

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

General Comments and Key Messages

A significant number of candidates 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 answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound 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 responses would have been improved by candidates' using factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach.

A small number of candidates wrote very lengthy responses to part **(a)** questions, which resulted in them having insufficient time to fully develop their responses to part **(c)** questions. More effective time planning would have benefited such responses. There were a small number of rubric errors; some candidates chose parts **(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)** from different questions, whilst some answered more than three questions. Generally, however, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with the majority completing the paper.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

- (a)** Candidates needed to show knowledge of the part played by Guizot in the events leading to the revolution in France in 1848, and some candidates were able to state that Guizot had banned a Reform Banquet. Other answers were more general, simply stating that Guizot was involved in some way.
- (b)** Candidates were able to identify general points relating to people wanting change, being unhappy, and wanting freedom; these points needed to be made relevant specifically to Hungary. There was some awareness of Kossuth's involvement; this identified point was developed into explanation in better responses.
- (c)** Some candidates developed explanations about the success of revolution in France, concentrating primarily upon the reforms introduced by Louis Napoleon. More references could have been made to success or failure of revolution in other European countries, so that more than one side of the argument was considered.

Questions 2 and 3

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

Question 4

- (a)** There were a number of clearly focused responses to this question, detailing economic and religious justifications, with some candidates also detailing justifications based on the South's belief in white superiority. A number of candidates described the life of slaves, rather than detailing the South's justification for using slaves.
- (b)** Some candidates were able to identify that the North had larger armies, more manufacturing industry and the majority of the railways. A number of candidates developed these identified points into explanations, explaining that the North had the advantage industrially, which meant that they

had much greater capacity for producing weapons and supplies needed for war. Some candidates offered generalised answers, stating mainly that the North was more powerful than the South.

- (c) Better responses explained both the success of reconstruction in improving life for black Americans, and the other side of the argument, by looking at the Ku Klux Klan's intimidation of former slaves. Other answers identified these same points without developing them into explanations.

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates were aware that the Rhineland was demilitarised and knew what demilitarisation entailed. Some candidates also made several valid points about Danzig, focusing on its status as a free city under the control of the League of Nations. This question was specific in nature, and asked about statements in the Treaty of Versailles relevant to the Rhineland and Danzig only. Some candidates wrote at length about terms of the Treaty other than the ones requested in the question, resulting in responses which lacked relevance.
- (b) There were some well focused answers to this question. Effective responses made clear comparisons between the victors to illustrate and explain why they were not free to make the peace they wanted. Comparisons focused on the level of Germany's punishment, different experiences of the war and the need to respond to the demands of the people in their individual countries. Less successful answers tended to list the aims of the victors without explaining why this meant they were not free to make the peace they wanted.
- (c) Answers to this question demonstrated that candidates had detailed factual knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. A number of candidates used this knowledge effectively to explain justification linked to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and to the desire to punish Germany. Arguments explaining the lack of justification focused on the effects of military restrictions on Germany and the role of nations other than Germany in the outbreak of war. The question asked 'at the time' and some candidates appeared to miss this, resulting in answers that struggled to remain relevant throughout.

Question 6

- (a) There were some concise and focused answers to this question, mentioning the role of the Assembly in admitting new members, controlling the League's budget, voting on the election of temporary members of the Council and discussing ideas put forward by the Council. Some answers focused solely on the aims of the League, rather than upon the role of the Assembly within the League. It was also the case that some answers focused on the role of the Council. An awareness of the distinct roles of the Assembly and the Council within the League would have improved some responses.
- (b) Some candidates used their contextual knowledge effectively here, developing focused explanations about the absence of the USA and the League not having its own army which affected the potential success of collective security. Some candidates described the concept of collective security, but then needed to develop this description to explain why collective security was unlikely to be successful. A clear understanding of the concept of collective security, and why it was unlikely to work, would have benefited some responses.
- (c) Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the successes and failures of the League of Nations, both in dealing with disputes between member nations and in their humanitarian work. Explanations of success usually focused on the Aaland Islands dispute, Upper Silesia, Greece and Bulgaria, and humanitarian work. Explanations of failure focused mainly on Corfu, with some explanation of Vilna. Some candidates introduced irrelevant material into their answers by detailing events in Manchuria and Abyssinia, when the question asked about the 1920s.

Question 7

- (a) Many candidates stated that the UN organised a meeting of the Security Council and that troops were deployed. A number of candidates wrote in detail about the UN's involvement throughout the Korean War, rather than the UN's immediate response in June 1950.

- (b) Most candidates were able to identify the policy of containment and/or concerns about American interests in the Far East as reasons why the US provided most of the forces that resisted North Korea's invasion of the South. Identifications about containment needed to be linked to the point that North Korea was communist; this would have enabled some candidates to develop a clearer explanation.
- (c) Effective responses to this question explained the threat to world peace by focusing on the involvement of the US, China and the USSR, and how the situation could easily have escalated into a conflict threatening world peace. MacArthur's desire to use nuclear weapons was also developed as an explanation of the threat to world peace. On the other side of the argument, explanation centred on the UN's prompt response to the aggression of North Korea, and also on the US's dismissal of MacArthur. Some candidates wrote at length about the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Vietnam War, with only a cursory mention of the situation in Korea. Lengthy descriptions of the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Vietnam War were not relevant to this question.

Question 8

- (a) Description here was related mostly to Nagy's announcement that Hungary was going to leave the Warsaw Pact, the arrival of Soviet troops in Hungary and the response to their arrival. Candidates needed to be aware of the chronology of events in Hungary at this time; some responses included description of events before 23 October 1956, and also description of events in Poland related to Solidarity, rather than events in Hungary.
- (b) Most candidates were able to give one explanation focused on the lack of freedom under the Communist regime. Some candidates would have benefited from an awareness of the specific details explaining why Hungarians opposed communist rule in their country, such as the role of the AVO, the persecution of the Catholic Church, and Soviet control of education.
- (c) Responses to this question showed an awareness of a number of differences and similarities between events in Hungary in 1956 and events in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Identifications given included differing views on membership of the Warsaw Pact, different reactions to Soviet invasion, both countries wanting to give their people more rights and both countries witnessing protest from their people. Some responses developed these identifications into explanations; answers needed to demonstrate how events were different and how they were similar by giving specific detail for each country.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) A number of candidates identified that the British Expeditionary Force was Britain's standing army. More factual details about the British Expeditionary Force would have improved responses.
- (b) There were some detailed descriptions of the Schlieffen Plan and how it was expected to work in practice. The question asked why the Schlieffen Plan failed; better responses identified that the Belgians slowed down the German advance and that the exhaustion of the German soldiers was a factor, although these points needed further development into explanations.
- (c) Some candidates identified the Battle of the Marne as being the main reason for the development of trench warfare on the Western Front, while others identified the failure of the Schlieffen Plan as the main reason. Many candidates wrote lengthy descriptions of life in the trenches; such responses lacked focus on the question set.

Question 10

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

Question 11

- (a) Detailed knowledge of Hitler's role in establishing the Nazi Party prior to 1923 was demonstrated by many candidates, with description of Hitler's oratory skills, his role in publicity and propaganda, his promotion to leader, his founding of the SA and the changing of the party name. A number of

candidates wrote about Hitler's role when he became Chancellor of Germany; such responses were not relevant to the actual question.

- (b) Whilst some candidates constructed developed explanations of Kahr going back on his word to support Hitler and Hitler's miscalculation of the German people's discontent with the Weimar Republic, many candidates wrote detailed narratives of the events of the Munich Putsch without explanation of why it failed. This narrative sometimes included some relevant identified reasons for the failure of the Putsch, but explanations needed to be developed.
- (c) Effective responses to this question developed clear explanations of the fear of industrialists and farmers that communism would completely erode their way of life, and explanation of Hitler's promises to combat this threat. On the other side of the argument, explanations of the importance of propaganda and the effects of the Depression as factors in the Nazis coming to power were clearly developed. A number of candidates wrote answers based on the Nazi consolidation of power, rather than on the Nazis coming to power.

Question 12

- (a) Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of Nazi persecution of the Jews in the 1930s, including citing the banning of Jews from certain professions, Kristallnacht, the Nuremberg Laws, Jews being prohibited from owning land and Jews being compelled to wear the Star of David. Some candidates missed the phrase 'in the 1930s', and wrote at length about persecution in the 1940s.
- (b) There were some clearly developed explanations of the role of mass media in the indoctrination of the German people and thus its importance to the Nazis. Candidates were less confident about why culture was important; candidates needed to be aware of the nature of culture in Nazi Germany and why it was important for the Nazis.
- (c) Responses to this question showed a detailed understanding of the nature of Nazi control of the German people. Developed explanations of Nazi control through propaganda, fear, education, the Hitler Youth groups and positive control through rewards, were apparent in many responses. Understanding of lack of control was less developed. Candidates were aware that there was dissent, and identified groups such as the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates; explanation of how these groups showed the Nazis were not in control of the German people needed to be developed.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of Lenin's 'Political Will', highlighting Lenin's mistrust of Stalin and the perception that Stalin would misuse power, and Lenin's preference for Trotsky as his successor as he felt Trotsky was the most capable man in the Central Committee. Some candidates also indicated Lenin's misgivings about Trotsky. Some responses stated only that Lenin preferred Trotsky to Stalin.
- (b) There were some very well developed explanations in response to this question. Explanations focused on Stalin tricking Trotsky into missing Lenin's funeral and the repercussions on Trotsky's reputation, Stalin's power as General Secretary of the Communist Party and Stalin's political manoeuvring with Rightist and Leftist opposition. Some answers contained material well beyond the date of 1928 which was stipulated in the question.
- (c) Arguments on both sides were clearly developed in response to this question. Clear understanding of the role of propaganda and fear was evident in answers, with explanation of the 'cult of Stalin', the role of the NKVD and fears centred on the purges and labour camps. A small number of candidates explained that positive control had a part to play, with explanation of people in the Soviet Union gaining employment and benefits for women in the workplace.

Question 14

- (a) Some knowledge of the New Economic Policy was demonstrated, with mention made that peasants could sell food surpluses on the open market and that grain production increased. Candidates needed to know the distinct features of the New Economic Policy and collectivisation; a number of responses focused on collectivisation rather than the New Economic Policy.

- (b) Most candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of Stalin's perception that collectivisation would make farms more efficient and thus combat the food shortages. There was also some explanation of more grain being needed for export to earn foreign currency, and of the need for more food for industrial workers. Some responses featured several identified points, including Stalin's desire to rid the countryside of the kulaks; points sometimes needed more effective development.
- (c) Answers showed a clear understanding of how the Soviet people did not benefit from Stalin's policies, with emphasis on factory discipline, poor living conditions for industrial workers, unrealistic production targets exacerbating the situation, and the adverse effects of collectivisation in the countryside. On the other side of the argument, some candidates mentioned that unemployment was almost non-existent and that workers could gain bonuses for meeting targets; these identified points needed to be developed into explanations.

Question 15

- (a) It was clear that many candidates had a detailed knowledge of popular entertainment in 1920s America. Relevant points made included the advent of new dances, the opening of nightclubs such as the Cotton Club, the release of the first 'talkie' movie, the increase in the number of radio stations and the increasing popularity of jazz. A number of candidates wrote at some length about popular entertainment without focusing on the changes. The question asked for the main changes in popular entertainment, so answers which simply described popular entertainment without focusing on change lacked relevance to the question.
- (b) Responses showed a developed understanding of the fear of a communist threat to the American way of life, and the belief that many immigrants had communist beliefs. The question had a specific time frame 'from 1919 to 1921' but some responses contained narratives of events in the 1950s and 1960s.
- (c) Detailed explanations of the harm prohibition caused to the US were given in response to this question. The increase in organised crime and corruption, the effects of moonshine and the effects on American tax revenue were all explained clearly. Candidates were less secure in their understanding of the other side of the argument. Many gave explanations of why prohibition was introduced, rather than explaining how prohibition could be perceived as not harming the US.

Question 16

- (a) Detailed knowledge was demonstrated of Roosevelt's actions during his first hundred days in office. Answers focused on the New Deal and the Alphabet Agencies, the Emergency Banking Act and the fireside chats.
- (b) Effective answers to this question explained Republican concerns that the New Deal was making people too dependent on the state and that schemes like the TVA and NRA were communist in nature. They also explained the concerns of those such as Huey Long that the New Deal was not helping those in need. A number of responses highlighted that many thought the New Deal was not doing enough to help the poor, or that the New Deal was doing too much; these points needed to be developed into clear explanations.
- (c) There were many clear and developed explanations of the New Deal's success in tackling unemployment, with reference made to the work of a number of different Alphabet Agencies. There was also explanation of the help given to farmers. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained the transient nature of the jobs provided by the New Deal, and how unemployment was not really adequately tackled until war production was introduced. Some answers listed agencies and described their main features without explaining how they solved the problems of the Depression.

Questions 17 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

General Comments and Key Messages

In all parts of a question the answer should be a response to the specific question set. Answers to part **(a)** questions should contain precise, specific detail. Part **(b)** and **(c)** answers require candidates to develop identified reasons into explanation if higher marks are to be achieved. Overall candidates performed well. In some instances candidates struggled as identification and description responses remained undeveloped.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

The more knowledgeable answers to **(a)** stated that the Sicilian Revolution of 1848-49 was against Bourbon rule and that the arrival of the Bourbon army from Naples crushed the Revolution in May 1849. Weaker answers lacked specific detail about the revolution, often giving reasons as to why the revolution took place, rather than describing the revolution as the question asked. In a limited number of cases vague reference to an earlier constitution was made. In response to **(b)** many answers concentrated on the strength of the Austrian military as the reason. In a few answers was the role of Charles Albert or the Pope explained. Less successful answers were more descriptive in nature, concentrating in general about events of 1848. The best answers to **(c)** used the ability to explain the respective roles of Cavour and Garibaldi to Italian unification. Some candidates produced less strong answers. These answers would have benefited from greater balance, as the answers were stronger about Garibaldi. Less successful answers were more descriptive in nature. These answers lacked specific, relevant factual detail to support judgements.

Question 2

Weaker answers to **(a)** tended to describe the Frankfurt Parliament rather than identify the difficulties it faced. Better answers described the importance of the rejection by Frederick William of Prussia of the crown that was offered to him. Other responses added to the strength of the answer by showing awareness that the parliament lacked discipline and that it was unrepresentative of the German people. Many candidates in answer to **(b)** wrote informatively about the Zollverein in more general terms, with the better answers linking it to German nationalism. Some answers to **(c)** were descriptive in nature. Stronger answers depended in part on some explanation of Schleswig-Holstein, with a limited number being able to put this into context. Better answers gave some explanation of the role of Bismarck and that of Moltke. The best answers emphasised Bismarck's use of the Schleswig-Holstein question to pick a quarrel with Austria and the military ambitions of the Prussian army.

Question 3

Most answers to **(a)** showed an awareness that captured slaves had to be returned to their masters and that 'free' states had to comply with the law. The better answers often included some detail of penalties which could be imposed for helping a slave. Less successful answers lacked relevance, concentrating more on general descriptions of slavery, slaves being able to buy their freedom and the Dred Scott case. Answers to **(b)** showed their strength in the positive way the election of Lincoln as President would affect the South. In the better answers, Lincoln being against slavery was considered as a threat to the economic wellbeing of the South. Most answers to **(c)** demonstrated knowledge of both sides of the issue. The better answers developed the identification of issues into explanation. On one side freedom and the right to vote featured strongly, whilst prejudice was often exemplified by the actions of the Ku Klux Klan. Weaker answers showed a general awareness of Reconstruction in general terms.

Question 4

The best answers to **(a)** showed sound awareness of the operation of indirect rule. The answers usually included areas of operation and its benefits to Britain and in some instances, how its operation benefited the 'local' population. In a small number of instances, answers lacked relevant detail beyond it being a system of government. Answers to **(b)** varied considerably. Weaker answers struggled to progress beyond the identification of one or two reasons for increased expansion. Better answers contained more identification, with usually one identification being developed into explanation. Often this development related to trade. The best answers seen gave some explanation of two or three reasons which, in most cases, concentrated on an economic aspect. Most answers to **(c)** centred on the Mutiny. Here, many answers were descriptive rather than explanatory and concentrated more on attempting to consider success. Most answers would have benefited from the development of a challenge to 'how successfully?'

Question 5

Some answers to **(a)** would have been improved by going beyond more general statements such as 'The Treaty reduced the size of the army' or 'They could only have six naval ships'. Answers needed to be more specific, an example of this being 'The Treaty of Versailles reduced the German army to 100 000 men'. In the majority of instances, the better answers were characterised by this specific detail. With reference to the strength of the navy, better answers made reference to the full limitations of '36 boats and no submarines'. Answers to **(b)** varied in quality. For successful responses, candidates needed to understand the important aspects under discussion at Versailles and reasons for inclusion, or not, in the Treaty. Weaker answers thought it related to 'self-sufficiency' or even to the policies of the League of Nations. Other responses mainly offered than the idea that the Treaty required give and take and that this aspect of the Fourteen Points was not acceptable to all. Here, some did produce explanation with the idea of incompatibility between self-determination and the idea of empires. The best answers considered Eastern Europe in addition to the treatment of some German people in more western areas, to produce convincing explanation. A number of candidates were under the misapprehension that under the Treaty of Versailles, Germany lost the Sudetenland. For **(c)** less successful answers contained more about the terms of the Treaty and the reasons for them, rather than a clear focus on the question. This question allowed candidates to consider a judgement about 'how harsh' and then apply arguments to substantiate their stance. Some candidates substituted their own word(s) for harsh, often making it more difficult to present an argument. Others were aware of events prior to the Treaty and suggested that it was harsh because the Fourteen Points were not included – a statement that is untrue, as many were. The better answers developed identification and description into explanation and, at the very top, evaluation. Many of these answers showed good balance between agreement and disagreement, demonstrating good understanding of this area of study. Some candidates took a different approach to the idea of 'harsh', by arguing successfully that the Treaty could have been much harsher.

Question 6

In response to **(a)** some candidates missed, either fully or partially, the question set, by writing about the organisation and structure of the League. Better responses detailed the role through the actions available following an act of aggression. Little was seen about the role in relation to the work of the commissions. In answering **(b)** a majority of candidates showed good awareness, with detail about the need to look after one's self, the impact of the rise of dictators and the reluctance to impose economic sanctions. The best answers went on to demonstrate understanding by producing good explanation. Weaker answers tended to concentrate more on the effects of the Depression but failed to explain how this made the work of the League difficult. In **(c)** general knowledge was good about both events and resulted in a descriptive approach for many as the part of the question relating to damage to the League was missed. Where this happened, movement to explanation was rare. Other candidates thought that the League did nothing in relation to Manchuria and Abyssinia and then wrote about Lytton or decisions relating to sanctions. Some were aware of the Hoare-Laval Pact but only in general terms. In better answers, events were considered and followed by an explanation as to the impact of an event on the League. The best answers produced a balance between the two sides. In their arguments at this level, candidates often made a distinction between British and French actions in presenting convincing arguments.

Question 7

Less successful answers to **(a)** were either characterised by emphasis on events outside the scope of the question, being more clearly focused on the period after 1945, or missed the 'agreed' aspect of the question. Better answers included the idea of free elections and the movement of boundaries. The best knowledge-based answers included these points, together with the idea of a provisional government linked with 'Lublin'

and 'London' Poles. Additional factual material, when provided, included reference to what was to happen to Germans living in Poland and the fact that Danzig was to be under Polish administration. In **(b)** some candidates neglected to take notice of the date in the question, writing about 1947/48. Better answers concentrated on relationships between the three leaders at the Conference to explain why there was tension between them. The best answers were more wide ranging and included what Stalin had done in Poland, the issue of German reparations and his enthusiasm to gain a foothold in Japan. Most answers included reference to the USA and the development of the atomic bomb, although the status of test as opposed to use was not always known. Occasionally the answer contained too much on the differences between Capitalism and Communism. Many excellent responses to **(c)** contained detailed explanation on either side of the hypothesis. Others needed to develop more thorough balanced arguments in order to achieve higher marks. Some answers proved to be one-sided by not explaining why Churchill's speech might have been a major cause of tension. Better answers explained the impact of the speech on the USA and the Soviets as well as Europeans. The best answers were often those that understood why he was making this speech in America. The opposite side of the argument was characterised by explanation of the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and the attempts by Stalin to spread Communism. There were many good examples of explanation provided to answer the question. In many answers the Berlin Blockade was included as an area of tension, although this was sometimes more descriptive than explanatory.

Question 8

There were many excellent responses to **(a)** demonstrating correct knowledge of the Iranian Revolution. Most focused on the Shah and Ayatollah Khomeini. It is important that answers to **(a)** questions remain focused on factual detail rather than developing into explanation. Some of the less strong answers in **(b)** indicated strong knowledge of the reasons for the invasion but they would have been improved by developing these into explanations. Better answers concentrated on Saddam Hussein's wish to gain oilfields in south-west Iran and the need to control the Shatt al-Arab waterway in an attempt to become the leading power in the oil-rich Gulf. Other well developed answers included Saddam's fear of Iranian plots to overthrow him and that he considered it was an ideal time to attack Iran because of the chaos in its economy. Answers to **(c)** provided opportunities for a variety of approaches. In ensuring a balanced approach candidates explained the threat to stability clearly and concisely. Balanced against this, candidates considered the impact on Iran and Iraq with the best answers including the impact on the wider world. Less strong answers often concentrated more on the high cost in terms of lives. On occasions this was more descriptive than explanatory. Weaker answers missed the point of the question, the 'threat to stability' producing more general answers.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Candidates need to be aware of the difference between trench warfare and trench conditions. In response to **(a)**, which was about trench warfare, some candidates wrote in some detail about the misery of trench conditions including food, trench foot, the mud and the lice. Better responses had a precise focus on trench warfare as a distinctive type of warfare. Here, comment on artillery bombardment, going 'over the top', the use of machine guns and 'no-man's land' attracted good marks. The amount of detail varied and it should be remembered that a maximum of four marks can be awarded to even the most detailed answer. In **(b)** many showed good understanding of the frailty issues in relation to the use of tanks, resulting in clear explanation, particularly in relation to the Battle of the Somme. Less strong answers were more descriptive of tank use and would have been improved by explanation as to what made them less successful. The best responses went beyond the Somme to discuss that whilst improvements had taken place there were still many difficulties. Whilst there were many excellent responses to **(c)** which contained detailed arguments on either side of the debate, others needed to develop more balanced arguments in order to achieve higher marks. Less strong answers neglected to offer any contribution to the idea that it achieved its aim of taking pressure off the French at Verdun and possibly saved the French army. Weaker answers concentrated on giving a description of the battle itself, without evaluating it. Whilst some just concentrated on the events of July 1, the highest quality answers evaluated the whole of the Battle of the Somme, assessing its significance within the history of the Western Front in World War I.

Question 10

The quality of answers to **(a)** varied. Most candidates made reference to the sinking of the Lusitania and unrestricted submarine warfare, although occasionally answers were inaccurate or vague. There was less frequent reference to the Zimmermann telegram, and details relating to it, where provided, were sometimes inaccurate. The majority of answers to **(b)** demonstrated knowledge of the importance of America joining the

war, identifying several points of which the contribution to morale and the increased resources were the most often mentioned. Some responses would have benefited from the demonstration of understanding that was present in the better answers. Some of the best answers looked at the wider view by explaining the impact on Germany and German morale. A lack of balance was often seen in responses to **(c)** with many being stronger on the misery inside Germany, for example the impact of influenza, mutinies and the increasing effect of the naval blockade, than on military failings. Where this side was mentioned, in the better answers explanation of the failure of the German offensive of 1918 was often well explained.

Question 11

There were many good responses to **(a)** with candidates recalling accurately that promises were made about the Treaty of Versailles, Communism, the 'Jewish problem', military growth and employment. On occasions answers strayed more into ideas of foreign policy. In **(b)** most answers identified at least two or three reasons for Hitler turning against Röhm. These centred on the perceived threat to Hitler's dictatorship. The better answers developed at least two of the points into explanation, showing a good grasp of the situation. Occasionally, answers confused the SA and the SS and care should be taken to avoid this as it can alter the sense of the explanation. Some weaker answers concentrated more on a narrative of the Night of the Long Knives. Some answers to **(c)** were excellent, with detailed explanation of both the Enabling Act and the death of Hindenburg. In many of these answers each of the factors was treated as a separate entity and where this happened the answer was often of high quality. The main points explained about the Enabling Act related to the creation of a legal dictator who did not have to rely on the Reichstag to pass laws, gain permission to spend money or face opposition from rivals. When Hindenburg was addressed, the better answers explained that the only person who had greater power than Hitler was now gone and that Hitler had total power over the army. Most were able at this stage to explain the significance of the title Führer. Less strong answers were characterised by the muddling of the two factors, together with more description to the exclusion of explanation. The weakest answers showed confusion over the impact of the Enabling Act and Emergency Decrees, whilst at the same time writing too much about the Reichstag Fire.

Question 12

The best answers to **(a)** indicated that autarky was about self-sufficiency before going on to recall the impact of the British blockade during the First World War and to state that this was part of Germany's preparation for another war. Often reference was made to a 'four-year plan'. Answers then went on to mention the impact on farming, the extraction of raw materials and the creation of synthetic substitutes. Some answers lacked specific detail or wrote about autocracy and the creation of a totalitarian state instead. Whilst many candidates in response to **(b)** wrote excellent explanation of the importance of women, others were less strong as the response became more descriptive or concentrated on how the Nazis treated women. Where the special role undertaken by women in relation to child birth was fully explored and explained the answer was usually of high quality. Weaker answers lacked focus on the question, being about the rewards received for having children. Sometimes in response to **(c)** the answers became highly descriptive in nature, neglecting to explain the success of the Nazis in gaining loyalty and support. Answers about the school curriculum and the Hitler Youth were detailed in relation to activity but some lacked that evaluative consideration of success. Better candidates ensured that a balanced approach by the use of explanation. The lack of success was more easily explained through the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates, although description was often present.

Question 13

Most answers to **(a)** were good. Candidates were aware that the Provisional Government was set up after the Tsar abdicated and that it was temporary until new elections were held. Many mentioned that a leading figure was Kerensky and that many members of the Provisional Government came from the last Duma. There were many good quality answers to **(b)**. The most popular given was that the government decided to continue the war and failed to address the issue of food shortages. The best answers revolved around the Kornilov Affair which undermined the government to the advantage of the Petrograd Soviet. Weaker answers showed awareness of many of the issues but were highly descriptive in nature. In **(c)** the question often needed to be more directly addressed as some candidates did not take account of the date in the question. Those who attempted to answer the question set usually produced a balanced argument about how the actions of Trotsky and Lenin contributed to the success of the Bolsheviks in 1917.

Question 14

The majority of answers to **(a)** included some mention of the policy of Russification. In addition, some candidates were aware of Stalin's policy of discouraging differing national identities within Russia and the encouragement of the use of the Russian language. Answers to **(b)** sometimes revolved around the basic idea of increasing food production. The idea behind collectivisation was significant and this was brought out in the better responses. The best answers gave explanations under headings such as modernisation, trade and human impact, ensuring that each area contained developed examples. For **(c)** candidates took different approaches to their answers. To balance the idea of misery and suffering, some argued that all was not as bad as was thought, whilst others argued for the improvements brought by increasing industrial success. Some answers were unbalanced as candidates produced stronger arguments for the idea that the lives of the Russian people remained awful.

Question 15

Some answers to **(a)** needed to be fuller and more detailed. Candidates often named the industries that faced difficulties but did not state what the difficulty was. Better answers did at least state the new industry that was providing the challenge. Some answers included agricultural difficulties but these were not valid. In **(b)** a significant majority of answers identified a variety of reasons for the economy boom of the 1920s. These reasons included government policy, new technology, advertising, credit facilities and the impact of the car industry. Despite this impressive knowledge, not all of these answers were developed into explanation. Where this did happen it was often in relation to the car industry. In answering **(c)** the better explanations were made in relation to those who did not benefit particularly - black Americans, Native Americans, immigrants and farmers. The part of the answer that related to those who did prosper often contained much narrative about the impact of domestic appliances and the new found freedom for some women.

Question 16

In **(a)** most answers showed awareness of the link to speculation, the borrowing of money and the payment of the loan when a quick profit was made. The less strong answers to **(b)** showed knowledge of a number of reasons as to why the economy was weakening. These reasons included over production and, for many Americans, a lack of money. The better answers developed these and other reasons into explanation. The best answers linked overproduction both to a declining internal market and to government tariff policies and these concepts were well understood. There were many excellent responses to **(c)** with well explained reasons for both Roosevelt's success and Hoover's failure providing a balanced response. The explanations on both sides showed good understanding of the issues. Some answers were brief in relation to Hoover, whilst others neglected to take note of the question and wrote about Roosevelt in terms of the New Deal. Less strong answers were characterised by strong description of an issue which didn't evolve into the explanation required to reach a higher level.

Question 17

Answers to **(a)** elicited from many candidates detailed and relevant descriptions which included the activities of Chiang Kai-shek including arrests, expulsions and executions. The best answers added specific numerical details and noted the impact on the Communist Party. Weaker responses concentrated more on the street violence aspect of the Massacre. Most answers showed knowledge of the extermination campaigns in **(b)** by identifying or describing at least one reason. Better answers took the writing on at least one factor into explanation mode. The best answers showed an understanding of how the negative publicity for the KMT led to an increase in popular support for the Communists. In addition the link between campaigns and the development of guerrilla warfare were often well explained. In answering **(c)** most candidates identified reasons on both sides of the argument. These were often clear and succinct. Better answers took one or more of these identifications and developed them into explanations. In some instances answers were unable to go beyond explaining 'massive casualties' for one side of the argument.

Question 18

In response to **(a)** some answers offered an outline understanding of Mao's disapproval of party policy, focusing on his concerns about the movement away from true communism. Where the better answers included specific concerns this often related to elements of privatisation and privilege in farming. The better responses to **(b)** were based on following in Mao's footsteps with its attendant unpopularity. The best responses included the previous point together with explanation of what Deng Xiaoping was suggesting. Some answers were less strong on an awareness of the 'Gang of Four' membership or their activities and

sometimes missed the opportunity to reference Deng Xiaoping in their answers. Excellent answers to **(c)** contained explained detail relating to both the social and political consequences of economic development, giving the answer balance. Other answers were less strong. Candidates emphasised social consequences but could have also written more on the political ones. Weaker answers could have been improved by concentrating less on description and more on explanation.

Questions 19 and 20

There were too few answers to these questions to make comment appropriate.

Question 21

In answering **(a)**, the majority of candidates described the proposed creation of two independent states, one Arab and one Jewish. A significant number went further to indicate the proposals for Jerusalem. The best answers included detail of the proposed geographical areas to be allocated to each state. Many answers to **(b)** were explanatory in nature, showing good and even excellent understanding of the situation. Most explained that Arab states refused to recognise the state of Israel and were therefore willing to attack and destroy the new state. Other answers linked this to the idea of vulnerability at a time of creation. Other points made included the conviction by the Arab states that they would triumph because their cause was just. Less strong answers, whilst demonstrating sound knowledge of a number of reasons, did not develop description into explanation. In **(c)** better answers showed good subject knowledge linked to both sides of the argument and the ability to create a balanced argument. Most explained that the War had left Britain short of money so that it was becoming increasingly difficult to keep large numbers of troops in Palestine. Some took this factor further by introducing a link to the newly elected British Labour government's priorities. Many answers vividly portrayed British troops under attack from groups such as Irgun and it was rare not to see reference to the King David Hotel. Better answers were able to explain the pressure being exerted by the US government in a bid to increase the number of Jewish settlers. Sophisticated responses showed excellent command of the subject matter with authoritative handling of the inter-relationship between differing factors. A relatively small number of answers would have benefited from increased explanation of the factors rather than over-reliance on description.

Question 22

There were too few answers to this question to make comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

General Comments and Key Messages

Part **(a)** questions require short, descriptive answers which are probably no more than a paragraph in length. The emphasis is on recalling accurate details rather than explanation. However, parts **(b)** and **(c)** require explanation. Generally, candidates continue to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. It was clear that many candidates continue to communicate their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features, or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1–4

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

Question 5

This was a very popular question. Part **(a)** could have been better answered by a number of candidates. A significant majority of candidates gained credit for mentioning that the Big Three organised discussions which aimed to punish Germany. More knowledge of Clemenceau's chairmanship, the Council of Ten overseeing the work of fifty advisory commissions, and the separate five treaties which were drawn up at the Conference would have improved responses. In part **(b)** good answers seized upon the chance to explain why Germany was treated so harshly. References were made to Allied attitudes towards the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, to the damage done to French and Belgian infrastructure and to perceptions about Prussian and German militarism in 1870 and 1914 which made it imperative that Germany's ability to attack again was dealt with.

Some responses to part **(c)** only described the aims of the Wilson. Well-developed answers explained precisely why Wilson would have been satisfied and dissatisfied by the peace treaties, although candidates tended to write more about the latter than the former, so there was a lack of balance in measuring the degree of his 'success'. It is important to emphasise that, in questions of this sort, reference should be made to particular features of the Versailles settlement.

Question 6

Many candidates performed well on part **(a)**. They were capable of drawing on their knowledge of moral condemnation, and economic and military sanctions. Many knew the narrative of the Corfu crisis (1923) in part **(b)**, but were less clear when explaining why each part of the crisis was a problem for the League.

Answers to part **(c)** were stronger, and there were some strong arguments relating to the reasons offered by Britain and France for their lack of determined action against Japan in 1931 on the one hand, and to the impact of the Wall Street Crash and the USA's absence from the League, on the other. However, some responses were unbalanced because there was a focus on agreement to the detriment of disagreement. Better candidates were able to take generalised references such as 'the League lacked an army' or that 'the League did not include all the major powers', and develop them into explanations, to achieve higher marks.

Question 7

In part **(a)** some candidates repeated what was agreed at Potsdam about Germany, rather than focussing on Poland. Credit was given for the specific changes to Poland's eastern and western borders, related to the rivers Oder and Neisse, and the idea of a 'buffer zone'. In part **(b)** good quality answers dealt effectively with the reason behind the Marshall Plan, referencing the containment of Communism and the reconstruction of Europe, to the advantage of the USA's economy. Less successful responses described what the Plan materially offered, which was not the focus of the question. Part **(c)** required a good knowledge of chronology, confining responses to the specified dates 1947–49. Those who did so were able to write at length about the Berlin Blockade and Airlift in agreement, while explaining such features as NATO, the Marshall Plan, the creation of two Germanys, and Cominform in disagreement. It is worth emphasising that those who avoided a narrative of each feature, but focussed on the causes of tension, performed better.

Question 8

This remains a popular topic and answers tended to be quite detailed. Many candidates were able to refer specifically to four features of Comecon, gaining full marks. In part **(b)** most were able to write at length about the building of the Berlin Wall, but then needed to relate their understanding and explain the causes of tension. Those candidates who did well in part **(c)** were able to compare events in Hungary and Czechoslovakia and argue about the extent of the threat posed by each set of events. Usually these related to the nature of Soviet perceptions about the aims of Nagy and Dubcek. It is worth emphasising that those who avoided a narrative of each feature, but linked their knowledge to the idea of 'threat', wrote better answers.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Most answers to part **(a)** were good, while explanations of the German attack on Verdun in **(b)** accurately focussed on attempts to break French morale and French resistance by 'bleeding the French dry'. There were some impressive answers to part **(c)**, examining the successes and failures of Haig's contribution as military leader. They balanced Haig's defence of the Channel ports in 1914 or his contribution to the development of new strategies which proved effective towards the end of the war with the accusation that he was the 'butcher of the Somme'. Explanations of these points were often detailed and relevant to the question set.

Question 10

Part **(a)** attracted some good responses about the advantages the USA brought to the Allies when they entered the war in 1917, and many responses recognised the tighter focus demanded by the inclusion of the word 'initially' in the question. In part **(b)** candidates wrote at length, and to good effect, about the impact of unrestricted U-boat warfare and of the Zimmerman Telegram. Some good responses were seen to part **(c)**.

Question 11

Candidates knew many features of the German Revolution of 1918 to score well in part **(a)**. They recognised the part played by naval mutinies and the Kaiser's abdication in the declaration of the republic. Some less successful answers went beyond 1918 and wrongly included such features as the Spartacist Revolt and the publication of the Weimar Constitution. Part **(b)** gave an opportunity for students to explain the problems faced by the Weimar Republic in 1919 and 1920. A significant majority were able to score highly as they kept to the dates and explained, in detail, two problems such as risings against the new republic or the immediate difficulties faced by Weimar politicians resulting from the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. There were many secure responses to part **(c)**, with good explanations of a range of factors which showed that Weimar had either overcome, or was still struggling with, its problems by 1929. Better quality answers drew on economic, political and cultural factors. Some unbalanced answers were seen.

Question 12

In part **(a)** the best answers covered the Gestapo's activities, such as spreading fear by discovering, arresting and detaining enemies of the state. Part **(b)** brought detailed responses, although some did tend to be descriptive. The key was to explain why Hitler persecuted the mentally and physically handicapped; hence descriptions of what happened gained only limited credit. Part **(c)** followed a similar pattern. Candidates described methods of propaganda at length but would have improved their responses by relating

them clearly to how propaganda underpinned Nazi control of the German people. On the other hand, details of the instruments of the police state were effectively used to answer the question set.

Question 13

In part (a), many candidates possessed some knowledge of the Tsar's personal autocracy but knew less about the part played by the Orthodox Church, the Okhrana and the aristocracy in maintaining Nicholas II's rule. It was important in part (b) that candidates should keep to the point of the question and apply detailed information to the reasons for the October Manifesto in 1905. Responses tended to talk in general terms about Bloody Sunday, the effects of the Russo–Japanese War and the demand for constitutional reform. Good marks were awarded when descriptive passages were explained by relating them to the need for the Tsar to react and respond – hence the Manifesto and what it was meant to achieve. In part (c) answers tended to be unbalanced; good explanations of the Tsarina's responsibility for the collapse of Tsarism were placed against descriptive paragraphs about the general condition of Russia in 1917.

Question 14

Answers to part (a) tended to be quite brief and confined to information about the posts held by Stalin. Those who included details of the Supreme Soviet, People's Commissars, the Presidium and the Politbureau, scored highly. Responses to part (b) reflected good understanding of Stakhanov's importance and there were many good answers about the purges and Great Terror in part (c). Candidates who read this question carefully gained more credit; the focus was on 'control' related to success and failure. Descriptions of Stalin's actions attracted lower marks. Many responses were confined to 'success'; where Stalin's problems of fully controlling people's personal lives was dealt with very briefly, there was a lack of balance.

Question 15

The benefits gained by the USA from the First World War in part (a) attracted some high marks; candidates knew this topic well. Similarly, in part (b) the focus of many good answers was on explaining the problems faced by the 'have-nots' during the 1920s boom. There were also many strong part (c) responses which covered the impact of competition from Canada on US agriculture in the 1920s. Balance (showing agreement and disagreement) was achieved by those candidates who not only explained the factor given in the question, but also went on to explain the effects of a declining US population, tariff policies, less demand from Europe and disease on southern farms.

Question 16

Although a less popular question, it was rare to see a weak answer to part (a). The reasons for the New Deal's lack of success in reducing unemployment, asked for in part (b), produced some generalised descriptions about who didn't benefit, rather than explaining 'why'. More positively, part (c) responses included sound arguments about the threat from radical critics to the New Deal on the one hand, and the effects of (for example) Republican and Supreme Court opposition on the other. Candidates seemed to know a great deal about this and were able to deploy information successfully to argue both for and against the statement.

Question 17

Part (a) was handled well; a significant number of candidates gained full marks by deploying four pieces of information about changes to agriculture in Communist China before 1957. For instance, they made reference to land being taken from landlords and shared out amongst peasants, the trend towards collectives, the destruction of the landlord class and the increase in grain production. There were good answers to part (b) covering the reasons for social changes introduced by the Communists. Relevant factors were related to literacy, health and hygiene, and the removal of traditional and feudal practices. Weaker responses drifted away from social changes (as required by the question) and included economic changes which lacked relevance. Part (c) answers were balanced, with a range of factors contributing to the failure of the Great Leap Forward identified and explained. Candidates were able to discuss the impact of the Sino–Soviet split on the one hand, and the effect of Mao's policies on the other.

Questions 18–22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

General Comments and Key Messages

On this paper, source-handling skills are crucial. These constitute comprehension (what does the source say?), interpretation (what does the source mean?) and evaluation (how can the source be used as evidence?), all of which need to be demonstrated in the historical context established by the question paper. All the questions will test some or all of these skills, but the wording of each question determines which. Candidates need to shape their answers appropriately in relation to the question: for example, a question asking 'How far do these sources agree?' has a primary focus on comprehension and interpretation, but one asking 'How useful is this source?' clearly brings evaluation into the equation. The best answers understood what the questions demanded, and concentrated on that. Less successful answers lacked this relevance, and spent time writing about the sources, but not answering the question set.

There were more answers to the nineteenth century option than is usual. The incidence of incomplete scripts was low. The level of contextual knowledge demonstrated in candidates' answers was good, and the ability of candidates to evaluate sources in context, and in particular their awareness of the need to consider the issues of audience and purpose, continues to improve. There was some evidence of candidates not reading sources carefully enough; for example, despite the given provenance in Source G (20th century option), it was surprising to see how many answers stated that the speaker in the source was Chamberlain.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

The question asked for a comparison of two sources. Even though the question asked how far the sources agreed, good responses appreciated that this wording invited the identification of both agreements and disagreements. There were plenty of both in the sources, for example that both sources agreed that there was a stepping-up of military preparations, or disagreed on the relative strength of Germany, seen as strong in Source A, but weaker in Source B. However, it was also possible to discern authors' opinions in the sources, a more sophisticated reading than simply matching or mismatching content details. Both sources discussed the preventative war issue, but Source A was clearly less understanding of Germany's predicament than Source B. The best answers saw this difference. As always with comparison questions, the most effective approach is to concentrate on direct matching/mismatching – Source A says X, but Source B says Y. There are now relatively few answers that first summarise Source A, then Source B, and finally attempt comparison. There are though plenty of answers that start focused on matching/mismatching, but then stray off the point, perhaps into writing about the events, or going back to writing about a single source.

Question 2

The question asked about the utility of a source as evidence about German foreign policy. Some candidates thought this was asking what the source says; in effect, they saw it as a comprehension question, and missed the invitation to evaluate the source. For these candidates, the source was useful because of what it said, or slightly better, for what you could infer from what it said. Although these answers were valid in their own terms, they were missing the judgement required by the wording of the question – *How useful?* Different sources raise different issues of evaluation, often with reliability an important matter. Here, because of the nature of the source, the central issue was not whether the author was telling the truth, but whether the diary extract gave an accurate impression of German foreign policy in 1912. The best answers reached a judgement on this by looking outside the source (i.e. by cross-reference to contextual knowledge or other sources) for corroboration/rebuttal.

Question 3

The focus was on whether or not one source could prove another wrong. It depends on the nature of the sources and the claims made in them. Some candidates approach this kind of question as another matching/mismatching exercise: if the sources contradict, then certainly one will be wrong (but which?); if they agree, then both are right. Most concluded that Source D proved the Kaiser right because it said England, France and Russia will close in, which is what the Kaiser agrees with in Source E. The problem is that this ignores the question of whether or not you can believe what the sources say. The Kaiser's opinion on the causation of the war should certainly not be taken at face value, and House's view on the situation in Europe merely reflects isolationist, anti-British sentiments common in the USA at that time. Better answers noted the content matches/mismatches between the two sources, but rested their judgment of the issue of proof on an evaluation of the reliability of one or both of the sources.

Question 4

The key to answering 'Are you surprised?' questions is first for candidates to say whether or not they are surprised, and to identify what is found surprising/unsurprising. Only once this is done can candidates then proceed to explaining why. Here, whatever use was made of Source F, the question was asking whether candidates were surprised by Source G. On the face of it, Source G was unsurprising – the Kaiser was happy, calling for champagne, because Britain had promised French neutrality. Who wouldn't be happy in these circumstances? Most answers were based on this kind of common sense reasoning. Better candidates added in some historical context. By 1 August Russia had started mobilisation. Source F shows that Germany is committed to Austria. German war plans depend on a pre-emptive strike against France. How can the Kaiser possibly say he will abandon action against France? In context, this is very surprising. The best answers found a way to explain in context why a source was not surprising - there will always be a reason for what it says. Ultimately, the Kaiser's behaviour on 1 August is explicable only in relation to his volatile, unpredictable personality.

Question 5

Interpreting cartoons requires a good grasp of the context, but even with this, making sense of what a cartoon shows is demanding, as cartoonists routinely use humour, sarcasm and imagery to make their point. In short few cartoons can simply be taken at face value. In addition, most cartoons do not make a single point; indeed they will usually have many sub-messages (points that are made by part, but not all of the cartoon). Of course, there is always a 'big message' that sums up all of what the cartoonist wants to say, and detecting this is a better response than seeing only sub-messages. With Source H, sub-messages included the idea that there was no peace in Europe, or that countries blamed each other for breaking the peace, or that Italy wanted to stay aloof from European disputes. Candidates answering on these lines missed the significance of the pointing finger in the corner of the cartoon, accusing all of the European nations of being to blame for the war – which was the cartoonist's 'big message'. The very best answers focused more explicitly on the cartoonist's opinion, and how this was critical of European militarism.

Question 6

This question is about the sources, and the evidence they give in relation to the given hypothesis. If an answer makes no mention of the sources, it can receive only limited credit. Secondly, the question asks 'how far', which is a clear signal that the sources will contain evidence both for and against the hypothesis. Answers on one side only will therefore be limited in the credit they receive. Finally, the source content must be used to show how it either supports or questions the hypothesis, and it is this final requirement that some candidates find hard to satisfy. Ideally, using a source means the identification of an aspect of the source (not necessarily a quote, a précis will do just as well) that is relevant to the argument. However, identification of a relevant aspect may not on its own be sufficient; how it offers support or not may need to be explained. So, the hypothesis was that Germany was planning a preventative war. How about Source A? Candidates using the source produced responses such as: 'Source A supports the hypothesis because it says Germany wanted a war as part of its aim to alter the international political system.' But does this fully explain how the hypothesis is supported? Better responses were able to add some explanation: 'This means that Germany was thinking about war as a way of preventing international developments it did not want.' The best approach on this question is to go through each of the sources in turn, and many candidates die this. Those candidates who grouped the sources often drew conclusions about the group which were not true of all the sources in the group. Generally, most candidates achieved reasonable marks on this question, although this was sometimes a result of successfully using only a small number of the sources they had actually written about.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

The question asked for a comparison of two sources. Even though the question asked how far the sources agreed, good responses appreciated that this wording invited the identification of both agreements and disagreements. There were plenty of both in the sources, for example that both sources agreed that Britain followed a policy of appeasement, or disagreed on whether or not Hitler would share Czechoslovakia (he wouldn't in Source A, he would in Source B). There was, though, an over-arching difference between the two sources in the impression they gave of Hitler. In Source A he is shown to want war and to be angry at losing the chance of it, but in Source B he is happy to avoid war and simply wait for events to deliver what he wants. The best answers saw this difference. With comparison questions, the most effective approach is to concentrate on direct matching/mismatching – Source A says X, but Source B says Y. There were relatively few answers that first summarised Source A, then Source B, and finally attempted comparison. There were though plenty of answers that started focused on matching/mismatching, but then strayed into writing about the events, or went back to writing about a single source.

Question 2

Successful answers needed candidates to be able to interpret the two cartoons. Source was well done, but Source D was misinterpreted by some, which made making valid comparisons harder. There were, nonetheless, some accessible approaches, generally on the idea that Hitler was troublesome/feared/powerful in both, so that Source D could be seen as supporting Source C. A frequent misinterpretation was to think that both sources showed that Hitler wanted to unite Germans (Source D does not show this). Differences were perhaps less obvious, though the idea that Source D shows that Hitler was going to attack the Soviet Union, whilst Source C shows that Hitler would attack wherever there were Germans was commonly used. The best candidates saw that the idea of one cartoon 'supporting' the other was more a matter of comparing the cartoonists' opinions, rather than matching/mismatching details from the cartoons. This could produce comparisons of the cartoonists' attitudes towards appeasement (both against) or on who was to blame for causing trouble (Hitler in Source C, Britain and France in Source D).

Question 3

The question asked about the utility of a source as evidence about Hitler's foreign policy. Some candidates thought that this was asking what the source says; in effect, they saw it as a comprehension question, and missed the invitation to evaluate the source. For these candidates, the source was useful because of what it said, or slightly better, for what could be inferred from what it said. Although these answers were valid in their own terms, they were missing the judgement required by the wording of the question – *How useful?* Different sources raise different issues of evaluation, often with reliability an important matter. Here, many candidates reached the conclusion that the source was not useful because Hitler was lying, and showed this using cross-reference to another source or, more commonly, to their background knowledge. More interesting were answers that used awareness of Hitler's purpose. These saw Source E as a deliberate attempt by Hitler to mislead in an attempt to get his own way over Czechoslovakia. Sometimes the conclusion was that this made the source unreliable, and so not useful, but better was to perceive the source as useful because of what could be learned from Hitler's purpose; for example, that it was useful as an example of the methods Hitler used to achieve his foreign policy aims.

Question 4

The key to answering 'Are you surprised?' questions is first for candidates to say whether or not they are surprised, and to identify what they find surprising or unsurprising. Only once this is done can they then proceed to explaining why. Here, whatever use was made of Source F, the question was asking whether candidates were surprised by Source G. It was unusual for an answer not to recognise the contradiction between the two sources, with most concluding that the difference made Source G surprising. As is usual, with this format of question, though, better answers could conclude that Source G was unsurprising once the context was taken into account. The most obvious way of explaining away the difference between the sources was to look at who produced them and why. Source F was a reflection of the public mood immediately post-Munich and had a clear purpose of supporting the government and reassuring the population, whilst Source G was spoken in parliament by an arch-opponent of appeasement, trying to warn that Munich was a disaster.

Question 5

When asked 'why' a source was produced, it is absolutely essential that the answer should contain a reason. Some candidates interpreted the source, but neglected to give a reason why it was published. Reasons could fall into three categories: context, i.e. because of what was happening at that time; message, i.e. in order to say something to the audience; and purpose, i.e. so as to produce an impact on the feelings or behaviour of the audience. Better answers put categories together to give a more developed response so, for example, whilst it was valid to reply, as many candidates did, that the reason for publication was that the war had just broken out (context), or that the cartoonist wanted to boost the morale of the British people (purpose), better responses were capable of putting the two together and saying that the reason was that Britain had declared war on Germany a couple of days before so the cartoonist wanted to stiffen the resolve of the British people in the fight to come. Interestingly, the interpretation of the cartoon proved challenging for some candidates, who often assumed that it meant Hitler did not want war. Nonetheless, many gave excellent interpretations incorporating contextual knowledge, saying that the message was that whilst Hitler had anticipated a small war over Poland, he had been taken by surprise by the response of Britain and France which meant that he would now be dealing with an unwanted 'big war'.

Question 6

This question is about the sources, and the evidence they give in relation to the given hypothesis. If an answer does not mention of the sources, it can only receive limited credit. Secondly, the question asks 'how far', which is a clear signal that the sources will contain evidence both for and against the hypothesis. Answers on one side only will therefore be limited in the credit they receive. Finally, the source content must be used to show how it either supports or questions the hypothesis, and it is this final requirement that some candidates find hard to satisfy. Ideally, using a source means the identification of an aspect of the source (not necessarily a quote, a précis will do just as well) that is relevant to the argument. However, identification of a relevant aspect may not on its own be sufficient; how it offers support or not may need to be explained. So, the hypothesis was that Hitler had a consistent plan in his foreign policy. How about Source A? Candidates using the source produced responses such as: 'Source A rejects the hypothesis because it says that when Hitler met Chamberlain on 22 September he increased his demands.' But does this fully explain how the hypothesis is rejected? Better responses added some explanation: 'If he had a consistent plan he would not have changed his mind from one meeting to the next.' None of these sources, in themselves, clearly demonstrated consistent planning or the lack of it, so this additional explanation was vital. The best approach is to go through each of the sources in turn. Those candidates who grouped the sources often drew conclusions about the group which were not true of all the sources in the group. In the end, most candidates achieved reasonable marks on this question, but this was often as a result of successfully using only a small number of the sources they had actually written about.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

General Comments and Key Messages

The main focus of the paper is on using historical sources in their historical context. This involves interpreting and evaluating sources and cross-referencing between them. This should be informed by candidates' knowledge and understanding of the period they have studied. This will help them to explain the messages of sources, whether they can be trusted and how far the sources agree and disagree with each other. Although the use of candidates' historical knowledge is important, candidates should understand that all the questions are about the sources, as should be their answers. They should try and answer these questions as directly as possible. The best answers were often those that answered the question straight away in an opening statement, and then justified these opening statements by using the sources and their knowledge. This approach can only be effective if candidates think about the question and the sources, and plan their answers, before beginning to write their answers. One of the keys to a good answer is knowing what the answer is going to be before the candidate starts writing it.

The majority of candidates answered the twentieth century option, although a larger than usual number of candidates chose the nineteenth century option. There was a wide range of interesting answers and a large number of good answers. Many candidates at this level can interpret, evaluate and use historical sources in meaningful ways, which leads to successful answers.

There are a few important points to be made that relate to the answers in both options. First, when asked to compare sources, better responses avoided simply summarising each source. They found agreements and disagreements, and explained them point by point, using a series of direct comparisons. Second, in 'message' questions, better responses considered the point of view of the author or artist of the source. Third, in purpose questions (e.g. 'why was this source published?'), the best approach was from those candidates who focused on the intended impact of the source on the intended audience - in terms of how it hoped to try and change their behaviour or attitudes. Finally, in the last question, better responses used the content of individual sources to explain how each either supported or disagreed with the statement in the question. A Less successful approach adopted by some candidates involved trying to make general statements about groups of sources.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

There were many agreements and disagreements between Sources A and B for candidates to find. Agreements included: many people were frightened by the prospect of war, Germany decided to risk war and the existence of anti-militarism. Disagreements exist over Germany's reason for going to war, over whether or not Germany was confident it would win and who was to blame. It is important that candidates take some time to go through the sources and work out the agreements and disagreements before they begin to write their answers. It is always a good idea to know what your answer is going to be before starting to write it. Not doing this led to some candidates summarising each source in turn, without making any point-by-point comparisons.

Question 2

This question requires candidates to explain the overall big message of the cartoon. This is that Germany has nothing to fear from a possible Franco-English alliance. A small number of candidates managed to get as far as this. Many, though, were able to explain valid sub-messages, e.g. that Britain and France did not really get on with each other, and a good number put the key sub-messages together to arrive at a

reasonable interpretation of the cartoon – that an alliance was being considered by England and France but they were both being hypocritical. There were also some misinterpretations – that Britain and France were genuine allies. When candidates are asked about the message of a source they should always try and consider the provenance of the source. In the case of this cartoon, considering what message the German cartoonist might want to send out to the German public about English–French relations helps get closer to the big message that there is nothing to worry about in terms of a possible alliance.

Question 3

Many candidates were able to compare the two sources and to use this to reach a reasonable conclusion about the reliability of Source D. There were two different ways of doing this depending on which part of Source D was used. The first part shows that Lloyd George was not worried about the possibility of war, while the second part shows that the Hungarian lady was worried. Of course, to really decide if Source E suggests that Source D is reliable, it is necessary to evaluate at least one of the sources. There were some successful attempts at this. Most attempts tended to make simple assertions about the provenance of one or both sources. Better evaluation of the sources was either by checking the claims of a source against contextual knowledge or by considering the possible purpose of the sources.

Question 4

There was a good range of answers to this question. Some candidates produced good analyses and evaluation of Source F but then needed to go on to state whether they were surprised or not. The best answers to this question stated in the opening sentence whether surprised or not surprised, and then spent the rest of the answer supporting this claim. Some justifications offered by candidates were not particularly strong, e.g. that it is surprising Russia was asking for German help when it had already partly mobilised, or that it is not surprising the Tsar was asking for help from his cousin. Better answers used either other sources or contextual knowledge to check the content of Source F. The very best answers showed that the candidates realised that it was important to explain surprise not just about the content of Source F but also about the sending of the message to the Kaiser.

Question 5

Questions such as this one asking about the reasons why a source was published are usually about the possible purpose of the source. In this case, the best answers suggested that the postcard was published to encourage the French war effort, to stiffen the French resistance or to encourage Frenchmen to join up. The question also asks why ‘at this time?’ This requires candidates to also explain the context at the time. This involved candidates putting the publishing of the postcard in the context of the beginning of the war. Many candidates struggled to get the purpose of the source but were able to explain the big message – that the Kaiser wanted world domination, but would fail. Weaker answers only explained the context and did not interpret the postcard, while there were also some answers that misinterpreted the source and claimed it was about the French.

Question 6

This question was answered well, with many candidates able to explain how some sources suggest the First World War could have been avoided, e.g. Sources C and D, and how other sources, e.g. Sources E and G, suggest otherwise. It is important that candidates understand that it is perfectly valid to use some sources on both sides of the argument. For example, Sources A, B, D and F fit into this category. The best answers used the content of the sources to produce clear explanations of how particular sources support or disagree with the claim that war could have been avoided. Less successful answers tended to group sources and then make general assertions about each group without reference to the content of particular sources within the group.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

This question produced a good range of answers. It asked candidates to compare two sources and explain how far they agreed. The best answers were based on holistic readings of the two sources and on their overall points of view about who was to blame for the fact that nothing was done about German remilitarisation of the Rhineland. Source A blames France, while Source B sees the failure more as a collective one with Britain, France and the League all being partly responsible. Most candidates produced

slightly less good answers by focusing on comparing points of detail between the two sources. The ‘how far’ part of the question means that these candidates needed to explain ways in which the two sources agreed and ways in which they disagreed, although some only covered agreements or disagreements. In answering this type of question, it is important to find the agreements and disagreements before writing the answer. This avoids the type of answer that summarises both sources and only begins to compare at the end. The best approach, and that adopted by many candidates, is to compare the sources point by point throughout the answer. For example, the sources agree, among other things, that there were 22 000 German troops, that the French Prime Minister made a broadcast about Strasbourg and that Britain was unwilling to risk war. On the other hand, they disagree about whether the German high command was anxious and why France did not act. A few candidates identified information that is in one source but not in the other. This approach to the question neglected to deal with agreements and disagreements. Weaker answers were those that just paraphrased both sources and did not make any point-by-point comparison.

Question 2

There was a good range of answers to this question, with few very weak answers. When a question asks for the cartoonist’s message, candidates should try and work out from the source the cartoonist’s point of view. Some very good candidates were able to explain that the American cartoonist (and the fact that the cartoon was American was an important clue) was criticising European militarism or aggression. In other words, he was criticising both France and Russia, and Germany. This can be seen by the unflattering way in which they are all portrayed. Many more candidates were able to suggest the cartoonist’s point of view based on a sub-message of the cartoon, rather than on its big message. Several, for example, explained that he was criticising France and Russia, while others argued that he was criticising Germany. A large number of candidates suggested a valid sub-message but did not get as far as the cartoonist’s point of view. For example, they explained how the source showed Germany to be strong or how it was a victim of France and Russia. The positive aspect of all these answers was that they were based on the cartoon. Some candidates did less well by explaining everything they knew about the Franco–Soviet Mutual Assistance Pact. This rather distracted them from focusing on the cartoon. Others simply described the details in the cartoon without making any inferences.

Question 3

Most candidates wrote good responses. There were many very good, and also very few weaker answers. The question required candidates to evaluate the source. There are various ways to do this and some are clearly better than others. Less successful answers were those that focused on the provenance of the source. They claimed, for example, that the German officer would know what he was talking about because he worked in army headquarters. A few candidates considered the plausibility of some of the claims in the source, e.g. that they did not sleep for five days and nights. Better answers were based on using either contextual knowledge or cross-referencing to other sources to check the claims made by the officer. Some of the knowledge used was very general, and the use of other sources, e.g. the German Defence Minister being ‘ashen-faced with anxiety’ in Source A, or the lack of anxiety in the German High Command in Source B, usually produced better answers. The best answers argued either that the officer would be mad to be lying about Hitler and his plans in this way, or that because of their successes in the Spanish Civil War, Germans such as the officer, were confident enough to admit the truth about the Rhineland episode.

Question 4

This question was generally answered well, with many candidates producing high-level responses. It asked candidates whether or not Source E makes Source F surprising. It is crucial that candidates state whether they are surprised or not. Some candidates produced good analyses, comparisons, and even evaluations, of the sources, but neglected to say whether they were surprised or not. Other candidates identified aspects of Source F that they were surprised about but did not explain why. The starting point for achieving good marks for this type of question is to compare what the two sources say. In one important way, the sources agree – that Britain did not want war. In another important way, the sources disagree – Source E suggests that there could be war, while Source F says there was a good chance of peace. Candidates could base their answers either on the agreement or the disagreement and use it as a reason for being surprised or not surprised by Source F. However, some candidates realised that one or both of the sources need to be evaluated if the question is to be fully answered. The most common way of doing this was to consider Eden’s purpose in making the speech in Source F. In the best answers this followed a comparison of the two sources. Thus a full answer first compared the sources for e.g. the disagreement about whether there would be war, and then explained that this disagreement did not make Source F surprising because it made perfect sense that Eden would want to reassure MPs and the public at that time.

Question 5

In some ways this question is similar to **Question 4** but is based on completely different types of sources. Candidates were less willing to evaluate these sources than Sources E and F in **Question 4**. This meant that many based their answers on comparisons of the two sources. There was still much they could do with these comparisons as there are clear differences and similarities between the impressions given by the cartoon and the photograph. It was important that these comparisons were based on inferences from the sources, rather than just on surface details. Some candidates struggled because they took Source G at face value and thought that its message was that Germany was peace loving and the German army had stepped into the Rhineland by mistake. There was some simplistic evaluation of the two sources, e.g. cartoons are to make people laugh, while photographs show what really happened, and only the very best candidates carried out valid evaluation by, for example, considering the purpose of the cartoon or by checking its claims against contextual knowledge.

Question 6

There were many good answers, with candidates explaining how some sources support the view that Hitler got away with the remilitarisation of the Rhineland because Britain did nothing, and how other sources disagree with this view. These answers contained clear explanations of how particular sources agreed or disagreed with the statement. They made clear which sources they were using and explained each source separately, using its content. There were several reasons why some candidates did less well. Some neglected to use the sources and wrote an essay about remilitarisation. Others only used sources that said something about Britain's role, not realising that sources such as Source D provide us with an alternative reason why Hitler got away with remilitarisation and are thus relevant to the question. Some candidates grouped a number of sources together but then made general assertions about the group as a whole, without using the content of individual sources. There was also some misuse of sources. Some candidates, for example, were so keen to get Britain into every source that they claimed that Sources C, D, G and H tell us something about Britain's role, when they actually tell us about other reasons why Hitler got away with remilitarisation.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

General Comments and Key Messages

There was an increase in the number of candidates attempting the nineteenth century option. The overwhelming majority of candidates, however, chose to answer questions on the 20th century option. On both options, candidates displayed a sound knowledge and understanding of the topics. Better responses tended to respond to the specific wording of the question set. Less successful answers often consisted of detailed knowledge which lacked relevance in the light of the question posed. Overall the standard of answers was high.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

Some candidates found it difficult to recognise that there was a disagreement between the worried attitude of Germany towards the Anglo-French relationship suggested in Source A, and the apparent lack of concern shown in Source B. Comparison of 'big messages' as to how Britain and France were snubbing Germany in Source A and how Germany was not worried about the Entente in Source B, were seen in better responses.

Question 2

Contextual knowledge of the 1905 Moroccan Crisis was often impressively used to support explanations that the big message of the cartoon was that Germany was unintentionally strengthening the Entente through her actions. If neglecting to describe the overarching message in context, candidates were able to interpret sub-messages in the cartoon about the tensions between the powers.

Question 3

Source D was a memorandum written by Sir Eyre Crowe, an official at the British Foreign Ministry, in 1907. The best answers recognised that the purpose of the source was to rebut criticisms of the Entente from Germany at a time of increasing diplomatic tension. Weaker responses were often the result of a lack of understanding of both the content and purpose of the source.

Question 4

Most candidates seemed to understand the context and content of the British cartoon source used in this question. Another strength in responses was that, as well as understanding that the cartoon was commenting on the Kaiser's actions in the 1911 Moroccan Crisis, answers explained why they found the cartoon surprising or not, instead of just offering an analysis of what was happening in the source.

Question 5

A number of candidates wrote about the two sources without addressing the question. More sophisticated answers recognised agreements and disagreements in what was written, and went on to evaluate them.

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, lines from the text were reproduced as candidates went through the sources. Grouping of sources, e.g. 'Sources A, B, D and F do not provide

convincing evidence that the Anglo-French Entente was a threat to Germany', rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another characteristic of less successful answers. Successful evaluation of sources for extra marks was seen in better answers and some candidates would have benefited from just picking out one or two particularly worthwhile sources to write something meaningful about, regarding purpose and audience.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify and explain agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources. A few candidates were unable to make comparisons and tended to paraphrase or write out sections of the sources, labelling them as agreements/disagreements. Some candidates identified agreements and/or disagreements without being specific, e.g. Source A says this, Source B does not. Better candidates were able to recognise the overarching agreement that Hitler had no reason to worry about attempting the Anschluss.

Question 2

In some weaker responses, candidates simply asserted that Hitler could not be trusted because he was a man who often went back on his word. Stronger answers offered support through contextual knowledge for their claims that Hitler's reported message to Mussolini could or could not be trusted.

Question 3

There was a lot of scope for candidates to find matches or mismatches in the content of Sources D and E and many candidates dealt with this question competently. Weaker responses offered summaries of the sources without making a valid comparison to explain their reasons for believing that Hitler was lying in Source E. A strength of many candidates' answers was that they could make valid comparisons and evaluations by bringing in references to other sources or contextual knowledge.

Question 4

This question was well answered by many candidates. After explaining their surprise or lack of surprise, responses then often considered the purpose and intended impact of the source to reach a higher level of answer.

Question 5

Less successful candidates misunderstood the cartoon Source H or struggled to understand the timing of its publication, which was before Hitler achieved Anschluss with Austria. However, many thoughtful answers were seen, recognising that the cartoon was anticipating Anschluss, commenting on Mussolini's decisive support for Hitler, and the cartoonist's purpose in warning the British public and government about the dangers of appeasement.

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 reproducing lines from the text as they moved from source to source. Grouping of sources, e.g. 'Sources A, B, D and F do not provide convincing evidence that Hitler achieved the Anschluss because of the attitude of Mussolini', rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another characteristic of weaker answers. Successful evaluation of sources for extra marks was a feature of better responses rare and some candidates' responses would have been improved by just selecting one or two particularly worthwhile sources to write something meaningful about, regarding purpose and audience.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

This year was the first year that coursework based on the new requirements was assessed. In nearly all Centres, candidates produced some excellent assessments of significance, with the focus being kept firmly on assessment of significance in virtually every paragraph, and with candidates developing and supporting their own judgements. A number of valid approaches were used, including assessing significance from different perspectives, using a range of criteria, using ideas such as long and short-term, turning point and false dawn, and considering the iconic importance of individuals, events and developments.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

The other type of title which worked less well was that which was phrased, 'Explain the significance of'. The problem with this type of title is that it requires candidates to explain significance instead of assessing it.

The types of title that were offered by many Centres and which were most appropriate included:

- How significant was the Tet Offensive?
- Assess the significance of the Reichstag Fire.
- How far was the New Deal a turning point in American history?
- Assess the significance of the Night of the Long Knives.
- Assess the significance of General Haig in the First World War.
- How significant was Lenin to the Soviet Union between 1917 and 1930?

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

Most of the coursework was carefully marked, with the generic mark scheme being used accurately and appropriately. Moderators found the detailed on-going marginal comments and the summative judgements very helpful. These were usually clearly focused on the concept of significance and on the mark scheme. Two points should be remembered when using the markscheme. Firstly, all the statements and criteria it includes need to be used in relation to the concept of significance. For example, criteria such as 'Candidates demonstrate some understanding of interrelationships' need to be achieved by candidates as part of their assessment of significance. Secondly, the markscheme needs to be used holistically. It is for making summative judgements about the overall qualities of a candidate's response. This means that a level cannot be awarded to an answer after the first paragraph or two.

Although there was much accurate use of the mark scheme, it was not uncommon for small adjustments to be made, particularly to marking right at the top of the mark range.

Most candidates kept to the word limit and made a real effort to focus on assessment of significance. The best answers started by summarising their conclusions about significance and then set about justifying them. They also made clear the different criteria or the different perspectives that would be used to assess significance. Less successful answers started by describing some background and sometimes giving mini-biographies of individuals. They then described the event or the actions of an individual without relating them to the issue of significance. Another feature of less successful answers was the tendency to attempt to assess the significance of an individual or event by trying to compare it with other individuals or events. This took the focus of the answer away from what was meant to be the main subject. It is possible to assess the significance of an event or individual without comparing it with others. Other answers explained significance well but did not get as far as assessing it. These answers would have benefited from the use of counter-arguments.

The best answers also explained how judgements about significance are provisional and are dependent on the criteria used to reach these judgements. This extra complexity was achieved in different ways. Some candidates asked different questions about the significance of their event, development or individual, while others considered long and short-term significance. In some answers, use of concepts such as 'turning point' and 'false dawn' proved to be effective; in other answers, examination of iconic significance proved to be effective.

The high quality of much of the work was clear, and this included many sophisticated and mature attempts at dealing with, and assessing, a challenging historical concept.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41

Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken in this new format for the alternative to coursework. Depth Study B: Germany was the most widely answered, followed by the USA and Russia. Some also attempted the new Depth Study A: The First World War. The other Depth Studies attracted few responses.

Good responses were often briefly planned to examine a range of material that could be used to address the question in a balanced style. Stronger responses provided well-developed and contextually supported explanations that directly addressed the question and gave balance in their arguments. The best answers also made supported judgements and conclusions, with a sustained line of argument. Some candidates would have benefited from greater use of contextual knowledge and understanding, and also better extended writing skills. Less successful answers often struggled to address the question of importance or significance and tended to be narrative in style, sometimes missing the chronological parameters of the question. Some of these responses provided generalised comments or lists that did not address the issue in the question. A few candidates erroneously attempted both questions within their chosen Depth Study.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

There were some responses to Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918. Most chose **Question 1**, rather than **Question 2**, and generally they struggled to go beyond descriptions of the Schlieffen Plan which would have benefited from a greater focus on the 'how important' required by the question. Most responses adopted narrative approaches and lacked contextual knowledge. Those responses which displayed a better knowledge and understanding of the different factors which led to the failure of the Schlieffen Plan included the unexpected Belgian resistance, the logistical issues, alterations to the Plan by General von Moltke, the impact of the BEF and the quick mobilisation of the Russian Army.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This was the most popular topic, with answers evenly spread between the two essays. Some good responses were seen. In **Question 3**, the problems of the Weimar Republic were known in outline by most candidates and successful responses tended to include good knowledge of the topic – the difficulties faced in the time period given. The better responses did try to link their answers to the question by analysing whether reparations caused more problems than other aspects of German experiences at that time. They produced balanced arguments, although some would have been improved by both a greater depth of knowledge, and a closer focus on the question itself, by comparing each point back to the stated point in the title. Less successful responses struggled to write an answer linked to the question, and some narrative answers about the period were seen.

Question 4 was not answered as well as **Question 3**. Some candidates wrote general answers about life in Nazi Germany as a whole – they would have benefited from a greater appreciation of the relevance of World War II to this question. Better approaches to this question examined life in Germany and the effects of Allied bombing, rationing, increased conscription and women's war work in the factories, as well as continued repression by the SS and the Gestapo, and a continuation of the propaganda and racial policies of the Nazi regime. Some candidates wrote too much material on the Holocaust – while this was partially relevant in Germany due to the removal and increased persecution of the Jews and other groups in Germany, it was mainly carried out in Poland, rather than Germany.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

A fairly equal distribution of answers between the two questions was seen. While there were some good responses, other answers adopted narrative approaches to the topics and lacked contextual knowledge.

Question 5 responses focused too closely on the 1905 Revolution itself, rather than linking it to the eventual overthrow of Tsarism in Russia, and more candidates needed to examine other factors such as the impact of the First World War, the issue of land ownership for the peasants or the growth in organised political opposition since 1905.

Question 6 responses tended to feature general ideas of, and narratives about, the continuation of the war having a negative impact on Russia. The role of the Soviets, the Kornilov Affair and the impact of Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolshevik Party were sometimes omitted, leading to undeveloped responses.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

The USA Depth Study was widely answered by candidates. Most answers were to **Question 7**. Here, knowledge of the period was good, and many candidates could relate changes in the 1920s to the entertainment industry, and some could compare to other factors, e.g. Ford and the assembly line or the availability of credit. A number of good responses were seen, although a greater depth of contextual knowledge would have improved some, as would more developed explanations. Some responses relied too much on generalisations and narrative-style descriptions about a single factor, rather providing specific material to support arguments.

Question 8 was not as popular as **Question 7** and, in general, not answered as well. Candidates tended to lose focus in writing about the cause of Wall St Crash, and knowledge of the actions Hoover did take, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Farm Board (even if it was inadequate) was sketchy. When writing about Roosevelt some included material on the Alphabet Agencies, which were not relevant in the context of this question about the Presidential election of 1932.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken in this new format for the alternative to coursework. Depth Study B: Germany was the most widely answered, followed by the USA and Russia. Some also attempted the new Depth Study A: The First World War, and the China and Israelis and Palestinians options. There were a small number of attempts at the South African Depth Study.

Good responses were often briefly planned to examine a range of material that could be used to address the question in a balanced style. Stronger responses provided well-developed and contextually supported explanations that directly addressed the question and gave balance in their arguments. The best answers also made supported judgements and conclusions, with a sustained line of argument. Some candidates would have benefited from greater use of contextual knowledge and understanding, and also better extended writing skills. Less successful answers often struggled to address the question of importance or significance and tended to be narrative in style, sometimes missing the chronological parameters of the question. Some of these responses provided generalised comments or lists that did not address the issue in the question. A few candidates erroneously attempted both questions within their chosen Depth Study.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

Question 1 was more popular than **Question 2**. Some candidates were able to examine a number of technological innovations for **Question 1**, most commonly machine guns, tanks, gas weapons and the use of aircraft. Some answers were mainly descriptive but other candidates were able to achieve better responses by evaluating how these weapons were not immediate in their changing of warfare on the Western Front. Some candidates unfortunately examined the war at sea, which was not relevant to the question.

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This was the most popular topic with answers evenly spread between the two questions. **Question 3** was generally well answered and there were a lot of good and very strong responses. The best answers examined lots of examples of political disorder such as the various left and right wing uprisings and compared their significance to other economic and social issues such as the Treaty of Versailles' impact, the Ruhr invasion and the hyperinflation. Some candidates went beyond the 'early years' parameter in the question and discussed the Wall Street Crash, the Depression and the rise of Hitler, which was not relevant to the question. Contextual knowledge was generally very strong for **Question 3**.

Question 4 was also well answered by candidates who were generally impressive on Hitler's consolidation of power after 1933. Good answers examined a wide range of examples of violence that led on from the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act, and examined the role of the SA, SS and Gestapo, as well as the use of concentration camps. Often, this was then compared well to other methods used by Hitler's regime to consolidate his power such as the use of propaganda, conscription and rearmament, as well as the various economic measures taken by the Nazis to end the Depression in Germany.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

A fairly equal distribution of answers between the two questions was seen here. **Question 5** mainly produced responses which were stronger on alternative reasons for the overthrow of the Provisional Government, as opposed to Lenin's role. Generally, candidates would have benefited from greater knowledge of the role played by Lenin and often only referred to his April Theses and Bolshevik slogans. Candidates were generally stronger on the other factors which commonly included the June Offensive and continuation of the war, rationing and starvation, and the role of Trotsky in the Petrograd Soviet and Kornilov Affair.

Question 6 was well answered by many candidates. Stronger candidates looked at a range of examples of how Trotsky helped establish Bolshevik rule from 1917 to 1924 from his role in the Petrograd Soviet and the Military Revolutionary Committee and its planning of the armed coup, to his role as commander of the Red Army during the Civil War. This was then compared against other factors such as Lenin's personal role in establishing Bolshevik rule including the various decrees, War Communism, the establishment of the Cheka and the Red Terror and NEP. The best answers explained in detail and evaluated the roles played by Lenin and Trotsky, some reaching well-substantiated judgements. Some candidates were too narrow in the parameters for this question which sometimes appeared to become an essay on why the Reds win the Civil War; though this was relevant as part of the discussion, it was not the question.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

There was an equal distribution of **Question 7** and **8** responses for Depth Study D. **Question 7** saw some descriptive answers that examined the impact of Prohibition and then compared this to the impact of racial, religious and political intolerance in 1920s USA. Contextual knowledge was often very strong, although some responses would have been improved by better linkage to the question and a less narrative style. However, stronger responses were seen and candidates understood well the different aspects of Prohibition (though they often gave too much background before the 1920s), and were able to examine other aspects of intolerance such as the Red Scare, the case of Sacco and Vanzetti, the growth of the KKK, segregation and the 'Monkey Trial'.

Question 8 was well answered in many cases, with a good number of high quality responses. The question allowed candidates to explore the different ways in which the Alphabet Agencies were important during Roosevelt's presidency. Many candidates showed excellent contextual knowledge of the various agencies and their impact, with lots of strong statistics and factual examples being used to support explanations – most commonly mentioned were the AAA, PWA, WPA, NRA, FERA, TVA, CWA and CCC. The best answers compared the successes with the failures of these agencies, including the various radical and conservative critics and the fact that the agencies never really solved the problems of the Depression until the outbreak of the Second World War. Some candidates also compared the work of the agencies with other aspects of the New Deal such as the Banking Act, the Wagner Act and Social Security Act.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

There were very few attempts at **Question 9**, but a number of responses to **Question 10** were seen. This was well answered, with some good responses produced. Candidates were stronger when examining alternative factors for the economic progress of China – most typically these included the First Five Year Plan, Soviet aid and expertise and even future economic reforms under Deng Xiaoping. The best answers also examined the shortfalls of the Great Leap Forward itself by explaining how, even though production increased in many places, it was often inflated by Communist officials and of very poor quality. They also examined the repercussions of the industrial plan on agriculture and the subsequent famine and temporary reduction in Mao's influence in China.

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

Few attempts at this Depth Study were made. **Question 11** was on the Pass Laws and responses tended to be poorly-constructed descriptions of the Pass Laws or thin narratives about the nature of apartheid, often lacking contextual knowledge. Candidates could have examined other aspects of apartheid such as the segregation in towns, in land, lack of political rights and the establishment of Bantustans.

Question 12 was better answered in general, with some candidates having a strong knowledge of the role of de Klerk in repealing apartheid laws, repealing the ban on the ANC and PAC, and releasing Mandela. Good responses then compared this to the role played by Mandela, Tambo, Tutu, Buthelezi as well as international pressures and the civil disorder in South Africa at the time caused by social and economic pressures.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

An overwhelming majority of candidates opted for **Question 13**, with **Question 14** producing too few attempts for meaningful comments to be made. **Question 13** was often well written and candidates appeared confident in their approach to this question on the establishment of the State of Israel. There were some strong responses - the best answers examined a wide range of factors that led to the establishment of Israel and evaluated their significance through very strong contextual understanding. The best responses sustained their judgements throughout their answers by making substantiated conclusions through direct comparison and analysis of the various factors. A few candidates would have benefited from not going past the chronological limits of the question as some responses went on to discuss the various Arab–Israeli wars in the 1960s and 1970s which was not relevant. Other lost direction in contextually heavy descriptions and neglected to explain their points by linking back to the question.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken in this new format for the alternative to coursework. Depth Study B: Germany was the most widely answered, followed by the USA and Russia. Some also attempted the new Depth Study A: The First World War, and the China, South Africa and Israelis and Palestinians options produced a small number of responses.

Good responses were often briefly planned to examine a range of material that could be used to address the question in a balanced style. Stronger responses provided well-developed and contextually supported explanations that directly addressed the question and gave balance in their arguments. The best answers also made supported judgements and conclusions, with a sustained line of argument. Some candidates would have benefited from greater use of contextual knowledge and understanding, and also better extended writing skills. Less successful answers often struggled to address the question of importance or significance and tended to be narrative in style, sometimes missing the chronological parameters of the question. Some of these responses provided generalised comments or lists that did not address the issue in the question. A few candidates erroneously attempted both questions within their chosen Depth Study.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

A small number of candidates opted for this new Depth Study, **Question 2** being the most popular. Many candidates would have benefited from a greater contextual understanding of the question. Some responses went on to give a narrative of the end of the war and the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, and the establishment of the Weimar Republic, rather than focusing on the question set. Better answers compared the events of the Kiel Mutiny and the resulting uprisings to other aspects that aided in the ending of the war such as the British blockade, the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive and the entry of the USA into the war.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This was the most popular topic, with most candidates opting for **Question 4** rather than **Question 3**. The few **Question 3** responses that were seen needed to address the question more closely. This question demanded that candidates examine and evaluate the changes Hitler made to the Nazi Party such as its attempts to appeal to voters after the failed Munich Putsch and the increase in the use of propaganda, parades and anti-communism to appeal to middle-class supporters.

Question 4 was well answered in general, and many candidates were able to attain good marks. Most commonly, candidates analysed the importance of Nazi propaganda after 1934 and compared this to the use of violence by the SS and Gestapo, youth indoctrination and the Nazi economic 'miracle' of the 1930s. Strong responses were able to explain how these factors helped the Nazis maintain control in Germany. Some candidates need to be careful of the parameters of the question as they examined factors that led to Hitler's appointment as Chancellor which was in 1933, as well as other factors between 1933 and 1934 such as the Reichstag Fire, Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives which were all 1933–34; the question states 'after 1934'.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Most candidates opted for **Question 5** rather than **Question 6**, though **Question 6** did have a few responses that were mainly descriptive, rather than analytical.

Question 5 was generally well answered, and candidates had a good knowledge and understanding of the various factors that allowed the Reds to win the Civil War. The best answers examined and analysed the significance of War Communism by citing factors such as grain seizures to feed the army and workers, and the nationalisation of industries to create a war economy. This was then compared well to other factors such as Trotsky's role as War Commissar and commander of the Red Army, the weaknesses and disorganisation of the Whites and the impact of Bolshevik propaganda. These answers were often well explained and addressed significance directly, some reaching substantiated conclusions.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This Depth Study is popular and there was a fairly equal distribution of answers for both **Questions 7** and **8**. On **Question 7** candidates struggled to give much in the way of strong contextual knowledge about the importance of agriculture to the US economy in the 1920s. The best answers examined how agriculture employed a huge number of people in the USA and how after the war, while in decline, it had a knock-on effect in demand for industrial goods in the USA. Alternative factors were often better explained and most commonly included analyses of new innovations and industrial methods, the impact of advertising, electrification, government policies, speculation and the availability of credit.

Question 8 was answered better in general. There were lots of good responses and even some excellent ones seen by Examiners. The stronger responses examined the legislation and agencies that dealt with the poor in the agricultural and industrial sectors and cited in detail the work of the CCC, PWA, CWA and FERA, as well as the impact of the Wagner Act and Social Security Act, often in excellent detail. This was then compared to the failures of the New Deal when dealing with poorer agricultural labourers, black Americans, those in older industries, as well as the growing opposition from the Supreme Court and the Republicans. The best answers gave sustained lines of argument and reached substantiated conclusions in their essays to great effect.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

Very few candidates opted for this Depth Study. A small number of responses to **Question 10** were seen and generally responses would have been improved by a better focus on the question about China's relations with the USA.

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A small number of responses to **Question 14** were seen but there were too few **Question 13** answers for meaningful comment to be made. On **Question 14**, answers were mainly descriptive or narrative. Better responses demonstrated some knowledge of the importance of Yasser Arafat and his role in al-Fatah and the PLO, and were able to discuss his input into the various negotiations that took place after the Arab–Israeli War – the Oslo Accords and the Washington Agreement, for example. More candidates could have examined valid counter-arguments, such as the negative impact certain factions of the PLO had on his promotion of the Palestinian cause, such as its association with violence, terrorism and Saddam Hussein, and the legacy of his death in 2004 with Hamas in Gaza.