. Candidates found it easier to explain the control exercised by the secret police in terms of instilling fear. Strong responses explained that because of the unlimited powers of the Gestapo to search houses and arrest people without charge and send them to concentration camps, Germans were frightened to speak out against the regime. Another valid explanation was related to the unwillingness to criticise due to the use of a network of informants, the tapping of telephones and intercepting of mail and not knowing who in your circle of friends and neighbours was working for the secret police.

Question 13

- (a) The focus of this question was the impact of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–05 on the people of Russia. Candidates who realised this gained marks by including that the war was an embarrassing failure for Russia as Japan was regarded as a third-rate military power. Food became scarce which led to starvation and Father Gapon's Petition included an end to the war with Japan. Less successful responses often focused on the events of the war or reasons why the war started.
- (b) Candidates displayed sound knowledge on the reasons why the Dumas failed to turn Russia into a parliamentary democracy. Strong responses included the explanation that the Tsar issued the Fundamental Laws before the first Duma met, which stated that ministers were responsible to the Tsar alone and could not be removed by a vote of censure in the Duma. Weaker responses tended to identify reasons, such as the Tsar broke the terms of the October Manifesto but included no further information..
- (c) Strong responses were characterised by detailed explanations on both sides of the hypothesis. Candidates gained credit for examining the role of the Tsarina's friendship with Rasputin and his influence on the appointment of government positions, especially when it meant removing good quality ministers and replacing them with second rate ministers. They were then able to gain credit by explaining other factors which led to the collapse of the Tsarist regime, such as the Tsar taking command on the Eastern Front and the food shortages which subsequently affected Russia. Weaker responses tended to be mainly one-sided answers, because although most candidates agreed with the hypothesis and were able to give detailed descriptions of Rasputin's character and

his relationship with the Tsarina, they were unable to explain the impact of their friendship on the collapse of the Tsarist regime.

Question 14

- (a) There were many candidates who gained very high marks for this question by focusing on the key features of the New Economic Policy, providing statements such as 'it was a policy announced by Lenin', 'it began in March 1921', 'it brought an end to War Communism' and 'it allowed peasants to sell surplus grain on the open market'.
- (b) A small number of candidates struggled with the 'plausible' part of the question but despite this there were some good responses. The most well explained reason was that Stalin's ideas seemed more realistic than Trotsky's ideas. Communist Party leaders were concerned by Trotsky's radicalism and belief in permanent revolution, which meant that the USSR would be obliged to help communist groups in other countries. Stalin believed in 'socialism in one country', which would allow the USSR to concentrate on establishing communism at home first. This was more acceptable to Communist Party Leaders.
- (c) Overall, the responses of the candidates revealed that the question had been clearly understood. Most candidates could give detailed explanations on how art and culture was used to control the Soviet people, most often explaining the cult of Stalin' and the censorship of books, art and films. These candidates then explained other ways in which Stalin controlled the Soviet people, including the creation of a new constitution and the purges and show trials which were carried out to remove any opposition. Other responses were limited to description, especially of the art and culture, making no direct link to control.

Question 15

- (a) This question was generally well answered. Nearly all candidates were aware that tariffs made foreign imports expensive and were designed to protect American businesses from foreign competition. Most were able to point to the positive effects, particularly the growth of American industries, the boom of the 1920s, increased employment and the growth of consumerism. Some, but fewer, were able to cite the negative effects of retaliatory tariffs.
- (b) Most candidates were able to identify reasons why the growth of mail order and nationwide advertising were important factors in the economic boom. Strong responses included two explanations, for example, how the use of newspaper and radio advertising created consumer demand and how both mail order and national advertising had enabled people in rural areas, who had previously been isolated, to access goods and increase the market. Less successful responses needed to add explanation to points such as 'they led to increased demand' or 'they led to more sales'.
- (c) Strong responses to this question included explanations of how overproduction led to difficulties faced by farmers, including what caused prices to fall, the impact on mortgage and rent payments and the increase in rural employment. Candidates developed the impact of improved machinery and the growing efficiency of American farming in the 1920s and highlighted the difficulties faced by farmers as a result, often including the negative knock on effects on tenant farmers, whose problems were intensified. In many cases, explanations about Canadian competition were less confident, the cheapness of Canadian wheat being the main factor cited, followed by the greater efficiency of Canadian farmers. Strong responses on this side of the question had clearly developed explanations, with reference to the impact of the American tariffs as a disincentive to European countries to buy American products, including agricultural produce, thus allowing Canadian farmers to make major inroads into a market which had benefited US farmers in the First World War. Weaker responses simply identified why there was overproduction or competition from Canada but made no reference to the difficulties faced by farmers.

Question 16

- (a) The responses to this question showed that candidates had a good understanding of the Social Security Act of 1935. Statements detailing what the act provided, for example, old age pensions, unemployment benefit, a national insurance scheme and help for the sick and disabled, led to high marks being achieved.

- (b) Candidates performed well in this question and overall had a very good understanding as to why Roosevelt's 'Hundred Days' had the effect of restoring confidence. Well-explained reasons included detailed accounts of how Roosevelt restored faith in the banks (such as the closure and the backing by the federal reserve), and how this led to an improvement in confidence, as, when banks reopened, people were willing to deposit their money in the system. Many responses also included Roosevelt's 'fireside chats' and how he was able to use these to restore a general feeling of confidence in the people that things would be improving with the New Deal. Weaker responses identified and described the 'alphabet agencies' but candidates needed to ensure that they thought carefully about how Roosevelt's actions translated into improved confidence. For example, if alphabet agencies are being described, they need to explain how the extent of government legislation, to provide work and opportunities, signalled that there would be jobs for people, which inspired confidence that unemployment would decrease and thus people gained the confidence to start spending again.
- (c) Many candidates performed strongly on this question by explaining the Supreme Court criticism to the New Deal and then explaining the criticism from other groups and individuals, most notably Huey Long and Father Coughlin. Criticisms from others were less commonly cited (such as the Liberty League, Dr. Townsend and state governors). The most successful responses were able to produce a balanced argument and then evaluate the relative seriousness of the threats, for example, by explaining that the Supreme Court posed the greater threat and was thus 'more serious' because it was only the Supreme Court that had vetoing power and had the power to actually change the law. Other responses, although familiar with some of the criticisms from individuals and groups, tended to feature narratives of what they did not like about the New Deal, rather than explanations of why the criticism was serious.

Questions 17 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

- At the start of the examination, candidates should take time to read carefully through all the sources.
- Candidates should use the time available efficiently, answering all the questions in their chosen option, and taking care not to run short of time on **Question 6**, which carries the most marks of all the questions.
- Candidates should directly answer the questions they are asked. If asked why something happened, reasons must be given. If candidates are asked to explain whether or not they are surprised, they should say what they find surprising and why. The same, direct approach, applies to the other types of question on the examination paper.

General comments

Most candidates produced complete scripts, consisting of positive responses to all the questions. The level of comprehension of the sources was good, as was knowledge of the context in which the sources are set. Questions offering opportunities for source evaluation were often answered effectively. Although most answers were properly focused on the question, there were candidates who commented on source reliability in almost every question. Whether or not you can believe what a source says is only relevant in certain questions – typically those asking about proof, trust, surprise – whilst in others, such as those asking for comparisons or messages, it is generally unnecessary. The other way that lack of focus can occur is when answers don't directly address the question. This might be, for example, where the question asks why something was published at a certain time, but the candidate's answer doesn't provide a reason.

There were many fewer responses to the nineteenth-century option. Generally, the quality of responses was stronger on the twentieth century option.

Comments on specific questions

Option A – 19th century topic

Question 1

This question asked what impressions could be derived from Source A about events leading to the Franco-Prussian War. This was inviting inferences that could be made from the source. Some candidates simply repeated parts of the source. No matter how relevant to the War, this could not be seen as an adequate response. There were also valid inferences that didn't deal with the main message of the source, such as France wanting revenge for being cheated in 1866. Better answers did not merely spot the inference, but also supported it from the source content. However, a good number of candidates saw that the overall inference to be drawn from the source was that Prussia was the most responsible for increasing tensions before 1870.

Question 2

Sources B and C contained both agreements and disagreements, and for almost all candidates the issue of whether Bismarck was lying in Source B was determined simply by face-value comparison of what the two sources said. Thus, in Source B Bismarck says there will be war with France before long, whilst in Source C he says there will be peace for ten or fifteen years, so he must be lying. Alternatively, in Source B he says he will never advise the King to wage war and in Source C he says he will do all he can to prevent war, so therefore he is telling the truth. A small number of stronger answers moved beyond this to question the

reliability of what Bismarck was claiming. For example, if Bismarck was planning to go to war with France, would he reveal this in an interview with a British journalist?

Question 3

Most candidates seemed unaware of the Luxembourg crisis of 1867, and therefore struggled to use Source D effectively. Without specific contextual awareness, answers could only be based on the content of the source, interpreted in a much more general context of Bismarck's plans for German unification. Some valid reasons were given based on messages of the source; for example, that it was published to show that Bismarck would protect Germany against France. However, answers which had the specific knowledge to interpret the source properly, or to suggest possible purposes the cartoonist might have had in mind, were the strongest.

Question 4

Some contextual knowledge would have improved a number of responses to this question. Those candidates who knew about the Ems Telegram were able to explain why the drastic change illustrated by the differences between Sources E and F had occurred, and were therefore unsurprised by it. Other answers were based on the fact that Source E shows the French wanting peace, but three days later in Source F they want war, which on the face of it is surprising. There were a few answers that neglected to address the question directly, and never stated whether or not they were surprised.

Question 5

It was possible for candidates to produce plausible misinterpretations of Source G. The most common was to think that the cartoon was predicting Prussian defeat. The fact that it shows 'the war dead' argues against this, and suggests that it applies to the actual fighting in August 1870. There were sub-messages that candidates identified, most obviously that the war had caused many casualties. However, a full interpretation needed to encompass both the dead and 'Bismarck's nightmare'. It was reasonable to see the nightmare as Bismarck regretting the casualties, or not having foreseen them. The very best answers pushed this idea a little further and saw that the cartoonist was blaming Bismarck for what was happening.

Question 6

This question always asks candidates to test a hypothesis against the evidence offered by the sources on the paper. There will always be some evidence to support, and some to question, the hypothesis. However, some candidates either just agreed or just disagreed with the hypothesis and found evidence on only that side. There were also answers that did not deal adequately with the sources, generally grouping them and just asserting whether or not they agreed. The task is to find evidence in the sources and to use this to illustrate how it shows agreement or disagreement. For example, it would not be sufficient to say '*Source F does not support the idea that Prussia was responsible for the war. It says France was.*' It would be necessary to show how Source F does this: '*.....because it says that Paris was gripped by war fever and that people who supported peace were shouted down by the mob.*' The best responses to this question took each source in turn, and showed how the source either supported or did not support the hypothesis. There are still a few candidates who think the question is about the hypothesis, rather than about the evidence (about the hypothesis) offered by the sources. These candidates wrote essays about the events but did not use the sources very much, if at all. This was not a valid approach to the question.

Option B – 20th century topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates to compare two sources to determine how far they agreed. The sources contained plenty of agreements and disagreements, and most candidates were able to find some. However, the nature of the sources required candidates to be careful about how exactly they matched them. For example, both sources made claims about the reactions of the French to proposals for the League of Nations. It was possible to match on the basis of what French liberals thought, but not on French socialists or conservatives, both of whom were mentioned in only one of the sources. It was also possible to show a difference between the two sources on Clemenceau's attitude. Similar details had to be noted on what the extract said about the Americans or the British, and their leaders. Candidates who generalised about the sources tended to miss the detail required for proper matching. A few stronger answers tried to see the overall messages of the sources, and view them as a whole. It was certainly possible to suggest that the sources did agree that overall prospects for the League were uncertain.

Question 2

Although many candidates were able to deal effectively with this question, there was evidence that others had problems in comprehending the sources in the context of early 1919. The reference to the 'Commission' in Source D was sometimes taken to mean a commission of the League. It was commonly assumed that the League was already in existence. The specific claims in the sources sometimes deflected candidates away from the main messages; for example, the claim in Source C that the Covenant was the work of so many Englishmen. In short, many candidates found comparing the sources, even on the basis of face-value comprehension, quite challenging. For those that could comprehend and compare the sources, it was generally the case that finding a contradiction was in itself proof that Source C was wrong, or, more rarely, concluding that the sources agreed and therefore Source C was right. Some candidates, though, were able to add some source evaluation to their analysis. They would provide the comparison, but their judgement on whether Source C was right would be based on whether one could believe it (or disbelieve Source D). Cross-references to other sources to resolve this issue, particularly to Sources A and B which had been used in the previous question, were quite common, but the sources could also be analysed on the basis of contextual knowledge of the differing views of the British and French about the forthcoming peace settlement.

Question 3

The question asked why the cartoon was published, so answers had to include reasons for publication. Some candidates managed to interpret the cartoon satisfactorily, but forgot to give a reason. Reasons could be based on context, on the messages of the cartoon, or on the possible purposes of the cartoonist, but without a reason, the question was not being properly answered. The cartoon could be interpreted in two entirely contrasting ways – optimistic or pessimistic about the League's prospects. Either way, the cartoon was saying that the League had high aspirations. A full interpretation required both the prospects and the aspirations to be included, and many candidates were able to give a reason which did this. Others managed either the prospects or the aspirations – not quite so good as a response. The best answers moved beyond the cartoon's messages to a consideration of why, at this time, the cartoonist might have wished the audience to see them; in other words, to a consideration of the cartoonist's purpose. The line most commonly taken was that the cartoonist was a supporter of the League and would therefore want to win over public opinion.

Question 4

This question was answered well by most candidates. The source was well understood, and this fed through into the quality of the responses. Contextual knowledge of the French attitude to peace-making was also good, and was used to inform many answers. Almost all candidates were able at the least to provide reasons based upon what Bourgeois wanted to tell Wilson, but very commonly this was supplemented with knowledge of what the French had experienced during the war, and what they wanted to avoid in future. The best answers could extend this kind of analysis into reasons based on Bourgeois' purpose, in other words into explaining what he wanted to get Wilson to do. The most common of these reasons was to ensure Wilson would agree to the League having a proper armed force with which to deal with future aggressors.

Question 5

There was a clear contradiction between Sources G and H. Source G said the League stood for peace, but Source H shows leaders of the league sowing the seeds of future wars. If this contradiction was spotted, candidates were generally ready to concede that Source H was indeed surprising. It was also possible to claim that the sources agreed that the League's purpose was to promote peace, and that therefore Source H was not surprising. However, not all candidates were able to do this matching of content. Source H in particular produced some miscomprehension, with candidates struggling to see the relevance of Eastern and Western hemispheres. Better candidates went beyond content matching, to question the reliability of the sources, and used their knowledge of American attitudes towards the League to explain that the sources simply reflected the pro- and anti- attitudes of their authors, and so disagreement between them was only to be expected.

Question 6

This question always asks candidates to test a hypothesis against the evidence offered by the sources on the paper. There will always be some evidence to support, and some to question, the hypothesis. However, some candidates either just agreed or just disagreed with the hypothesis and found evidence on only that side. There were also answers that did not deal adequately with the sources, generally grouping them and

just asserting whether or not they agreed. The task is to find evidence in the sources and to use this to illustrate how it shows agreement or disagreement. For example, it would not be sufficient to say '*Source E does not support the idea that the League had little support from the beginning, because the cartoonist obviously supported it.*' It would be necessary to show how Source E does this: '*.....because it shows how the League will have a great future and work for the abolition of war.*' Better responses to this question took each source in turn and showed how the source either did or did not support the hypothesis. A few candidates misinterpreted the wording of the hypothesis and thought they had to judge whether the League had a little or a lot of support. There are still a few candidates who think the question is about the hypothesis, rather than about the evidence (about the hypothesis) offered by the sources. These candidates wrote essays about the events but did not use the sources very much, if at all. This was not a valid approach to the question.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Candidates should spend a few minutes carefully considering the questions and the relevant source(s). Then they should plan answers before beginning to write. This will enable candidates to provide the answer in the opening sentence, for example, 'Source C does make Source D surprising because...' or 'The cartoonist's message is...' The rest of the answer should then be spent using the source(s) and knowledge to explain and support the opening statement.

Contextual knowledge should never be used for its own sake. Answers should not begin with descriptions of the context (or descriptions of the sources). Knowledge should only be used to improve and support the points being made about the sources, whether it be interpreting, evaluating or comparing them.

If quotations from the sources are used, and this can be particularly useful when answering **Question 6**, candidates should not use an abbreviated form of quotation that misses out some of the words. The words that are used must do the job the candidates want them to do, so giving the quotation in full is important.

When using a source that comments on the views of others, for example Source A (twentieth century) describing the position of Britain towards Japan, candidates should be careful to distinguish between what the author of the source is saying and what the point of view of Britain was. In other words, Source A does not say that Japan had a strong case in Manchuria, but the British government did. Neglecting to make this distinction can undermine attempts at comparing what sources say, as in **Question 1**.

When comparing sources, common criteria should be used. In other words, candidates should decide which aspects of the sources they are going to compare. If they start, for example, with what Source A (twentieth century) says about France, when they move to Source B, they should only look for what it has to say about France.

General comments

The majority of scripts were on the twentieth-century option, but the quality was fairly even across the two options. Nearly all candidates completed all six questions, with only a very small number running out of time. Few candidates appeared to be struggling with their understanding the sources. The overall standard was high, with many candidates able to problem solve, think through tricky issues and respond in thoughtful ways, thus displaying a range of source skills and much understanding of the nature of historical sources and the issues that surround them. Contextual knowledge and understanding was strong, although this was not always used in the most appropriate ways. This should always be to strengthen and support what is being written about the sources.

Candidates are advised to read all the sources before beginning to write any answers. This will give them an understanding of the main issue of the Paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding will feed into all of their answers, as well as helping to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.

Comments on specific questions

Option A - 19th century topic

Question 1

To answer this question well it was necessary to explain how the overall views of these two sources differ.

Source A describes Bismarck as a planner, while Source B sees him as an opportunist. Although a reasonable number of candidates were able to explain this, answers that focused on agreements or disagreements of detail were more common. Many candidates were able to explain agreements such as Austria playing into Germany's hands or those wanting a united Germany looking to Austria, but fewer found agreements and disagreements. Examples of the latter are Source A claiming that Germany was unified, while Source B claims it was a conquest. A small number of candidates paraphrased both sources and then claimed that they agreed without actually matching any agreements or disagreements.

Question 2

Most candidates explained how Sources C and D disagree – in Source C Bismarck expects a war against Austria, while in Source D he claims he wants to work with Austria. These candidates used this difference as a reason why Source C makes Source D surprising and gained reasonable marks. However, the valid use of contextual knowledge would have improved a number of responses. Relevant contextual knowledge tells us that Bismarck had very good reasons for writing what he did in both sources, leading to the conclusion that Source C does not necessarily make Source D surprising. For example, it can be argued that in Source D Bismarck was already planning conflict with Austria after the war with Denmark, but obviously did not want Austria to know this. It is important in questions like this to actually answer the question about surprise. Some candidates compared the two sources, even used their contextual knowledge, but did not state whether they thought that Source C made Source D surprising.

Question 3

A good number of candidates were able to explain how this exchange of letters can be used as evidence about the relationship between Prussia and Austria. It is clearly tense. The best responses used the context of 1865 to confirm this. Some candidates did not get as far as the relationship between the two countries but did make valid inferences, for example they clearly disagree about Austria's position in Germany. The weakest answers failed to use the content of the sources and focused instead on the provenance of the sources.

Question 4

This question produced many good answers. Many explained that the cartoon suggests that Austria will triumph in a war with Prussia, which has no idea what is going to happen. The best answers added to this by explaining the point of view of the Austrian cartoonist, for example, he is gloating about what will happen to Prussia. The majority of the remaining candidates did not get quite this far but were still able to explain valid sub-messages of the cartoon, for example, there was going to be war between Austria and Prussia, Prussia was going to be defeated by Austria. There were few surface descriptions or misinterpretations.

Question 5

This is a 'purpose' question and the best answers focused on William's purpose in making this speech, for example, to encourage the Prussian people to support their country in the war that was just about to begin against Austria. To qualify as a proper 'purpose' answer, it is necessary to explain the intended impact on the audience. A number of answers instead simply paraphrased what William said, without explaining why he was saying it, or explained the context (weeks before war with Austria) but didn't use this as a reason for the proclamation.

Question 6

Most candidates understood what they had to do in this question and many provided very strong responses by explaining how some sources support the hypothesis and how others do not. It is not enough to just identify which sources support or disagree with the hypothesis. There were many careful explanations, for example, 'Source A agrees with the idea that Bismarck was responsible for the war because it says that he thought such a struggle was inevitable and steadily prepared for it. It explains how he planned for the war and claims that he 'provoked' the war.' A small number of candidates did not make use of any of the sources and wrote essays about the causes of the Austro-Prussian War.

Option B - 20th century topic

Question 1

An encouraging number of candidates managed to produce very strong answers by taking each source as a whole and explaining that the failure of the League over Manchuria was due to the Great Powers in Source A, but that Source B blames the League. There were many answers that analysed the two sources carefully and were able to explain agreements, for example, Britain sympathised with Japan, France was not keen on acting against Japan, and it was a test for the League's authority, and/or disagreements, for example, in Source A the League was Eurocentric, in Source B it was not. There were, however, some answers that did not make proper comparisons. The best way to carry out comparisons is to use a common criterion – first focus on a point about a particular subject that is made in one source and then to see if the other source says the same thing about that subject, for example, Source A says the USA was suspicious of the League – does Source B have anything to say about this, and if it does, does it agree or disagree?

Question 2

There was a wide range of responses to this question. As some candidates pointed out, at first sight it might seem obvious that Source C is surprising as the League (or a leading member of the League) is refusing to help China against Japanese aggression. It was the purpose of the League to act in such cases. However, more careful consideration will suggest other possible responses. For example, the League did not have the resources to act and did not have a good track record against major powers. The source actually comes from Britain and answers based on this fact, and explaining a lack of surprise, were generally very strong. There were a good number of candidates who, aware of Britain's economic and imperial interests in the Far East, produced excellent answers. There was also some good relevant cross-referencing to Sources A and B.

The best answers explained how contextual knowledge leads to surprise or not surprised, but there were a number of answers that simply identified a contextual point, for example, the League did not have an army, or Britain traded in the Far East, and failed to explain its significance. It is crucial in questions about 'surprise' that candidates do make clear whether or not they are surprised. A number of candidates used and analysed the sources appropriately, but nowhere did they actually say whether they were surprised or not.

Question 3

This question was generally answered well. The best answers were produced only after the candidates had considered the two cartoons carefully and decided what they wanted to write. Candidates who did not take this approach tended to write about each cartoon in turn and struggled to directly compare them. The former type of answers avoided description and compared the cartoons point by point. This included: Japan is aggressive in both, the League is at fault or powerless in both, and the League is weak in Source D but simply refusing to act in Source E. The best answers compared the big messages – in Source D Japan is being criticised, while in Source E the main target of the cartoonist is the Great Powers.

Question 4

There were many reasonable, but few very strong, answers to this question. There was a tendency to focus on the background to Source F in terms of the Lytton Report, rather than on its message. Contextual knowledge is important in answers to questions like this, but it should be used to help explain the message and not to write a long introduction. There was also a tendency to write answers in terms of teachers, school classrooms and naughty candidates, rather than in terms of the historical events and players. The detail in a cartoon needs to be mentioned to support an interpretation but it should not be the main focus. However, many candidates did understand either that Japan was being defiant or that the League was weak (this is where the Lytton Report could come in). Few focused on both Japan and the League, even though the cartoon is criticising both Japan and the League. Candidates should also remember that it is always helpful to consider the point of view of the cartoonist. This cartoon does suggest that the League was weak, but the artist is also criticising the League.

There were some misinterpretations of the cartoon. These were usually about the League being too forceful and bullying the unfortunate Japan.

Question 5

Some candidates explained the historical context of the telegram and used this as the reason for sending it. Understanding the context is useful but the content (the message) of the telegram should be the main focus,

as this will take candidates to the purpose of the Japanese government. The majority of candidates did provide solid answers. They did this by explaining how Japan was trying to justify its actions in Manchuria. However, all the claims in the telegram about the incompetence of the League, the chaos in Manchuria and the unreasonable treatment of Japan are really being used to explain, or to justify, Japan's departure from the League. Answers explaining this were generally stronger, with the best answers placing this purpose in its appropriate historical context. Answers that just paraphrased the source, without using it as a reason, could not achieve many marks.

Question 6

This question was generally answered well, with only a small number of candidates neglecting to make use of the sources. A few candidates struggled with the distinction between the Great Powers and the League but most coped. Most candidates understood that their answers had to be about the sources but some were unsure of how to use these sources. First, some approaches that candidates used but which should be avoided: **(i)** Writing about the sources in groups of two or three. What is written about each group has to be valid in terms of each source in the group, and this was often not the case. **(ii)** Using abbreviated versions of quotations. If a quote is to be used, it should be used in full. **(iii)** Simply asserting that a source supports the hypothesis. The candidates' first move in preparing an answer to this question should be to identify which sources support the hypothesis, and which go against it. It does not matter whether a candidate then writes about the sources in the order in which they appear or sources supporting the hypothesis first and then sources against the hypothesis. What matters is that clear explanations of how sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis are produced. Here is an example: 'Source E supports the claim that the Great Powers were responsible for the failure of the League because it shows them deliberately ignoring events in Manchuria and claiming that it was too risky to intervene.' It should be noted that this is brief, relevant and to the point. There is no need to write any more about this source. Some more successful responses provided material such as this. Candidates should use this approach to explain how some sources support the hypothesis, while others disagree with it. Not all the sources have to be used, but there should be an attempt to use most of them. There are marks for evaluation, but this needs to be properly developed evaluation. Considering the purpose of a source, using its content, its provenance and its context, is often a useful way forward.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

- At the start of the examination, candidates should take time to read carefully through all the sources.
- Candidates should use the time available efficiently, answering all the questions in their chosen option, and taking care not to run short of time on **Question 6**, which carries the most marks of all the questions.
- Candidates should directly answer the questions they are asked. If asked why something happened, reasons must be given. If candidates are asked to explain whether or not they are surprised, they should say what they find surprising and why. The same, direct approach, applies to the other types of question on the examination paper.

General comments

There was a rise in the number of candidates attempting the nineteenth century option (on Bismarck) this year. The majority of candidates chose to answer questions on the twentieth century option (on the League of Nations). Concerning the candidates' overall performance and handling of the questions, there was a sound knowledge and understanding of the topics. Indeed, as a general rule, candidates should look to construct answers which respond to the specific wording of the question set. This year, it was noticeable that some answers contained detailed knowledge, but knowledge which could have been applied more relevantly, in light of the questions posed.

Comments on specific questions

Option A – 19th century topic

Question 1

Less successful responses copied or paraphrased the source without making successful moves to make inferences, about Bismarck in this case. Candidates also wrote at length about Bismarck, using their contextual knowledge of his career and political ambitions, but in doing so neglecting to refer to the details of the source in order to support inferences made. The best answers reached well supported conclusions which explained his political ambitions for Prussia and Germany, linking foreign and domestic policies.

Question 2

It is important that when answering questions like these that candidates give a reason or reasons for sending the letter. Stronger responses were able to explain the context of relations between Prussia and Austria in April 1866, enabling them to explore the concerns of the Crown Prince regarding Bismarck's ambitions and influence over the King, and to work towards suggesting purpose.

Question 3

Most candidates understood that the German liberal author of source D approved of Bismarck's achievements in bringing about moves toward German unity under Prussian leadership. The British cartoon, Source D, proved more of a challenge to many, though the unflattering picture of Bismarck was generally recognised. The question demands a reasoned comparison of the contrasting messages given of Bismarck, one approving and the other disapproving.

Question 4

There were few misinterpretations of the Austrian cartoon and candidates were able to explain that it showed Prussia would dominate the new Greater Germany. At the higher levels there was an understanding that unification was being achieved due to Prussian militarism, which was not agreeable to many Germans. The question asked for the 'cartoonist's message', so those candidates who went as far as explanation of the explicit disapproval of Prussian methods and its outcome provided the strongest responses.

Question 5

Candidates needed to recognise how events affecting Prussia and France developed between July 1870 and March 1871. Most candidates identified disagreements between the sources and were able to explain why Source G made Source F surprising. Understanding that, by March 1871 France had been defeated and William I was now German Emperor thanks to Bismarck, enabled candidates to carry out the evaluation of Source F or Source G that the highest level answers required.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A small number of candidates neglected to use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source linked to the question, instead repeating lines from the text before moving on to deal with another source. Grouping of the sources, for example, 'Sources A, C and G do provide convincing evidence that Bismarck and his achievements were admired', rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another characteristic of weaker answers. Successful evaluation of sources was less frequent than it could have been, and some candidates would improve their responses by just picking out two or three particularly worthwhile sources to say something meaningful about, regarding purpose and audience.

Option B – 20th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to successfully explain appropriate sub-messages given by the cartoon about the League of Nations and its potential to prevent war. The main message required candidates to explain the confidence expressed in the cartoon that the League would be effective in its work of successfully preventing war in the future. The best answers responded to the wording of the question and explained the cartoonist's point of view, which is that the setting up of the League of Nations is approved because it will stop war.

Question 2

Agreements and/or disagreements between the sources which caused surprise were standard and it was encouraging to read so many attempts to explain disagreements through evaluation of one or both of the sources. A common misconception was to believe that Lodge was a member of Wilson's government. Generally, knowledge of the American political system appeared limited, though some candidates wrote impressive answers in which they understood why Lodge, as a leading Republican Senator, sought a return to traditional isolationism and opposed Wilsonian internationalism and membership of the League of Nations.

Question 3

Some candidates had difficulties answering this question. Assertions made after a simple surface description of the sources were provided by some. Also, a lot of answers misread America instead of Armenia in Source E. Knowledge of the League of Nations failure to successfully protect the newly created state of Armenia from Turkish aggression in 1920 enabled other candidates to successfully explain why Lord Cecil in Source D did not prove Lloyd George wrong in E. Often candidates tended to cite incidents from Manchuria and Abyssinia in the 1930s, as well as League failures in the 1920s, to erroneously support arguments. Some candidates did present sound answers based on differences or agreements in the respective opinions about the League. Comparison of the source content, then explanation of why Source E was/was not wrong using cross reference or contextual knowledge, could have been done by more candidates.

Question 4

Although Source F proved difficult for a number of candidates, there was an overwhelming sense that the cartoons disagreed in their views of the League of Nations. Candidates recognised that the cartoon in

Source F feared for the future of the League, while the cartoon in Source G was more optimistic and believed that the League would become stronger and be able to deal with the threat of war in the future. For the higher levels, it was critical that an answer made a clear comparison between the cartoons and stated whether they agreed or disagreed. The best answers compared the pessimism of F with the optimism shown in G.

Question 5

Less successful responses relied on the use of provenance to explain that Clemenceau decided to write his memoirs because of his imminent death. Equally popular was a belief that he anticipated the Great Crash and this encouraged him to put down his thoughts on paper. Some answers also offered perfectly valid interpretations of the source but did not give a reason to explain why Clemenceau wrote his memoirs in 1929. The main message to explain why he wrote the extract in 1929 was that he wanted to express his disappointment that the League of Nations had proven to be such a failure. Some candidates gave additional context with reference to his early criticism of Wilson's idealism, the lack of military resources to enforce League rulings, and failings during the 1920s. This could then lead to the best answers where Clemenceau's justifications resulted in him writing his memoirs against the background of the 1920s.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A small number of candidates did not use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source linked to the question, instead repeating lines from the text before moving on to deal with another source. Some candidates also had difficulty with the wording of the hypothesis being tested in the question. It was common this year for candidates to answer a different question to the one set such as 'How far was the League of Nations successful?' Grouping of the sources, for example 'Sources A, B, D and G do not provide convincing evidence that the League of Nations was seen positively from the start', rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another characteristic of weaker answers. The question also demanded some recognition that consideration be given to how the League was seen from the start, i.e. 1920. Successful evaluation of sources was less frequent than it could have been, and some candidates would benefit from just picking out two or three particularly worthwhile sources to say something meaningful about, regarding purpose and audience.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

Titles are crucial. They need to be appropriate to enable candidates to demonstrate the necessary skills and understandings.

It is important that candidates understand they need to assess significance in its broadest sense. This means that they need to ask themselves how far someone or something was significant for different reasons and in different ways.

It is also helpful if candidates understand that they need to assess significance, rather than simply explain or describe it. They should attempt to do this throughout their answers and leave out passages of description, narrative or background.

Candidates often claim that someone or something is significant because it led to a particular outcome. They also need to assess how far the outcome mattered.

General comments

The overall standard of the work was high, with many candidates using appropriate titles and demonstrating a good understanding of how to assess significance. The Germany Depth Study was used by most centres but the Depth Studies on the USA and Russia were also used. A small number of centres developed their own Depth Studies for coursework. These enabled the centres to study aspects of their own local or national history. Some very interesting work was produced.

Nearly all centres carried out the administration of their coursework efficiently. The appropriate forms were correctly completed and the requested sample of work was promptly dispatched, often with helpful letters explaining the context in which the coursework was taught and completed.

Comments on specific questions

Although there were a few titles this year that did not focus on significance at all, most of the titles were appropriate and worked well. Those that worked best were worded 'Assess the significance of X' or were very similar to this. The advantages of this type of title are that it puts the focus on assessment and is open. Naming an outcome is deliberately avoided. If a title asks 'How significant was X in helping Hitler to consolidate his power?' this openness is lost. Such a title puts the focus on the consolidation of power instead of on 'X' and will lead many candidates into a causation-style answer, where they compare the importance of a range of factors that contributed to the consolidation of power. This is not what is required. The first type of title mentioned above allows candidates to consider the different ways in which 'X' may have been significant. They can use a range of criteria to help them do this and they can assess whether it was more significant in some ways than in others. Titles such as 'Explain the significance of X' or 'How was X significant' encourage candidates to explain how someone/something was significant, rather than assess how far it was significant.

The choice of subject is important. Some work better than others. Some can simply be too big and often overwhelm the candidates. The title 'Assess the significance of Hitler' follows the approach advocated earlier and has been seen to work, but it involves a massive topic making it hard for candidates to control and organise. It would also be rather difficult to argue that Hitler was of little significance. Subjects of a medium size often worked best – not too large to control and get on top of, but large enough to raise a range of

possible approaches and arguments. Excellent work has been seen this year on topics such as the Reichstag Fire, the Munich Putsch, the New Deal, Prohibition and the 1905 revolution in Russia.

The one exception to these comments about titles is if the focus is to be on 'the idea of a 'turning point'. However, the same format can be used, for example, 'Assess how far X was a turning point.'

There were many excellent answers this year and the overall standard was very high, demonstrating a good understanding of the concept of significance and of the approaches used to assess it. The best answers were well organised, with a consistent focus on assessment of significance. It was significant that this assessment was not left to conclusions at the end of the answers but was present throughout the responses. They contained little description, narrative or long introductions. Good knowledge and understanding of the historical period was used to support arguments and conclusions. A significant feature of these answers was that they took the form of an argument about significance which gradually built and developed. There was a sense that the candidates were in control and knew exactly where they were going. They investigated different ways in which their subject might or might not be significant, using argument and counter-argument. One way in which these answers were distinguishable from less successful ones was that they made effective use of counter-argument to explore arguments that their subject was not so significant. Other answers simply gave lots of examples of how their subjects were significant. The best answers also demonstrated some understanding that judgements about significance are provisional and can change according to the criteria used to measure significance. These answers often showed candidates developing their own ideas and taking some risks, often using ideas such as 'turning point' and 'tipping point'. There were often conclusions that compared the different ways in which their subjects were significant and reached supported, argued overall judgements.

Although candidates are encouraged to use a range of criteria to measure significance, these criteria should not be used mechanically, nor should they be listed at the beginning of answers and then not revisited. Candidates need to choose the criteria and approaches that they think are most appropriate for their subject.

The best answers did not base judgements about significance simply on what an individual did or achieved, or on the results of an event or development. Instead, they investigated why these achievements or results mattered. This might be in an economic, political, social or cultural sense. Long and short-term impact might be considered. It might involve assessing the impact on different groups and considering the depth, breadth and duration of the impact. Some candidates produced some very interesting work by asking whether failures could be significant. In contrast to answers that tended to repeat more predictable arguments, much of the best work focused on assessments of significance, used interesting ideas and took some risks with arguments which were fresh and genuinely based on the candidates' own ideas.

Most centres correctly used the generic mark scheme which can be found in the syllabus booklet. This mark scheme should be used exactly as it is and should not be adapted. It should be used holistically. Candidates' answers also need to be considered as whole with their overall qualities then matched to the overall demands of one of the levels in the mark scheme. Exact matches are not expected and so a 'best-fit' approach needs to be used.

Overall, the marking this year was accurate, although some centres had their marks adjusted. Many centres provided very useful detailed marginal and summative comments on their candidates' work. Marginal comments are most useful when they identify key features of an answer such as passages of description or effective assessment. The summative comments should be used to explain why a certain level has been awarded and direct reference to the features of the level should be made.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Successful candidates:

- Planned their answers carefully
- Addressed the key words of the question such as ‘importance’ or ‘significance’
- Supported their arguments with detailed contextual knowledge.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken, with Depth Study B: Germany, 1914–18 the most popular. Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41, also attracted a number of responses. There were a significant number of answers on Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18 and some candidates answered questions from Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945. Depth Study C (Russia) was also attempted. There were very few responses to the other options.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported and sustained arguments, but a number of responses would have benefited from providing supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description, or did not properly address the question that was set. Some candidates simply provided much information about a particular topic or Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. The other key point for candidates is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations. Some rubric errors were seen, with the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in a number of Depth Studies. It is imperative that candidates read the instructions carefully before starting their responses.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of responses to **Question 1**, with fewer candidates attempting **Question 2**.

In successful responses to **Question 1**, candidates realised that the focus of the question was on the early stages of the war up to the beginning of stalemate and the development of the system of trenches. There was some misunderstanding of the term ‘mobilisation’ in terms of the Russian army and also some confusion around the changes to the Schlieffen Plan. There were also some general descriptions of life in the trenches which were not focused on the question.

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This was the most popular Depth Study, with many responses to **Question 3** and to **Question 4**.

Answers to **Question 3** demonstrated that there was generally good knowledge of the Golden Age and German recovery during the 1920s. Many answers had detailed knowledge of cultural changes in cities and understood that the lifting of censorship under Weimar allowed freedom of expression and a growth in the

arts. Successful answers specifically named authors, books and films to support their points. Other responses struggled to fully understand the term 'cultural' and therefore were unable to link any developments in Germany to it. There was also a tendency to miss the focus on the lives of ordinary Germans and to write more generally about problems during the Weimar period.

Successful answers to **Question 4** made the distinction between public work schemes such as the building of autobahns and other measures to improve the lives of workers. There was good knowledge of the various measures used such as 'Strength Through Joy' and 'Beauty of Labour' and many balanced, supported answers. Less specific knowledge of public work schemes was shown in other answers, with some confusing these with other measures. This sometimes led to one-sided answers. There were also generalised answers which outlined events under Hitler and neglected the question of how the lives of German workers were improved.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Question 5 was more popular but there were also a number of attempts at **Question 6**.

Successful answers to **Question 5** made a distinction between the roles of the peasants and people in urban areas in causing disturbances. There was a good level of knowledge of the problems faced by peasants in the countryside but more general description of how they reacted to them. There were many descriptions of the 1905 Revolution and Bloody Sunday. A number of answers would have been improved by differentiation between peasants and urban workers.

In **Question 6** successful answers showed an understanding that the Five-Year Plans were about industry, and an attempt to make the USSR stronger economically through becoming more self-sufficient. This gave the chance to write about collectivisation as a separate point and achieve balance. There were many general descriptions of collectivisation and industry, with no reference to economic or other reasons for their introduction.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

Question 7 was the most chosen option. Successful answers demonstrated a good knowledge of the causes of economic problems by 1929 and provided specific detailed support for these. Less successful answers showed a lack of understanding of what tariffs are and therefore struggled to achieve a balanced answer and to make the link to explain how they caused economic problems. There were also some generalised descriptions of the Wall Street Crash, looking at what happened next rather than what caused it.

In **Question 8** there was some good knowledge of the New Deals and their agencies. Successful answers had knowledge of the impact on industry, although some answers missed this.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

There were too few responses to **Questions 9** and **10** for meaningful comments to be made.

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

There were too few responses to **Questions 11** and **12** for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were too few responses to **Questions 13** and **14** for meaningful comments to be made.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Successful candidates:

- Planned their answers carefully
- Addressed the key words of the question such as ‘importance’ or ‘significance’.
- Supported their arguments with detailed contextual knowledge.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 and Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41 received the most responses. There were also a good number of answers on Depth Studies A (First World War), C (Russia) and G (Israelis and Palestinians), with very few candidates choosing Depth Studies E (China) or F (South Africa).

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported and sustained arguments, but a number of responses would have benefited from providing supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description, or did not properly address the question that was set. Some candidates simply provided much information about a particular topic or Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. The other key point for candidates is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations. Some rubric errors were seen, with the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in a number of Depth Studies. It is imperative that candidates read the instructions carefully before starting their responses.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were responses for both **Question 1** and **Question 2**, although **Question 1** proved the more popular.

Question 1 required candidates to focus on the development of the stalemate on the Western Front. The best answers were very focused on explaining how the use of artillery led to the development of the trench system by both the Allies and the Germans, and provided balance by examining the importance of other factors, such as the use of the machine gun, the lack of tactics, the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and the actual nature and conditions of the trenches. Good answers gave detailed examples and factual detail, coupled with some explicit explanations of how each factor led to the development of the stalemate. Weaker responses tended to not address the question properly and focused on how different weapons and tactics tried to break the stalemate instead.

Question 2 was less popular as a choice, but well answered when chosen. Some candidates had a good understanding of the significance of the German U-boat campaign and its impact on civilian life in Britain – most notably, candidates referenced the food shortages and rationing introduced later in 1918. This was then balanced by examining the significance of other factors such as the introduction of DORA, the recruitment campaign and later conscription, as well as women’s war work. Explanations were generally very convincing and focused on addressing the question. A small number of candidates also evaluated the impact

the U-boat campaign had on civilian life, as Britain dealt with the U-boats, with the convoy system and Q-boats, and only had to introduce rationing near the end of the war. Less successful responses tended to be descriptive or one-sided, or focused on the war at sea, rather than on civilian life.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates, though **Question 3** was the more popular choice.

Question 3 was the better answered out of the two questions available. Many candidates were able to identify some of the inherent weaknesses in the Weimar Constitution and develop their paragraphs by explaining how this caused Germany problems, although weaker responses tended to be quite implicit when doing this. The strongest responses examined the most common weaknesses in the Weimar Constitution, such as proportional representation and Article 48, to explain how these led to problems such as weak coalitions and the rule by Presidential Decree, as well as how it aided the rise of the Nazi Party after 1930. This was then balanced with a wide variety of alternative factors such as the aftermath of the First World War and its impact on society and the economy, the resentment towards the various terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the problems caused by extremist groups, the crises of 1923 and the impact of the Wall Street Crash and Depression. A few of the best responses drew valid conclusions and judgements about the most important factor, with strong examples used to support the argument. Other responses tended to conflate the Weimar Constitution with the Weimar government in general, and so confused the knowledge they had to refer to and ended up giving one-sided answers.

Question 4 was, in general, poorly answered compared to **Question 3**. Less successful responses struggled to refer to a wide variety of material on 'Mein Kampf' and how it helped Hitler to win support. Stronger responses were able to critically evaluate the success of the book in the 1920s compared to later on, but also pointed to the fact that Mein Kampf attracted greater membership in the Nazi Party and the SA in the later 1920s, as well as map out the ideological and strategic route for Hitler, particularly the change in Nazi methods of assuming political power from violent coup to democratic methods. Candidates tended to have a wider variety of knowledge on other factors that helped Hitler gain support, such as propaganda, the focus on anti-communism and negative cohesion, Hitler's speaking and leadership qualities and the change in the role of the SA. The weakest responses tended to be descriptive and lacked factual detail.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study, but **Question 6** was the more frequently answered question.

Question 5 varied in the quality of responses it received. The best answers understood what the July Days were and how they led to growing resentment towards the Provisional Government and Kerensky in particular. Successful responses were able to critically evaluate the July Days and explain how it both helped lead to the downfall of the Provisional Government, but also removed some key Bolshevik leaders and sent Lenin into exile again. This was then balanced by examining a range of other factors, such as the Kornilov Coup, the role of Lenin and Trotsky and the failures of the Provisional Government in solving the social and economic issues in Russia, such as the peasants' land issue and the war shortages. Weaker responses tended to give a narrative of Russia in 1917, with some answers going even further back in time. Some candidates were also not versed in what exactly the July Days were, which led to one-sided responses.

Question 6 was more popular and often answered better than **Question 5**. Many responses had a good knowledge of the Five-Year Plans, as well as many other key significant factors that helped Stalin maintain his dictatorship, such as the use of terror with the NKVD, the Purges and Show Trials, propaganda and the Cult of Personality and the policy of Russification. The strongest answers contained lots of precise factual detail and focused their explanations clearly on addressing the maintenance of the dictatorship. Weaker responses tended to confuse the Five-Year Plans and the collectivisation of agriculture, often seeing them as the same thing. Although they were linked, it would be inaccurate to see collectivisation as a Five-Year Plan for industry. Some candidates would have benefited from linking these factors to the maintenance of the dictatorship, rather than just describing what they were. It is crucial that candidates read the question carefully and plan their answers before they begin writing.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was a popular topic among candidates, with both **Question 7** and **Question 8** receiving many responses. However, there were more **Question 7** responses this session.

Question 7 was generally well-answered. Candidates were often able to explain the importance of new industries such as the motor industry, radios, refrigerators, electricity, entertainment and advertising, and to explain how these helped fuel the economic boom in the 1920s. Many candidates explained how these industries had knock-on effects with other sectors of the economy and led to higher wages, higher employment in the cities and increased share prices, as profits increased. The strongest responses balanced their answers by examining the importance of other factors that led to economic growth – most notably, the policies of the Republican governments was commonly cited, as well as the impact the First World War had on the US economy, the USA's natural resources and the increased confidence in the stock market at the time. Successful candidates were able to draw valid and supported conclusions from their arguments. Other responses tended to confuse old and new industries – some even included agriculture as a cause for economic growth in the 1920s. These responses would have been improved by the inclusion of more detail and less description.

Question 8 produced some strong responses that had a good grasp of racial intolerance in the USA in the 1920s. Commonly cited in these answers were the growth of the Ku Klux Klan, the nature of segregation in the southern states and the impact of immigration. This was then balanced by examining the nature of the Red Scare, religious fundamentalism and Prohibition. Less successful responses tended to be very thin on detail and lacked focused explanations of how these factors changed the nature of US society.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

There were too few responses to **Questions 9** and **10** for meaningful comments to be made.

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

There were too few responses to **Questions 11** and **12** for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A small number of candidates chose this Depth Study. **Question 13** was the more popular of the two questions.

Question 13 was generally very well-answered. Candidates were well-prepared for a question on the 1948–49 war and responses contained accurate and precise detail. Candidates were able to examine how external support from the USA, the United Nations and other European countries aided the Israelis in their final victory against the Arab states, and then compare the importance of this factor with other factors such as Israeli determination, the quality of leadership and Arab disunity. Strong responses showed sustained judgement and focused explanations which were well-supported by well-selected and sometimes very impressive factual knowledge. A few less successful responses tended to still be reasonably strong on detail, but lacked the explicit explanations required to produce the strongest answers.

Question 14 was also well answered. Strong responses showed a detailed knowledge of the refugee crisis and were able to explain how this led to hostility between Israel and its Arab neighbours. Explanations were convincing and well-supported by examples, and many answers were able to reach a strong judgement in the conclusion. Other responses tended to be slightly over-descriptive in style and lacked the focused explanation needed for stronger answers.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Successful candidates:

- Planned their answers carefully
- Addressed the key words of the question such as ‘importance’ or ‘significance’
- Supported their arguments with detailed contextual knowledge.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 and Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41, proved the most popular choices among candidates. There were also a good number of attempts at Depth Study A (First World War) and Depth Study C (Russia), though very few candidates chose to attempt Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians).

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported and sustained arguments, but a number of responses would have benefited from providing supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description, or did not properly address the question that was set. Some candidates simply provided much information about a particular topic or Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance. The other key point for candidates is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations. Some rubric errors were seen, with the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in a number of Depth Studies. It is imperative that candidates read the instructions carefully before starting their responses.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of responses for Depth Study A. **Question 1** was the most popular, with too few **Question 2** responses attempted for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 1 was generally answered well. Good responses were able to examine the importance of the failure of the Schlieffen Plan as a reason for the start of trench warfare. Candidates were able to cite good details about the Plan and its shortcomings, as well as refer to the different battles that led to its failure and the subsequent defensive tactics that emerged on the Western Front from digging in. This was then balanced by examining other factors such as the importance of the ‘race to the sea’, which resulted in the trench system spanning Belgium and North-Eastern France, the impact of new technology, such as machine guns and artillery, and the lack of military tactics to cope with the new style of warfare. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive or narrative in style and recounted the first six months of the First World War and sometimes beyond. A few candidates made important factual errors in terms of chronology and key events.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were attempted by many candidates.

Question 3 was generally well-answered. Good responses contained plenty of detail about the importance of proportional representation and how it led to coalition governments in the Weimar Republic and allowed small extremist parties access to political power. This was then balanced by comparing it to other factors which ranged from the resentment caused by the Treaty of Versailles, the growth in political extremism of the right and the left, the 1923 crises and the impact of the Wall Street Crash and Depression. Less strong responses confused key knowledge such as the period of hyperinflation with the Depression and saw it as the same event or a repeat of the same event. A few candidates gave a more narrative response and included large amounts of detail on the Golden Years from 1924–28, which lacked relevance to this question. These candidates could have improved their responses by a more careful reading of the question and planning of their answer before beginning to write.

Question 4 was also generally well-answered by candidates. The stronger responses were able to fully explain the significance of schools in Nazi Germany and how they helped bring about the type of society the Nazis wanted. Some good responses were able to give lots of examples of how the school curriculum was manipulated by the Nazis to promote Nazi racism, anti-Semitism and the worship of Hitler, as well as to differentiate how schools prepared boys for war and girls for child-bearing. This was then compared with a large variety of alternative factors such as the significance of the Hitler Youth, everyday Nazi propaganda, policies towards women and the family and Nazi anti-Semitic and racial policies. Other responses often saw the Hitler Youth and schools as the same institution, which is inaccurate, and a few answers focused more on how these factors helped the Nazis keep control, which was not the question set.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Both questions in this Depth Study received a good number of responses.

Question 5 was well answered by some candidates, but weaker responses lacked detail and contextual knowledge of the period after the November 1917 seizure of power by the Bolshevik Party. The strongest responses were able to link the NEP to control and saw how Lenin used the limited capitalism re-introduced to settle the Russian economy and allow it to return to pre-First World War levels. This was then balanced by comparing it with other factors. Most commonly cited were Lenin's Decrees, the period of Red Terror during the Russian Civil War, the Bolshevik victory in the Civil War due to both Trotsky's Red Army and Lenin's policy of War Communism and the crushing of the Kronstadt Uprising.

Question 6 was, in general, answered with a similar level of quality to **Question 5**. Good responses were able to explain the significance of Stalin's ideas about Communism with a high degree of accuracy and detail – reference was made to 'Socialism in One Country' and Stalin's ability to ally himself with both the left and right of the Bolshevik Party. This was then compared with other factors, ranging from Trotsky's character traits, Stalin's political manoeuvres - using his position as General Secretary, and the role luck played, particularly before Lenin's funeral. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive or narrative in style or lacked explanation.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was a popular topic, with both **Questions 7** and **8** answered by many candidates.

Question 7 was answered fairly well. Most candidates were able to give examples of the consequences of the Wall Street Crash and then link them to why Hoover lost to Roosevelt in the 1932 Presidential election. The best answers were very secure over the meaning of 'social consequences' and examined the nature of high unemployment, homelessness and starvation, and the importance of the 1932 Bonus Marchers, who camped in Washington, D.C. This was then compared with economic and political consequences, such as the loss of confidence in the stock market, the plummeting share prices, the bank closures and the blame that Hoover received as the 'do nothing' President. Less successful responses often focused their answers on the causes, rather than the consequences of the Wall Street Crash, or lacked specific factual detail on this Key Question.

Question 8 was better answered in most cases. Candidates were able to provide some strong evidence that explained the significance of the Second New Deal and how it improved the lives of American people. Most commonly cited were references to the Social Security Act, the Wagner Act and the actions of the WPA and RA in helping the unemployed masses and the farmers respectively. This was then compared against the significant role played by the First New Deal and its alphabet agencies and legislation. A few very strong answers were able to critically evaluate the impact of the Second New Deal based on the 1937 Budget cuts, which severely reduced its impact, and the growing opposition from Republicans, business leaders, radical critics and the Supreme Court. Some responses also drew conclusions based on the fact that the outbreak of

the Second World War ultimately solved the problems caused by the Depression. Other responses would have benefited from more depth and detail, and a few responses confused the First and Second New Deal agencies.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

There were too few responses to **Questions 9** and **10** for meaningful comments to be made.

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

There were too few responses to **Questions 11** and **12** for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were too few responses to **Questions 13** and **14** for meaningful comments to be made.