

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

The main focus of the coursework is the assessment of the significance of an event, individual (or group), development or place. It is important that titles use terms that make this focus clear. It is a good idea to use in the title the term 'significance'. It also helps if the instruction 'assess' is used. These two terms will help candidates understand what they are required to do. A title such as 'Assess the significance of the Night of the Long Knives' would be perfectly satisfactory and should work well.

Secondly, it is important that candidates understand that they have to attempt a broad assessment of significance. Whether they are assessing the significance of an event, development or individual, it is necessary to consider different ways in which it may have been significant. The best way to achieve this is to ask different questions about their subject and to use a range of criteria to judge how far it was significant in different ways, for different reasons and for different groups.

It is important that candidates attempt to assess significance rather than just describe or explain it. It is not necessary to write descriptive introductory sections 'setting the scene'. The focus should be on assessment all the way through answers.

The best answers assess whether the development, event or individual was more significant in some ways than in others. Reasoned arguments should be used, leading to an overall assessment of significance.

Finally, it is important that candidates do not confuse 'failure' with a lack of significance, or 'success' with significance. Actions or individuals that failed or events that led to nothing important can still be significant (the important point is if how far the failure mattered). It is also important to remember that an individual or event may have had little impact at the time, but a much greater one in the longer term.

Assessing significance often requires two moves on the part of the candidate. Firstly, they need to explain the consequences, results, impact or outcomes of an event, development or individual. Then they need to reach and support a judgement about how far the consequences, results, impact or outcomes mattered at the time or later.

General comments

A very high standard of work was seen, with candidates able to focus on the issue of significance due to titles which facilitated this. Titles that worked well included: 'Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch', 'Assess the significance of the British naval blockade in the First World War', 'How significant was Hitler in the period 1923–1934?', 'How significant was Gustav Stresemann for Germany, 1923 to 1933?' and 'Assess the significance of Steve Biko'. These titles demonstrate that it is possible to set an end date – the end date in the Hitler title worked well as it made the task more manageable – but that it is equally effective to have no end date, as in the title about Steve Biko. This allowed candidates to consider his legacy.

A good number of valid alternative approaches were seen, such as focusing the title on the idea of a 'turning point'. Two titles of this type which worked well were 'Assess how far the Munich Putsch was a turning point' and 'How far was the New Deal a turning point in US history up to 1941'. It is important when responding to 'turning point' questions that candidates consider what happened before, as well as after, the event. Judging whether an event was a turning point involves comparing what was happening before the event with what the situation was afterwards, and assessing how far the event changed the direction of events rather than simply continuing, or accelerating, developments already underway.

The subject matter chosen for an assessment of significance is important. Some subjects can be difficult to manage because they are so large, e.g. the significance of Hitler or Mao (although it is possible to make these manageable by focusing on one aspect of their careers), while others lack potential for judgements about significance. The development, event or individual chosen must have the potential of being assessed for significance in different ways. It should also provide potential for assessment, rather than just explanation. In other words, it must be a development, individual or event where judgements about significance are provisional and debatable, rather than clear-cut.

Comments on specific questions

The best answers were those that avoided both lengthy introductory sections setting the scene and sections that drifted into narrative and description. It was evident from these answers that candidates had planned and therefore knew what they wanted to say when they started writing. They had clearly asked themselves how their development, individual or event could be significant in different ways. In other words, they asked themselves different questions about significance, for example: was it more significant politically or economically, was its main impact at the time or later, what was the breadth and depth of its impact, was it more or less significant for different groups? These questions then provided the backbone and shape of their answers.

The criteria that was used to assess significance was varied; some was less, and some was more appropriate, depending on the topic. For some topics criteria such as political, social and economic worked well. For others, duration and breadth of impact worked better. Long and short term were also useful for some topics, while for others the idea of 'turning point' gave candidates useful possibilities. In better answers, the criteria was not used in mechanistic ways and it was clear that individual candidates had selected which criteria they thought was useful to use.

Some candidates were helped a lot by asking themselves whether their event or individual represented a turning point. To explore this properly they considered what had gone before, as well as after, and were able to assess how far their event or individual had truly changed the direction of events in a major way or had merely accelerated developments already underway.

Some answers did use a range of criteria but were limited because significance was just described or explained, but not assessed. Others answers were limited because they made few connections or comparisons. The best answers pursued links between the different ways in which a development, individual or topic was significant. Another useful approach was to compare the different ways in which the development, individual or event was significant and to make assessments about whether it was more significant in some ways than in others or whether it was more significant for some people than for others. These types of approaches opened up for the candidates the interesting and challenging question about the overall significance of their development, individual or event.

There were some very good answers that involved considering how far an event, development or individual was remembered or commemorated and what this tells us about its significance. This approach is always relevant. Some candidates just explained the impact of their subject. Their answers would have been improved by taking a second step and assessing how far the impact mattered, and to whom.

Candidates do not have to use all the approaches mentioned above but the careful use of some of them led to many interesting and excellent answers. In stronger answers, candidates appeared to have decided which approaches would work best with their event, development or individual.

The generic mark scheme should be used unchanged for all coursework. It needs to be used in a holistic way by considering answers as a whole and focusing on how well knowledge and understanding has been used to assess significance. Much of the work seen was accurately marked. Detailed annotations and summative comments were common and were most useful when they referred to key parts of the markscheme. It should be remembered that the statements in the mark scheme are to be used to help overall judgements about the work. Some marks were adjusted, often due to an over emphasis on description and narrative in the answers or because there needed to be greater focus on assessment of significance. Overall, however, the marking of candidates' work was done to a very high standard.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.
- Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

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

General comments

Successful **part (a)** answers focused on relevant details; explanation was not required. A small number of candidates wrote lengthy responses to **part (a)** which resulted in them not having enough time to fully develop their responses to **part (c)** questions.

Both **parts (b)** and **(c)** demand explanation, and many responses provided this. Some responses would have been improved by excluding narrative material or long introductions which 'set the scene'.

In **part (c)** the stronger responses were well organised, included detailed arguments on either side of the debate, and were evaluative, with conclusions managing to avoid summaries of the points presented earlier in the answer. Less successful responses were very descriptive and often included information that was not relevant to the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

This question was answered by many candidates.

- (a) Many candidates had a good knowledge of The Treaty of Sevres and most performed strongly. Others did not know the treaty or confused it with the Treaty of St Germain or the Treaty of Versailles. The strongest answers showed that the Treaty of Sevres was harsh, and that Smyrna was lost to Greece, leading to a nationalist uprising. Responses could have mentioned that the Turkish army was reduced to 55 000, that the uprising was led by Mustapha Kemel and that the Treaty was renegotiated. Answers which showed the involvement of Britain and France in Turkish financial and economic affairs and the ruling of mandated areas from the Turkish Empire also gained credit. Some responses were very long. They had gained maximum credit in the first four

lines but went on to write nearly a page. This appeared to take time away from **parts (b) and (c)**, which required explanation.

- (b)** The focus of this question was the attitudes of the German people towards the Treaty of Versailles. Less successful responses concentrated on the views of Clemenceau, the French or the views of historians. When explaining the reparation payments, the size of the German army or the war guilt clause, responses needed to show how German people considered these terms excessive, unfair or vindictive and, therefore, show that the terms were motivated by revenge. Some candidates explained the actions of Clemenceau without showing why Germans felt that the Treaty of Versailles was motivated by revenge.
- (c)** Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer explaining why Lloyd George and President Wilson were satisfied and dissatisfied with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Stronger responses explained that Lloyd George was satisfied that the Treaty was not too harsh so that the German economy would recover quickly and resume trading with Britain to the level it had been at pre-war. Responses also explained that Wilson was satisfied that his proposal in his Fourteen Points to set up an organisation to keep world peace had been accepted and would be called the League of Nations. Some less successful responses focused just on explaining Lloyd George's and Wilson's aims for the Treaty. Some focused on Clemenceau's reactions to the Treaty, which lacked relevance to the question.

Question 6

- (a)** There were many candidates who gained very high marks for this question by focusing on the events and role of the League of Nations in the Upper Silesia dispute of 1919–1921. Four brief statements such as 'it was between Germany and Poland', 'the League organised a plebiscite', 'the League decided that the territory should be shared' and 'the League safeguarded rail links between the two countries' were provided in the best responses. Less successful candidates were confused as to which countries were involved and a small number struggled to recall the role of the League in this dispute.
- (b)** Successful responses to this question identified which countries were absent from the League (usually USA, Russia or Germany), then took each country separately and went on to explain the impact of their absence on the workings of the League. For example, as a result of the USA not being in the League, imposing economic sanctions was ineffective, because the aggressor country could carry on trading with the USA. It is important that candidates read the question carefully, as a number of candidates spent time writing in detail about why America, Germany and Russia were not members of the League, which was not the focus of the question.
- (c)** There were some well-developed responses to this question, with candidates demonstrating a clear and detailed understanding of the humanitarian work of the League of Nations on one side of the argument, and then discussing the diplomatic and peace-keeping activities on the other side. Stronger responses demonstrated good contextual knowledge on both sides of the argument and were also able to demonstrate clearly the impact of their work. It was important to emphasise the impact of the League's work; weaker responses tended to be descriptive lists of humanitarian, peace-keeping and diplomatic activities, with little attempt to explain the impact. Some candidates missed the dates in the question and went on to include, often in depth, details of the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises, which lacked relevance to the question.

Question 7

- (a)** This question was well answered. Answers, such as 'What was to happen to Nazi war criminals?', 'Would Germany have to pay reparations?', 'How should Berlin be ruled?', 'Were there to be any boundary changes in the east of Germany?' were all acceptable.
- (b)** Answers to this question were variable in quality, with weaker responses limited to simple description of reasons as to why Poland was a cause of tension between the Great Powers in 1945. Such responses included statements such as 'It was in the Soviet sphere of influence' or 'There had been no free elections'. The stronger responses explained that at Yalta it had been agreed that a provisional government would be set up in Poland consisting of pro-Soviet Lublin Poles and exiled London Poles, and that there would be free elections, yet these hadn't happened. A small number misread the question and made the focus of their answer the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939.

- (c) Effective answers to this question explained how both the Soviet Union and the USA contributed to the start of the Cold War. Candidates explained how Stalin's failure to abide by the decisions made at Yalta and Potsdam, the forming of Cominform and Comecon and then the blockading of Berlin contributed to the start of the Cold War. Similarly, good responses explained how Truman's aggressive attitude towards Stalin, Truman's 'Truman Doctrine', Marshall Aid, the establishment of Bizonia and the setting up of NATO equally contributed to the start of the Cold War. Weaker answers often described these points in detail without explaining how they contributed to the start of the Cold War. Some candidates wrote about the Korean War, Cuban Crisis and the Vietnam War, which all occurred during the Cold War but were not the cause.

Question 8

A small number of candidates answered this question.

- (a) Most candidates performed very strongly on this question by outlining four benefits to the Iraqi people of Saddam Hussein's rule. These responses included electrification extended throughout the country, more employment available, a major campaign to end adult illiteracy and hospital treatment being free.
- (b) Candidates found it a challenge to explain two distinct reasons why Saddam Hussein introduced purges. Most identified reasons such as to remove potential rivals and to act as an example to anyone who thought of opposing him, but more detail needed to be included by some candidates to ensure a strong answer.
- (c) There were some good well-developed answers to this question, with candidates being able to deploy strong, relevant evidence to support the hypothesis that the influence of Khairallah Tulfah was the most important reason for Saddam Hussein being able to come to power in Iraq. Evidence included Khairallah's inspiration and insistence on a good education, in addition to instilling in Saddam an appreciation of Arab Nationalism and hatred of the monarchy that ruled Iraq. To balance this argument, strong responses developed other factors that contributed to Saddam coming to power, including his own ambitions, his role as Deputy Chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council and increasing his popularity through his spending on schools and hospitals.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Many candidates achieved very high marks with simple statements such as, Luxemburg led the Spartacists, she encouraged them to rebel against the Weimar Government, the revolt was halted by the Freikorps and she was put to death. Some candidates did not know who Rosa Luxemburg was.
- (b) There were many good responses to this question. Highly successful answers were restricted to 1923, as the question indicated. Two explained reasons were needed to show how the Weimar Republic was under threat. Most explained the invasion of the Ruhr by the French and Belgians and its impact on Germany. Candidates had the opportunity to explain why and how hyperinflation seriously affected the civilian population and therefore, the Republic. Most candidates explained a direct threat to the Republic, with the Munich Putsch.

- (c) Many candidates achieved strong responses by explaining the recovery of the Weimar Republic between 1924 and 1929 and by showing its problems. Both sides of the argument were required for better answers. Most were able to explain Stresemann's work to overcome hyperinflation and put the economy on a seemingly sound footing with a new currency and American loans. Cultural achievements and the progress made in foreign relations were well explained. Some candidates could have improved their answers by providing more than a list of actions by Stresemann and the government in the form of a narrative. It was important to explain how the actions created an impression of recovery. Less successful responses comprised one-sided answers which did not explain that many did not see the period as one of secure recovery. Candidates could have mentioned the poor unemployment record and the depressed agricultural sector throughout the period. Those that did explain the negative side concentrated on the recovery being an illusion, because the economic recovery depended on American loans and if the loans were called in, then Germany would be in serious economic trouble.

Question 12

- (a) The focus of this question was on the school curriculum and what was taught to reflect Nazi ideas. Candidates who realised this scored highly, concentrating on specific subjects such as History which was taught to impress on children that Germany had been 'stabbed in the back' by the Weimar politicians who had made peace in 1919. Another subject frequently mentioned was Biology, where students were taught that they were special by belonging to the Aryan Race. Other subjects used to reflect Nazi ideas included PE, Maths and Domestic Science. The responses of weaker candidates were more general and concentrated more on 'why' the curriculum changed rather than 'how'.
- (b) Candidates displayed sound knowledge of the activities of the Edelweiss Pirates and the 'Swing' movement but weaker answers tended to be purely descriptive of the activities of the two groups. Stronger responses identified why some young people did not join the Nazi youth groups, such as that they preferred 'to do their own thing, their own way' and then linked these reasons to the activities of the Edelweiss Pirates and the 'Swing' movement in order to explain their answers.
- (c) This question produced some unbalanced answers. Most candidates agreed with the hypothesis and were able to give detailed descriptions about the key role of women being to produce lots of children. Answers such as these included details about the falling birth rate and how important it was to increase the master race and provide more soldiers for future armies. Candidates were also well-versed on the various incentives given to women to encourage them to have more children. Weaker answers did not provide convincing arguments against the hypothesis, which could have included the Nazi regime U-turn because of the lead-up to the Second World War when there was a need for women to work, especially in factories producing armaments. As a result of this, the role of women changed, and they were persuaded back into work to support the war effort.

Question 13

- (a) Some candidates would have benefited from giving more attention to the words 'at the turn of the century' in the question; rather than just providing narrative on the 1905 Revolution and Bloody Sunday, they could have simply identified the serious problems that were facing the Tsar at this time. These included that the empire was huge, had twenty different nationalities, had regular famines and that living and working conditions were poor.
- (b) There were some very good responses to this question. The most well explained reason was that after the 1905 Revolution, Nicholas produced the October Manifesto which offered the people a Duma, the right to free speech and the right to form political parties, thus satisfying some of the discontented groups. The most successful responses went on to explain a second reason, which usually was the impact of Nicholas' troops returning from the Russo-Japanese War.
- (c) Answers to this question were variable, with most responses being one-sided, focusing on the Tsar's effective dealings with the difficulties of ruling Russia, usually the granting of a Duma in the October Manifesto. There was little acknowledgement of the Fundamental Laws. More candidates could have developed the work of Stolypin, which could have been used as an example on both sides of the argument: for example his 'carrot and stick' approach.

Question 14

- (a) Most of the small number of candidates who attempted this question performed well as they were aware of Stalin's views on Trotsky's idea of a 'permanent revolution'. A few candidates missed 'permanent revolution' and wrote generally as to why Stalin did not like Trotsky.
- (b) Successful responses to this question explained 'a cult of personality' and then linked it to why Stalin created such a cult. Many candidates developed the idea that Stalin wanted to be popular and worshipped as a great leader and hero of the Revolution and Second World War. This was an explained reason. The best responses went on to explain a second reason, usually developing the idea that the 'cult of personality' made it more difficult for the opposition to criticise Stalin's rule.
- (c) Some less successful candidates wrote a one-sided argument going against the hypothesis in the question. Most responses confined their response to details on the purges and the 'Great Terror'. There was little acknowledgement of the ways in which Stalin's dictatorship was not as total as it appeared. Answers would have been improved if they had included details on both sides of the argument.

Question 15

- (a) Good responses understood the Fordney-McCumber Tariff and the best ones often provided four simple statements such as: it was passed in 1922, it was passed by a Republican government, it raised tariffs on many imported goods and it was part of the policy called 'Protectionism'. A small number of candidates did not answer this part question at all.
- (b) A good number of successful responses were seen, including many which contained two explained reasons. Explained reasons included the impact of the competition from Canada and Argentina and the effect of US tariffs on imports. A small number of candidates shifted the focus of the question to what happened to the farmers as a result of finding it difficult to make a living in the 1920s, rather than addressing the issue of why they found it difficult.
- (c) There were some well-developed responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a clear and detailed understanding of the reasons for the boom in America in the 1920s. Effective responses to the question discussed the importance of electricity, usually through linking it to the increase in demand for electrical appliances such as fridges, washing machines and vacuum cleaners. Some stronger responses then went on to explain other factors which contributed to the boom, usually including Republican policies, advertising and mass production. The best responses assessed and evaluated whether electricity did create the boom or whether it was one of the other factors.

Question 16

- (a) Many candidates had a detailed knowledge of the Emergency Quota and the National Origins Acts. The significance of the 1920s in controlling immigration was understood by most candidates even when specific legislation was not recalled. These candidates would refer in general terms to legislation, perhaps mentioning the specific banning of Asian peoples. A few candidates misread the question and wrote about 'why' the government controlled immigration rather than 'how'.
- (b) The trial of Sacco and Vanzetti was generally well known, and candidates usually placed it in the context of the 'Red Scare' though not necessarily making a distinction between fears about Communism and the threat posed by Anarchism. When a candidate developed a good explanation, it was usually for linking the trial to the Red Scare. Some struggled to draft a second relevant explanation through reference to the political bias of the trial judge or the flimsiness of the evidence.

- (c) It was unusual to find a response that addressed both sides of the hypothesis. Candidates were more knowledgeable about the consequences for women of increasing employment opportunities than on the range and nature of employment available to them in the 1920s. They tended to know more about war work than peacetime opportunities. On the greater independence of some women, candidates wrote relevantly, amongst other things, about flappers, labour-saving devices and the increase in divorce. More candidates could have mentioned women getting the vote, though for those who did include it, this point was usually identified, rather than explained.

Questions 17 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.
- Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

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

General comments

Many candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the specific question set. **Parts (b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but needed to go on further and develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers, successful candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced responses. Candidates need to ensure that they use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make; some candidates set out a clear argument but were unable to support this argument with relevant factual knowledge. Successful responses focused carefully upon the specific question set; in other answers, candidates wrote in considerable depth about the topic given in the question, but without a clear focus on the actual question asked.

There were a small number of rubric errors; some candidates chose **parts (a), (b)** and **(c)** from different questions, some answered fewer than the required number of questions, and some answered three questions and then an extra **part (a)** or **part (b)** from another question. On the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively. A small number of candidates wrote over one side in response to a **part (a)** question; this should not be required, and it clearly reduced the time then available to answer the remaining questions on the paper.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

- (a) There were many effective answers to this question, with candidates giving four clear and focused details from the Fourteen Points. These usually focused upon the desire to uphold the principle of self-determination, the desire to build a more peaceful world, free access to the seas, free trade between countries, no secret treaties, disarmament and the formation of an international body, later known as the League of Nations. Some candidates wrote out the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, rather than focusing upon the Fourteen Points.
- (b) A number of candidates were able to explain clearly that Lloyd George was unhappy with the French demands because a harsh treaty could damage the German economy and ultimately damage the British economy. Further explanations focused upon a weak Germany being an inadequate barrier to Communism from the east, and Lloyd George's fears about possible French domination in Europe if Germany were left too weak. Some less successful candidates wrote long lists of the demands made by Clemenceau and the concerns of Lloyd George, without linking them together to give a clear and focused explanation.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained carefully that the reduction in military strength meant that Germany was vulnerable to attack, and also that Germany would be unable to cope effectively with large-scale uprisings with such a reduced military. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained that reparations linked with certain territorial losses were the main reason for Germany's bitterness, and that war guilt caused bitterness given the circumstances actually causing the war. A number of candidates demonstrated comprehensive knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and described them in substantial detail. This knowledge needed to be used to explain why these terms caused Germany's bitterness

Question 6

- (a) Many candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the work of the League of Nations in the 1920s in relation to health. Relevant points given included the setting up of research institutions in London, Copenhagen and Singapore, information and advice being given to countries who were not members of the League at the time, such as the USSR, the campaign to exterminate mosquitoes and thus reduce the incidence of diseases such as malaria, the organisation of an education campaign on sanitation and the development of vaccines for fighting diphtheria, tetanus and tuberculosis. Some less successful responses wrote about health matters generally, without focus on the particular role of the League in the 1920s. Some candidates exaggerated the role of the League, erroneously crediting the League with eradicating a number of diseases which are still prevalent today.
- (b) A small number of candidates wrote detailed and carefully structured explanations in response to this question. They explained that the concerns of Britain and France about upsetting Italy prevented effective action being taken, and also that Italy undermined the League by taking matters to the Conference of Ambassadors. Some candidates identified weaknesses of the League such as the lack of a standing army and the absence of the USA; these points needed to be developed into explanations specific to the Corfu Crisis. Some less successful answers wrote at some length about events in Abyssinia, rather than events in the Corfu Crisis; candidates needed to be able to distinguish between the two.
- (c) Effective responses to this question gave clearly constructed explanations on both sides of the argument. Agreement with the statement in the question focused primarily upon the absence of the USA, and this making League trade sanctions ineffective, as nations could still trade with the USA. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained the effect of Britain and France acting in their own self-interest, the lack of a standing army, the League being very slow to act and the effects of the Depression in bringing extreme political parties to power. Less successful responses identified numerous reasons why the League failed to preserve world peace, but these

identifications were not developed into explanations. A small number of candidates wrote about the work of the League with health matters and working conditions, which lacked relevance to the question.

Question 7

- (a) A number of candidates gave clearly focused responses to this question, detailing relevant points such as the USSR gaining a 'sphere of influence', a buffer against attack from the west, a market for Soviet goods and a supply of cheap raw materials. Some candidates wrote only about what the USSR provided for Communist Eastern Europe; this was not the focus required in the question, which asked what a strong Communist Eastern Europe provided for the USSR.
- (b) Effective answers to this question constructed clear explanations focused upon the USA failing to tell the USSR about the USA's atomic weapon until the eve of Potsdam, the fear of an atomic war and the race to develop more powerful atomic weapons. Some less successful answers wrote about multiple reasons why there was tension between East and West, rather than focusing upon the tension engendered by the development of the atomic bomb, as required by the question. Some candidates described the effects of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, without linking this to the focus of the question.
- (c) There were some clearly argued and clearly structured responses to this question. Explanations focused on Stalin's decision being surprising due to the inherent risk of causing a war, and, on the other side of the argument, his decision being unsurprising as Stalin hoped to force the Western Allies out of Berlin, and his belief that the actions of the West, such as the creation of Bizonia and Trizonia, were clear threats to his regime. Some less successful answers comprised lengthy descriptions of the events of the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Airlift, lacking explanation of whether Stalin's decision to impose the blockade was surprising or not. A number of candidates wrote answers focused upon the Berlin Wall and why it was built, which was not relevant.

Question 8

- (a) There were a number of concise and focused responses to this question, with candidates detailing the division of Vietnam into north and south, the respective leaders and ideologies of both parts of Vietnam and the actions of the Vietcong immediately after the Peace Accords. Other answers focused on events in the 1960s in Vietnam, whereas the question asked what happened immediately following the Geneva Peace Accords of 1954.
- (b) Most candidates answering this question were able to identify at least one reason why Khrushchev placed nuclear weapons in Cuba. Identifications usually focused upon Khrushchev wanting to test Kennedy, Khrushchev wanting to defend Cuba against threats from the USA, the increased bargaining-power gained and the location of the missiles meaning the USSR would be able to attack many of the USA's major cities. Many candidates then developed at least one of these points into an explanation. A small number of candidates described at length the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis, rather than answering the specific question set.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained that America failed to contain communism in North Vietnam as it rapidly spread to South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Answers also explained that Cuba remained a Communist country after the Missile Crisis, and pointed to the situation in Eastern Europe, with so many countries being under Communist control. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained that the USA prevented the spread of communism into South Korea and Greece. A number of candidates wrote in great depth about the events of war in Korea and in Vietnam, and would have improved their responses by explaining the outcomes in terms of the USA's failure or success in containing Communism.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Candidates were able to identify that rationing was introduced, that posters encouraged people not to waste food, that women were encouraged to join the Land Army and that public parks were ploughed up and used to grow food. A number of candidates focused their answers on the situation in other countries, which lacked relevance to a question asking about the methods used in Britain to deal with food shortages.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify that the Defence of the Realm Act brought in censorship of the press, and developed this point into an explanation focused upon this helping the government to ensure good news was published to keep up civilian morale. Less successful responses were only able to identify a general point such as that the Act gave the government certain powers.
- (c) Candidates were able to identify that censorship ensured public morale remained high, and that it ensured military secrets remained secret and were not leaked. They also identified that propaganda focused on the portrayal of the enemy as evil, and the glorification of the bravery of British troops. The best answers developed these points into explanations, giving specific contextual support relevant to the war effort on the home front in Britain.

Question 10

- (a) A number of candidates were able to identify four relevant details in response to this question. These usually focused upon the use of 'storm-troopers' acting in small groups and at speed, the tactics being to attack along the whole front line, to try to win the war before the Americans arrived, and Ludendorff hoping to seize Paris. Many candidates wrote answers based on tactics used generally on the Western Front, and thus gave no specific focus to the tactics used by Ludendorff between March and May 1918.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify that Ludendorff's Offensive of 1918 was a gamble because it would mean leaving the safety of the Hindenburg Line and because the Germans did not have the reserves to cope if the gamble failed. A small number of candidates also identified that the Offensive changed the nature of the war into a war of movement, with its inherent unpredictability. Answers could have been improved by developing these identifications into explanations.
- (c) The role of America in ending the First World War was clearly explained by some candidates, with explanation focused on the numbers of US troops, the weapons they had, and the food supplies they brought, together with the huge morale boost this gave to Allied troops and the ways in which this hastened the ending of the war. Explanation of the contribution of the Kiel Mutiny to the ending of the war was less effective. Candidates gave descriptions of the events of the Kiel Mutiny, but only rarely was this linked explicitly to the ending of the war.

Question 11

- (a) A number of candidates were able to give several relevant points in response to this question. These points included that the SA were known as Brown-Shirts, that their leader was Ernst Röhm, that they were often ex-soldiers, that they provided protection at Nazi rallies and meetings, and that they disrupted the meetings of parties other than the Nazis. Some candidates wrote about the SS, rather than the SA.
- (b) Some candidates were able to give one clear explanation, focusing upon Hitler's speaking ability and how this attracted people, as Hitler gave them scapegoats to blame for Germany's problems. Responses also showed an awareness that Germans were attracted to the Nazis, due to their 25-Point programme and due to the propaganda methods used by Goebbels. A number of responses focused solely upon why Germans were attracted to the Nazis in the 1930s, whereas the question asked, 'by the end of the 1920s'.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained that the Munich Putsch was crushed too easily by the police and the army for it to be any real threat to the Weimar Republic. Further explanation focused upon Hitler's misjudgement of the mood of the German people, who did not actually support him. On the other side of the argument, explanation was given of Hitler gaining publicity from the Putsch at his trial, and of his realisation that he could not achieve power through violence and would need

to gain power through legal means. Some less successful responses described the events of the Munich Putsch in detail, without explaining whether or not it was a threat to the Weimar Republic. A few candidates wrote at considerable length about the Great Depression of the 1930s; this was not relevant to this question.

Question 12

- (a) Relevant points given in response to this question included the signing of a Concordat between the Catholic Church and the Nazis, with the Church agreeing to make no comments on political matters if the Nazis did not interfere in religion, the denouncement of Nazism as anti-Christian by Pope Pius XI, Niemöller's setting up of a Protestant Church to rival the Reich Church, and Bishop Galen's criticisms of euthanasia, forced sterilisation and concentration camps. Some responses focused on the actions of the Nazis, rather than the response of the churches to Nazi rule.
- (b) There were a number of highly effective responses to this question. Candidates clearly explained the importance of the Night of the Long Knives for Hitler in eliminating the threat posed by Röhm and its importance in ensuring the loyalty of the army. Some candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the events of the Night of the Long Knives, describing events in depth; this knowledge needed to be used to frame explanations of why the Night of the Long Knives was important for Hitler. A small number of candidates wrote about the events of Kristallnacht, rather than the Night of the Long Knives.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained clearly the importance of the Gestapo to the Nazis in dealing with opposition and with engendering fear in ordinary Germans so that they were too frightened to oppose the regime. On the other side of the argument, clear explanations were focused on the control of education being important as it engendered loyalty to Hitler and also ensured the future of the Nazi Party was assured. A number of responses described the actions of the Gestapo and/or the changes in education without addressing the importance of the Gestapo and the control of education to the Nazis.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the ways in which Stolypin helped the Tsar. Relevant points given included the use of a 'carrot and stick' approach, the exiling of opponents and the hanging of over 1000 opponents, specific reference to Stolypin's 'necktie', the encouragement given to the kulaks to buy more land and improvements to elementary education. Some candidates were only able to give one relevant point, usually referring to the 'carrot and stick'.
- (b) Many candidates were able to give at least one clear explanation of why the events of Bloody Sunday were a threat to the Tsarist regime, with most focusing on people losing confidence in the Tsar as their 'Little Father'. Some responses also explained how the events of Bloody Sunday led to strikes and to attacks on the houses of nobles, thus endangering the very fabric of the Tsarist regime. Some less successful responses described the events of Bloody Sunday, rather than explaining why these events were a threat to the Tsarist regime.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained that food shortages led to strikes, looting and violent protests, which undermined the position of the Tsar, with his failure to address the situation leading to a loss of support. On the whole, agreement with the statement in the question was less effectively explained than disagreement; many candidates wrote in general terms about food shortages. Disagreement with the statement focused clearly on the Tsar's failure as commander-in-chief of the armed forces, mutiny within the armed forces, the ineptitude of the Tsarina in controlling domestic affairs while the Tsar was away at the front, and the role of Rasputin. Some responses described events, rather than explaining how they contributed to the downfall of the Tsar.

Question 14

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

Question 15

- (a) Most candidates answering this question were able to give at least two valid points. Relevant points made included details about the number of licensed radio stations, the content of broadcasts such as news and light musical entertainment, developments in cinema including the introduction of 'talkies', and the way in which mass media were increasingly used as a tool for advertising. A small number of candidates seemed to be unaware of the meaning of the term 'mass media', and wrote about developments in the car industry, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) There were some effective answers to this question, with explanations clearly focused on the film 'The Birth of a Nation' being instrumental in the revival of support for the Ku Klux Klan, together with concerns about increased immigration into the USA and the fear of a communist revolution. Some candidates identified a number of relevant reasons why there was a revival of support for the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations. A small number of candidates described the activities of the Ku Klux Klan and/or the structure of the Ku Klux Klan, without explaining why there was a revival of support for them in the 1920s.
- (c) Candidates demonstrated a clear and detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the failure of prohibition. Clear explanations were given, showing that those who were meant to enforce prohibition did not do so for a variety of reasons – insufficient enforcement agents to deal with such a large area, the poor pay of enforcement agents meaning they were open to bribery, and the number of judges, jury members and police officers who were open to bribery. On the other side of the argument, clear explanations were given relating to those who undermined prohibition through the opening of speakeasies, smuggling and the increasing control exercised by criminal gangs and individuals such as Al Capone. This side of the argument was also explained with reference to the reluctance of so many Americans to obey the prohibition law. A few candidates described events such as the St. Valentine's Day Massacre, and made no explicit explanation of why prohibition failed.

Question 16

- (a) Relevant points made in response to this question included Hoover's refusal to meet the Bonus Marchers, his belief that the Marchers were a revolutionary threat, his orders to the police to remove the Bonus Marchers from their camp and his refusal to give the Marchers their war pensions early. Less successful responses wrote generally about the Bonus Marchers, rather than focusing upon Hoover's reaction to them. Some candidates were not aware of the details relating to Hoover's reaction to the Bonus Marchers.
- (b) Many candidates were able to give at least one clear explanation, usually focused upon the Wall Street Crash harming the American economy, as businesses collapsed, and people lost their jobs. Some explanations also focused on the large number of banks who ceased trading and the way in which the Wall Street Crash caused a loss of confidence. There candidates who simply described the events of the Wall Street Crash; their responses would have benefited from the inclusion of clear explanations.
- (c) Effective answers to this question gave clear explanations focused upon Hoover's idea of rugged individualism being interpreted by people as showing that he did not care about their suffering during the very difficult times of the Depression, and that his idea of staying out of business matters at this time was totally inappropriate for the circumstances. On the other side of the argument, explanations focused upon the appeal of Roosevelt, and how he presented himself as a person who empathised with the American people and promised government intervention to address the serious issues of the time. Some candidates also emphasised that Hoover's reaction to the Bonus Marchers further reinforced the impression of his uncaring nature. A few candidates wrote at some length about Roosevelt's actual New Deal that was enacted once he became president; this was not relevant to a question asking why Hoover lost the 1932 election.

Questions 17 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Paper 13

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.
- Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

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

General comments

Generally, answers reflected sound understanding and good knowledge. Candidates expressed themselves clearly, provided a great deal of information and were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions which require straightforward recall and description. Most candidates answered these questions in the appropriate form of a short paragraph and realised that explanation is not required here.

The best answers to **part (b)** and **(c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the questions were asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information which was lacking relevance. Candidates receive credit for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but the best responses go further and develop each factor fully. In other responses, candidates clearly possessed accurate knowledge but struggled to use it to answer the question set.

A significant number of responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue on both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given hypothesis), but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Candidates should avoid repeating points already made in the answer but, instead, should explain and analyse *how far* the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions were limited to just asserting 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument is stronger than the other.

Comments on specific questions.

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

This was a widely-answered question, although some struggled with **part (a)**, which was about the Vilna crisis of 1920. However, many candidates were able to provide four pieces of information or two developed points. Answers included, 'Polish troops seized Vilna', 'Lithuania appealed to the League of Nations over Vilna', 'The League of Nations told the Polish troops to leave Vilna' and 'Poland ignored the League's request'. In **part (b)**, the reasons why the League failed to impose sanctions following the Japanese invasion

of Manchuria were well known. Better answers focussed on the Eurocentric focus of the League's main members and the potentially damaging effect of trying to impose sanctions in the wake of the Great Depression. In **part (c)** some candidates appeared to answer the question 'Why did the League fail to deal with the Abyssinian crisis?' However, the focus of the question set was about whether or not the League did all it could to deal with the crisis. Better responses included actions the League did take and why it did as much as was possible, given the circumstances, on the one hand, and why the League's sanctions did not go far enough, on the other. Candidates were also able to use their knowledge of the Hoare-Laval pact to reflect on the inadequacy of the League's response to the crisis.

Question 6

In **part (a)** there were some excellent answers reflecting detailed knowledge of Hitler's foreign policy aims. However, it was not unusual for responses to stray beyond foreign policy (for example, into economics). In **part (b)** candidates were able to show why Britain failed to act when Hitler broke the Treaty of Versailles. The best answers included two developed explanations which centred on justifications for appeasement. In **part (c)** there was evidence that students were striving hard to create arguments about whether or not the Munich crisis was a turning point in Hitler's foreign policy. An effective approach offered a debate which balanced the view that Munich changed Hitler, making him more confident and aggressive, with the concept of continuity, i.e. little had happened to change the basic aims of his foreign policy. When both sides of the argument were supported and explained, candidates provided strong responses.

Question 7

Candidates wrote about the more well-known aspects of the terms of Yalta and Potsdam relating to reparations and Japan in **part (a)**. Some answers went beyond the demands of the question including, for example, issues about Poland and the division of Germany. Responses to **part (b)** attracted some general information about Soviet expansion into Europe in 1945, ideological differences between the USA and the USSR and the fact that the USA possessed atomic weapons. Two or three developed explanations (rather than descriptions) of these would have led to very strong answers. It is important to look at dates in questions carefully, as the end date here was 1945. Similarly, **part (c)** answers should have focused on the reasons for the Cold War but sometimes strayed too far into the 1960s and 1970s. More successful responses were able to balance the importance of the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the Berlin Airlift, with the impact of the USA's possession of the atom bomb.

Question 8

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

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Part (a) posed few problems and there was good knowledge of the intentions behind the Schlieffen Plan. Focusing on 'importance' was a helpful approach which drew candidates away from narrative and towards explanation in **part (b)**, which offered opportunities to explain the importance of the Battle of Ypres. Many were able to construct good responses which focussed on the 'race to the sea' and the development of trench defences to defend the salient. Some less successful answers confused Ypres with the Marne and the end of the Schlieffen Plan. It was rare to see weak answers to **part (c)** as there was good understanding of the impact of Russia's rapid mobilisation, balanced by explanations of the impact of the BEF, and Belgian and French actions which weakened the German armies attempting to encircle Paris. Candidates were able to use knowledge to support their arguments and explain why events led to military stalemate.

Question 10

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

Question 11

Candidates knew a great deal about the impact of hyper-inflation in **part (a)**, and answers to **part (b)** similarly attracted detailed knowledge which was applied effectively to the question. The question was looking for a precise explanation of the anger caused by the French occupation of the Ruhr. Better answers explained German resentment as the French seized industrial wealth, the treatment of German protestors and the way the Germans suffered as the economy was plunged into the chaos of inflation. **Part (c)** responses tended to be unbalanced; there was secure understanding of the benefits of the Dawes Plan on the German economy but candidates found it more difficult to sustain counter arguments to achieve higher marks, such as explaining the role of the individual (Stresemann) in bringing recovery. Some credit was gained for discussing what 'recovery' might have meant, as this drew students into explanations of cultural and foreign policy factors which brought benefits to Weimar Germany.

Question 12

Part (a) revealed a lack of knowledge from some candidates about who supported the Nazis in the 1920s; references to peasant farmers, middle class shopkeepers, nationalists and ex-soldiers featured in better responses. It was rare to see weak answers to **part (b)** – the reasons why Nazi aims, policies and methods seemed irrelevant and inappropriate to the majority of Germans in the 1920s, were well known. **Part (c)** answers could have been more effectively argued on the whole, as they dealt with Hitler's racial views in a general way, instead of focussing on their appeal during the period 1929–32, as specified in the question. Good answers, for example, focussed on the way Hitler exploited the Jews as a scapegoat for the problems faced by Germans during the Depression. Counter arguments drew upon the way Nazi propaganda offered hope to the unemployed, thereby increasing electoral support, especially during 1932.

Question 13

Part (a) was generally well answered as many candidates correctly identified several ways in which the July days damaged the Bolsheviks, although a number confused the July Days with the Kornilov affair. Responses to **part (b)** focused on explanations of how the Kornilov affair played into the hands of the Bolsheviks who then gained credit for saving Petrograd. For **part (c)** candidates were able to offer arguments on both sides of the question, dealing with reasons why the Whites were the architects of their own defeat on the one hand, and explanations of the Communists' significant advantages on the other. Less successful responses sometimes did not separate these factors out clearly.

Question 14

Part (a) was generally very well answered, with details of the leading old Bolsheviks who confessed to crimes, the manner in which the show trials aimed to expose spies and conspirators, plus specific references, for example, to the 1936 show trial which accused Zinoviev and Kamenev of planning to assassinate Stalin. **Part (b)** tended to attract general comments about NKVD activities, rather than explanations of why they created such a climate of fear. Answers to **part (c)** were well argued; candidates attempted to develop valid arguments which dealt precisely with the 'surprise' element of the question. Good answers contrasted Trotsky's charisma with Stalin's use of his position as General Secretary to put his supporters into important posts.

Question 15

Most candidates were able to recall four points which described assembly line production in **part (a)**. **Part (b)** tended to produce generalised, identified factors; a number of responses would have been improved by providing two identified and explained points – the impact of new machines, changing European markets and competition from Canada and US tariffs could have been cited by more candidates. Unbalanced answers characterised **part (c)** because of a tendency to write much more about a wide range of other reasons for the American 'boom' of the 1920s, rather than fully addressing the main factor stated in the question. Better response tended to deal with 'hire purchase' first by fully explaining why it was able to stimulate the US economy at that time.

Question 16

It was rare to see weak answers to **part (a)** and **part (b)**. The benefits of the TVA were well known, and there were some detailed explanations of Republican and Constitutional objections to New Deal measures. **Part (c)** required an explanation of the extent of New Deal success, measured against its aims. One approach was to argue that it did a great deal to provide relief for those in desperate need. On the other hand, the limitations of New Deal measures to effectively reduce unemployment provided a counter argument. Strong responses featured two explained factors on both sides of the debate. Other answers would have been improved by a less descriptive approach and by fully assessing the 'impact' of the New Deal.

Questions 17 to 20

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

Question 21

The benefits for Israel of the Six-Day War of 1967 produced some strong responses in **part (a)**. Similarly, candidates were able to explain in detail why the War of Yom Kippur occurred in 1973 (**part (b)**). Better answers analysed the impact of Egyptian and Syrian disagreements with Israel, as well as the opportunity of a surprise attack. In **part (c)** candidates were asked to consider how far problems between Jews and Arabs had been solved by the 1990s. They applied their knowledge of the impact of key peace agreements on the one hand, and explained continuing problems between Israel and Palestinians on the other, to produce strong responses.

Question 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

Answering these questions well requires candidates to make good use of three elements: their knowledge, the sources and the information provided about the provenance of the sources. These elements need to be used together. Candidates need to be able to use their knowledge and understanding of the period they have studied to interpret the sources. This, with good use of the provenance of the sources, should then be used to directly address the question.

Knowledge is not rewarded for its own sake. It only has value in these answers when it is used by candidates to say something better about the sources. Candidates should also avoid using the provenance of the sources by itself, for example, 'This source is not reliable because it was not written at the time.' The provenance of sources is used best when knowledge and the content of the sources are also used.

When required to compare sources, candidates should avoid summarising each source in turn and then asserting that they agree or disagree. Comparisons need to be made point by point. Some preparation is needed to answer these questions well. It is a good idea to go through both sources marking the key points. A comparison can then be made using these key points – are the sources saying the same things about them? Candidates should also be aware that comparisons need to be about the same point. The best responses in comparison questions are comparisons of overall points of view.

It is important that candidates try to work out the overall sense ('the big message') of both written and pictorial sources. Most candidates understand parts of sources based on their details. Generally, fewer understand the overall point of view of the author or artist. When asked to compare sources, the best responses tend to compare this overall point of view. Candidates should try and be as explicit as possible about the point of view. Rather than simply stating that, for example, Source D is showing Khrushchev using unpleasant force, it is necessary to go beyond this and explicitly state that the cartoonist is being critical of Khrushchev.

Question 6, like all the other questions, is about the sources in the paper and candidates need to go through the sources carefully and systematically, explaining whether each one supports the hypothesis given in the question. Some candidates could have improved their answers by giving more attention to individual sources. Some missed the sources completely and wrote essays about how far the Soviets were using force in Hungary. Other candidates grouped the sources into those that support the hypothesis and those that do not. They then made rather general comments about each group which lacked specific references and often did not apply to every source in the group. These answers could have been improved by writing about each source in turn. Some candidates when writing about the sources did not deal directly with the exact hypothesis but wrote about something fairly similar. It is crucial that candidates read the hypothesis carefully and write about it, and nothing else. Some candidates did not grasp exactly how the sources agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis. Explanations would have been improved by more precision. Many candidates performed strongly on this question by going through each source in turn and carefully and briefly explaining how each supported or disagreed with the statement.

General comments

The twentieth century option was more widely answered than the nineteenth century one but a good number of candidates answered questions on the latter. There was much evidence that candidates were able to cope with the demands of this component and there were many good answers for both options, with candidates demonstrating the ability to use their contextual knowledge and understanding to interpret and evaluate historical sources. Very few candidates struggled to understand the language of written sources and most coped with the cartoons well.

Comments on specific questions

19th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify some agreements or disagreements of detail, for example both sources agree that Germany violated Belgium. A small number of candidates compared the overall points of view of the sources in terms of who was to blame for the First World War – Germany in A, Britain or France and Russia or Austria in B. Some candidates tried to explain that points that are made by one source were absent in the other. This is not a comparison. A small number of candidates simply summarised each source and were unable to make any valid comparisons either point by point or of the overall points of view.

Question 2

A number of candidates struggled with this question and wrote generally about the sources and then ended with assertions about them. The first step in answering this question is to work out whether they are saying the same thing, for example in Source C Britain is trying to find a solution, while in D it wants war, or it could be argued that they both suggest that Britain was playing other countries off against each other. The most common answer was to use a disagreement to argue that C does make D surprising because they disagree. However, this misses the authors of the sources. The best answers used their contextual understanding of the time to consider the possible motive, purpose or view of Grey and the Kaiser. For example, the Kaiser's views are well known and they suggest that even if Sources C and D disagree about Britain, what the Kaiser says about Britain in D is not surprising.

Question 3

Source E proved less straightforward to candidates than Source F. The latter clearly suggests that Britain had Germany under control, or had the upper hand. Most candidates understood this and explained the cartoon well. However, some candidates thought that Source E showed Britain. This is most unlikely, given the way that the figure is portrayed and the area of his interest – the Balkans. This meant that a number of candidates provided just a valid interpretation of one source. A good number of candidates did compare valid sub-messages, for example they both suggest Germany was a problem, and stronger responses gave comparisons of the big messages – Britain has Germany under control in F but not in E. A small number of candidates went on to compare the points of view of the artists by explaining that they are both anti-German.

Question 4

A reasonable number of candidates understood that this cartoon tells us that the Germans were 'brutes'. However, some missed the suggestion of hypocrisy. The German gentleman/soldier is claiming God is on his side, while using women and children as a shield. The 'gentleman' is actually the very opposite – uncivilised. The question asks why the source was published in September 1914 and many candidates were more confident in explaining a valid purpose, for example to stir up hatred against the Germans at the beginning of the war. The cartoon actually refers to claims of German mistreatment of Belgian civilians and better answers realised this.

Question 5

There was some undeveloped use of provenance to claim, for example, that Prince Lichnowsky is German and therefore cannot be trusted. However, the most common way to answer this question was by using cross reference to knowledge, or to other sources, to check the claims made by the Prince. For candidates that made it clear what was being checked, these answers worked well. The provenance for this source provided candidates with a lot of detail and some responses would have benefited from using it more relevantly. For example, we are told that Lichnowsky circulated this pamphlet in Germany during the war and that he was expelled from the Prussian House of Lords. This was used by a small number of candidates to explain sensible reasons why they did, or did not, trust him.

Question 6

Although some made very little or any reference to the sources, the majority of candidates did use them and were able to explain which ones supported the hypothesis and which disagreed with it. Some candidates did group the sources and their answers would have been improved by a source by source approach. It is vital

that candidates understand this question is about the sources and that answers must be based on an analysis of them. Some candidates attempted this but would have improved their responses with more careful explanations. For example, 'Source E supports the hypothesis because it shows Germany had ambitions to expand in the Balkans.' is a much better explanation than 'Source E supports the hypothesis because it shows Germany was to blame.'

20th century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered very well. Most candidates were able to make a valid inference about the uprising from the photograph and support it with relevant details. Many went beyond this and also made valid inferences about what the photograph tells us about the relationship between the Hungarians and the Soviets, for example hatred of Soviet rule as indicated by the toppling of Stalin's head. A few candidates wrote answers that suggested that Stalin was still alive. Only a small number of candidates made the mistake of writing about the uprising without reference to the source, although a number did do this at some length before moving to the source.

Question 2

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Most candidates were able to find agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources, for example they both worry about the danger of counter-revolution, B apologises for the use of violence, while C thinks it is justified, and many focused on the crucial disagreement about whether the Soviet army should be withdrawn. These agreements and/or disagreements were used to argue that Source B did, or did not, make Source C surprising. Better answers used their knowledge and understanding of the context to develop their answers. For example, it can be argued that the fact that the differences between B and C make C surprising is confirmed by the fact that in C Khrushchev appears to be going back on the spirit of his 1956 secret speech, or that although there are disagreements between the two sources, these do not make C surprising because the fears it expresses about the West are repeated in Sources E and G. Some candidates bypassed Source B and explained good contextual reasons for being surprised/not surprised by Khrushchev. These answers were reasonable but to achieve a higher level response it was necessary to compare Sources B and C first and then evaluate at least one of them to reach a conclusion about surprise. Weaker answers tended to simply base their answers on the provenance of the sources, for example surprised because they both come from the Soviet side and yet they disagree (without explaining what the disagreement is). Other candidates struggled to make comparisons. They summarised one source, then the other, and wrote that the fact they agree or disagree made them surprised (leaving it unclear as to what the agreement or disagreement was). There were some answers that demonstrated the ability to compare the sources, and even evaluate them well, but these answers did not state whether any of this analysis led them to being surprised or not. The question asks candidates if they think Source B makes Source C surprising and, somewhere in their answer, candidates need to reveal this. This is best done in the opening sentence, with the rest of the answer being used to justify this initial claim.

Question 3

Some candidates explained the context in 1956 as a reason for why this cartoon was published at that time. While these answers make sense, they would have been improved by some attempt at interpreting the cartoon. Many candidates were able to explain something valid about individual countries, for example that Hungary and Poland were beginning to rebel against Soviet control, but more could have looked at the cartoon as a whole for its big message – that the Soviet Union tried to control Eastern Europe in an unpleasant way, but was failing. It is important that candidates try and look at cartoons as a whole for the overall big message, rather than focusing on a detail. In this cartoon the individual countries are being used to say something more broadly about Eastern Europe and Soviet control. The best answers went beyond explaining the big message to make the point that the cartoon was published to criticise how the Soviet Union was behaving in Eastern Europe. These answers were explicit about the criticism. Better responses understood that cartoons represent or symbolise historical events. Others wrote in terms of, for example, Yugoslavia trying to get through the bars, rather than being unhappy with Soviet control and influence. Answers need to go beyond what cartoons show

Question 4

The first step in answering this question well was to compare what Zhukov and Tito are saying. Zhukov claims the Soviets went into Hungary to fight fascism and did so at the request of the Government and people of Hungary. Tito, on the other hand, claims that the Hungarian people were opposed to the Government which called in Soviet troops. Some candidates used these disagreements as proof that Zhukov was lying. These answers could have been improved by evaluating either E or F. For example, a good number of candidates were aware of Tito's opposition to Soviet control, while Zhukov's motives in E can be worked out from his position as the Soviet Minister of Defence. The best answers realised that it is not sufficient to identify these points about Zhukov and Tito, and explained why they made sense of what they said and what their purpose was in context.

Question 5

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Most candidates were able to suggest a valid sub-message but some fell just short of the big message. The Soviets were often seen by candidates as trying to hide what was going on in Hungary. This is valid but needs to go further. The cartoonist is criticising the Soviets for their brutal behaviour in Hungary and for their hypocrisy in stopping the international community from intervening while they had intervened in a foreign country. Some strong responses explained all of this and were explicit on the point about criticism. Others understood part of the big message but could not quite put it all together. Some candidates were side-tracked by details and worried about who individual members of the crowd were or why the cartoon came from Holland. They would have improved their responses by looking at the cartoon as a whole for the big point was making.

Question 6

Many candidates reached wrote reasonable replies but some answers would have been improved by focusing on the sources more, and by careful explanation. Other answers would have been improved by giving more time to what individual sources say. Some grouped the sources correctly, for example stating that A, B, E and F support the hypothesis, but then made a general assertion about the group such as 'These sources show that the Soviets were influenced only by factors within Hungary.' Better responses stated, for example, that 'Source F supports the statement because Tito makes clear the Soviets acted because it was the Hungarian people that were opposing the Government and it was Gero who asked for help from the Soviet Union.' There are marks for evaluating the sources but this evaluation must be of appropriate quality; it needs to be properly developed evaluation. Candidates that focused on the purpose of the author of the source were more likely to achieve this.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

This paper, which tests the interpretation and evaluation of sources, requires candidates to address in a valid way the particular skill or concept demanded by each question. Thus, if a question asks why a source was published at a certain time, discussing whether or not it is reliable is not a valid approach. Recognising what a question requires, and responding relevantly, is therefore essential. An equally important aspect is in understanding exactly what a source says or shows. Time spent on carefully studying the sources before answering is essential, enabling candidates to assess the precise nature of the claims made by the authors, and to appreciate potential links between different sources.

General comments

On both the nineteenth and twentieth century options, the sources appeared to pose few comprehension problems. Almost all candidates produced complete scripts, with positive answers to all the questions on their option. The level of contextual knowledge was good, though some responses would have benefited from remembering that contextual knowledge is never tested in isolation this paper – it has to be used to help answer the questions, all of which are about the sources. Overall, scripts displayed improved confidence in questions requiring evaluation of the sources. However, in **Question 6**, a number of answers did not use the sources to test the given hypothesis, writing instead about just the hypothesis itself.

Comments on specific questions

19th century topic

Question 1

Candidates were generally able to spot at least one agreement or disagreement between the sources. Many answers took the approach of summarising each source in turn before making direct comparisons but this was not needed as only the direct comparisons were required. Agreements, such as the idea that both sources saw the Ottoman Empire as ailing, were more common than disagreements. Better answers were able to give examples of both. More candidates could have focused on the main issue of who was being blamed for war.

Question 2

Both sources dealt with the issue of whether the plot to assassinate Franz Ferdinand could be traced back to Belgrade. Source C, an Austrian source, claimed that it could, whilst Source D said that the Austrians claimed that it could, but that an enquiry had given no support to this claim. Some candidates missed the essential difference, and simply claimed that the sources agreed the plot was hatched in Belgrade. This produced the erroneous conclusion that Source D did not prove Source C wrong because they agreed.

Question 3

Candidates detected two possible routes to answering this question. The most common was to spot the obvious contradiction between Tsar Nicholas in Source E appealing for Wilhelm's help in preserving peace, whilst in Source F he is mobilising his troops for war. On the face of it, this was surprising. The other approach was to use the relationship between the two men as the basis for surprise, for example by asking why they would be going to war when they were obviously friends. Many answers would have been improved by a stronger grasp of what was actually going on during the last days of July 1914.

Question 4

As the question asked why the postcard was published, giving reasons for publication was essential. Some answers missed this, and instead gave an interpretation of what the card showed. Most answers mentioned the context as a reason, and most also mentioned the message that ‘Serbia must die’. However, the real message was that Serbia must die because of its responsibility for the assassination, and more candidates could have put these two elements together as a reason for publication. Ultimately, though, the best reasons also had to show awareness of a potential audience, and the impact the message was intended to have on this audience – for example, to raise support in Austria for an aggressive policy towards Serbia.

Question 5

The cartoon was generally well understood, though there was a little confusion over the identity of the bear, with some candidates taking it as Austria. Plenty of valid sub-messages were identified, such as Serbia being prepared to stand up to Austria, with perhaps a majority of answers being able to explain the cartoon’s big message of Serbia’s willingness to confront Austria due to the support it was getting from Russia.

Question 6

This paper always concludes with a question asking candidates to test a hypothesis against the evidence offered in the sources. The most effective way of answering the question is to go through the sources, one at a time, indicating how the source content either does or does not support the hypothesis. The question is about the sources and the evidence they offer in relation to the hypothesis, and is not asking about the validity of the hypothesis. Most candidates understood this, and were able to find evidence in the sources both for and against the hypothesis, but some did not. Among these were answers which did not use the sources in an appropriate manner, if at all in some cases.

20th century topic

Question 1

By asking for impressions that could be gained from the source, the question was inviting candidates to make inferences, and many responses demonstrated this approach; less successful ones simply described the picture. Some answers were lengthy narratives of what happened during the Hungarian uprising, making only passing reference to the picture. Some answers assumed the picture showed Nagy, rather than simply an idealised ‘freedom fighter’. Despite this, most answers included valid inferences – for example, that the uprising was violent, that it was supported by a wide cross-section of Hungarian society, that it had international support – and also used details from the picture to show how these inferences had been made. The most important inference – that the uprising was a good thing – was seen in the best responses.

Question 2

For some candidates there was a misconception about the exact context of Source B. Many thought that it referred to the final crushing of the uprising, rather than to the initial outbreak of violence that led to the resignation of the Gero government. In practice this made little difference to the validity of answers, though it did prevent candidates from explaining the particular purpose of the Soviets on 23/24 October. Most answers included reasons based on a more general awareness of context – because there had been protests against the government – or on the messages that the Soviets wished to pass on to their audience – that agitators and fascists were to blame for the violence. A slightly better version of this was to detect the particular manner in which the Russians were attempting to represent the events as their way of helping the Hungarians out in dealing with the evil counter-revolutionaries who were threatening them. The best answers were those that identified the Russians’ purpose in issuing the statement; that is, the impact that they wished to have on their audience, which was to persuade people that they were in the right, and that what they were doing in Hungary was justified. It was here that lack of precision about the context could prevent the Russians’ purpose being properly explained, since they were justifying their initial involvement and not the mass bloodshed of later in the month.

Question 3

Despite the fact that there were a few answers claiming that the two sources actually agreed (for example, on the fact that there was trouble in Hungary), and therefore neither proved the other wrong, the great majority of answers were nonetheless based on some valid direct comparison of the content of the two sources. Since the sources offered several clear contradictions, for most candidates these were sufficient to

prove that Source D either did or did not (in which case it was Source C that was believed) show that Source C was wrong. All such answers were limited in being based only on what the sources said, rather than on whether this could be believed. There were, though, opportunities to suspect the veracity of the sources. Zhukov's broadcast was an exercise in self-justification, and whilst Nagy's last message might have been more credible on the basis of him having little to lose, it still had the purpose of rousing international feeling against the Soviets. Whether one of these sources was capable of proving the other wrong was therefore not entirely clear-cut, as many answers pointed out.

Question 4

The cartoon was rich in detail, and contained many sub-messages. The challenge was to accommodate all that it showed in detecting the overarching 'Big Message'. Most candidates could explain the depiction of the Soviets' brutality in dealing with the Hungarian uprising, and their wish to remove any record of this from world history. More could have explained that the use of blood to clean the historical record meant that their efforts would fail. The figure of the grim reaper in the background was often noticed, but was interpreted by many candidates as being merely representative of the Hungarians who had died, rather than as a figure of doom haunting the Soviets. The final element which could be included, which was seen in better responses, was the opinion of the cartoonist. This was clearly condemnatory, portraying the Soviets in the most disapproving way.

Question 5

There were some candidates who struggled to grasp the nature of Source F – a statement issued by a group of Communist countries looking back on the Hungarian uprising and concluding that everything turned out fine (or at least claiming that it had). This made it hard to offer an explanation, and these answers were generally limited to making assertions on what was surprising or not. Fortunately, these answers were relatively few in number. Most answers took one or more of the claims made in the source, and judged whether or not they were surprising by comparing them against what actually happened. As the source was no more than Soviet propaganda, most candidates found it a fairly straightforward matter to illustrate its inaccuracy. However, being inaccurate factually did not necessarily make it surprising. Better candidates appreciated the purpose that the Communist countries had in issuing the statement, or at least why they might perceive the events in the manner they did, and thereby reached the conclusion that the statement was not at all surprising.

Question 6

This paper always concludes with a question asking candidates to test a hypothesis against the evidence offered in the sources. The most effective way of answering the question is to go through the sources, one at a time, indicating how the source content either does or does not support the hypothesis. The question is about the sources and the evidence they offer in relation to the hypothesis, and is not asking about the validity of the hypothesis. Most candidates understood this, and were able to find evidence in the sources both for and against the hypothesis, but some did not. The evidence in this set of sources fell into two clear groups, though sometimes candidates seemed to lose sight of the nature of the particular source they were using and so reached an incorrect conclusion. For example, some candidates looked at Source A and concluded that it showed Soviet intervention was justified, on the grounds that the Hungarians were rebelling against them. Although the source undoubtedly does show Hungarians rebelling against Soviet control, it actually supports them in doing this, and therefore shows Soviet intervention as unjustified. Another problem arose when candidates lost sight of the actual hypothesis to be tested. Sometimes this occurred from the start of the answer, with the hypothesis itself being misunderstood, but it also happened in the course of the answer, such answers starting with sources being used in the right manner, but then losing focus. On this question some answers were on *whether the Soviet intervention happened*, rather than on *whether it was justified*. These candidates unsurprisingly concluded that all the sources agreed that it happened – although this in itself should have alerted candidates to a problem, as the sources always contain evidence on both sides of the hypothesis.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

On both the nineteenth and twentieth century options, the sources appeared to pose few comprehension problems. Almost all candidates produced complete scripts, with positive answers to all the questions on their option. The level of contextual knowledge was good, though some responses would have benefited from remembering that contextual knowledge is never tested in isolation this paper – it has to be used to help answer the questions, all of which are about the sources. Overall, scripts displayed improved confidence in questions requiring evaluation of the sources. However, in **Question 6**, a number of answers did not use the sources to test the given hypothesis, writing instead about just the hypothesis itself.

General comments

Overall, candidates responded well to the precise details in the questions. For example, on **Question 4** on both options, the issue of surprise was addressed by many in their opening sentence; this is a strategy that works well. The understanding of the context of the sources was generally good and there was evidence of background knowledge being used to help answer the questions being asked. Candidates were better at interpreting sources, rather than comparing or evaluating them. Many were able to work out the messages of the sources; however, some would have benefited from giving greater consideration to the point of view of the author or artist. An often helpful question to ask is whether or not the author or artist approves or is critical of the subject of their work. When comparing sources, candidates need to find agreements and disagreements and explain these point by point, using a series of direct comparisons. Those adopting this approach were more successful in their responses than those providing a simple summary of each source in turn. Those who attempted to evaluate the sources with generalisations about source type also struggled. Candidates need to go beyond accepting or rejecting sources at face value, or at the level of undeveloped provenance. The best attempts at evaluation were nearly always those that focused on a source's purpose in its historical context. These answers considered the reservations one should have about a source because of its purpose and used this to inform their responses.

While many candidates did well in response to **Question 6**, there were still some who did not use the sources as the basis of their answer. Similarly, those who grouped the sources together and made general comments about the statement generally neglected to engage with the content of each source. Better responses used the sources to both support and disagree with the given statement.

Comments on specific questions

19th century topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates to compare two sources and assess the level of agreement between them. The best responses identified points of agreement and disagreement and illustrated these with content from both sources. Weaker answers summarised the sources without making specific comparisons. Candidates found the agreements easier to spot than the disagreements, and many were able to explain the former well. For example, many responses explained that both sources agree that Germany was trying to break the British/French Alliance, that the Kaiser visited Tangiers and that Grey was fearful about Germany starting a war. One point of disagreement centred on Delcasse; in A he resigned, whereas in B he was dismissed. The best responses were from candidates who compared the overall 'big messages' of the sources; that is that in Source A, the Moroccan Crisis was a 'win' for Germany, while in Source B, there were limits to Germany's success.

Question 2

With the exception of candidates who did not address the issue of utility at any point during their response, this question was answered fairly well. Most candidates were able to understand the content of the source and explain how this makes it useful. Some candidates recognised the clear bias in the tone of the source and rejected it on this basis. Others considered the purpose of the source and, as a result, either rejected it, or, at the highest level, explained how this is precisely what makes it useful.

Question 3

This question asked candidates to explain the overall message of the cartoon; that being that the Kaiser caused crises wherever he intervened. A small number of candidates achieved this. Many, though, were able to explain valid sub-messages, for example, that the Kaiser had just visited Morocco, that the Kaiser was a significant figure or that he was responsible for Moroccan Crisis. When candidates are asked about the message of a source they should always try and consider the author's voice or opinion. In this instance, the best responses were provided by candidates who could explain that the cartoonist is being critical of the Kaiser's actions; he clearly disapproves of the trouble he caused wherever he went.

Question 4

While most candidates clearly stated whether or not Source F makes Source E surprising, there was a small number that did not address this vital element of the question. It is often a helpful strategy to begin an answer by using the key words from the question in order to avoid an omission of this kind. Other candidates identified aspects of Source E that they were surprised about but did not explain why. Better responses started by comparing what the two sources said. In one way, the sources agreed – that there was pro-French feeling in Britain. However, in another way, the sources disagreed on the central issue of British intervention; in Source E Grey suggests that Britain would remain neutral if France were to be attacked, while in Source F he says that British intervention on the side of France would be likely. Candidates could base their answers either on the agreement or the disagreement and use this as a reason for being surprised or not surprised by Source E. In order to answer the question fully, one or both of the sources needed to be evaluated; the most common way of doing this was to compare the sources and then consider Grey's purpose in Source F. A small number of candidates were able to compare the sources and evaluate them both.

Question 5

In this question candidates were required to compare the views of two cartoonists. Less successful responses tended to compare surface details or undeveloped provenance. However, few candidates failed to address the question and clear attempts at comparisons were made in most responses, although some were based on a misinterpretation of one or both sources. Source H was more commonly misinterpreted, with some candidates identifying one of the characters in the cartoon as Germany, rather than Britain and France. There is a clear difference in the big messages of the cartoons. In Source H, the crisis has been resolved and war averted, while in G, although they are talking, there is still a possibility of war. Those candidates that were able to interpret both cartoons in this way provided very good answers. The best responses directly compared the views of the cartoonists. For example, in H the cartoonist approves of the results of the Algeiras Conference but in G, the cartoonist approves rather less.

Question 6

There were some good answers to this question, with candidates explaining how some sources, (A,B,D, E, F and G) support the view that the Moroccan Crisis made war likely, and how other sources, (A,C, D, E and H) disagree with this view. These responses examined the sources one by one, made it clear which source they were using and explained how the content either agreed or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Less successful answers often neglected to use the sources at all and involved a general response about whether the Moroccan Crises made war likely. Some candidates would have improved their responses by making it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. Candidates should avoid grouping the sources together and making assertions about them as a group, this rarely works well. Those candidates who provided genuine evaluation based it on a source's purpose, rather than on simple statements involving bias or undeveloped provenance.

20th century topic

Question 1

Many candidates were able to make inferences from the source about events in Hungary in November 1956. Most could also support these by referring to details in the source and consequently, many responses achieved good marks. Stronger responses were from candidates who recognised the overall 'big impression' of events that the source gives; that is that the Soviets are repressing the rebellion in Hungary, while at the same time pretending to restore peace or pretending to be friends of the Hungarians. The best responses were provided by candidates who explained both elements of the 'big impression' and supported this with details from the source. While many candidates appreciated that the source's caption contradicted the image or recognised that the mask was intended to comment on the brutality of the Russians, some missed the idea of deception or pretence.

Question 2

In this question, candidates were required to compare two written sources and reach a decision about whether the content of one (B) made the other (C) unreliable. Candidates needed to compare the two sources for agreements and/or disagreements and then evaluate at least one source to establish whether B makes C unreliable or not. Some responses identified agreements between the two sources - for instance, they both agree that Hungary was in chaos, whereas others focused on disagreements, the most obvious one being that B is pro-Soviet and anti-revolutionary, while Source C is anti-Soviet and supports the introduction of reform in Hungary. While some candidates were able to write an answer based on agreements or disagreements, others would have benefited from being able to effectively evaluate the sources. A large majority of responses recognised that the provenance of the two sources was an important element in the answer but needed to go further than stating that they were both written by communists, or, more commonly, that B was Chinese and therefore communist, while C was written by a British journalist and Britain wasn't a communist country (thereby missing the fact that the author of C was writing for a communist newspaper). Those candidates that were able to make a developed use of the provenance performed very well. Candidates at this level evaluated Source B (or, less frequently, Source C) by referring to their contextual knowledge, for example the Chinese disapproval of de-Stalinisation. Source B could also be evaluated internally, for example, it cannot make Source C unreliable as B is not a reliable account of events as the author admits to not having reliable information, rather the Chinese have to rely on students and the radio.

Question 3

There were some very good answers to this question which asked why the cartoon was published at this time. In order to answer the question well, it was necessary to consider the context the cartoon was published in, and the cartoonist's overall message and point of view. Many candidates were able to accurately explain the context of the time by referring to both the Suez Crisis and events in Hungary in 1956. Many responses also recognised the cartoonist's 'big message', that is that the Soviets were getting away with their actions in Hungary because the Western powers, or the UN, were distracted by events surrounding Suez. Stronger answers were seen from candidates that recognised that the cartoonist was criticising either the Soviets or the UN; the Soviets for taking advantage of the fact that the West/UN was distracted by events in Suez to behave badly in Hungary, or the UN for its inaction over Hungary as a result of Suez. Similarly, the cartoonist could be criticising the UN for its hypocrisy – it was punishing the western powers for their aggressive actions over Suez, while at the same time ignoring Russia's actions in Hungary.

Question 4

A number of candidates struggled with this question, and there was misunderstanding surrounding the role and position of the Hungarian Workers' Party, the government, Communism and democracy. These candidates would have benefited from a firmer grasp of who and/or what the author of each source was supporting. Some candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to evaluate Gero and Nagy, but did not compare the content of the sources in order to explain their surprise or lack of surprise. The question asked whether Source E, written by Gero, makes Source F, written by Nagy, surprising. Most candidates began their answers well, by giving a direct answer in response to the question. This is crucial, as answers that don't address the required issue of surprise are limited in what they can achieve. In order to answer the question fully, the content of the two sources needed to be examined and direct comparisons between the two sources needed to be made. In addition to this, candidates needed to evaluate the sources. The best responses did this by considering Gero's purpose in Source E and Nagy's purpose in Source F. In other words, they considered the intended impact of the words of these men on their intended audience in terms of

how they hoped to try and change people's behaviour and attitudes. While some candidates could competently compare the content of the sources, a relatively small number was able to compare them and then evaluate.

Question 5

This question was answered well. In **Question 5**, candidates were asked to explain the overall message of a cartoon. Many recognised this and were able to explain that the cartoon shows us that the Soviets wanted to use the Suez Crisis to distract people from their brutality in Hungary. Those that fell short of this were able to explain valid sub-messages or part of the overall big message. When candidates are asked about the message of a source, they should always try and consider the author's voice or opinion. In this instance, better responses explained that the cartoonist is being critical of the Soviets' brutal behaviour in Hungary and their attempt to use Suez to distract others from their actions. The best answers picked up on the cartoonist's criticism of Soviet hypocrisy, that is that Soviets were condemning the aggressive actions of other nations over Suez, while doing the exact same thing themselves.

Question 6

Overall this question was answered well and many candidates performed strongly by carefully explaining how some of the sources (B, E, H) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that the Soviet armed intervention in Hungary was justified, while others (A, C, D, F, G) argue that Soviet actions were unjustified. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Some candidates would have improved their answers by making it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. Candidates should avoid grouping the sources together and making assertions about them as a group; this rarely works well. Answers need not include a summary of the source, nor should they involve generalisations about source type. More candidates could have included genuine evaluation based on a source's purpose, rather than simple statements involving bias or undeveloped provenance.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages and general comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 received comfortably the most responses, with a good number of candidates also attempting Depth Studies A (The First World War), C (Russia) and D (the USA). There were few responses to the other Depth Studies.

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

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of responses for Depth Study A with both **Questions 1** and **2** being attempted by candidates.

Question 2 proved challenging for many candidates. The better responses were able to explain how the ‘race to the sea’ in 1914 helped develop a trench system in Western Europe after the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and compared this with other factors such as the impact of new technology and weapons like the machine gun, the lack of effective tactics on both sides, the early mobilisation of Russia and the intervention of both Belgium and the BEF during the initial German offensive. Many strong answers included explanations of the importance of specific events such as the Battle of the Marne. However, some candidates misunderstood the term ‘race to the sea’ and confused it with the ‘war at sea’, resulting in material lacking relevance to the question.

Question 3 was generally well answered by candidates. Some strong responses confidently explained the domestic problems faced by Germany by 1918, with many focusing on the impact of the British naval blockade of German ports, the consequences of the Kiel Mutiny and the October Revolution. This was then compared against other factors that led to the Armistice – most commonly candidates cited the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive and the entry of the USA in to the war in 1917. A small number of weaker responses concentrated too much on earlier events such as the failure of the Schlieffen Plan or the battles of 1914 which lacked relevance to the signing of the Armistice in 1918.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were widely-answered by candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered by candidates. Good responses contained plenty of examples how the Ruhr invasion led to instability, although more could have linked the invasion to the subsequent period of hyperinflation in Germany in 1923. Knowledge of the occupation and the government's responses tended to be strong. The better answers compared the significance of the invasion with other factors that led to instability. These ranged from the impact of the First World War, the Weimar Constitution (particularly the system of proportional representation), the political uprisings by the left and right and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The very best responses were able to give well-developed explanations but many answers were more descriptive and did not explicitly link the material to the focus in the question – how it led to instability.

Question 4 was also generally well answered by candidates. The stronger responses were able to fully explain the importance of the fear of communism as a reason for Nazi success. Candidates most commonly examined the impact anti-Communism had on the ruling elites, including the President, industrialists and farmers. This was then developed by linking it to Nazi propaganda and the role of the SA in causing problems on the streets. This was then balanced by explaining the significance of other factors such as the effects of the Depression, Hitler's leadership qualities and the weaknesses of the Weimar governments. Weaker responses were often more descriptive or narrative in style, with little contextual knowledge. A few candidates went beyond the chronological parameters of the question and cited events in 1934.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study but **Question 6** was the slightly more popular choice.

Question 5 saw some good responses, although many candidates would have benefited from a greater knowledge of the causes of the weakness of the Tsarist regime before 1914. The stronger answers were able to describe the events of Bloody Sunday competently and its subsequent knock on effects in the 1905 Revolution. This was then compared with other factors such as the disillusionment of the peasants and the land question, the desire for greater representation by the middle-classes and liberals and the growth in more radical opposition. References to the October Manifesto were commonly made, with a few candidates critically analysing the Bloody Sunday incident as insignificant as the Tsar was able to use the army and Stolypin's leadership to crush opposition effectively from 1906 onwards. Other responses would have been improved by better knowledge of the events of Bloody Sunday. A few responses went beyond the chronological parameters of the question and examined the effects of the First World War.

Question 6, in general, was answered more competently than **Question 5**. Good responses were able to explain the importance of Nicholas II's actions as a cause of the March Revolution and compare this with other causes competently. Most commonly cited were Nicholas II's decision to take charge of the Russian troops on the Eastern Front and the fact that he left the German-born Tsarina and Rasputin in charge in Russia. Candidates then examined the overall social and economic consequences of the war on Russian society, the growth in opposition and the failure by governments to address the land question, to give balance. Less successful responses tended to confuse the March Revolution with the November seizure of power and so often concentrated too much on the role of Lenin and the Bolsheviks which lacked relevance to this question.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

More candidates attempted **Question 7** than **Question 8**.

Question 7 produced some good responses which were able to explain how mass-produced goods such as cars, radios, vacuum cleaners and refrigerators changed the lives of some women in the 1920s, and this was balanced by examining other factors such as the rise of the entertainment industry including the cinema, night clubs and jazz music, as well as women gaining the vote in 1920. A few of the strongest answers were able to evaluate how far these changes actually affected women across rural America at the time, which led to some convincing conclusions. Weaker answers gave non-specific material on the economic boom in general, with little focus on how it changed women's lives. There were also a number of one-sided responses and answers that did not get to grips with what goods constituted 'mass-produced' goods.

Question 8 generated some good answers in which candidates were able to provide impressive evidence about how important the Second New Deal was in dealing with the effects of the Depression, including the Wagner Act, the Social Security Act and the creation of new alphabet agencies such as the WPA and RA. This was then successfully compared with legislation created to tackle the Depression in the first New Deal or first Hundred Days, including the CCC, AAA, TVA, NIRA and PWA. Some stronger answers were able to evaluate the overall impact the Second New Deal had due to the cuts in public funding and growing opposition from radical and conservative critics, and also drew conclusions regarding the importance the outbreak of the Second World War ultimately had in solving the effects of the Depression. Weaker responses lacked knowledge of the Second New Deal and often confused the legislation with the First New Deal.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages and general comments

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 and Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41 received the most responses from candidates. There were also some responses to Depth Study A (The First World War) and Depth Study C (Russia), with very few candidates choosing the other Depth Studies on the paper.

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

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of candidate responses for both **Question 1** and **Question 2**.

Question 1 required candidates to examine poor intelligence as a reason for the huge losses at the Battle of the Somme. While some candidates were able to get to grips with the focus of the question, others would have benefited from a better understanding of the meaning of ‘intelligence’. The best answers examined the importance of Haig’s poor planning, his grand plan and ignorance of intelligence information being received from the trenches. This was compared with other factors such as the impact of weapons, German tactics and the use of volunteers and conscripts as opposed to the professional BEF.

Question 2 was an equally popular choice among candidates and, in general, the better answered of the two questions in this Depth Study. The question required candidates to consider the significance of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk to the outcome of the First World War. The strongest responses were able to analyse the effect the Russian departure from the war had on German troops and the effect it had on German tactics, notably an end to the two-front war and the launch of Operation Michael. This was then balanced with a consideration of other factors ranging from the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, the impact of new technology and tactics, the impact of the British blockade and the entry of the USA in to the war in 1917. A small number of the best answers were able to critically evaluate the actual significance of the Treaty when the USA had already entered the war and had started to send fresh troops to the Western Front. Weaker responses tended to have a limited knowledge of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, with a small number of answers mistaking the Treaty with the Versailles Settlement.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates, though **Question 3** received a higher number of responses.

Question 3 produced a wide range of different quality responses. The best responses examined the use of the SA, SS and Gestapo in allowing Hitler to control Germany by 1934. The impact of the use of concentration camps, the crushing of the Communists after the Reichstag Fire, the forceful intimidation used to pass the Enabling Act and the significance of the Night of the Long Knives were all referenced and explained well. This was then balanced with a comparison of other methods used to control Germany such as propaganda, censorship, the concordat with the Catholic Church and the promises made by the Nazis to solve the effects of the Depression and end the restrictions placed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. These responses tended to be well-developed and supported by good factual knowledge. Less successful responses often focused too much on events in the 1920s such as the Munich Putsch in 1923, which is not very relevant to Nazi control by 1934 beyond the fact that it changed Nazi tactics in the late 1920s. There was sometimes confusion between the SA and SS, and a few answers cited events beyond 1934.

Question 4 was, in general, well answered. Candidates were expected to compare the significance of Nazi policies towards the workers to the popularity of the Nazi regime with other policies. A few weaker responses tended to be thin on material or focused on control rather than popularity. The best responses focused on the new organisations set up by the Nazis such as ‘Strength Through Joy’ and ‘Beauty of Labour’, as well as the focus put on the Nazis in solving the unemployment problem in Germany as a result of the Depression. This was then often balanced with a critical evaluation of the loss of trade unions and the setting up of the German Labour Front, the long working hours and poor pay in the Reich Labour Service, the banning of workers’ parties such as the Social Democrats, as well as a comparison with other Nazi policies which also tended to be popular, such as legislation to help farmers.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study but **Question 5** received a greater number of responses.

Question 5 varied in the quality of response produced. The best responses tended to give good examples of the social and economic impact of the war such as food and fuel shortages and consider how the Bolsheviks took advantage of this through Lenin’s April Theses and popular Bolshevik slogans. This was then contrasted against other factors such as the significance of the Petrograd Soviet and the Dual Power system in Russia, the weaknesses of the Provisional Government and its failure to end the war and solve the land question, as well as focus on individual events such as the Kornilov Affair. A few responses overestimated the hold the Bolsheviks had on the Russian peasantry at the time.

Question 6 produced answers were generally weaker than those to **Question 5**. Some candidates were unsure of the term ‘national security’, which led to material being cited on the use of the NKVD and censorship, which was not relevant to the question. Very few candidates focused entirely on the reasons for Stalin’s economic policies and many went on to examine the impact of these policies instead, which led to material lacking in relevance. The good answers seen were able to compare the importance of national security (namely the need for defence against the West and the growth in fascism in Europe) with other reasons, such as ideology (including the elimination of class enemies like the kulaks and Nepmen), and Stalin’s desire for the modernisation and growth of Russia’s industry and agricultural production.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was a popular topic, with both **Question 7** and **Question 8** answered by candidates. Of the two, **Question 7** received the most responses.

Question 7 was generally well-answered. Candidates were often able to explain multiple examples of how confidence in the economy helped cause the prosperity of the 1920s and compared it with other factors, such as the use of mass production, mass advertising, the USA’s natural resources and the Republican policies at the time. The best answers contained convincing explanations and some excellent supporting material, with some candidates attempting conclusions and reaching substantiated judgements on the relative importance of the different factors. Weaker responses tended to lack knowledge or presented a vague understanding of the term ‘confidence’.

Question 8 saw a few good answers which got to grips with the question and examined the nature of opposition from both conservative and Republican critics of the New Deal, as well as the Supreme Court and radical opponents like Huey Long. This was then balanced with explanations on the relative success of the New Deal despite the opposition, such as the restoration of confidence in the banking system, the impact of some alphabet agencies like the TVA and the significance of legislation like the Wagner Act and Social Security Act. Other responses would have been improved by a deeper understanding of the political opposition towards the New Deal and some only gave one-sided responses only.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages and general comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45 received the most responses. Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-41 also attracted a number of responses. There were a significant number of attempts at Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and a number of candidates answered questions from Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945. There were a small number of answers to Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41. There were very few responses to the other options.

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

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of responses to **Question 1**, with fewer for **Question 2**. Many answers showed a good knowledge of the war at sea and were able to reference major battles and their impact. Most understood the impact of the naval blockade and its influence on the outcome of the war. The entry of the USA as a factor in the Allied victory was also well known. Less successful answers provided much description of the build up to war and the naval race, meaning that they tended to put less focus on outcome.

Question 2 had fewer responses but those answering this question showed a good knowledge of Germany's situation at the end of the war. Specific knowledge of the Kiel Mutiny would have improved a number of answers and lead to less general responses about German defeat.

Depth Study B, Germany, 1918–1945

This was the most widely answered Depth Study, with some responses to **Question 3** but more to **Question 4**.

Less successful answers to **Question 3** did not focus on the specific period of Hitler becoming Chancellor and tended to produce a long term narrative of Germany's problems from the end of World War I. Others gave a general account of Hitler's long term career, not focusing on him becoming Chancellor. The role of Hindenburg and his powers as President could have been better understood by some. Some candidates went beyond the period of the appointment and wrote about how Hitler kept control once in power. Successful responses were more controlled and addressed events around the specific period and immediately before, referring, for example, to the role of the Depression and a rise in the Nazi votes for Hitler's appointment.

Question 4 drew many responses, with a very good level of knowledge of lessons during the period displayed by candidates. This sometimes led to narratives of life in a Nazi school and some responses would have benefited from linking this material to the question of promoting Nazi ideas. More successful responses demonstrated an understanding of what the Nazis were trying to achieve through the indoctrination of children and others. How propaganda was spread was well understood, with references to radios, posters and control of the press but these measures were more frequently described than used to answer the question. The Hitler Youth was often included as part of the school curriculum.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

There were too few responses to **Question 5** for meaningful comments to be made.

Successful answers to **Question 6** demonstrated a good knowledge of the failures of the Provisional Government and the role of the Bolsheviks during the period. Less successful answers were generally a little confused about the period and sometimes wrote more about the Tsar. Others confused the Bolshevik takeover with the Civil War and so wrote about the role of the Red Army and Trotsky. There were also a small number of candidates who wrote general answers on Russia's problems from the nineteenth century onwards.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

Question 7 was the most widely answered question on the USA. Successful answers were able to make a distinction between segregation and general racial intolerance and reference specific laws like the Jim Crow Laws to support their answers. Overall knowledge of the period was good and many answers demonstrated balance.

Question 8 was less well done, with many answers looking at the reasons for the Wall Street Crash, rather than how the Republicans reacted. Successful answers were able to balance Republican actions and demonstrate how these led to unpopularity, and show that Roosevelt's popularity grew as a result. There were a few answers which described the New Deal, rather than understanding that it was the promise of this which helped Roosevelt's success.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

The majority of responses to this Depth Study were on **Question 13**. Successful responses were able to demonstrate the concept of determination and link it directly to Israeli success. Examples such as the impact of the Holocaust and how this led to Israeli determination to defend everything achieved up to 1948 were cited. Candidates were also able to demonstrate alternative factors, including the specific military experience of the Israeli fighters and the weakness and lack of unity of the Arab states. Less successful answers were more generalised narratives which did not fully address the concept of determination.

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