eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com
www.XtremePapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

General comments

A significant number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. These candidates were able to use their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments to their chosen questions. However, some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to use this knowledge effectively to answer the actual question set.

A small number of candidates wrote very lengthy responses to part **(a)** questions, which resulted in them having insufficient time to fully develop their responses to part **(c)** questions. Candidates should be encouraged to plan their time more effectively.

Parts **(b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach.

There were a small number of rubric errors; some candidates chose parts **(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)** from different questions, whilst some answered more than three questions. On the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with the majority completing the paper.

It would be helpful to Examiners if candidates ensured that they indicated clearly the question number and part of the question being answered. Some candidates wrote one long paragraph in response to a question and it was not always possible to distinguish where one part question finished and another part question began.

Comments on specific questions

The comments which follow do not imply that a question was answered badly. They are intended to help Centres in improving the preparation of their candidates. Comments are not made on every part of every question written about.

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

(a) Answers were variable. Some candidates were able to describe the overthrow of Louis Philippe succinctly and gained five marks with ease. A number of answers were very generalised, and based solely upon a superficial description of the illustration on the question paper.

(b) Candidates were able to identify why there were revolutions in Italy, but few were able to develop these identified points into effective explanations.

(c) Candidates wrote about revolutions in a number of European countries, such as Hungary, Italy, Germany and France. However, a significant number of candidates described the events of these revolutions without explaining how they were successful. Candidates' answers were often unbalanced, focusing on agreement with the question only.

Question 2

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 3

(a) There were a number of excellent responses to this question. Candidates were well-versed in the terms of the Treaty of Kanagawa and wrote concise answers. A small minority confused the Treaty of Kanagawa of 1854 with the Treaty of Edo of 1858.

(b) A substantial number of candidates achieved high Level 3 marks here, by clearly explaining the Shoguns' fear of foreign influence, their anxiety about the balance of power in the Pacific and their perception that American interest in Japan was a direct threat to the Shoguns' position.

(c) Answers were focused very much on agreement with the statement in the question; candidates deployed their knowledge most effectively to explain how Japan was fully modernised by 1914. However, these answers were unbalanced and few candidates were able to explain that in some respects, Japan was not fully modernised by this date. This aspect could have been addressed by explaining the role of the Emperor and/or the problems faced by the peasant farmers.

Question 4

(a) Candidates needed to look carefully at the dates given in the question – 1908 to 1909. A number of candidates wrote about the First Balkan War (1912-13) and/or the Second Balkan War (1913), instead of answering the actual question set.

(b) Many candidates achieved Level 3 by explaining the building of Dreadnoughts, but relatively few were able to explain other reasons such as Tirpitz's Naval Law or Germany's belief that sea power was crucial to the successful development of a great empire.

(c) The majority of candidates could readily identify both German actions causing the First World War and other reasons for the war such as the Alliance System and the assassination of Archduke Franz-Ferdinand. Many did not move on to develop explanations. Some candidates tried to explain the Alliance System but were unaware of the distinction between the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance.

Question 5

(a) Many candidates displayed good knowledge of Wilson's hopes for the peace settlement. However, a significant number wrote about Lloyd George and Clemenceau; the question specifically indicated Wilson as the focus.

(b) This was well-answered by many, but some candidates wrote a lengthy list of Clemenceau's and Lloyd George's aims, rather than explaining reasons why they disagreed over the treatment of Germany.

(c) The vast majority of candidates were able to identify a number of reasons why Versailles was fair and/or unfair, with many also describing the terms of the treaty in detail. In some cases answers did not progress beyond Level 2, as there was no explanation given. There were a substantial number of well-argued responses; candidates focused on the treaty being unfair due to leaving Germany vulnerable (arms restrictions), and punishing the German people, rather than the government (the economy and reparations), and upon it being fair due to Germany's extremely harsh treatment of Russia at Brest-Litovsk.

Question 6

(a) A considerable number of candidates did not display any knowledge of the Anschluss; they wrote instead about the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia. Some candidates wrote lengthy descriptions of the events of the Anschluss, rather than describing Hitler's achievements. Too many candidates erroneously believed that Anschluss gave Germany Lebensraum (living space), and that Germany and Austria had been one country before World War One, and had been split by the Treaty of Versailles. Consequently, only a small number of candidates were able to achieve the higher marks on this question.

(b) There were a number of detailed explanations here, focusing on Hitler's desire for Lebensraum and also the unification of German speaking people, together with the economic and strategic significance of Czechoslovakia. Candidates are expected to be aware that Czechoslovakia was a

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

new state formed under the terms of the Treaties of St. Germain and Trianon; it was not formed at Versailles.

(c) This question was well answered by most. Candidates could explain a variety of reasons why appeasement was and was not a mistake. A small number of candidates mistakenly thought that appeasement was formulated by the League of Nations or that it was a formal agreement signed by Britain, France and Germany.

Question 7

(a) A significant number of candidates displayed detailed knowledge of both Yalta and Potsdam. Where candidates did not achieve the higher marks it was because they did not focus their answers on Germany as the question required.

(b) Candidates were almost all able to describe the Truman Doctrine; most were unable to explain its significance.

(c) Responses to this question were variable. Many were able to give effective explanations relating to Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe, the USA's development of the atomic bomb, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. A significant number went well beyond the brief of the question by writing about Vietnam and the Cuban Missile Crisis, when the question clearly asked for responses to be focused upon what caused the Cold War.

Question 8

(a) Many candidates wrote in detail about the Bay of Pigs invasion (April 1961) and the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962), both outside the date specified of January 1961. Dates in questions are important; candidates will not receive credit for material outside the time span given. However, there were also many concise answers focused totally on the period up to January 1961 which received high marks.

(b) Answers to this question tended to focus primarily on describing the events of the Bay of Pigs invasion, rather than explaining why it resulted in humiliation for Kennedy.

(c) There were a number of well argued responses to this question, but some read the question as "The Cuban Missile Crisis was a success for the USA" and therefore did not focus their responses on the actual question of "success for the US policy of containment." Too many candidates simply described the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Many candidates scored well on this question; however, there were a number of candidates who seemed to be unaware of what the Weimar Constitution actually was.

(b) There were many well-developed answers to this question, with candidates displaying detailed understanding of the Spartacist rising, the Kapp Putsch and how knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles affected Germany. A number of candidates completely ignored the dates of 1919-1920, given in the question.

(c) Candidates were able to explain in some depth why the Weimar Republic was not a failure, focusing upon Stresemann's contribution to economic recovery, the improvement in Germany's position internationally and also the cultural revival. Relatively few could explain why Weimar was a failure; those who did explained the effects of the Wall Street Crash upon an economy sustained by American loans.

Question 10

(a) Relatively few candidates knew what the Strength through Joy programme was; many believed it was part of the Hitler Youth movement. Most were able to identify that the programme provided holidays for workers by using the source on the question paper.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Answers focused mainly on the role of women in bearing children for Germany. Only a few candidates were able to explain that unemployment was high, so women were encouraged to stay at home to ensure more jobs were available for men.

(c) Candidates were usually able to offer at least one clear explanation of the effectiveness of Nazi education and youth policies in controlling young people. Many could also identify groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement, but did not explain their significance.

Question 11

(a) Most candidates gained high marks here, describing clearly the events of Bloody Sunday.

(b) Candidates were less confident in part **(b)**. Many were able to explain Stolypin's necktie, but little else.

(c) There were many well-developed answers relating to the influence of Rasputin on the Tsarina and the Tsar's role in the war, but relatively few were able to explain discontent among the working classes; this meant most answers did not progress beyond Level 3.

Question 12

(a) Answers focused on Lenin's views of Stalin, gaining some marks. Candidates generally did not give Lenin's views on Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev and Kamenev.

(b) Candidates explained in detail Trotsky's personality, his belief in world revolution and his failure to take opposition seriously as factors. However, a significant number did not notice that the question asked about Trotsky's qualities as a potential leader and explained instead why some Bolsheviks were suspicious of Stalin.

(c) Candidates generally found it difficult to distinguish between the two aspects of this question. There were some effective explanations of the purges on one side and propaganda on the other. Some candidates were able only to make generalisations about terror, stating people were imprisoned or killed.

Question 13

(a) Candidates were usually able to achieve four or five marks here, by describing cinema, jazz, dance and sport.

(b) A significant number of candidates simply described the lives of flappers. The question expected candidates to understand and be able to explain the impact of the flappers and the reasons for disapproval of their lifestyle.

(c) Candidates explained the impact of prohibition clearly, focusing upon the gangsters and increased crime, and also upon how prohibition made alcohol more desirable. Only a few candidates explained religious intolerance, but many were secure in their knowledge and understanding of the impact of racial intolerance, explaining the Ku Klux Klan and the Jim Crow laws.

Question 14

(a) There were many well-focused answers to this question, highlighting active government, relief, recovery and reform promises. A significant number did not focus upon Roosevelt's promises at the time of his election to the presidency and instead gave detailed descriptions of the achievements of the Alphabet Agencies, which were not relevant to this particular question.

(b) Explanations were focused upon the temporary nature of many jobs and the failure of the New Deal to address the needs of specific groups, such as black people. A number of candidates were only able to identify that the New Deal did not help farmers enough and did not help black people, and so did not progress beyond Level 2.

(c) A minority of candidates were able to explain the Supreme Court's opposition to the New Deal. Many more were able to explain other forms of opposition such as Dr. Francis Townsend, Huey

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Long, Father Coughlin and the Republicans; overall other forms of opposition were clearly explained.

Questions 15 and Question 16

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

Question 17

(a) Some candidates were able to describe the impact of the 1913 Land Act in detail; however, many candidates were unable to move beyond generalised statements about the Land Act penalising black people.

(b) Candidates were able to identify reasons why South Africa became more segregated, but few developed these identifications into explanations.

(c) Answers focused explanation on the pass system and the Broederbond; few candidates displayed awareness of the role of the Indian community or the black trade union activity.

Questions 18 - 25

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

General comments

Many candidates were well prepared for the demands of the examination, having a good grounding in historical knowledge. This, together with an understanding of the demands of the questions and how to apply that knowledge, resulted in Examiners commenting on the quality of many answers. These candidates produced answers focused clearly on the demands of individual questions. Candidates who had a sound understanding of the historical topics they had studied were able to order their knowledge to meet the different emphases that a number of questions posed. Candidates are encouraged to be able 'to think on their feet', rather than enter the examination room with answers already fixed in their minds.

In a significant minority of instances candidates demonstrated misunderstanding in relation to historical knowledge and lacked an awareness of the techniques required to present a successful answer. These responses were characterised by a display of historical knowledge related to the area of content of the question, but they showed an inability to relate this material to the question as set.

Many Centres find the layout of the syllabus helpful in ensuring a sound grounding for their candidates. Candidates are expected to show an understanding of the Key Questions and Focus Points which appear in the syllabus and should be capable of developing these through relevant historical examples.

Despite the improvements in more recent years, this year saw the return of many extended answers to part **(a)** questions. To gain maximum credit does not require lengthy description but more a clarity of thought that identifies four pieces of information. Maximum credit can also be achieved by the development of two of the pieces of information. In answering part **(b)** of a question, candidates' attempts generally produced an appropriate response. It is worth noting here that maximum marks can be gained through four correct explanations. Additionally, the maximum can be achieved by the production of two well-developed explanations which contain significant relevant, supporting detail. Answers to **(c)** parts of a question require an explanation of the issues, with the explanation being linked to the question. An example of where candidates failed to do this was in **Question 6(c)** where events in Czechoslovakia and the Nazi-Soviet Pact were described, rather than explained, as to why they might have been partially responsible for war.

The nature of part **(c)** of a question requires candidates to construct an argument to support and challenge the hypothesis. To this end it is commendable that some Centres encourage candidates to plan responses before writing the final version. This does produce more coherent arguments, with a more logical flow through each inter-related argument. In some instances, however, the planning was longer that the actual answer, and in such cases it is hard to identify the benefit gained by the candidate. Disappointingly, some candidates failed to challenge the question, writing only about one side of the argument. This approach limits the marks available.

As with previous sessions, this session brought a number of comments from Examiners about the presentation of responses where single sheets are being used. It was noted that on a significant number of occasions, the single sheets were presented in the wrong order. Additionally, where string is used, it should be of appropriate length so that it does not become undone and should be tied securely, whilst allowing the script pages to be accessed. Centres do not need to include the question papers with the candidates' work, nor should answers be written on the question paper. Examiners find it helpful if candidates indicate on the very first sheet the numbers of the questions answered.

For the vast majority of candidates time was not an issue, with most candidates using the two hours wisely. Fewer rubric errors were reported by Examiners this year. Where rubric errors occurred, it was where candidates had answered both of the Depth Study questions from one topic.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Comments on specific questions

The comments which follow do not imply that a question was answered badly. They are intended to help Centres in improving the preparation of their candidates. Comments are not made on every part of every question written about.

Section A - Core Content

Question 1

Although there were only small numbers answering this question, the following comments may be helpful. Part **(a)** demands specific recalled information and in this instance some candidates were unable even to offer a basic response to the term 'liberalism'. In **(b)**, many were aware of the events of the Hungarian Revolution but failed to turn their knowledge of Kossuth into an understanding of causation, thus limiting the marks available. The quality of answers to part **(c)** varied. Most were content to describe aspects rather than consider relative importance.

Question 2

Once again, a limited number of answers were seen. Some candidates wasted valuable time when answering part **(a)** by ignoring the end date and wrote about 1849 and beyond. Many were more successful with **(b)**, producing some answers clearly focused on failure. Here, candidates were well aware of the in-fighting leading to the wider issues being ignored. In **(c)**, there was a tendency to concentrate on the story of unification with Bismarck as the hero, rather than focus on the question.

Question 3

Those limited numbers attempting this question showed sound knowledge of the enthusiasm to trade, particularly in silks and porcelain, and the need to build up relationships, in answering part **(a)**. The quality of answers to **(b)** varied, with some thinking about impact in its widest sense on the Shogunate, as well as the beginnings of westernisation. Others remained firmly fixed on the idea of trade. Some very good examples of 'westernisation' were seen in answer to part **(c)**, including the constitution and the military, as well as the more common 'dress' and 'education'. Many candidates reached the higher levels but were more comfortable with agreement than disagreement.

Question 4

Answers to **(a)** concentrated too much on the Dreadnought issue, often going into great detail on numbers and size. Many candidates failed to develop the wider aspects of, for example, the intentions of the Kaiser and Tirpitz. A small number of candidates ignored 'navy' and wrote more generally about military. This approach did not receive credit. Part **(b)** was generally quite well done. Many candidates showed a good outline knowledge of the two crises, although slightly fewer accepted the challenge of developing explanation as to why tension in Europe was increased. Those who did made good use of Algeciras, and particularly the challenge to the Entente Cordiale. For part **(c), c**andidates' were generally aware of the issues relating to the Bosnian Crisis and the Balkan Wars, but failed to make any link to a deteriorating situation or to the outbreak of war. Good answers made use of common features such as Austria, Russia and Serbia, whilst weaker responses looked for their answers in areas outside the question, such as the assassination. This approach was not given credit.

Question 5

Some very good responses to **(a)** made good use of the detail remembered about the terms of the Treaty, such as reparations (usually quoting the amount correctly), unemployment and the loss of industrial areas such as the Saar and Upper Silesia, although Examiners did comment that the Ruhr was often quoted in error for the Saar. There were additional errors showing candidates' misunderstanding. These included the often made point that German industry was destroyed by the war. Germans destroyed infrastructure and industry as they retreated from France and Belgium but there was no fighting on German soil; that the Sudetenland with its industry was lost despite the fact that the Sudetenland was not Germany's to lose and probably the most common - a misunderstanding of what 'demilitarisation' in relation to the Rhineland actually meant. Part **(b)** brought many descriptions, often in considerable detail, of what the 'Big Three' wanted, rather than explaining why they did not always get what they wanted. A point worth making here is

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

that when writing about Lloyd George, candidates insist on referring to the 'man in the middle', rather than showing awareness of Lloyd George's individual stance. In response to **(c)**, candidates were often quite strong on a sense of 'unjustness' and 'unfairness' but less strong on explaining why the treaty was just and fair at the time. The better answers looked at the relevance of a) the impact of war on the victors' respective countries, b) their ideas about long term peace and c) their economic interests, as well as considering Germany's position. This made for a much more interesting and relevant response.

Question 6

Most candidates had little difficulty in identifying at least two aspects of Hitler's Foreign Policy, such as lebensraum and the re-militarisation of the Rhineland, although some candidates did not pay enough attention to the question, writing mainly about the actions Hitler took. Many do not understand the term Anschluss, thinking it is to do with reunification. They fail to recognise in this context that Austria was not part of Germany - even if they know that an Austro-Hungarian empire once existed and that Austria warranted a separate peace treaty after the world war. Appeasement is generally well-known and good answers were able to offer at least three reasons why Britain followed that policy. Occasionally reasons were known but candidates failed to develop them into an explanation. Some failed to focus on the question as set, straying into the disadvantages appeasement brought. In response to part **(c)**, there were many candidates who very ably described the several meetings between Chamberlain and Hitler in 1938, including Munich, in great detail but who never got closer to the question than by saying, in relation to Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1939, that 'this led them to lose trust in Hitler' or 'this ended appeasement'. Clearly, for many candidates Czechoslovakia is but one of a number of events that centres deal with as Europe moves to war in 1939 but whose significance is not fully understood. That said, the course of events relating to Czechoslovakia in 1938-39 was better understood than the significance of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. All too often the Pact was described and then its significance for Stalin both in the short and the mid terms was explained. It was as if the phrase 'causing war' in the question was irrelevant. Again, Hitler's claim to former German land, now the Sudetenland, predominated.

Question 7

After referring to Churchill's speech, most candidates wrote about the east-west divide. Some would describe the ideological division. A few candidates only wrote about the 'curtain' dividing the two Germanys and some thought it referred to the Berlin Wall or the blockade. Answers to **(b)** were predominantly descriptive. Candidates would start with the zoning of Germany. Then they would move to the zoning of Berlin, without getting to grips with the question. Better answers began to develop some understanding if the issue of the Blockade was addressed. Many answers were stronger on the West than on the successes of the USSR. Many candidates referred to the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan but the weaker answers rarely moved further than description. It was encouraging to see some answers referring to Greece, although equally some forgot about the relevance of the Berlin airlift.

Question 8

Very few candidates did not write, by way of introduction, about the USA and Batista before he was overthrown in **(a)**. There were candidates who secured high marks by making references to trade, with many references to sugar but there were others who were confused about American-Cuban, Cuban-Soviet relations before the Bay of Pigs. For **(b)**, most candidates emphasised the nuclear threat to mankind and to the USA: rarely did one see references to the strengthening of communism in the American sphere of influence, the arms race and the threat to the USA's supremacy. It was the end of the world scenario, MAD etc. that preoccupied many candidates. In **(c)**, there were many good responses. Most candidates came down on the side of Kennedy because the missiles were withdrawn from Cuba. Some referred to his decision not to invade Cuba or to retaliate when the U2 plane was shot down over Cuba, as being wise. Many referred to his decision to ignore Khrushchev's second letter, without explaining its significance. Where a counter-argument was attempted, candidates talked of the withdrawal of US missiles from Turkey and that the USA would not invade Cuba. Many could see success for Khrushchev in terms of maintaining Soviet influence so close to the USA.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Many candidates found part **(a)** a challenge. Almost without exception, there was an awareness of the Freikorps in relation to the Spartacists and the Kapp Putsch and this was often well-documented. Fewer were aware of other activities after 1920. Answers to **(b)** were often strong, with explanations based on the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Ruhr invasion, the collapse of trade and hyperinflation. References to the Munich Putsch were rarely awarded more than Level 2 because the development was descriptive rather than explanatory, with candidates writing about the course of the putsch, rather than its impact. Many answers to **(c)** were strong, with good explanation on both sides, although the positives were often stronger than the negatives. Some candidates were content to offer basic statements such as 'Stresemann created a new currency' or 'Stresemann ended passive resistance in the Ruhr' or even 'American loans reduced unemployment'. Being able to select the main points is only half of the task. It is important to develop the points to show understanding and explanation.

Question 10

Either candidates knew about self-sufficiency (part **(a)**), or they did not. A majority of candidates appeared never to have come across the term before, often writing about the Nazi education system. In **(b)**, many responses were compromised by bracketing gypsies, homosexuals and the handicapped with the Jews, whilst other candidates wrote at length of killing techniques. Answers to **(c)** were much stronger. Most candidates were able to provide information relevant to both sides of the question, dealing with School and the Hitler Youth as opposed to the 'Swing' and 'Pirates' opposition. Better answers even challenged the idea of control in relation to the Hitler Youth by stating that it had to be made compulsory.

Question 11

It was rare to find a response that did not refer to the 'carrot and stick' method and illustrate one or other, or both. This was not just the kernel of many responses but sometimes the entirety, but with developed explanation, it scored highly. Responses to **(b)** were often general. Shortage of food, employment grievances and references to poor living conditions predominated. Better answers made reference to the specific problems in 1912, although perhaps could have made more of the many promises made by the Tsar which remained unfulfilled. Part **(c)** elicited many worthy to good responses. Where there were problems was in structuring a response and not letting one factor slip into another. Where greater clarity existed, explanation was developed in relation to the Tsar being personally associated with defeats, poor management of the war, Rasputin's influence, hostility to the Tsarina and general discontent.

Question 12

Many answers were able to provide a description of Stalin's actions and roles in the leadership contest but some were less confident about linking these to his 'qualities' of character. Answers to **(b)** were wide ranging. Most were able to explain why there was a struggle between Stalin and Trotsky, whilst better answers looked at the widest issues involving different personnel. References were made to the Testament and the different views of Communism which the two main rivals held. Part **(c)** answers were often at a good level. Most candidates had plenty of material to work on but here, as in other **(c)** responses, not all were effective in the development a relevant point.

Question 13

For the well-prepared candidate, producing four points in relation to prosperity in the 1920s was not difficult. Cheaper, mass produced goods predominated, followed by increased wealth and affordable pastimes. Some thought the question was purely about social change and took the opportunity to introduce flappers and smoking in public, etc. In **(b)**, there were numerous references to 'Birth of a Nation', but not all developed its significance. Candidates knew of examples of prejudice but did not develop them in relation to the question. Inevitably there were candidates who wrote at length about lynchings and other unsavoury activities. Examiners saw many good examples of why Prohibition was not a success, producing many well-explained points. Some spent too long on the reasons why Prohibition was introduced, when these points might have provided the basis for evaluation to support the hypothesis in the question.

Question 14

Most candidates were aware of the Hundred Days and what happened during this time (part **(a)**), producing many good responses. Candidates were often strong on the banking crisis and the 'alphabet agencies'. Fewer mentioned Roosevelt's 'fireside chats'. Some, perhaps unintentionally, wrote as if all had been achieved by the end of this initial period. Examiners commented on the fact they had seen many good answers to part **(b)**, with much detail about the TVA and the impact of its work. There were also many strong, but one-sided, answers to part **(c)**, particularly with reference to the benefits of the New Deal in creating jobs and improving infrastructure. The problems of the New Deal rarely moved past the idea of the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

failure with regard to reducing unemployment, although a small number did consider the limited effect on black Americans. Farm workers and the issue of workers' rights rarely gained a mention.

The limited numbers of responses to **Questions 15-19** prevent useful comment.

Question 20

Most explained 'Zionism' at great length, with many giving a long-term history to support their answer to part **(a)**. Candidates should realise that for five marks only four relevant points are required, and that valuable time consumed here could be used more profitably elsewhere. The better answers to **(b)** looked both at the violence which pressurised Britain to leave and also the problems Britain was facing at that time, following a long and expensive period of war. Comments about the influence of the United Nations added to the quality of answers, although in weaker answers this was often missing. Examiners did comment again about the over-long answers but at the same time recognised the high level of explanation produced. There were many balanced answers to **(c)**, often developing the deep-rooted problems which supported the idea that war was unavoidable. On the other side, actions which could have been taken to avoid conflict were fully considered, with many pointing out the weaknesses of Britain and the United Nations.

Question 21

Plenty of general points were made in **(a)** about refugees' treatment in camps which lacked basic necessities. Generally, points were well-made, although there was limited detail of where these camps were. Part **(b)** answers varied in quality, although the vast majority of candidates possessed a wealth of information about terrorism. Most gave the history of the Palestinian cause, with examples of attention-seeking acts of terrorism. Examiners did comment on the amount of 'saturation coverage', rather than direct attempts to answer the question. Most candidates, in answering part **(c)**, produced a balanced answer, using examples of terrorist acts to consider 'effectiveness'. Some candidates might have found it beneficial to think more carefully about their response before starting to write, to ensure that they have clarity about the demands of the question. In these instances there were numerous examples of PLO operations, although the effectiveness of these operations was not always considered.

The limited numbers of responses to **Questions 22-25** prevents useful comment.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

General comments

Previous reports have referred to the significant majority of candidates who have been able to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. This year is no exception. It was clear that many candidates communicated their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features, or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement.

Teachers had, quite rightly, reminded their candidates that part **(a)** questions require short, descriptive answers which are probably no more than a paragraph in length. The emphasis is on recalling accurate details, rather than explanation.

However, parts **(b)** and **(c)** demand explanation. Few marks are awarded for narrative or 'setting the scene'. Candidates who score highly are able to stick to the point, apply their knowledge to the precise requirements of the question, and develop each of the identified factors fully. In part **(c)**, the mark scheme rewards those who argue both for and against the focus of the question, and reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated, by addressing 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Poorer candidates will tend to rely on retelling the story and including irrelevant information.

Comments on specific questions

The comments which follow do not imply that a question was answered badly. They are intended to help Centres in improving the preparation of their candidates. Comments are not made on every part of every question written about.

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

This was answered by a limited number of candidates. Part **(a)** answers tended to be very general and confined to Metternich and the Emperor's departure from Vienna. A wider approach might have dealt with the establishment of the parliament and Central Committee, and with the reassertion of Imperial control at the end of 1848. Parts **(b)** and **(c)** attracted vague responses which could have focused on specific events in France, Austria, Prussia, Italy and Hungary.

Question 2

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

Question 3

There were many good answers to part **(a)**, with attention being given to basic agricultural and industrial processes, the restrictiveness of the class system and the fear of foreign influences. Acceptable points might also have included the lack of education in Japan and how poor technology hindered development. Some answers to part **(b)** drifted away from the point of the question, by merely repeating the terms of the Alliance or explaining why Britain, rather than Japan, wished to sign the Alliance. Better candidates appreciated the advantages for Japan of Britain's support regarding Korea and the Russian threat. In part **(c)**, many answers only identified the effects of the war with Russia and ought to have gone further by discussing, in detail, expansion into Korea and the establishment of dominance in the Far East. There was a lack of balance because only rarely were alternative factors included, such as military reform, university

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

education, constitutional change and industrial growth. Unfortunately there was some confusion with later events in Manchuria and the 1930s.

Question 4

In part **(a)**, candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the assassination of Franz Ferdinand. Sometimes there was too much detail and time was wasted writing a complete narrative from the 1890s onwards instead of precisely responding to the date in the question which was the 28 June 1914.

The mark scheme for part **(b)** rewarded answers which dealt with the German threat to Britain up to 1914. While the Naval Race and colonial rivalries were identified, there was little detail beyond information about Dreadnoughts and Germany wanting a 'place in the sun'. This limited marks within Level 2. To gain Level 3 marks would have required explanation of the German threat in the North Sea, the Moroccan crises, the challenge to the Entente Cordiale or Germany's industrial and imperial growth.

Part **(c)** responses were spoiled by lack of developed explanation. Here, there were opportunities to discuss, on the one hand, Britain's guarantee to Belgium and, on the other hand, the Moroccan Crisis, the French desire for revenge after 1870, events in the Balkans as well as further detail of naval and imperial tensions.

Question 5

This was a very popular question. Part **(a)** was well answered, although some candidates incorrectly claimed that the Rhineland and Sudetenland counted as territorial losses at Versailles. Regrettably, part **(b)** attracted descriptions only of the terms of the Treaty, gaining few marks. Better candidates linked these terms to post- war problems, such as the unemployment caused by the reduction of the military, attempts to overthrow the Republic, and the impact of reparations on the German economy. Some dwelt on inflation and mistakenly thought that hyper-inflation was caused by the need to pay reparations. Nevertheless, good candidates were able to seize the chance to make links between the Treaty and the Ruhr invasion and even the Munich Putsch.

Responses to part **(c)** which only described the aims of the Big Three, did not progress beyond Level 2. Well developed answers explained precisely why each representative would have been satisfied and dissatisfied by the final terms when measured against their aims. Lloyd George was sometimes merely described as holding the 'middle ground', without any explanation of whether he achieved his aims.

Question 6

A significant majority of candidates scored well on part **(a)**. They were capable of linking Hitler's measures with his preparations for war. Care should be taken with the date in the question (1938) as some went beyond and incorrectly included the Nazi Soviet Pact. No credit was given for the 1934 Anschluss or the retaking of the Saar in 1935. Many made a good attempt at part **(b)**, explaining fully the Sudeten issue and the strategic and industrial importance of Czechoslovakia. A common misconception was that Germany lost the Sudetenland at the Versailles Settlement.

Answers to part **(c)** were often well argued, with good attempts to put the case for and against appeasement. It was pleasing to see responses which went beyond repeating points already made, going on to explain the extent to which appeasement was the only realistic policy at that time. Candidates gained no marks where they wrongly linked appeasement to the activities of the League of Nations.

Question 7

Part **(a)** posed few problems and was well done. Only a minority confused Yalta and Potsdam. Many gained maximum marks concentrating on the division of Berlin and Germany, the Polish issue, the setting up of the UNO and the Soviet sphere of influence. In part **(b)**, quality answers dealt effectively with the impact of the changes of heads of state, suspicion of the A bomb and the expansion of the Soviet army. Part **(c)** required a precise focus on 1945 to 1949; hence NATO was accepted but not Korea, nor the Warsaw Pact, nor references to the Berlin Wall. Many candidates were perfectly capable of arguing about the successes and failures of both the USA and USSR by concentrating on the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and Berlin Airlift, then going on to develop points about Soviet expansion, the Berlin Blockade and the setting up of Comecon and Cominform. It is worth emphasising that those who avoided a narrative of each feature, but linked their knowledge to success and failure, scored more highly.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 8

This remains a popular topic but, disappointingly, a minority of answers continued to confuse details of the Missile Crisis when the focus is on events up to and including the Bay of Pigs. This is the case with part **(a)** and part **(b)**. Still, there were many good answers to part **(a)**, detailing the diplomatic and commercial breakdown in relations between the USA and Cuba. Two or three developed points would attract maximum marks. In part **(b)** it was important to make explicit links between the Bay of Pigs and US anger over the Cuban nationalisation programme, Castro's communist beliefs and the growing relationship with the USSR. Candidates clearly possessed a great deal of knowledge about part **(c)**. The most effective approach was to agree with the statement in the first paragraph then produce the counter argument in the next paragraph; a final conclusion would assess the extent of Khrushchev's victory. A minority of candidates had not planned a clear line of argument and answers became disorganised.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Candidates knew the more obvious points about the Spartacist rising to score well in part **(a)**. They recognised its leaders, its communist aims, and they understood its defeat. Part **(b)** gave an opportunity to explain the Ruhr invasion and hyper-inflation; many candidates occasionally lapsed into narrative. As mentioned previously, there is a common misconception that reparations caused hyper-inflation rather than the government's response to the invasion of the Ruhr. It was encouraging to see so many secure responses to part **(c)**, with good explanations of both foreign and domestic failures and successes. Many candidates explained the end of hyper-inflation alongside the Dawes and Young plans (which could be used in either a foreign or domestic context), the Locarno Pact and admission to the League. Candidates could link each feature and explain its success or failure. Many could also deal effectively with the cultural freedom of Weimar while also explaining why part of the political class continued to despise the new Republic.

Question 10

In part **(a)**, answers tended to be very limited to references derived from the source or to general descriptions about how boys and girls were prepared for adulthood in the Nazi state. Only a few went on to describe changes in curriculum and fewer still recognised the role played by the Nazi Teachers' League. Part **(b)** brought better responses, although some did tend to be descriptive. The key was to explain the importance of indoctrination, preparation for adult life, control and loyalty by developing each point thoroughly. Merely identifying each factor would lead only to a Level 2 mark. Disappointingly, part **(c)** answers were often one sided, concentrating on the opposition of youth groups. Only a handful of candidates could explain the continuing loyalty for the Nazi regime during the Second World War such as the cult of Hitler, France's defeat, and the loyalty and sacrifices of factory workers.

Question 11

In part **(a)**, many candidates possessed a good knowledge of Tsarist rule, concentrating on the support provided by the Church, nobility and secret police. Better candidates provided details of the way the Tsar's autocracy worked; weaker ones merely stated that the Tsar had total power and ruled alone.

There were some impressive explanations in part **(b)**, particularly of the impact of defeat in the 1904-5 war, and of Bloody Sunday. A minority of answers relied on generalised comments about harsh conditions, food shortages and repression without relating these to specific events in 1905. In part **(c)**, there were some real strengths. Most responses referred to Stolypin's policy of repression, and the failure of the Dumas. Credit was also given for some explanation of Stolypin's agricultural, industrial and health reforms. Rasputin was introduced as a sign of the Tsar's weakness.

Question 12

Answers to this question tended to be less strong. Those who referred to imagery, art, Social Realism, the rewriting of the history of the Russian Revolution – even the naming of features of Russian towns, scored well in part **(a)**.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

However, responses to part **(b)** tended to lack detail relating to, for example, Lenin's will, Trotsky's exclusion, Stalin's power base and the removal of Zinoviev and Kamenev. Limited answers relied on descriptions of Stalin's role as General Secretary or of the way Trotsky was tricked over Lenin's funeral. A minority failed to stop at 1929 and gained no credit taking the explanation into the 1930s.

A lack of balance characterised attempts at part **(c)**. The more obvious aspects of control were explained, such as the Purges. However, there was less secure knowledge about the difficulties Stalin faced in controlling people's personal lives or in dealing with passive resistance. The view that Stalin's repressive measures were a sign of weakness was also overlooked and would have gained credit.

Question 13

The social side of part **(a)** was well covered, although some candidates were sidetracked into describing the economic boom before the Wall Street Crash. Part **(b)** brought some extremely sound explanations relating to smuggling, moonshine, speakeasies and the corrupt relationship between law enforcement and gang leaders. Less strong answers drifted into narrative, mainly about Capone and gang violence.

Encouragingly, there were many strong part **(c)** responses which covered the place of women and immigrants in society, as well as the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. The best answers were balanced and could use their knowledge of the changing role of women as evidence of a more and a less tolerant society. Candidates found it easier to deal with the intolerant arguments, which could confine them to Level 3.

Question 14

It was rare to see a weak answer to part **(a)**, while opposition to the New Deal, asked in part **(b)**, was less thoroughly known. Generalised comments about the attitudes of laissez-faire Republicans predominated. Good candidates were able to show their understanding of 'rugged individualism', constitutional and federal issues, the problem of expense and accusations of socialist dictatorship. Others explored the role of individuals who opposed Roosevelt. Part **(c)** reflected good preparation for the examination as many were able to construct well supported, balanced arguments to assess the relative success of the New Deal.

Questions 15 to 23

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

Question 24

Generalised answers to part **(a)** tended to be confined to references to the Opium Wars and attempts by Europeans to secure trading rights. The mark scheme also rewarded details about favoured status, concessions allowed after 1895, the nature of trade with, for example, Britain, as well as Chinese efforts to maintain a degree of isolation. Part **(b)** brought a descriptive approach to the Boxer Rising, rewarded at Level 2. A more developed Level 3 would have included explanation of 'significance', such as anti-foreigner feeling, frustration with government, resentment of European trading rights and of missionaries. Again, answers to part **(c)** tended to be rather vague and only carried more obvious points about the opium trade and Chinese dislike of change and foreign interference. Hence coverage was related to the status quo and there was little about the changes or the roles of individuals like Emperor Guangxu and the Dowager Cixi.

Question 25

Part **(a)** was well answered by those who attempted it; there was a great deal of in-depth knowledge of the results of the Berlin Conference. Part **(b)** responses were characterised by undeveloped lists of reasons for colonisation, including references to extending power, patriotism, trade and Imperial ambition. These answers, with further explanation, would have moved candidates from a Level 2 mark to Level 3.

In part **(c)**, there was broad coverage of a wide range of significant strategic, social, economic, religious and cultural factors. Clearly, this reflected some sound knowledge, although each factor could have been supported with specific examples, as well as more balance in defining the interpretation of 'civilisation'.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

General comments

The majority of candidates were entered for the twentieth century option, and in general the standards reached were higher on that option. There were plenty of excellent scripts, with candidates showing the ability to analyse the sources and to buttress their answers with sound contextual knowledge. Weaker candidates were often those who were not entirely familiar with the requirements of this paper, and it is worth repeating some of the points made in previous reports.

(a) It is necessary to answer the question set. If this is 'Are you surprised by X?' then candidates should begin their answers with a statement directly responding to the question - ' *I do find X surprising because....'.* If the question is 'Do you believe Y?' then it is best to begin with - ' *There is / is not a good reason to believe Y because...'.*

(b) Utility questions are never simply about the information clearly contained within the source. Some marks can be obtained by treating the source as information. Lower marks still go to those who dismiss the source/s as being biased, so unreliable or useless. The higher level answers adopt a more critical approach and seek to evaluate the source content. The best candidates see that a source can be useful to reveal the attitudes or purpose of the author, despite or even because of the unreliable information contained within it. The provenance given with the source is often a clue to this approach.

(c) Cartoons need to have been examined regularly in preparation. They are often misleading in the sense that their meaning is often the exact opposite of what they appear to be saying; and there are often several possible messages contained within them. The key to finding the overall message is to consider the cartoon as a whole rather than focusing on individual small details within them.

(d) **Question 6** requires a very straightforward approach for high marks to be gained. There will be a hypothesis which candidates are asked to test against the sources. Failure to refer to any source will result in low marks. Each source can and should be used in the answer. There will always be some sources which support the proposition and some which do not. Candidates should at least seek to find one source on either side. They must, however, do more than just show an awareness that a source is on one side or the other. They must show how it is, by explaining how the content of the source supports / opposes the hypothesis. They can obtain extra marks by evaluating the source/s against their knowledge, though these bonus marks are not awarded for stock comments about source types such as ' not reliable because it's a cartoon so only a picture '.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth Century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered quite well. There were some obvious agreements such as the population differential between North and South. Disagreements were more difficult to find, but they were there, e.g. in the suggestion in Source A that the South had virtually no hope whilst in B they might have had if they had followed Lee's strategy. Higher marks were reserved for those who could explain both agreement and disagreement.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

The cartoon was not difficult for candidates to interpret, although a minority did little more than describe it, and some got drawn into weak interpretations by focusing on minor details such as rats, rather than on the whole picture. There were some misinterpretations which generally were from those who took the cartoon to be a Southern complaint about shortages of food etc. However, although most could see that this was a Northern source, ridiculing the military weakness of the South, few really set out to answer the question. The question asked why it was published, and particularly why in 1861. Both aspects needed to be considered in order to reach higher levels. For example, ' it was published to boost Northern morale after the setbacks of 1861 by mocking the Southern army'.

Question 3

Candidates found this question difficult. Many just described Source D, rather than interpreting its message, for example, 'South is fighting North and the Union is breaking'. Source E itself posed much greater problems for candidates. Many thought the two figures beside Lincoln represented North and South and used this for a false comparison with D. Few managed to place the source in the context of the question posed by the paper as a whole, and thus to see that the source reprinted the financial problems facing Lincoln in pursuing the war, whilst D had both sides in financial difficulty. No candidates actually managed the highest level by looking at the viewpoints of the two cartoonists.

Question 4

A surprising number answered the wrong question, i.e. writing that they were surprised by Source F. Otherwise, it was not too difficult to realise that there was an apparent tension between F and G, so one might have expected Davis to dismiss Lee, or to see that the tension was more apparent than real as Davis had little choice but to retain Lee as the latter was still supported by his men. Both elements together led to high marks; there was scope here also for some context about the battle of Gettysburg to inform the answer.

Question 5

All questions which ask why something was said/drawn/done require a reason to be included in the answer. Reasons can vary widely, but the simplest level is usually along the lines of ' *to show what was happening*', whilst the highest level usually involves looking at the purpose of the author. In this question Lee is not just explaining the defeat which has just occurred, he is also seeking to justify it, to explain it away as inevitable and no fault of his or of the army.

Question 6

In addition to the advice given in the general comments, it must be stressed that candidates need to focus on the question which was set. Candidates did not always see what was relevant to the issue of the financial position, but this was certainly not a question asking whether the North won the Civil War, nor even a question asking why the North won. The question was whether the North's financial strength was decisive, allowing candidates to suggest other factors, of which there were plenty, from the sources, as well as looking at the given factor.

Option B: Twentieth Century topic

Question 1

This type of question, asking the candidates to compare two sources, is quite common as an initial question. There are several failings of technique in candidates' answers which can depress their marks. The question simply asks candidates to find agreements or/and disagreements between the two sources. It is not a question about reliability; it does not ask for any evaluation or reference to other sources. It does not require the use of contextual knowledge. What it does require is careful reading of the two sources, and then an identification of points in both which can be matched for an agreement or disagreement. These matches need to be precise, and about the same point. So, in these sources there is an agreement, for example, that Jaruzelski declared martial law, or that Solidarity members were imprisoned. There is not, for example, an agreement that the Soviets influenced matters; this is in Source B only. Disagreements must also be precise. It is not a disagreement to say that Soviet influence is mentioned in one source but not the other. There is a disagreement as to whether opposition was completely subdued **(A)** or survived **(B)**; and so on.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

The easiest initial move with questions like this is to compare the two sources and find a difference between them which makes one surprising. Most found this a straightforward exercise here, with Walesa seen as almost a terrorist in C but a peacemaker in D. Weaker answers either misread C completely, seeing it as a Government plan of action, or simply neglected to say whether the difference was surprising. But better candidates go on to look at the possibility that one should not be surprised also in this case because of the origins and purposes of the two sources. So, it would hardly be surprising that the Communist government wanted to portray Solidarity in such a way at a time when they were trying to suppress it.

Question 3

There was some misreading of the source, where it was seen as a threat to Solidarity by the government but the question was generally well answered, with most candidates being able to see the message of the source and put it in the context of 1981. Fewer explored the purpose of the source along the lines of ' to turn Poles into supporting Solidarity and opposing the government '.

Question 4

There were so many ways of interpreting these two cartoons, especially F, that most candidates were able to find at least one sub-message, for example, that Russia wanted to see Soldarity crushed. Some candidates thought that they had done this when in fact what they had done was described a source, for example, 'the message of F is that the Polish Government wants to kill Solidarity but Solidarity is too fast for it to catch '. This is just description. It needs to be explained in the context of the situation. The overall message of the two sources seemed to be that in Source G Solidarity was rather helpless, under the control of the authorities, but in F it was not.

Question 5

There were many answers here which simply asserted that everything the general said was true, and in line with the candidate's knowledge. This is very low level. There must be some specific cross-reference to other sources or to contextual knowledge to allow the claims made to be checked. Better answers immediately saw that in the light of events in Hungary, for example, it was very likely that the Soviets would have made such threats. Many answers tried to use the provenance but got no further than asserting that he was trying to excuse himself, to pass the blame for martial law to the Soviets. Some did see that the date / place of the interview was important but few really capitalised on this by pointing out that it took place after the fall of the Soviet empire and therefore it was likely that the general was seeking to make a favourable impression in the West by distancing himself from anything oppressive.

Question 6

This type of question has been dealt with in the general comments. However, there was one major problem specific to this question. Large numbers of answers assumed that 'Soviets' simply meant 'Communists', rather than the USSR. This led them to argue that the Soviets were responsible in almost every source. Even Source I, which clearly says that the weakness of the Polish Communist party was a factor, was seen as evidence of Soviet weakness because it starts by referring to the decline of the Communist party. This basic error meant that marks were generally lower than normal on this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

General comments

The number of candidates taking the examination for IGCSE History continues to increase each year. The overall standard of answers showed some improvement compared to previous years. It was encouraging to see so many candidates using, interpreting and evaluating historical sources so well. The twentieth century option remains by far the more popular of the two options, although a small minority of candidates did attempt to answer the questions in both sections.

The candidates' knowledge and understanding of the historical context remain important strengths. However, there are still some areas where a number of candidates still struggle.

Firstly, candidates should be strongly encouraged to spend time working through the sources and working out their answers before they put pen to paper. It is clear that many candidates are still unclear about what their answer is, even when they are halfway through writing it. A simple rule can be applied - decide what your answer is going to be before you start writing it. This will then enable candidates to follow the second important rule (for answering **Questions 1-5**) - answer the question directly in the first sentence of your answer. For example, if a question asks 'What is the message of this cartoon?' the answer should begin, 'The message of this cartoon is...' At the moment quite a number of candidates write generally about the source and the context and only address the question directly in the last few lines of the answer.

Some candidates still struggle with comparison questions. They simply summarise each source and then claim that they agree or disagree. Comparisons need to be made point by point, for example, by explaining what one source says about a particular issue, then explaining how the other source agrees or disagrees about that issue. Then move on to make another comparison. Candidates should be aware that almost every time such questions are set, there will be scope for both agreements and disagreements to be found.

Some candidates still struggle with reading the overall message or argument of a source. They are very good at focusing on points of detail but less good on working out the 'big point' that a cartoonist or a writer is trying to make. When faced with questions about the message of a cartoon, it might help candidates if they think about the cartoonist and ask themselves - what is the opinion/point of view of the cartoonist - is he or she approving or disapproving of what is shown happening in the cartoon?

Evaluation of sources is still an area that causes problems for a number of candidates. There is still much simplistic evaluation based on undeveloped use of provenance. This often comes in the form of claiming that a source is reliable simply because it is, for example, a photograph, or it is unreliable simply because it was written long after the event or because the author/artist is biased. There are three methods for evaluating sources. Firstly, candidates can consider the tone and language of the source. Secondly, they can use their knowledge or other sources in the paper to check the claim being made in the source. Thirdly, they can use their contextual knowledge to consider the purpose of the author/artist of the source. However, this needs to be done in an informed way. Not all these methods will work with all sources and the real challenge for candidates is to decide which is the most appropriate method for each particular source.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth Century topic

Question 1

This question was answered reasonably well, with most candidates realising that the two sources needed to be compared in terms of what they have to say about the causes of the American Civil War. Candidates found it easier to find the disagreements than the agreements. They should be aware of the fact that with

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

questions such as this one there are always both agreements and disagreements to be found. Some candidates wrote about the sources generally, or summarised one after the other, without pinpointing any actual agreements or disagreements. Comparisons should be made point by point, and not source by source.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to find the disagreement between the two sources. Davis makes it clear that slavery was not the cause of the Civil War while Stephens in Source C suggests that it was. Better candidates realised that before one can judge whether or not Source D proves C to be wrong, the sources have to be evaluated. This was done either through contextual knowledge or by reference to other sources in the paper. It is important that having completed the evaluation, candidates then use it to answer the question. Some carried out the evaluation but failed to use it to address the question.

Question 3

This question presented candidates with a problem that had to be carefully thought through. It produced an interesting range of answers. A few candidates misinterpreted the cartoon and claimed it shows John Brown arming slaves (despite what they were told under the source). Other candidates went for the obvious answer - they were surprised that a planter was arming his slaves. Better candidates placed their answers in the context of John Brown's raid and the situation in 1859 and explained why they were not surprised. The best answers focused on whether or not they were surprised that the cartoon had been drawn and published and investigated its possible purpose.

Question 4

Most candidates were able to find agreements and/or disagreements between Sources F and G and base their answers on them. To reach the higher levels of the mark scheme candidates needed to use some knowledge of Lincoln to explain that he would have been sympathetic to the idea that the dispute should be resolved or that war should be avoided. Only a small number of candidates were able to do this.

Question 5

There were many good and valid interpretations of this cartoon and the question was answered well. Most candidates at least understood that the cartoon is saying that North and South are breaking up the Union. However, it was good to see so many candidates going beyond this and adding to their answers the implications of the dispute/split for the slave who can be seen in the background. The best answers were those that focused on the cartoonist's opinion of what is shown i.e. he is criticising the quarrel - he is saying how foolish the North and South are for breaking up the Union, and that nobody but the slave can benefit from what will happen.

Question 6

This question was answered reasonably well but there were some candidates who made little or no use of the sources. These candidates could have ended up with a significantly higher total mark if they had answered this question well. It is both surprising and disappointing to find so many candidates still ignoring the sources and writing an essay about the topic. Candidates can go into this examination confident in the knowledge that this question always works in the same way. There will be some sources that support the statement and there will be other sources that disagree with it. Candidates need to carefully explain, source by source, how the former support the statement and how the latter disagree with it. If Centres want to know where to focus their efforts to improve their results, then **Question 6** is the answer. Some candidates make very general use of the sources, so it is worth repeating below the instructions that appear in the mark scheme for this question.

> *Source use must be reference to a source by letter, by provenance, or by direct quotation. There must be examples from source content. There must be an explanation of how these support or do not support the statement.*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Option B: Twentieth Century topic

Question 1

It is common for the paper to begin with a comparison question similar to this one and it was disappointing to find a number of candidates simply writing in an unfocused way about the sources. Some simply summarised one source after the other, while others claimed to be making a comparison but never got that far. However, a majority of candidates were able to find an agreement - usually over Gorbachev's role. Far fewer found a disagreement, although there were several available. The top levels in the mark scheme were reserved for candidates who understood the big disagreement between the two sources - Source A says the most important reason was the failure of nerve of the elites in Eastern Europe, while Source B says Gorbachev was the most important factor. Candidates should be reminded that comparisons questions require them to analyse the sources carefully before putting pen to paper. Candidates should be annotating the sources to mark disagreements and agreements. Only when they think they have identified these should they write their answer. They are then in a position to produce a clear point-by-point comparison of the sources, rather than a summary of each source.

Question 2

This question was generally answered well, although there are still some candidates who simply describe the surface features of cartoons or interpret one detail in the cartoon and fail to consider the 'big' point that the cartoonist is trying to make. A number of candidates misinterpreted the cartoon, claiming that the strikes and unrest were happening in the Soviet Union. However, a good number of candidates were able to interpret the big message - that things were going wrong for Gorbachev and his policies. Candidates used their contextual knowledge effectively to explain their interpretations. The best candidates realised that the cartoon is putting forward a point of view - the cartoonist is being critical of Gorbachev. When faced with a question about the message of a cartoon, candidates should try to consider the cartoonist's perspective or opinion.

Question 3

A few candidates wrote about the sources in a general way, without ever addressing the issue of utility. With questions such as this one, candidates should try to begin their answers with a direct addressing of the question, for example, 'This source is/is not useful because...' There were some answers based on undeveloped use of provenance, for example, it is useful because it is a photograph, it is not useful because he is remembering what happened years later. These answers received low marks. There is nothing wrong with evaluating the sources but the evaluation must be developed and not simply based on source type, and must be used to then make a judgement about utility. Some candidates think that 'reliable' is the same as 'useful' and as soon as they have decided that a source is, for example, unreliable, they then assert that it is not useful. For some candidates, Source E could not be useful simply because it was said ten years later. The best candidates evaluated the sources properly through cross-reference to their knowledge or to other sources in the paper, and the basis of this evaluation made a judgement about the usefulness of the sources.

Question 4

There was a wide range of answers to this question. The weakest candidates simply repeated the information in the source and then claimed it was reliable. There was also a fair amount of attempted evaluation through undeveloped use of the provenance of the source. Some candidates went slightly further and considered the tone and language of the source as a way of evaluating it. The better candidates used their knowledge of relevant events or other sources in the paper to evaluate the claims being made in Source F. It is not enough to simply tell the Examiner lots of details about the context and then claim that this makes the source reliable. Such knowledge should be used to check particular claims being made by the source being evaluated.

Question 5

Most candidates were comfortable with writing about the 'why 1989?' part of the question. In other words, they were able to tell the Examiner a lot about the context. Such answers could reach Level 4 of the mark scheme. However, what is important is why this particular cartoon was published at that time. To answer this satisfactorily, candidates had to also interpret the message of the cartoon. A good number of candidates argued that the cartoon focuses on the dependency of the Communist regimes on the capitalist West. The

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

best candidates went further and explained that the cartoon is actually celebrating the superiority of the capitalism over communism and placed this in its appropriate historical context.

Question 6

More candidates could have ended up with significantly higher total marks if they had answered this question well. It is both surprising and disappointing to find so many candidates still ignoring the sources and writing an essay about the topic. Candidates can go into this examination confident in the knowledge that this question always works in the same way. There will be some sources that support the statement and there will be other sources that disagree with it. Candidates need to carefully explain, source by source, how the former support the statement and how the latter disagree with it. If Centres want to know where to focus their efforts to improve their results, then **Question 6** is the answer. Some candidates make very general use of the sources, so it is worth repeating below the instructions that appear in the mark scheme for this question.

> *Source use must be reference to a source by letter, by provenance, or by direct quotation. There must be examples from source content. There must be an explanation of how these support or do not support the statement.*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

General Comments

The overwhelming majority of candidates chose the twentieth century option; indeed, there were so few responses to the nineteenth century questions that it is not possible to provide a meaningful report on them. The topic for the twentieth century option was 'How important was Lech Walesa?' This topic was well known and most candidates had a good amount of contextual knowledge which they were able to use in their answers. With one or two small exceptions which are noted in the question-specific comments below, the sources and questions were accessible and posed no particular comprehension problems. Candidates seemed to experience no problems in completing the paper in the time available; in some respects it might even be argued that they have too much time, since a common weakness is for candidates to repeat what sources say or show before getting down to the real business of answering the question. Nonetheless, the general level of responses was high, with many answers showing the ability not merely to comprehend and explain source content, but also to evaluate it.

Comments on specific questions

Option B: Twentieth Century topic

Question 1

Candidates were given two accounts of the early phase in Solidarity's development, and were asked to compare them. In recent sessions, most answers to these kinds of questions show that candidates are aware of the need to make explicit and direct comparisons. It is rare to see an answer that summarises first one source, then the other, with a final assertion that they agree or disagree, though these still exist, and score low marks. The two sources had plenty of similar points of detail – that martial law was imposed, that Solidarity had the support of the Catholic Church, that Solidarity's protests included opposition to higher food prices, and so on. Differences of detail were harder to spot, and were therefore given slightly higher marks – the most obvious of these was that Source B indicated that the Polish government was prepared to compromise, whilst Source A said the government was reluctant to concede any power. Naturally, answers which detected both similarities and differences of detail earned more than those which dealt with only one side. However, the essential disagreement between the two sources was in their estimation of the importance or impact of Solidarity. Source A made it clear that Solidarity was not a serious threat to the established order; it was one of a series of workers' protests, but that was all it was. It did not promise the overthrow of Communist power. Source B had a different view: Solidarity was 'the sharpest challenge to the Soviet system' since 1968. Spotting this fundamental disagreement earned the highest mark. Interestingly, many answers slightly misread Source A and reached an opposite conclusion; that the sources agreed because both showed that Solidarity was a serious threat. The source actually said, 'Solidarity *appears* as the opening shot in the final struggle against Communism.' It continued, 'But (it) is better understood as the last of a series of workers' protests.' In other words, one should *not* see it as part of the story of the overthrow of Communism.

Question 2

This question asked candidates to explain the different impressions of Solidarity given by two sources. The first task was to identify these, and there were plenty of candidates who fell at this first hurdle. Source C was about the importance of the ordinary members of Solidarity, Source D was a picture of the cover of 'Time' magazine, showing Lech Walesa as 'Man of the Year'. The obvious difference was that Source C gave the impression that it was the masses that gave Solidarity its power, whilst Source D stressed the importance of Walesa. However, many candidates thought Walesa was also being described in Source C, and searched fruitlessly for differences about him that simply did not exist. For those who were able to spot the real difference, the next challenge should have been to explain why the impressions differed, yet many failed

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

even to attempt to do this, apparently thinking that identifying was the same as explaining. Better answers saw their way through to providing reasons, though these had to be developed properly to earn any extra credit. Undeveloped comments about the source provenance – e.g. *They are different because Source C is British and Source D is American* – were not enough. The best candidates were able to explain why (for Source C) the fact that the historian had been present at the Gdansk demonstrations, and had mixed with the demonstrators, would lead him to present the events in a certain way, whilst (for Source D) an American magazine with an anti-Communist agenda would present them differently.

Question 3

This was certainly the question that weaker candidates found hardest to cope with. To understand the source, a reasonable grasp of the context was needed. Many candidates did not have this and assumed, for example, that Kania was still in power, or that martial law had still to be imposed, or that the two people in the source were anti-Communist conspirators. Once this kind of mistake had been made, it was hard to give a sensible reply to the question, though some marks might still be earned for simply identifying something in the source that would or would not be worrying to the Communists. Amongst those who did understand what was going on in the source, an important discriminator was whether or not they made explicit use of the context in their answer. It was possible, by using the detail of the source, to infer that the Communists might be worried, but without giving a contextually informed reason. An important clue here was the obvious reluctance of the Military Commissar to speak honestly. Candidates could infer from this that the Communists might be embarrassed by the source, or that something dishonest was going on, but better answers would use their knowledge of the period, perhaps by mentioning the fear of a resurgence in the strength of Solidarity should the true circumstances of Kania's dismissal become known, to explain why the source would worry the authorities. Finally, explanations could be further enhanced by two additional details. The provenance mentioned that the authorities tried to claim that the source was a forgery – but why would they bother to do this unless it was, in fact, true? The level of embarrassment would be heightened still more by the fact that it was a Military Commissar who was talking. If he did not know what he was talking about, then who would? And what did this say about Jaruzelski, whose decision about martial law was being questioned?

Question 4

This question asked candidates to compare the messages of two cartoons. The first showed Walesa in prison during martial law, the second (from 1989) showed Walesa dragging the Polish Communist Party into the twentieth century. Of course, in order to compare messages these had first to be detected. In general, most answers were able to interpret the cartoons successfully, though there were a few who thought Source F was criticising Walesa for causing problems in Poland. For many candidates, the difficulty arose when they tried to compare. They seemed unaware that true comparisons must be made on the basis of a common criterion, shared by both cartoons. Thus it would be fair enough to say that the cartoons have a different message since Source F shows Walesa as under Communist control, whilst Source G shows the reverse, the Communists under Walesa's control. The common criterion here is the issue of who is in control. A lot of answers were much less explicit. Typically they might have claimed, 'The sources have different messages because in Source F you can see that Walesa is not free, but in Source G you can see that he has the power to control the Communist Party.' Technically such statements have no common basis on which a comparison can be made. The sources actually offered many possibilities, both for similarity and difference, and most answers eventually found their way to at least one valid comparison. However, almost always these were based on details of what the cartoons showed – Walesa weak/strong, free/not free, important in both, Poland's hope in both – rather than on the opinion of the cartoonist (the same person for both cartoons). The best answers were, therefore, those that detected similarities in the cartoonist's opinions about the events portrayed – his sympathy for Walesa, or his hostility to the Communists.

Question 5

This question asked whether Sources H and I proved that Gorbachev was a failure. Since both sources directly addressed this issue, most candidates had little difficulty in demonstrating how failure, or lack of failure, was suggested. What limited many answers was a failure to consider whether these suggestions constituted proof. Another flaw in many answers was a tendency to focus on whether or not Gorbachev was a failure, rather than on whether or not the two sources proved it. This produced some lengthy, unfocused narratives of Gorbachev's career. Nonetheless, taking the two sources at face value, and showing how their content could be used relevantly to indicate success and/or failure, earned reasonable marks – more for dealing with both sides rather than just one. Achieving higher marks meant that the sources had to be evaluated as evidence. This was done in two main ways. First by assessing the accuracy of the claims in the sources against background knowledge of Gorbachev's career or of British and American Cold War

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

attitudes towards the Soviet Union, and second by analysing the possible purposes of the British and Americans in representing Gorbachev in the ways shown in Sources H and I.

Question 6

The requirements of **Question 6** – to test a given hypothesis against the set of sources – should be familiar enough by now, but remarkably a few candidates still fail to use the sources at all, and focus exclusively on the accuracy or otherwise of the hypothesis. This earns a low mark. Another aspect of the exercise is that candidates should always expect the sources to offer evidence both for and against the hypothesis, yet some nonetheless take a clear stand in relation to the hypothesis – in this case, generally that Walesa was not a crucial factor, thus covering only one side - again significantly limiting the number of marks that can be scored. The most important point to report, however, is that some candidates have considerable problems in using the content of a source to illustrate how it either does or does not support the hypothesis. It is commonplace to read comments that show awareness that a source can be used in support of one side or other, but fail to show how. For example: 'Sources H and I did not show that Walesa was a crucial factor, but instead said it was Gorbachev who was crucial.' No credit will be given unless some reference is made to how the content of the stated sources constitutes support, or lack of it, for the hypothesis. Nonetheless, the sources so clearly gave opportunities on both sides of the hypothesis that most candidates were able to achieve a good mark. This generally did not include any marks for source evaluation. Two 'bonus' marks are available for use of a source that does not simply take it at face value, yet these are very rarely scored. They are not awarded for 'stock' comments about source types – 'This cartoon is reliable because it was drawn at the time' etc. – even when these comments actually make some sense. Rather, there needs to be an evaluation of source content that reveals how face-value treatment is not enough. Source D, for example, offered a good opportunity. Clearly it suggests that Walesa was a crucial factor – it calls him 'Man of the Year' – yet it comes from an American magazine that would have had an ulterior purpose in presenting any high-profile opponent of Communism in this way, thus rendering the judgement questionable.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

The number of candidates using the coursework option is slowly increasing. The overall quality of the work remains high, with some really exceptional work being seen by the Moderators. Most candidates clearly put a lot of care and hard work into their responses and achieved high marks. Centres are to be thanked for the careful way in which they present their candidates work, and also enclose copies of assignments, mark schemes and other helpful additional materials. This makes the task of moderating the work so much easier. Most Centres also mark the work in great detail and with care and include comments on candidates' work explaining where and why certain levels and marks have been awarded. There are, however, a small minority of Centres who fail to give any indication of why they have awarded certain marks to particular pieces of work.

The general quality of the marking of the work was high. Most was accurate and pitched at an appropriate level for IGCSE. A small number of Centres had their marks adjusted although these adjustments were usually small ones. The most common reason why Moderators had to adjust marks was, in Assignment 1, the tendency in some Centres to over reward detailed description and rather superficial analysis of causes. Less frequently, the reason for marks being adjusted was to be found in Assignment 2, with simplistic comments about sources being given too many marks.

Assignment 1

The danger in this assignment is that candidates will relapse into description or narrative. Teachers should look carefully at the wording of the questions to make sure that candidates are not given the opportunity. Candidates should only be given very high marks for this assignment if they justify their prioritising of causal factors, show how causal factors are often linked, and demonstrate an understanding of how different types of causal factors operate differently from each other. When candidates state that some causal factors were more important than others, they should support their claims by detailed analysis and argument. This will involve direct comparison of the importance of the causal factors. When candidates are discussing, for example, long and short term causes, they should show a clear understanding of how these differ from each other in terms of their function and how they operate as causal factors. This understanding needs to be demonstrated through actual examples, rather than stated as a learned response. Candidates should be aware that it is the quality of their analyses that will determine their marks, rather than the length or detail of their answer. In the small number of cases where marks were adjusted by Moderators, the responses to Assignment 1 were usually the cause.

Assignment 2

Many of the answers about historical sources were excellent. Many candidates produced thoughtful interpretation and evaluation of sources. A particular strength was the ability to use contextual knowledge and understanding in their analyses of sources. Candidates must not write about the context for its own sake; it should always be used to enable candidates to say something better about the sources. Centres should ensure that the final question in this assignment requires candidates to reach an overall conclusion based on analysis and evaluation of a number of sources. Five sources should be the minimum number used.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41

Alternative to Coursework 41

General Comments

In this season of examinations, candidates almost invariably chose Depth Studies A, B and C. As with all previous seasons, Depth Study A, Germany, 1918-1945 was the most popular choice. Attempts at other Depth Studies appeared largely to be from candidates unsure of the questions set for the Depth Study for which they had prepared. Most scripts had been well organised and neatly written so that all that the candidates wished to convey was accessible to the Examiners. However, there were some poorly written scripts which made efficient marking difficult; there was also a small increase in colloquial terms which are not very impressive in an academic argument.

There appears to be a growing trend of problems with **Questions (a) (iii)**. The answers provided by candidates are beginning to erode the marks that they can achieve. Candidates either write generally of the sources or they attempt 'stock' or incomplete evaluations. Examples will be given in the comments on specific questions, but candidates should be aware that source-based questions require source-based answers, and that any evaluations must be full and relevant, with an explanation of how the comments made by candidates helps to evaluate the source.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Candidates were able to draw many inferences from Source A about attitudes towards Jews in Nazi Germany, and were able to show where, within the source, evidence could be found to support their inferences. Some candidates clearly became angered by the descriptions of the attitudes and treatment and wrote heated answers. Some candidates either repeated the detail of the source only, or wrote answers of contextual knowledge unrelated to the question that had been set. Many candidates were able to offer balanced answer to **Question (a) (ii)** and scored well but a significant minority could only find evidence to show that the government approved of the mistreatment of the Jews. There were some excellent answers to **Question (a) (iii)** which used the detail from the sources and evaluated them by contextual knowledge, tone and language, purpose, cross reference etc. However, many candidates wrote that 'Source A tells us about a Jewish man's experiences on Kristallnacht'. The Examiners need to know what those experiences are; candidates must use source material to answer. Others told Examiners that Source A was reliable because it was an eyewitness account so could be trusted, while others asserted speculatively that his memories over 42 years might have changed, blurred, been exaggerated etc. These two types of answer will score poorly if no source detail is found. Some very good candidates found it easiest to evaluate these sources by cross-referencing what each had to say about the police reaction to the Jews, how the laughing at them in Source A was supported by the order not to interfere with destruction of businesses and apartments in Source B etc.

Many candidates had problems identifying the SS (**Question (b) (i)**). However, there were many that could identify them as bodyguards to Hitler, black uniforms and running concentration camps, and there were references to the Waffen SS. Descriptions in answers to **Question (b) (ii)** were often vivid and understandably emotional. Most asserted that the physically and mentally handicapped were seen as scars on Hitler's racial theories and that these examples received little sympathy, but only a few managed to discuss the development of the programme of euthanasia and the problems this caused between the Nazi Government and the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, many scored well on this question. Many almost repeated their **(b) (ii)** answers in answer to **Question (b) (iii)**, but added other groups of people apart from the mentally and physically handicapped that suffered under Nazi racial policies. However, candidates persisted in description when the question was asking for reasons why racial groups suffered under the Nazis. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on the Final Solution being Hitler's main aim received a variety of treatments. Some stated briefly that they confirmed or denied that it was his major aim, but provided little evidence in support of their arguments, while others wrote long tracts, accepting or denying that the Final

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Solution was Hitler's major aim. Others offered balanced arguments and supporting evidence. The question had certainly made many candidates think deeply.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates were able to draw appropriate and valid inferences from Source A in their answers to **Question (a) (i)**. They readily saw that the Russian workers needed rules and strong management to make Russia an industrial power. Sometimes candidates struggled to find a two-sided argument with regard to Source B but many noticed that the period saw losses and yet Gorbachev still asserted that Stalin's policy had been 'basically correct'. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** still had weak answers that told the Examiner that Source A was about Russian workers and Source B was about Stalin's polices. Stock evaluations include that Source A was by a British historian so he would have had time to research thoroughly, and that Gorbachev was 'a famous Russian'. Better evaluations came from candidates who knew something of Gorbachev's record and history while others recognised that the 'repressive regime', and the strict 'labour regulations' in Source A were very similar to the 'effectiveness of rigid centralisation' in Source B, and thus allowed an effective cross-reference.

Most candidates could answer that Kulaks reacted to collectivisation by burning crops, killing livestock etc. Also, answers to **Question (b) (ii)** showed that most candidates understood that Show Trials were for external consumption and that there would be no justice but much pain. Many candidates scored well here. Candidates had prepared their answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons for Stalin's modernisation of agriculture and again scored well. In answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on whether the Five Year Plans brought benefit to the Soviet Union, candidates tended to accept benefit for the nation as a whole but felt that the workers and peasants shared little of the benefit, with occasional exceptions referring to education, housing and the role of women.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Most candidates were able to find valid inferences about President Harding's optimism for the future in Source A. Candidates performed well here. It was not quite the same case with Source B and **Question (a) (ii)** where candidates often found evidence in the source to demonstrate the weaknesses in the American economy but only the better candidates could find evidence like consumer spending, cheap credit and untaxed wealth as strengths – even though many of these factors would undermine the American economy later. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** made weak attempts, with Source A 'being very optimistic about the future' and Source B being from an American economic history book in 2001, so the writer will have had time 'to research all the facts'. Better candidates evaluated with comments about the content of Harding's inaugural speech by saying it would have been inappropriate on that particular occasion to have delivered a pessimistic message, while others saw how the hopes of Harding's speech had or had not been delivered by 1929 in Source B. There were many good examples of cross-referencing here.

There were many candidates who could nominate two American Presidents, other than Harding, in the 1920s. However, some nominated F D Roosevelt and some nineteenth-century presidents were also nominated. **Question (b) (ii)** asked for a description of the effects of mass production on American workers. However, a significant minority interpreted the question to mean general benefits of mass production and the workers were mentioned only in passing. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)**, asking why some regions did not share in the prosperity of the 1920s, provoked some thoughtful answers, not only using the term to mean geographical regions but also industrial and/or agricultural regions. There were many full and well-rewarded answers. Answers on the extent that government policies were responsible for the economic boom of the 1920s were very mixed. Some candidates did not completely understand which government policies applied here. Nevertheless most were fluent in non-government policies.

Depth Studies D, E, F, G and H

There were too few attempts at the questions set for these Depth Studies to make useful comment.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework 42

General Comments

Germany was again the most popular Depth Study in this season of examinations and for this variant of the paper. Depth Study A was followed in popularity by Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941, and Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941. There were also a significant number of attempts at questions set for Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994, and some attempts at Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990. However, the number of attempts at questions set for other Depth Studies, in this particular session, were too few to enable helpful and useful comments to be made.

For the huge majority of candidates, scripts were neatly set out and the hand writing was clear enough to make all that the candidates wished to convey accessible to Examiners. Also, very few candidates appeared to have problems in organising their time, which meant that most answers were given due time and consideration. A few candidates are still writing in very pale inks.

There appears to be something of a growing problem developing with the answers to all **Questions (a) (iii)**. Marks achieved are being lowered by two clear problems. Candidates are either telling Examiners what the sources are saying generally rather than specifically, or they are providing 'stock' or incomplete evaluations of the sources. Examples will be given under 'Comments on specific questions', but candidates must be aware that source-based questions must receive source-based answers.

It was very pleasing to note how many candidates clearly enjoyed the challenges set by the questions for their chosen Depth Studies.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945

Most candidates were able to make valid inferences about Source A in their answers to **Question (a) (i)**, and show where, within the source, supporting evidence could be found. Many scored well on this question but some weaker candidates did not understand fully who was 'to eat the soup'. Equally, it was pleasing to note that many candidates saw that the use of 'His Majesty' showed that the Kaiser was still held in respect, by the military, at least. In answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, it soon became clear that many candidates thought that the German Government had collapsed in November 1918, and that this was finally signalled by the flight of the Kaiser to Holland. Better candidates were able also to point out that there had been a smooth transfer of power from Prince Max of Baden to a six-man moderate socialist government, followed by the declaration of a republic. In other words, government continued but in a new form. Weaker answers to **Question (a) (iii)** said that Source A was about 'who was going to make peace' and that Source B was about 'the collapse of the German Government at the end of the war'. No actual source detail was found in these answers. Weak or 'stock' evaluations of this question included 'Ludendorff would know what happened as he was there' and the British historian, writing in 1997, 'would have had plenty of time to complete his research'. Better candidates gave the context of Ludendorff's war efforts and his current health problems, set against the severity of the crisis facing the Army High Command, while others compared the respect for the Kaiser in Source A and the increasing signs disobedience in Source B, and the respect for the Kaiser in Source A against his gradual removal from control of matters to his flight in Source B.

Many candidates were able to score well in answers to **Question (b) (i)**, although there were many misconceptions about what territories Germany had lost in the Treaty of Versailles, with Austria being the most common error. Many candidates scored high marks on **Question (b) (ii)** on the Spartacist Revolt with good descriptions of context, personalities, outcomes and impact. Sadly, there were a few who thought that the question referred to Hitler and the Munich Putsch. Details of the Freikorps were well known too, but the question asked why it was important. Candidates often failed to develop reasons and gave descriptions of

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

events surrounding the Freikorps. However, some very good marks were awarded. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, on the extent to which Weimar governments were successful in handling Germany's difficulties to 1929, were mixed. Weaker candidates tended to concentrate on the early Weimar years and only saw problems of revolts and hyperinflation, or they concentrated on the Stresemann years of success. Better candidates gave more balanced answers showing both the successes and failures of the period, while the very best noted that despite the problems in the early years the Weimar Government maintained power, and that even during Stresemann's Golden Years, some Germans were still disgruntled, being either farmers or conservative Germans who disapproved of the new art, theatre and morals of Berlin.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates were easily able to offer valid inferences from Source A about living conditions in Petrograd being harsh and life threatening, and reasons for revolt, either by way of the food shortages, the diseases and the seeming impossibility of any change. **Question (a) (ii)** brought many balanced answers showing that military defeats had undermined the Tsar considerably but there were other factors like the unpopularity of the Tsarina, and the middle class despair at food shortages and price rises. Good marks were usually gained here. Weaker answers to **Question (a) (iii)** often said that Source A was not about the fall of the Tsar but about problems in Petrograd, while Source B was 'about why people were angry with the Tsar'. Better evaluations looked at the provenance of Source A and expected a secret police report to give actuality rather than blur issues, and candidates found information in both sources to effect good cross-references about shortages and prices.

Many candidates were able to give two features of the July Days, but some also confused this with the April Theses, the Kornilov Affair and some believed these days to be the time that the Bolsheviks 'stormed the Winter Palace'. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** on Rasputin were often full and very detailed. Perhaps, some candidates knew too much of Rasputin's activities, especially his social activities. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** showed that candidates had a great deal of information regarding the Kornilov Affair and reasons for it harming the Provisional Government, or they knew little and quickly became confused. **Question (b) (iv)** allowed many candidates to agree that Land and Bread were important factors in the overthrow of the Provisional Government but that Peace was another important factor as well. Better answers included information that the Provisional Government tried to stop peasants from taking land, that it seemed no more competent than the government of the Tsar, and that returning revolutionary groups, especially the Bolsheviks, were important factors as well.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Candidates readily made valid inferences for Source A to show that women had to play a game of allowing men, of no greater intellect, to discuss politics alone and talked of less important things like the theatre and scandal when 'joining the ladies'. Some candidates were surprised that Eleanor Roosevelt made excuses for both men and women in being unable to adjust to 'modern conditions'. Most candidates were also successful in their answers to **Question (a) (ii)** by offering a balance of evidence about women's political progress in the 1920s and 1930s. A few candidates found it rather strange that the politician should be so insulting about women in his campaign speech, for example. 'He is presumably trying to garner support and women are now half of the voters'. Weaker answers for **Question (a) (iii)** said that Source A was 'about men and women' and Source B was about 'women not having the brains to cope with a job'. Examples of incomplete evaluation included that Eleanor Roosevelt 'would know all about politics because she was the president' and 'politicians always lie especially if there is a vote coming up'. Better answers developed Eleanor Roosevelt's background, her position as First Lady etc., while other candidates saw possibilities in cross-referencing attitudes towards women in both sources.

There were many types of people that were acceptable as answers to **Question (b) (i)** and candidates scored well. **Question (b) (ii)** asked about the aims of the Ku Klux Klan. Many candidates were able to score well here but some candidates were seduced into long descriptions of the activities of the Klan. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)**, on the reasons for the establishment of immigration quotas in the 1920s, showed that this area was either very well known with much detail, context and explanation, or poorly understood with candidates struggling to build logical and historically correct cases. Many candidates in answer to **Question (b) (iv)** agreed that black Americans had suffered most from the intolerance of American society in the 1920s. They built strong and detailed cases. Others argued that some black Americans had suffered, while others had prospered and built movements and groups to help black Americans, while another group of candidates contrasted the suffering of black Americans to the intolerance shown to Native Americans, immigrants, women etc.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

Candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about communes during the Great Leap Forward, but many were surprised that the source showed a careless and indisciplined approach to food. Equally candidates were able to find evidence in Source B to show the benefits and disadvantages of the Great Leap Forward in answer to **Question (a) (ii)**. The difference in attitudes towards the responsibility of the Chinese became the basis of answers to **Question (a) (iii)** about the Great Leap Forward. Many demonstrated the careless and gluttonous attitude to work and food, and compared that to Source B where it showed enthusiasm and famine. Candidates found it difficult to explain the difference. Attempts at evaluation commented on the author of Source A 'being there at the time' and the British historian of Source B 'having plenty of time to research'. A few candidates wondered why the author of Source A came to Britain while others commented that Source B was written only twenty years after the Great Leap Forward.

Candidates had few problems with giving two features of collectives and were also able to answer **Question (b) (ii)** on measures taken to improve the lives of women. Both areas appeared to be well understood. Candidates appeared to be well drilled in their answers to **Question (b) (iii)** and were able to give reasons, supported by detail, about why Mao introduced the Great Leap Forward. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on the success of Communist rule between 1949 and 1958 were well informed but some candidates decided to ignore the date restraints in the question and wrote more about the Great Leap Forward's impact rather than on strictly 1949-1958 material.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

There were insufficient attempts at these questions to be able to make helpful and useful comments.

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

Candidates who attempted this Depth Study were clearly well-schooled in the technique of answering source-based questions and Examiners commented on the high quality of all Part **(a)** answers. The candidates' ability to discuss and give evidence of the extent to which Fatah had the support of the Arab nations and the extent that each source was useful as evidence about the Palestinians showed good technique and impressive knowledge. There were many full evaluations completed by candidates for both sources with much cross-referencing and information on the backgrounds of the authors and their motives for saying what they had said in the sources.

Candidates found some problems in their answers to **Question (b) (i)**. However, Examiners allowed aims that were along the lines of the unification of the various Palestinian Arab groups opposed to the existence of Israel, or the terms of the PLO Covenant (1964) which called for a democratic and secular Palestine with the elimination of the state of Israel. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** showed imagination in the selection of help provided by UNO to the Palestine refugee camps and most were awarded high marks. Reasons and detail were very impressive regarding the expulsion of the PLO from Jordan and Lebanon (**Question (b) (iii)**), with the answers to the Jordan part of the question superior to that dealing with the Lebanon. Again, there were some interesting and very good answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on whether Yasser Arafat was the most important factor in advancing the Palestinian cause. Some candidates chose to answer this question solely with the successes and failures of Arafat's policies and actions, while others decided to compare Arafat's role to the contributions of other elements like the role of the USA, the role of extremist groups etc. Both methods were acceptable and marks and levels were awarded according to arguments, supporting details and balance in the answers.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were insufficient attempts at these questions to make helpful and useful comments.

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

There were insufficient attempts at these questions to make helpful and useful comments.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43

Alternative to Coursework 43

General comments

Depth Study A (Germany, 1918–1945) was, as in recent sessions, the most popular choice but in this session's examination this was almost matched by the number of candidates tackling Depth Study C (USA, 1919–1941). Too few responses were seen to **Question 5**, Depth Study E (Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century) and **Question 7**, Depth Study G (The Creation of Modern Industrial Society), to make comment appropriate but all other topics were addressed.

On a practical level most of the scripts were well presented, although pale ink does still make some handwriting difficult to read. A problem which has increased is in the number of scripts which are not fastened: simply turning down a corner is insufficient given how often a script needs to be handled as part of the examining process. Centres are urged to ensure that each candidate's work is securely fastened together, a tie with a piece of string is all that is needed and would conform to the Instructions given on the front page of the Examination Paper.

It is a pleasure to report that the historical knowledge of candidates was sound in the majority of cases and outstanding in a significant number of scripts. Few rubric infringements were seen and there were only a small number of very weak responses. In general, **Question (a) (iii)** remains the least effectively tackled by many candidates who appear to address the issues of bias and provenance without substantiation from the sources in relation to the specific issue presented in the question. The lack of such focus on the wording of **Question (b)(iv)** also weakens responses, particularly so when dates are ignored. So, too, merely presenting knowledge and leaving the Examiner to discern the implied relevance is, not advisable.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945

(a) (i) The majority of candidates made valid inferences from Source A that the Nazis viewed the working class as a mere tool and were contemptuous of the workers' humanity and negotiating rights. Very few failed to support this with reference to the source.

(ii) Most responses focused clearly on the quality of the management of the economy and, rather than simply prefacing quotation with a 'however', a reasoned balance was the pleasing approach of many candidates. Such candidates also gave considered comment on the recognised importance of Schacht and the significance for the economy of differences between him and Goering, as well as on the implications of Hitler's 'other means'.

(iii) Here a disappointingly large number of candidates appeared to hope that reiterating earlier points would suffice, together with assertions on probable bias or possible expertise. For example, the claim that Source A is biased because its author was British cannot simply stop there if it is to gain high award. Substantiation through contextual knowledge linked with reference to the date of the source, and comment on the choice of words, would carry the response much further, with focus securely on the economy. Similarly, there was opportunity for supported cross-reference on the aims and methods of the Four-Year Plan; this was seized by very few candidates, although some did comment that both sources indicated how single-minded the Nazis were.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from edureourceza.com

(b) (i) Most could identify the German Labour Front as the Nazi replacement for free trade unions and some indicated its role in directing labour. That it was the largest of the Party organisations, and Ley's leadership, did not feature in responses.

(ii) Some very secure answers to this question developed a range of activities of the Strength Through Joy organisation and the majority of candidates had some general awareness of the rewards offered for hard work. The weakest responses saw this as the happiness generated by membership of the Hitler Youth organisation.

(iii) Many candidates gave excellent responses in which they developed a good range of reasons for the Nazis to control women's lives and all candidates were aware of the desire to increase Germany's Aryan population. Weaker candidates, however, went on to describe the incentives offered, rather than to consider other relevant reasons such as the initial perceived need to increase employment for men and then war leading to the redirection of women into the workforce.

(iv) Whilst some impressive answers were seen, the greatest failing of a large number of candidates was in ignoring the dates set. In the main, candidates argued that jobs and renewed pride in their nationality were benefits for many Germans and acted as some counterbalance to the repressive tactics of the regime but, without considering the war and the changes it made as a major part of the period 1933–1945, responses were partial at best and thus could not attain the highest level of award. Some excellent candidates pointed to the Nazis' narrowing of the definition of "German citizen" as a significant factor in assessing benefit.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941

(a) (i) There were many sound responses to this question where candidates perceived Stalin's careful and devious presentation of himself as the loyal disciple of Lenin, who was already established as his successor. Most supported this with reference to the source.

(ii) Almost all candidates saw the balance in this source and a number went beyond mere quotation in demonstrating their grasp of the subtle manoeuvrings indicated. A small number of candidates appeared to have misread the source as they saw Trotsky as refusing to accept Stalin as Deputy Chairman.

(iii) Responses here fell into two categories: weaker ones repeated the points made in the earlier questions; the smaller number of good answers focused clearly on the issue of the leadership of the USSR and what this meant. Thus they made points on the major significance of Lenin, even after his death, that there was evidence of the bureaucratic and/or democratic nature of the system by citing the Politburo, Second All-Union Congress of Soviets and Council of People's Commissars, as well as the vying for leadership and what this could mean for the USSR. Very few candidates commented on the reliability of the sources, as well as this.

(b) (i) Lenin's Political Will and the significance for Stalin of it being suppressed were well known by candidates. Fewer mentioned that it contained comment on other Bolshevik colleagues.

(ii) Whilst a few candidates scored no marks, as they wrote about the battleship Potemkin, most answers displayed command of aspects of the Kronstadt Mutiny. That it involved sailors who had previously supported the Bolsheviks reacting to the severity of War Communism and its role in Lenin's shift to the NEP was well known. Fewer candidates also considered how it was put down with such brutality.

(iii) This question elicited many excellent answers which fully merited high level award. Why Trotsky was viewed as suspect, the skill of Stalin in securing a Party power-base and his exploitation of Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin were often supported with impressive detail.

(iv) Many balanced responses were seen, although few supported this with specific detail or a range of aspects. The effects of War Communism and the comparative benefits of the NEP were the usual route of most candidates but there were a number who apparently then ignored the 1929 date of the question as they drifted into the 1930s purges and Five Year Plans. Whilst it is true that the first Plan was introduced in 1928 its effects were not immediate. Better candidates did broaden the range of aspects with consideration of the benefits of ending Russia's part in the First World War and compared this with the effects of War Communism as well as the role of the secret police. The disappointment of those with Communist ideals was not considered.

Downloaded from edureourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

(a) (i) There were many excellent answers to this question in which candidates supported a number of inferences from the source. The farmer's resentment of the New Deal as undermining self-reliance and freedom as well as the claim that its costs would weaken the economy were clearly focused and many commented that the concern typified the views of a rugged individualist.

(ii) Here, too, a substantial number of candidates did well, with balanced responses which went beyond mere quotation into reasoned focus on the issue of Presidential powers and substantiated this from the source. In particular, those candidates who pointed to the Supreme Court approving only 'most' of the Second New Deal's measures and linking this to Congress rejecting the President's proposal of 1938 as evidence that they were still powerful opposition. Some offered further qualification by appreciating that the Executive Office only gave the President 'more' rather than total power. On the whole, some very impressive work was evident.

(iii) Although there were some candidates who rose to the highest level award, in general, as in other Depth Studies, this proved the weakest source-based answer. Many did not go beyond assertions that 'Source A is more reliable because the farmer was there', sometimes at length, yet without reference to any source detail whatsoever. The focus of the question was on the 'impact' of the New Deal - not just on opposition to it, although clear cross-reference was possible on the stance taken by the farmer and national institutions. That Source A included Social Security and Old Age Pensions gave candidates the opportunity to assess their impact from contextual knowledge - an opportunity that was rarely appreciated. A few candidates did consider how far the farmer reflected the unhappiness of the general farming community with the New Deal measures, supporting this from both own knowledge and the source. Only one script also indicated that the Federal Writers' Project was, in itself, a direct 'impact' of the New Deal.

(b) (i) A small but significant minority seemed to have misread this question as they offered New Deal measures that were seen as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, rather than the President's unsuccessful measures taken to deal with the judges' powers. Most, however, appreciated that these were the 'Packing Scheme' and the attempt to force judges to retire at seventy.

(ii) There were some full answers which scored well as they both appreciated who Father Coughlin was and the specific methods he used to campaign against the inadequacies of the New Deal, as well as Roosevelt's 'dictatorship', such as his own radio programme, which attracted as many as 45 million listeners, the National Union for Social Justice and his support for Lemke's Third Party. However, there were a number showing no knowledge whatsoever of this major radical critic, as they claimed he was a right-wing Republican in Congress.

(iii) The majority of candidates were on surer ground here and offered a good range of developed reasons for the objections of businessmen, and many attained full marks. The costs to business of having free enterprise restricted by higher taxes, regulation by government bodies and, in particular, business resentment of unions having negotiating powers, were particularly well considered, with knowledge of specific New Deal measures.

(iv) There were candidates who saw this question as an invitation to recite knowledge of all the Alphabet Agencies. Unfortunately, detailed as these answers often were, they had only implied relevance to the issue of change. Better candidates tailored their knowledge to explicit focus on how far the New Deal made fundamental or only superficial changes in a range of aspects. They argued that this was unprecedented government involvement in the relief of poverty, social security, banking, workers' rights, agriculture etc., some of which became permanent and thus meant profound change. Countering this with the limited intentions and scope of policies, the cutting back of the Second New Deal and those groups who saw no change in their circumstances, was often securely supported and a sound conclusion was drawn on the issue.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

(a) (i) The majority of candidates had little difficulty in drawing valid inferences directly supported from the source on the attitude of the peasants towards their landlords. Fewer made points on the evident wealth of the landlord and how reluctant he was to part with it, despite many of the violent actions of the peasants.

(ii) There were many secure answers here in which candidates ensured a balanced consideration of the differences and similarities between the Nationalists and Communists. A number of weaker responses misinterpreted the source as indicating that the Nationalists launched the 'Three Antis' campaign and were thus far less corrupt than the Communists.

(iii) As with other Depth Studies this was the weakest source-based response for many candidates, as they made comments such as 'they were both Chinese so were both reliable', or that 'the woman is biased because she left China', and offered no support from the sources to justify this or to indicate why this should be relevant to the issue of 'changes made in China'. Contextual knowledge could have been used to consider the shifting balance between peasants and landlords, the enthusiasm generated by the promised reform of finances and how far this did result in genuine change. Supported from the sources this should then enable a secure assessment of their reliability and utility.

(b) (i) All candidates had some awareness of the 'barefoot doctors'.

(ii) Most answers indicated some knowledge of a People's Court as dealing with peasants' resentment of landlords but fewer could develop any detail on its workings, in particular on the government's role and the punishments meted out.

(iii) The majority of candidates knew what the Hundred Flowers Campaign was but a smaller number could explain why it was important to the government beyond an invitation to allow free discussion and the subsequent surprise at the volume of criticism which resulted. Whether or not it was intended to flush out intellectual critics and strengthen the government's power, given the outcome, was considered in some good answers.

(iv) As in some other Depth Studies, the dates in this question were simply ignored by a number of candidates who proceeded to write all they knew about the results of the Great Leap Forward and Third Five Year Plan. In one or two cases even the Cultural Revolution was seen as the relevant period. Those with a more secure grasp of the set dates did develop aspects of the 1953 Five Year Plan, the 1950 Land Reform and collectivisation, as well as changes in the status of women to dispute 'more difficult'. Interestingly, agreement with the proposition was less evident so that answers were often unbalanced. The sheer scale of killings in the period did not appear to be known but some candidates did point to the anti-religious campaigns, the early purges of the party and the suffering of landlords as difficulties.

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

(a) (i) Israel's confidence in its military strength was identified and supported by all candidates but its complacency and attitude towards the Arab states was rarely added to this, as other valid inferences from the source.

(ii) Most candidates used the first sentence of Source B to indicate there was a balance here but few used further points from the source to convince Examiners that this was fully supported.

(iii) There were some answers which made good use of the content of the sources to evaluate their merits in relation to the Yom Kippur War; others were of the 'B is from a British book so it is biased' or, even worse, 'the sources are too short to tell' variety. Those candidates who pointed out that Source A was published before the war had real potential to develop good answers but disappointingly they merely claimed the source was useless as a result, rather than testing it against any contextual knowledge.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) (i) The majority of candidates were unaware that Moshe Dayan was the Minister of Defence at the time of the Yom Kippur War and seen as responsible for the ill-preparedness of the Israeli forces.

(ii) Answers to this question were, on the whole, more secure as most knew that oil was used as a bargaining counter, although few developed this fully with specific examples such as the banning of its export to America and Holland or the influence on the USA, USSR and the UN to seek an end to the hostilities.

(iii) Many candidates did appreciate that Egypt and Syria aimed to regain the Sinai and Golan Heights respectively but few developed these points, for example by showing how and when they had been lost or why they were territorially important. None considered why there was cooperation between the states or Egypt's increased confidence as a result of USSR support as factors, but most did show the significance of the chosen date for the attack.

(iv) The approach to this question was, in the main, a mixture of the vague and the assertive. Even how the war ended and the significance of the settlement were markedly absent. Better responses did show some awareness of the degree of thawing in Israeli-Egyptian negotiations but very, very few gave any consideration to the wider focus of the question which was on Arab-Israeli relations.

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

(a) (i) Candidates had little difficulty in seeing valid inferences here and supporting them from the source.

(ii) This question, however, proved rather more challenging as a balanced judgement was rarely drawn. Comment was usually made on the denigrating attitudes displayed in Source C as making a mutiny very likely, as well as understandable, but few candidates contrasted this with the mutual respect evident in Source B, which could indicate loyalty, or the point in Source C that the English were not physically cruel. Nothing was made of the nineteen-year difference in the dates of the sources as a possible shortcoming.

(iii) The contemptuous attitudes evident in Sources A and C were, again, dwelt upon and very few candidates pointed to the degree of respect and sensitivity indicated in B and C. Surprisingly, none commented on the sources indicating that women appeared to be the most prejudiced. Measuring the sources against contextual knowledge or any other test for reliability was not demonstrated.

(b) (i) All candidates were able to identify some of the major religions of India.

(ii) That the East India Company was involved with trade in India was known but fewer candidates widened this to include its direct role in the government and military aspects of the country.

(iii) Trading opportunities were given as the major reason for British interest in India but trade in what was rarely considered. Jobs in the wide range of government activities and the possibility of a good lifestyle were the other reasons considered.

(iv) Improvements in communications and the banning of suttee were the benefits put forward by many candidates and this was balanced by the resentments felt which led to the Mutiny. Without any wider range of aspects, or considering the changes made after the Mutiny, such answers could rarely be seen as beyond a Level 3 award.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010