eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com
www.XtremePapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

General comments

There were many responses that consistently demonstrated the skills required by the questions. These ensured description for **(a)**, explanation for **(b)** and explanation and analysis for **(c)** were present in all answers. Less secure responses were characterised by a weakness to demonstrate analysis and explanation to the degree required if higher marks are to be achieved. These answers were often restricted to more generalised comment.

The best responses addressed the specific question asked, considered the all aspects of the question in a relevant way, and were supported with careful explanation and relevant examples. Sometimes the question itself was not adequately addressed or candidates did not take account of the dates in the question. Candidates need to answer the question which is set on the paper.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

Those answers to part **(a)** which used examples from Italy, Hungary and Germany to describe the influence of nationalism at that time, were good. If this approach started with detail of what was meant by nationalism, a high quality answer resulted. Other answers needed a more developed approach than just 'nationalists would have liked their own country' or 'nationalists wanted to rule themselves.' In response to **(b)**, there were many answers which identified why the Austro-Hungarian Empire almost collapsed in 1848-9. Others developed more thorough, explained reasons relating to repression and the role of Metternich. This naturally led to the demonstration of a high level of understanding relating to Metternich's dismissal and the resulting opportunity to rise against the Emperor. Excellent responses to part **(c)** were characterised by the use of specific examples to support the arguments on either side of the debate. These examples often related to events in Hungary and Italy. Others needed to develop the identification of reasons into explanation relating to both sides of the argument.

Question 2

It was common to see answers to **(a)** which indicated there was 'a rising in Rome'. Candidates need to be more specific in their answers and reference to the establishment of the Roman Republic by Mazzini and its defence by Garibaldi and Mazzini would have been appropriate. In **(b)**, there were many who explained the key point that Cavour tempted Napoleon to help fight the Austrians by offering Savoy and Nice. To achieve higher marks, others needed to develop more of the identified reasons into explained reasons. In **(c)**, there were many responses which explained well the contribution of Garibaldi to the unification of Italy, going on to explain how others such as Cavour, Mazzini and Victor Emmanuel played a part. This approach produced a balanced answer to the debate. Others needed to develop more thoroughly identified reasons / description to achieve high marks.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 3

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

Question 4

Candidates would benefit from understanding the need to answer the question as set. Part **(a)** related to 'colonial rivalry' and not to other aspects of rivalry, such as 'naval'. Stronger responses referred to colonial rivalry between Britain, Germany and France, pointing out the impact of Germany trying to make up for lost time. Many candidates in **(b)** showed a good grasp of the events in Morocco in 1911 and demonstrated how these events contributed to increasing tension. Others need to develop more thoroughly explained answers from the narrative of events given in their answer. Sometimes candidates did not take account of the date in the question in writing about the first Moroccan Crisis. Part **(c)** provided some good answers which developed explanations about events in Bosnia and the significance of the Balkan Wars, with some being developed into excellent answers by making clear links to 'bringing war closer'. Other answers were characterised by a tendency to generalised comment, and were less well supported by explanation within the context of the period.

Question 5

Many candidates demonstrated a high level of factual recall when answering part **(a)**, including the recall of names of the colonial territories in Africa. Three common mistakes were evident though in many answers. The most common was that 'Germany lost the Rhineland', additionally it was often stated that 'Germany lost the Ruhr'. Less often attributed to the Treaty of Versailles terms was that 'the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia were taken away from Germany.' In part **(b)**, some of the answers were excellent, with detailed explanation of why Clemenceau was left dissatisfied with the Treaty of Versailles. These candidates realised explanation was required as to why Clemenceau was challenged by Wilson and Lloyd George. An example of this approach saw explanation such as 'Clemenceau was disappointed because he had wanted Germany to be split into several states but was not allowed this by Wilson and Lloyd George who could see the danger of the German people wanting revenge in the future'. Others needed to develop their thinking beyond what Clemenceau wanted on his way to Versailles and consider what he thought about the Treaty on his return from Versailles. Many excellent responses contained detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Others need to develop their ability to explain justification for the Treaty beyond how Germany had treated the Russians at Brest-Litovsk.

Question 6

Some candidates in **(a)** had greater awareness of sanctions than the International Court of Justice. Good answers to **(b)** showed sound knowledge of the reasons for America not joining the League, developing the answer into a good explanation. The best answers did the same with Germany and Russia. Some explanations relating to America were particularly good. Candidates need to understand that it is factual detail directed at the question as set which gains marks and not answers to a 'different question', in this instance 'why countries left the League'. Candidates should be able to explain why the League failed in Manchuria (part **(c)**), if high marks are to be achieved. This involves taking the reasons for failure of the League, in general terms, and developing specific explanation in relation to Manchuria. Many better responses did just that in relation to 'other reasons', but the 'lack of an army' was not always understood.

Question 7

Good description of events in answer to **(a)** brought high marks. Most were aware of the incident and its repercussions and stated these in a clear, concise manner. Some went further to construct an excellent answer which considered the impact on what was happening in Vietnam. Answers to **(b)** would have been much improved if candidates had been able to explain 'vietnamisation'. Many responses to **(c)** were excellent, putting both sides of the argument. Military failure was well-explained using guerrilla warfare, search and destroy, bombing and the use of chemical weapons as good examples. The best gave specific examples of these. Most answers were balanced with other reasons explained as reasons for withdrawal. The strongest of these was the impact of the media message which was often of a high quality. Other candidates need to develop their argument, rather than just identifying reasons if the highest marks are to be achieved.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 8

Candidates should be aware that answers to any questions relating to the Cold War require as much knowledge and understanding as other aspects of the syllabus. For **(a)**, candidates needed to show what was upsetting the USSR in Czechoslovakia. Only a small number were able to describe what Dubcek was trying to do in relation to 'socialism with a human face.' In **(b)**, candidates needed to understand the significance of Berlin in this period of Cold War history if they were to present explanations as to why it remained a pivotal issue. In **(c)**, some answers were strong on Solidarity and its relation to Poland. Others needed to develop an understanding of the part it played in the loss of Soviet control in Eastern Europe. Some responses were good on one side of the argument explaining the changes made by Gorbachev and explaining these in relation to the focus of the question.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Many responses to **(a)** were excellent, detailing prison, publicity, 'Mein Kampf' and 'ballot not bullet'. A small number needed to get away from describing the Putsch, which was not the focus of the question. Candidates must use all the subject matter from the period in answering **(b)**, if they are to achieve the higher levels. The best answers dealt with the appointments by Hindenburg chronologically, explained how these allowed Hitler to become Chancellor, as well as explaining how success in securing votes was dependent on both propaganda and Hitler's personality. Others were content with limiting their response to explaining why Hitler was popular. Some responses to **(c)** were excellent, explaining the link between the Reichstag Fire and the destruction of Communism as a political force. The counter-balancing argument was strongly related to the Enabling Act and the death of Hindenburg. A small number added the importance of the Night of the Long Knives to their argument. Others were content to concentrate on a description of the Fire, and these responses would have been improved a developed explanation, based on a balanced argument.

Question 10

The question in **(a)** was about education in schools, rather than the Hitler Youth. Most candidates were able to describe aspects of the curriculum. Fewer wrote about the teachers. Some of the responses to **(b)** were excellent, with explanation of the aims of the Hitler Youth linked to how these were achieved. Others needed to avoid the drift into description of the activities, without explanation of why. Many responses to **(c)** were excellent. These contained detailed explanations addressing both sides of the argument, producing a balanced response which focused on the question. Particularly well explained was the existence of opposition through groups such as the Swing Movement. Others were less strong in explaining the popularity of the regime. This could have been achieved through explanation of how the Nazis dealt with unemployment. In some instances, candidates failed to address the question as set, writing at length on censorship and propaganda.

Question 11

In **(a)**, most not only knew the slogan 'Peace, Bread and Land', but were able to describe how it fitted into the period. Others described the significance of the Bolsheviks gaining power and the introduction of communist ideals. Good responses to **(b)** focused on the weaknesses and failures of the Provisional Government to explain fully why the Bolsheviks were able to seize power. This focus was not exclusive, with excellent answers explaining what the Bolsheviks had to offer as well as the failings of Kerensky. Others answers required more depth and explanation. This approach featured bold statements such as 'The Provisional Government was unpopular' and 'The Bolsheviks were more disciplined'. There were responses to **(c)** which showed consistently clear explanation and argument to produce balanced answers which both supported and questioned the hypothesis of the question. Some candidates needed to focus more on different arguments, rather than using a positive argument as to why the Bolsheviks won, as a reason for the Whites' failure. Weaker answers were characterised by a listing of a number of identified reasons for either success or failure.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 12

Candidates in answering **(a)** focused almost entirely on the impact of collectivisation on the kulaks. This question is targeted on factual recall and candidates are expected to describe impact in a number of ways which, in this instance, might have included 'farms large enough to use modern machinery, increased production' and probably most importantly 'Stalin having control of the peasants'. The best answers to **(b)** produced convincing explanations as to why Stalin introduced his plans, including the transformation of the Soviet Union industrially and economically, as well as reducing the power of the peasants whom Stalin deeply distrusted. Less successful answers were characterised by the tendency to generalise, producing answers such as 'to transform the Soviet Union' or 'to spread Communism'. Many answers to **(c)** offered strong explanations of the impact of Soviet industrialisation on the people, particularly in relation to the harsh discipline, the secret police and living conditions. Seen less frequently were the benefits introduced, such as doctors and education. This strength relating to one side of the argument was offset by weakness in explanation of the other side. Thus this brought an imbalance to some answers.

Question 13

There were many answers which showed how the **(a)** question should be answered. These answers were characterised by clear, concise factual statements which gave the important features of the assembly-line. Other answers were often over-long and more generalised. A small number thought Ford actually invented the idea. Some excellent answers were seen in response to **(b)**. Here, identification of the reasons was expanded into explanation, with the growth of credit and advertising and the role of government featuring strongly. Some candidates were very strong on Republican policies. Answers to **(c)** were often excellent, with convincing explanation in a clear, well-argued format. Particularly strong were explanations relating to the benefits of the boom socially, financially and within the home. Some explanations relating to benefit limitations were not quite as strong, although in most instances, adequate. Here the plight of black agricultural workers featured alongside racial discrimination. The Ku Klux Klan was mentioned frequently. Other answers failed to see the difference between the 'boom' of the question and 'the roaring twenties', resulting in some irrelevance.

Question 14

Candidates should be aware of the events leading up to the Wall Street Crash, as well as knowing the reasons behind the Crash. Part **(a)** highlighted the difference between candidates. Some produced excellent responses which detailed the disasters hitting Wall Street in October 1929, including 'Black Thursday' whilst others responded more generally with a description of 1920s share investment, with reference to the crash being limited. The many good answers to **(b)** were characterised by high quality explanation of Hoover's attitude and policies, particularly 'rugged individualism' and the idea that things were about to improve. Some candidates needed to focus more on these issues, rather than on the more general narrative of Republican policies of the 1920s. Answers to **(c)** tended to be stronger on the explanation of the social impact of the Wall Street Crash. Candidates were well-aware of bankruptcy, homelessness and unemployment, and were able to put these issues firmly into context. On the other side, the issue of the banks figured prominently. This limited the argument, resulting in some unevenness and lack of balance. Others would have benefitted from a clearer understanding of the terms 'economic' and 'social'.

Questions 15-25

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

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. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound factual knowledge, could have used this knowledge more 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 should focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach.

On the whole candidates used the time allocated effectively, with the majority completing the paper. There were some rubric errors; some candidates chose parts **(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)** from different questions, whilst some answered more than three questions. A significant number of candidates answered two depth study questions rather than the one required. Also, it would be helpful to Examiners if candidates ensured that they indicated clearly the question number and part of the question being answered.

Comments on specific questions

The following comments do not imply that a question was answered badly. They are intended to help Centres in preparing their candidates for the examination.

***Section A* – Core Content**

Questions 1 to 3

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

Question 4

(a) Candidates displayed detailed knowledge of events in Morocco in 1914. More candidates could have focused their answer upon German actions, as asked for in the question.

(b) Candidates were able to identify why problems in the Balkans were difficult for the Great Powers to solve, but going on to explain why would have improved some responses.

(c) Candidates needed to show how the Alliance System caused war by explaining how the members of each alliance were drawn into war. Some candidates only described the membership of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. Other causes of war in 1914 were very clearly explained. Candidates showed detailed knowledge and understanding of the contribution of the assassination at Sarajevo, the arms race, rivalry in the Balkans and the actions of Germany to causing war.

Question 5

(a) A greater focus on the actual question would have benefitted some here. It required knowledge of the ways in which Versailles weakened Germany militarily; some candidates described land loss terms and other terms not relevant to the question set.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) There were many excellent answers to this question, with explanation clearly focused on Clemenceau. Some candidates wrote lengthy answers about Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson, as well as Clemenceau; the question required candidates to focus upon Clemenceau.

(c) Candidates explained justification at the time, based on the agreement at the Armistice, Germany's treatment of Russia at the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the need to punish Germany, as she was believed by many to be guilty of causing the war. Candidates explained that the treaty was not justified by focusing on the treaty punishing ordinary people in Germany rather than the leaders who had gone to war, and by emphasising that Germany was not solely responsible for the outbreak of war in 1914. Candidates did need to focus on the words 'at the time' in the question; some wrote at length about events in the Ruhr and hyperinflation, which lacked relevance to this question. Some candidates appeared to be answering the question as if it asked, 'What were the aims of the Big Three at Versailles?'

Question 6

(a) There were many excellent answers to this question, with candidates showing detailed knowledge of peacekeeping successes such as the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia and the Greece – Bulgaria dispute. A number of candidates, though, wrote about failures in the 1930s, rather than success in the 1920s. Candidates need to able to distinguish between the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations; there were a number of lengthy descriptions of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in response to this question.

(b) Many valid identifications were given in response to this question – the USA was not a member, decisions had to be unanimous, the League was slow to take action, the League had no army – but more candidates could have explained how these aspects made the League weak.

(c) Candidates were able to identify a range of other reasons for the failure of the League, such as events in Manchuria, the absence of the USA from the League and the lack of an army, but relatively few were able to explain their significance to the destruction of the League as an effective peacekeeping body. Many candidates were able to describe events in Abyssinia, but they would have benefitted from an explanation of how this contributed to the destruction of the League. There were some excellent answers to this question, with candidates explaining that League economic sanctions failed to include items necessary for war, thus enabling Mussolini to continue with his invasion of Abyssinia and also explaining the significance of the Hoare Laval Pact. The effects of the Manchurian invasion were also explained clearly, with focus upon the slow response of the League.

Question 7

(a) Candidates needed to look carefully at the dates in the question – between 1954 and 1963. Some candidates missed the dates and wrote about American actions throughout the Vietnam War.

(b) Most candidates understood the nature of guerrilla warfare and were able to explain clearly its effect on the morale of the US soldiers. Candidates should realise that part **(b)** questions require explanations; some candidates described guerrilla tactics at great length without addressing why these tactics were so effective.

(c) A significant number of candidates explained clearly other reasons such as the role of the media and the growing discontent at home in the USA. A minority of candidates were able to explain the significance of the Tet Offensive and how it highlighted the huge cost of the war, both financially and in terms of loss of American soldiers, and that the Vietcong were still able to launch offensives against the USA.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 8

(a) Relatively few candidates answered this question, but those who did so displayed detailed knowledge of the events of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

(b) Candidates displayed detailed knowledge of Lech Walesa and Solidarity; some responses would have achieved higher marks if they had focused this knowledge on why Solidarity was formed, rather than using it to write a description of Walesa and Solidarity. Focused answers explained the deteriorating conditions for workers in Poland and the need for an effective trade union to challenge the government policies.

(c) Candidates showed detailed knowledge of Gorbachev's reforms of perestroika and glasnost, but needed to link these reforms to the collapse of Soviet control. Explanation of other reasons tended to focus upon the role of Solidarity.

***Section B* – Depth Studies**

Question 9

(a) There were a number of excellent answers to this question, with candidates displaying a clear understanding of the impact of the Munich Putsch. Some candidates described the events of the Putsch, rather than detailing its impact on Hitler and the Nazi Party.

(b) There were a number of excellent answers to this question, with clear explanation of Nazi promises to tackle unemployment and to reverse the Treaty of Versailles, the Nazi emphasis on discipline and order, and the idea of negative cohesion. Candidates needed to note the dates in the question. Some wrote about events in 1933 and later, when the question asked about 1929-1932.

(c) There were many well-balanced responses to this question, explaining the role of Papen and Hindenburg and other reasons such as economic depression and Hitler's promise to end unemployment, the support of big business for Hitler and the desire of the German people for a radical solution to their problems. Some candidates concentrated on events after Hitler became Chancellor; these events were not relevant to this question

Question 10

(a) Candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge, outlining a variety of actions taken by the Nazis. These included jobs in the armaments industry, conscription, public works schemes, the changing role of women and the restrictions on employment for Jews.

(b) This question was well answered. There was clear explanation of the Nazis' views on women having a traditional role, the need to increase the population to provide the army of the future, the need to provide jobs for men and also women being encouraged to return to work during World War Two.

(c) Explanation of benefits focused on employment opportunities and the Beauty of Labour and Strength through Joy schemes. Disadvantages explained included the lack of freedom, the persecution of Jews and the sense of fear generated by the use of the Gestapo and the network of informers.

Questions 11 and 12

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

Question 13

(a) Candidates were able to describe the loss of markets and the lower cost of newer products. Candidates also needed to describe the competition from newer industries, such as man-made fibres instead of cotton, and electricity instead of oil.

(b) This was well answered. Clear explanation of a range of factors was demonstrated – tariffs, over-production and competition from Canada.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Relatively few candidates were able to explain how hire purchase and the wider issue of credit contributed to economic success. A wide range of other factors such as Republican government policies, the expansion of the motor industry, the legacy of World War One and the USA's natural resources were very clearly explained.

Questions 14 to 22

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

Question 23

(a) Responses focused on the desire to live close to the place of work. Some answers were over generalised. Candidates needed to focus their answers on the need to find work in towns, as employment was increasingly difficult to find in the countryside, and also the influx of people from depressed areas such as Ireland.

(b) Many candidates were able to identify the lack of space, but few moved beyond this. Candidates needed to explain the laissez-faire policy of the government and the lack of planning.

(c) Responses to this question were generalised. To explain how towns had become healthier, candidates needed to focus on the work of Joseph Chamberlain, Titus Salt, Lever and Cadbury, and also the effects of various acts such as the Public Health Act of 1875. Explanation of how towns remained unhealthy needed to focus on how improvements were limited to small areas rather than to towns nationwide, the slow rate of progress and the lack of funding.

Questions 24 and 25

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

General comments

It was encouraging to see so many good responses to the questions on the paper; they were characterised by secure knowledge and understanding, underpinned by clarity of communication and accurate recall of historical details. The significant majority of candidates were able to score highly on **part (a)** questions, providing short, descriptive answers, rather than explanation.

The best answers to **parts (b) and (c)** style questions focused on explanation and selecting information to meet the precise demands of the question set. Lower marks were gained by those candidates who confined themselves to just *identifying* causal factors, while more credit was given for *developing* each identified factor more fully, within the context of the question.

In **part (c),** it was pleasing to see much evidence of answers which argued both for and against the proposition offered in the question, followed by a good conclusion which did not just repeat points already raised in the answer but went further, with an evaluation of 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Descriptive narrative, which just re-tells a story ought to be avoided in **part (b) and (c)** questions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A **– Core Content**

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

This was a popular question. There were many good answers to **part (a)** which went beyond general points such as 'Clemenceau wished to punish Germany' or 'He wanted to make Germany suffer', to then include points relating to war of 1870-71, military and economic aims and a detailed knowledge of France's territorial demands. **Part (b)** proved more challenging for some. Weaker answers focused on describing the aims of the 'Big Three', narrating either what happened at the peace talks or who received the most from the Treaty. The best responses made direct comparisons between the 'Big Three', explaining why they disagreed. For instance, what was it about Wilson's Fourteen Points which Lloyd George and Clemenceau found it difficult to accept? Why was Lloyd George occasionally at odds with Clemenceau? And so on. In **part (c)**, there was sound coverage of both reparations and War Guilt, although answers could have been better balanced, rather than just concentrating on the former. Some candidates were tempted to identify that 'other countries were to blame' (War Guilt), and should have further explained the point, referring, perhaps to the assassination at Sarajevo, the arms race, and/or the impact of imperialism.

Question 6

Part (a) answers could have been stronger. The work of the Court of Justice could have been more adequately addressed, while candidates concentrated on who sat on the Council and on the veto exercised by Permanent members. The mark scheme rewarded the role of each body within the organisation of the League, including actions taken, issues dealt with, powers exercised and what hindered their work within the organisation. Candidates seemed to be well prepared for **part (b)**, and the stronger answers focused on Japan and Italy's expansionism to combat the effects of the Depression, the threat to world peace caused by the rise of Hitler and the difficulties faced by Britain and France in trying to deal with their own economies, and to meet their obligations to the League. Weaker answers lacked relevance, describing the impact of the Depression in detail but not linking it to the work of the League. Narratives of Hitler's foreign policy were not

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

required here. In **part (c)**, there was evidence of good knowledge of the crises in which the League was involved, although it is important to explain why each was considered a success or a failure. Some candidates incorrectly thought that the League was closely involved with appeasement.

Question 7

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**, while generalised answers to **part (b)** were in evidence. Many candidates knew about the Domino Theory, Containment and the fear of the spread of Communism against the background of the Cold War. Better answers focused on increasing levels of US involvement, quoting the attack on the Maddox, Johnson's appeal to Congress and the need to protect US bases during 'Operation Rolling Thunder', as supporting evidence up to 1965. There were many strong responses to **part (c)**, covering the failure of the US military, balanced against the impact of the US media, concerns about the expense of the war in the United States and the strategic and psychological advantages exploited by the Vietcong. Some candidates struggled to clearly separate their arguments into 'agree' and 'disagree'.

Question 8

Part (a) posed few problems and was well done by those who attempted it. Many gained maximum marks with an in-depth knowledge of what happened during the Hungarian Rising and, later, of Nagy's fate and the imposition of a compliant Hungarian government. Answers to **part (b)** tended to be characterised by narratives about the Prague Spring. Better candidates were able to concentrate on why the Soviet Union saw the Prague Spring as a threat, dealing effectively with undermining Soviet control in Eastern Europe, the potential split in the Warsaw Pact and why 'socialism with a human face' was unacceptable to Brezhnev. **Part (c)** answers could, sometimes, have been more balanced; there were good explanations of the part played by Gorbachev in undermining Communism in Eastern Europe. On the other hand, some answers described what Solidarity was, rather than linking Solidarity to the collapse of Communism.

Section B **– Depth Studies**

Question 9

A majority of candidates scored well on **part (a)**. **Part (b)** gave an opportunity to explain the factors which brought Hitler to power in 1933, with particular reference to the impact of the Depression, rule by Presidential decree, election results and the political manoeuvrings between Schleicher and von Papen following the sacking of Bruning. There were some sound attempts to deal with these events, while less successful answers were confined to just explaining the popularity of Hitler. A sense of chronology is the key; for example, some thought that Hindenburg died before Hitler became Chancellor. Answers to **part (c)** were often well argued, with good analysis of the links between the Reichstag Fire, Night of the Long Knives and the establishment of Nazi control, as required by the question. Some candidates achieved Level 5 by comparing the relative importance of each factor.

Question 10

In **part (a)**, candidates demonstrated secure knowledge of the Hitler Youth, while there were many detailed explanations of the reasons behind Nazi persecution in **part (b)**. Most answers dealt with anti-Semitism, although there was an awareness of Nazi persecution of political opponents and other groups such as homosexuals and the disabled. Descriptive answers to **part (c)** could not achieve high marks. Candidates certainly found it easier to deal with evidence of the young peoples' opposition to the Nazis, but the best answers were also able to explain support for the Nazis amongst the young and, thereby, produce a balanced answer. Evidence of support included the popularity of some Youth activities, or the number of young Germans who joined voluntarily before membership became compulsory.

Question 11

Candidates knew many aspects of the answer, describing fully the actions of Lenin in promising 'Peace, Land and Bread' in **part (a)**. **Part (b)** knowledge about the Provisional Government was generalised (mainly related to the need for peace and reliable food supplies), although credit was given in the mark scheme for specific details relating to the clash with the Petrograd Soviet, the 'July Days' and the impact of Kornilov's failure. For **part (c)**, higher marks were attained by answers which showed evidence of planning and organising a clear line of argument. The problems of the Whites were sometimes repeated as advantages for the Reds, gaining no extra credit. Many explained the geographical and tactical difficulties faced by the Whites, but more secure knowledge about 'aims' would have produced more balanced answers.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 12 to 19

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

Question 20

This question was well answered. Candidates clearly knew a great deal of detail about the territories occupied during the Six Day War in **part (a)**. The more obvious reasons for Superpower concern at the time of the Yom Kippur War in **part (b)** were known, such as the oil crisis and the danger that the USA and USSR would be dragged into the conflict because of separate commitments to the Arabs and Israelis. Encouragingly, a significant number of candidates developed their explanations with reference to the wider Cold War context and to US concerns over Sadat's motives. **Part (c)** saw many secure responses and effective arguments about the importance of both accords. Level 5 answers went beyond repeating points already made, measuring and comparing both accords, arguing that they were essentially linked – without one, the other might not have happened. Good answers recognised their weaknesses, as well as their strengths.

Question 21

Part (a) posed few problems, although there were many aspects of both **parts (b) and (c)** which could have been more adequately addressed. There were opportunities to explain the Intifada, the impact of Likud's expansion of settlements and specific examples of tension such as in Hebron **(part b). In part (c)**, answers relied on arguments about Israeli unity in the face of Arab attacks but the counter argument was less developed. The mark scheme gave credit for understanding disunity over Israeli settlements, policy towards the setting up of a Palestinian state and differing attitudes towards specific Arab states such as Syria, Egypt and Jordan.

Question 22 – 25

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

General comments

The overwhelming majority of candidates were entered for the twentieth century option and as a result the comments below on the nineteenth century questions are relatively brief. The overall performance of candidates was strong. Most were able to comprehend the sources and understood what the questions were asking them to do. There were few answers that demonstrated candidates could improve in certain areas to meet the demands of the paper. Most understand that this paper is not a straightforward test of knowledge. Instead, candidates have to use their knowledge to interpret, evaluate and use sources in their historical context. Most were able to do this to at least some degree, and many did it very well.

Most candidates enjoy comparisons questions (**Question 1** on both options) and showed considerable skill in comparing the details of sources for agreements and disagreements. It should be remembered that these questions nearly always offer a better type of response - to go beyond details and read each source as whole, and then compare the overall message of the source or the overall attitude of the authors e.g. the authors of Sources A and B were both horrified by the bombing of Guernica.

Others areas of strength included candidates responses to 'are you surprised' questions, where many candidates made appropriate use of relevant knowledge, and questions that ask about the message of sources where candidates demonstrated the ability to go beyond the surface information to infer message and purpose.

Candidates should remember that when they evaluate sources, there are a number of strategies that can be deployed, but not all these will be all suitable in all circumstances. One of the key skills required is the ability to work out which strategy will work best with a particular question and particular sources. One approach is to check the claims being made by a source against the candidate's own knowledge, or against the evidence in other sources in the paper. Candidates can, where appropriate, use any of the sources to help them answer any of the questions. Another approach is to evaluate a source on the basis of its language or tone. The method most often used by candidates is to evaluate sources on the basis of who wrote or drew them. It is important, when using this approach, that candidates use the content of the source (what it is saying) in conjunction with their knowledge of the author, or artist, of the source, and their knowledge and understanding of the historical context. For example, one might question the reliability of a source by arguing that that particular person, or type of person, would have an interest in claiming what they are claiming because of the context at the time. All of this needs to be explained, and the knowledge needs to be made explicit.

One final point - candidates should answer the question which is set. When candidates are asked to say e.g. if they are surprised by a source or whether they think one source is more useful than other, they must provide an explicit answer. It is not advisable to show a range of skills in one's answer e.g. interpretation and evaluation, if these are not used to lead to a direct answer to the question.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to find ways in which the two Sources suggested different causes of the American Civil War. Others focused on the overall message of the sources, and realised that both sources state that slavery was the fundamental issue, or that Source B says the war was inevitable whereas A suggests it was not. Candidates should realise that with comparison questions such as this one, it is important to compare the overall messages of the sources and not just the details within them.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

A few candidates rejected Source C simply because it is a novel. Most candidates were able explain how the information in Source C about the conditions suffered by slaves is still useful despite it being a novel. A better use of the source would have been to focus on the message of the source about the evils of slavery, or on the popularity of the novel which tells us that slavery was a significant issue for many people at that time.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to interpret Source D. They explained how it shows us that the slave is happy, and the slave owner unhappy, about the election of Lincoln. Many candidates also explained why the slave and the slave owner had these different attitudes. Source E proved more difficult with some candidates claiming that Lincoln had suddenly turned into a slavery-loving racist. What Source E does suggest is that the issue of slavery was making Lincoln's job as President very difficult.

Question 4

Some candidates accepted Source F at face value and accepted literally claims that the state of Carolina was having Lincoln Cathedral pulled down. Other candidates appreciated the absurdity of what is in the source, and used this to explain that it must have been written by somebody from the North.

Question 5

Most candidates expressed surprise because the description in Source G of how well off slaves were in the South, was at odds with their own knowledge, or with accounts in other sources. Candidates should be careful not to just assert this. They need to explicitly state what their knowledge is, or what the evidence is from other sources, which challenges the account in Source G.

Question 6

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to explain how some sources support the statement that the Civil War was caused by Lincoln's election, and how other sources disagree and suggest other causes. There were almost no candidates who ignored the sources and wrote a general account of the causes of the Civil War.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

This question produced a full range of answers, including many excellent ones. To achieve full marks candidates needed to compare the overall attitude of each author towards the bombing of Guernica. Many candidates were able to reach the level below this one by finding agreements and disagreements of detail between the two sources. These answers were often well organised and detailed. Their key characteristic was that they compared the sources point by point e.g. 'One disagreement between the sources is that Source A says that people panicked 'people were running about in all directions', while Source B says the opposite 'perfect order was maintained".' Candidate responses would benefit from the avoidance of the strategy of summarising one source, and then in a separate paragraph, summarising the second source. This usually leads to no direct comparisons being made. Candidates should also be aware that identifying information in a source that is missing from the other source does not constitute finding a disagreement. General and vague comparisons should also be avoided e.g. 'The two sources agree about how many planes there were.'

Question 2

This question was answered much better than similar questions in previous sessions. An encouraging number of candidates explained how Sources C and D agree about the Republicans setting fire to Guernica, and then explained that this agreement does not necessarily mean that Source D prove Source C to be true because the reliability of Source D is suspect. They went on to make a developed evaluation of Source D, using the information provided about the author being based at Nationalist headquarters and working under strict censorship. A slightly less impressive approach (but still gaining good marks) was to compare C and D as described above, and then cross-referencing to other sources to check the claims being made in Source

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

D. Candidate responses would be improved by the avoidance of making assertions about the reliability of sources e.g. 'Source D cannot be trusted because the author was working under censorship'. Much better is 'Source D cannot be trusted because the journalist was working at Nationalist headquarters. This probably means that he was fed pro-Nationalist accounts of events. It also says that he was working under strict censorship which means the Nationalists would check what he was writing and would ban any material that they thought was not pro-Nationalist. This is why he tells us about the Republicans setting fire to Guernica.'

Question 3

There were many very good responses to this question. Only a small number of candidates read the cartoon literally and claimed that it was published to show that Franco wanted to bring peace to the Basques. Some candidates focused on the date of the cartoon and argued that it was published then because Guernica had just been bombed. The weakness of this approach is that it ignores the message of the cartoon. Many candidates understood that the cartoon is criticising Franco and his allies, and used terms such as 'ironic' or sarcastic' to describe the cartoon. They went on to explain how the cartoonist is actually blaming Franco for the terrible destruction of Guernica. The best responses went one step further and considered the possible purpose of the cartoonist e.g. to persuade the British government to change its policy of non-intervention in the Spanish Civil War.

Question 4

Many candidates wrote perfectly reasonable answers by focusing on the surface information of the sources. This works well with Source F, but not so well with Source G which is not directly related to the events in Guernica on 26 April 1937. Some candidates pointed this out and quite legitimately used it as a reason for why Source F is more useful than Source G. The best answers used Source F as evidence of French attitudes towards the bombing, and pointed out that although Source G is not directly about Guernica, it does suggest that the Germans might have been responsible for the bombing. Candidates should avoid dismissing sources on the basis of undeveloped evaluation e.g. 'Source F is not useful because it is French.' Evaluation of sources should always be developed e.g. 'Source F is useful/not useful because it was produced by the French. The French were very anti-German because of what Germany did to them in the First World War and they were worried that Hitler might invade France. This is why they claim in the postcard that the German planes murdered the Basques.' Of course, as has been explained already, the best candidates realized it is the fact that Source F is French that makes it so useful - as evidence of French attitudes.

Question 5

This 'Are you surprised' question produced a range of interesting and valid responses. Candidates should be aware of the fact that they must tell the Examiner whether they are surprised or not, rather than writing a good analysis of Source H but failing to state whether this makes them surprised. Candidates also needed to avoid claiming that they were surprised that Rosalles was disagreeing with, and censoring, those that he talked to. As Rosalles was a Nationalist press officer, we would expect him to be acting in these ways. Different candidates focused on different parts of Source H. Some wrote perfectly good empathetic answers by explaining how they were surprised by the brutality of the officer when he boasted about the bombing of Guernica. Better answers focused on the reactions of Rosalles towards the old man, the Nationalist officers and the American reporter, and explained why in the context of the Spanish Civil War his reactions were not at all surprising. Some very perceptive candidates went on to suggest that, given the circumstances described in Source H, they were surprised that the American journalist managed to have his account published.

Question 6

This question has the highest number of marks allocated to it. This session, many candidates produced strong answers. They carefully explained how some sources support the hypothesis that the Republicans set fire to Guernica, and then carefully explained how other sources disagree with it. Candidate responses would be further improved by the avoidance of making assertions e.g. 'Sources A and B both disagree with the statement because they say it was the Germans.' Instead, they should explain how a source agrees or disagrees with the statement e.g. ' Source B disagrees with the statement because it says that Guernica was bombed by German planes. In one place it actually says 'a German bomber' and in another it says 'three Junkers.' A larger number of candidates this year achieved high marks by evaluating the sources as they used them.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

General comments

A large majority of candidates chose the twentieth century option. Responses to both this and the nineteenth century option showed similar characteristics. Most IGCSE History candidates have little difficulty in comprehending the sources, and in using contextual knowledge to explain their main features. Source evaluation could be improved – candidates sometimes rely on generalisations based on source provenance, rather than using the provenance to help explain the reliability or utility of what the source actually says or shows. A significant number of candidates repeated the content of sources before answering the question set. In **Question 1**, which involved comparison of the content of two sources, this often meant that they wrote nearly two sides before making direct comparisons. Those candidates who adopted this approach on every question often began to run out of time by the time they reached **Question 6**, which carries the largest number of marks. Also, some candidates started every answer with a generalised comment about the provenance of the source, whether or not the question involved source evaluation. Again, on **Question 1**, many candidates' answers began with a lengthy paragraph comparing source provenance –not required on a question that was asking about how far the sources agreed. So, to sum up, the most important advice to give candidates is to *answer the question set*, and to *answer it directly*.

Comments on specific questions: 19th Century option

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

Comments on specific questions: 20th Century option

Question 1

In one sense, this question was answered quite well. It was a rare candidate who could not find some similarity or difference in detail between the two sources. Both sources suggested that there could be various culprits for the bombing/burning of Guernica – Basques, Nationalists, Germans, Republicans, and so on - and these could be matched or mismatched for agreement and disagreement. However, it would have helped many candidates if they had seen that the two sources each had an overall view on who was to blame; that Source A, for instance was not really saying that the Basques were to blame, but that this was part of a Nationalist plan to conceal the truth, and that the real opinion of the author of Source A was that the Germans bombed Guernica. In contrast, the overall opinion of Source B was that the 'Reds' were to blame. Spotting this fundamental disagreement could lead to candidates' scoring high marks.

Question 2

By asking directly about the reliability of two sources, this question required candidates to evaluate the competing claims made in them. As mentioned in the introduction to this report, this is something that some candidates could improve on. Some of these candidates gave answers based on source provenance alone. Such answers would argue, for example, that Source C is biased because the author was a Communist and so would be against the Nationalists, and that Source D is biased because the author was a Nationalist so would be biased against the Communists, or that Source C is reliable because she was an eye-witness, but Source D is unreliable because it was written long after the events. What is needed for higher marks is an analysis of what the sources actually say. Here, three possible approaches to evaluating the source content offered themselves. First, it was possible to focus on the language used by the writers, and to use the provenance to help explain why the writers would present events in the way they did. For example, the Communist account portrays Guernica as a peaceful town, with no military significance, with women and children as innocent victims of the attack. This is clearly intended to create sympathy for the Republican side, and thus raises doubts about its reliability. Second, these accounts could be compared against other

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

accounts – in **Question 1** candidates had already used Sources A and B which focused on the issue of who was to blame for the attack on Guernica, which was exactly the focus of the disagreements between Sources C and D. Third, consideration could have been given to the probable purposes of the authors in presenting events as they did; why, for example, would Source C have wanted the audience to sympathise with the victims? Candidates who were able to adopt any of these three approaches could open up a proper discussion of the credibility of the two sources.

Question 3

This was probably the best answered question. It produced well focused responses – that is, answers that concentrated on answering the question by giving *reasons* why the source was published – and gave candidates a chance to use their contextual knowledge. Those who did not answer quite so well tended to concentrate on the context, arguing that the poster was published to tell people about what had happened, or because of what had happened. Better candidates understood the point that the Republicans must have had some ulterior motives – wanting to pass on specific messages to the audience, or to produce some impact on the audience's behaviour. The central message was about who was to blame – the Germans /Nationalists – and to portray them as brutal aggressors. The purpose in presenting them in this way was, of course, to win support. It was in developing these perceptions about message and purpose that candidates could use contextual knowledge most effectively. For example, whilst it was reasonably obvious that the Republicans were seeking more support, many candidates were able to develop this by mentioning the Non-Intervention Committee, and the targeting of the poster on the British and French as a possible way of making them reconsider their policies, or by suggesting that the poster would be a way of increasing recruitment to the International Brigades.

Question 4

This question asked about the utility of two sources for studying events *at Guernica*. Some answers could have been improved by appreciating that both sources are not directly about Guernica. They asserted that the sources were useful because of information they provided, even though this information was not actually about Guernica. Some candidates also found themselves writing on issues of reliability (not necessarily a bad thing if done properly), but limited themselves to comments about provenance (e.g. 'Goering was on trial so he would not lie, so the source must be useful'). The best approach was from candidates who noted that neither source was about Guernica; many concluded that, therefore, both were not useful. This gained reasonable credit, but marks would have been higher if responses had not missed the point that the sources could have uses in relation to the attack on Guernica, but that these uses are *suggestive* rather than *informational*. In other words, the sources allow one to make inferences about the attack, even though they do not tell you about the attack. Source F, for example, does not say the Germans attacked Guernica, but it does strongly suggest that they did since it shows they had both the capacity and the motive.

Question 5

To answer questions of the 'Are you surprised?' type successfully, candidates must first identify clearly what it is in the source that they find surprising/not surprising, and then provide a reason, consistent with whether they are surprised or not, to explain their answer. Many answers would benefit observing these requirements. It is, for example, commonplace for answers to claim surprise about the source as a whole, even though the source contains several different points or claims. This was particularly relevant with Source H, where the author considered, in turn, the Germans, Nationalists and Republicans as potential culprits for the attack on Guernica. Which was a surprise and which not? There were also some miscomprehensions. Such answers thought the source was saying that German Stukas destroyed the town, when it said the opposite. Others argued that they were not surprised because the author, being on the Nationalists' side, would be bound to present the Nationalists in a good light – even though he was admitting that they were the ones who bombed Guernica. Valid answers were usually explained through cross-reference, either to other sources or to background knowledge. The most common approach was to express surprise that he says it was not the Germans, since there is so much evidence elsewhere that it was. The best answers made the point that the source is surprising since in it a Nationalist is prepared to admit that his own side was the one responsible for the bombing (an answer that could be further developed by pointing out that some of the other sources show how keen the Nationalists were to avoid responsibility).

Question 6

Most candidates were able to find some evidence in the sources both to support and to question the idea that the Germans used terror bombing on Guernica. Some would have benefitted from seeing the sources as more 'problematic' than they at first appeared. A good example was Source F, which, as discussed

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

above with reference to **Question 4**, did not actually deal with the attack on Guernica. To use it here, candidates needed to do more than simply quote its content as if it proved the Germans had attacked Guernica – they had to make it clear that it made it more likely that the Germans were responsible, or suggested that they were responsible. Another example was Source E - did this show German bombers or not? Answers needed to address this issue before the source could be used as evidence. Other sources, notably Source A, considered several possible candidates for blame. Also, whilst candidates could recognise whether or not a source suggested the Germans were to blame, some did not *use* the source content properly to illustrate their answers, which therefore produced lists of which said it was the Germans and which did not. The use of a source for or against the given hypothesis is credited where the answer shows not just which side of the hypothesis it is on, but how the source indicates this, as in this example:

> *Source C shows that it was the Germans who used terror bombing at Guernica because it says more than 50 German planes rained bombs on the town and machine-gunned the streets incessantly. Source H shows that it was not the Germans because it says that Guernica was bombed by the Nationalist airforce who hit the railway station and an arms factory.*

Finally, some marks are allocated for any valid evaluation of the source content – that is, for explaining why the source content cannot simply be taken at face value. These marks are not awarded for generalised comments on source provenance, but only for a piece of developed evaluation of source content. While a number of candidates achieved these marks in November 2010, it is hoped that more candidates will achieve this in future sessions.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

Overall, the standard was impressive. Candidates responded well to the needs of the paper. There were few weak responses, and a good understanding of the period studied was shown, as well as of the majority of sources. Sources were often intelligently applied and answers were well thought out, well argued and well expressed. There was much evidence of good practice and a high level of candidate interest was apparent.

Whilst there were many good responses, many of these could have been even better, by keeping the following in mind:

(1) In the use of sources there was much evidence to suggest that candidates were familiar with the context in which the sources were placed and they were often able to interpret the sources well. In some cases, though, candidates just picked out details from within the sources. This meant that sources were not looked at in holistic terms, and the overall message behind the sources was not always grasped.

(2) In the evaluation of sources, when looking at sources in terms of reliability or unreliability, candidates sometimes answered with basic and simplistic responses, such as, 'this source must be reliable as it was written by a historian.' This led to an acceptance of some sources at face value.

(3) Cross referencing, whilst present in a number of scripts, was at times not as developed as it could have been. This is particularly important when looking at questions concerned with how truthful or reliable a particular source is. This is an area to consider and develop.

There were too few responses to the Nineteenth Century Option to make any meaningful comments.

Twentieth Century Option

Question 1

This asked candidates to look at how far two sources agreed with each other. The overwhelming majority of candidates responded well to this question. Candidates identified points of agreement and disagreement between the sources. Good examples of agreement were that both sources agreed that Franco needed the help of the other Fascist powers, or that there were effects on the situation in Europe, particularly the detrimental effect on France. A number of disagreements were also explained, in particular the differences between the sources regarding the fact that Source A suggested that both Hitler and Mussolini aided Franco, whilst Source B showed that the level of aid given by Mussolini far exceeded that given by Hitler.

Many candidates were very clear regarding agreements and disagreements over detail; the overall message between the two sources could have been more fully developed by some candidates. By looking at the Sources holistically, both agreements and disagreements could have been seen. In both sources the overall message of agreement was that all Fascists benefited from their involvement in the Spanish Civil War, whereas Source B suggested that the real beneficiary was Hitler.

Question 2

Here candidates were asked to look at two conflicting sources and state whether the content of one made them surprised by the other. There were some very good responses to this question. Candidates, in order to access the higher levels of the markscheme, needed to look at the two sources together and to state surprise or lack of surprise based on, for example, either the time factor or the context of the two sources. Where candidates focused on the time factor, many suggested a lack of surprise because they were written at different times. Consideration of the content of the sources to suggest how or why things might have changed would have led to some higher level responses from some candidates, as would using the two

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

sources together, rather than focusing on just one source. In this answer, candidates often expressed that they were surprised by Source C.

Question 3

As with any question on the reliability of sources, this elicited a wide range of responses. Encouragingly, many candidates commented on the partiality of the source, clearly understanding its biased nature - based on the language and tone of the source, or by recognising that the provenance of the source would affect its reliability by virtue of the fact that the writer was a Nationalist officer. Candidates could have taken this further, and used either of these approaches to develop the overall impression of the source to suggest that it was unreliable because, as a nationalist message, it was by its very nature unreliable as it was trying to present Spain as a strong power, and Franco as being able to win the war without the need for foreign assistance. Where candidates did do this, their answers were very good indeed. Also a good number of candidates were able to cross reference to other sources to check as to whether the source was reliable or unreliable. Overall, the responses seen demonstrated a growing confidence among candidates in answering this type of question.

Question 4

Again, this question elicited a wide range of responses. These ranged from candidates who simply suggested that they could both be right because they talk about different things which they found difficult to justify in any meaningful way, to those who were able to explicitly cross reference to both sources to show how they are right or wrong. The latter responses were very sound - cross referencing to Source A to support F, or to background knowledge to challenge it. The most frequent way this was done was by candidates pointing out that Hitler, with a long track record of anti-communism, was highly unlikely to support Red Catalonia as suggested in Source F. Source G was supported by cross reference to Source B, concerning the manoeuvres against the French.

Although there were many good responses as described above, some candidate responses to this question simply used differences between the sources to suggest that one must be wrong. Cross referencing to other sources, or to contextual knowledge in order to check the veracity of particular sources, would have improved these answers.

Question 5

There were some very good responses to this particular question. Within the two cartoons, there were a number of sub messages which were spotted and developed by many candidates. Many candidates would have benefitted further by picking up on the nature of the overall message. Some viewed the cartoons as being principally about Hitler and Mussolini and their involvement in helping Franco in the Spanish Civil War. In doing this, the provenance of the source, which was British, was often missed. Low was a New Zealander, but he was working for a British newspaper and therefore his primary concern was in commenting on the British attitude to what was happening in Spain. The overall message was in the fact that Britain was being deluded, or deluding itself about what was going on in Spain. Some candidates picked up on this and they produced very good responses. As stated above, most concentrated on the roles of Hitler and Mussolini, particularly with regard to their manipulation of Franco. Other sub messages included those on the role of Franco in the conflict, shown by his size in relation to the other two dictators.

Question 6

Responses were clear, well written, and in the vast majority of cases, focused on the question set. Most responses focused on the sources, which was the best approach to take. Candidates generally found it easier to show the sources which did not support the statement, suggesting that Hitler had the greatest benefit from the war. With regard to specific sources, C and E proved most challenging, as candidates could have shown more appreciation of how they showed that Franco benefited from the war. Candidates could also improve on their evaluation of sources. For example, sources were seen as reliable and truthful because they were printed in newspapers, or because they were written by a historian. Answers need to show a greater depth of analysis. Also, some answers were unbalanced by the fact that although they were keen to evaluate the sources, they did not always relate them to the question set.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

The general quality of work was excellent this year. For Assignment 1, many candidates produced sophisticated analyses, well supported by factual knowledge. In Assignment 2, there was much excellent source evaluation.

Nearly all Centres produced well-organised and clear coursework schemes. The correct samples were sent to Moderators on time and with helpful notes about the coursework scheme and the conditions under which the work was completed. Generally, the standard of marking was high, with many Centres providing detailed comments on candidate answers, explaining why certain levels and marks had been awarded. These comments are very helpful to Moderators.

Many Centres used the assignments provided by CIE, and some produced their own assignments. Questions work best for Assignment 1 when they test a range of skills including description, explanation, analysis and the ability to produce supported judgements based on argument, reasoning, knowledge and understanding. It should be remembered that the more demanding questions, for example, demanding judgements, should be allocated more marks than questions requiring mainly description. There is no need for more than about four questions. Some Centres, however, prefer to set essays. These can work well for able candidates, although most are helped by the use of structured questions, where they can focus on one aspect or issue at a time.

The best exercises for Assignment 2 are based on a range of different types of source material from written sources such as letters and government documents to pictorial sources such as cartoons, posters and photographs. There should be about five or six questions testing in turn the ability to compare sources, interpret sources and evaluate sources in context. There should also be a final question that requires candidates to use all the sources together to test a hypothesis.

Much of the work seen this year for Assignment 1 was excellent. The best work answered the questions directly and gave well-supported and informed responses. This work contained analysis and explanation rather than narrative, and prioritising of causal factors and judgements that were well argued and well supported. Moderators welcome candidates' own views rather than predictable arguments taken from textbooks, as long as they are well supported with evidence. Candidates should be careful not to fall into the trap of telling the story of what happened, rather than analysing what happened, and should avoid writing long and unnecessary narrative introductions to their answers. They should tell the Examiner what their answer to the question is in the first sentence and then use the rest of the answer to argue, support and defend their point of view. It is possible to answer questions this way in coursework because candidates have time to think about and plan their answers.

The work for Assignment 2 was even stronger than that for Assignment 1. The best work interpreted sources, rather than reading them at a surface level, and produced developed contextual evaluation of sources. The latter involves using knowledge and understanding of the context to consider the possible purpose of sources. It was good to see so many candidates using their contextual knowledge in a relevant way. This involves using it to explain their interpretation of sources and to check claims being made in sources, as well as considering the position and interest of the authors of sources. These are much more appropriate uses of contextual knowledge than simply including within answers lots of detail that is not used in conjunction with the sources.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

General Comments.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945, remained the most popular choice with candidates in this session. There were also substantial numbers of candidates attempting Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941, and Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994. There were fewer attempts at other Depth Studies and certainly not enough to be able to make relevant and helpful comments.

Candidates should be congratulated in the manner in which they set out their scripts. Most of the hand writing was neat and tidy, and the questions were clearly labelled which made all that the candidates wished to convey accessible to Examiners. There were very few rubric offences, and candidates handled the time constraints well, although candidates should ensure that they leave enough time to fully answer **Question (b) (iv)**, which has the highest mark tariff of all questions on the paper.

Some candidates could improve on their responses to **Question (a) (iii)**. For marks in the range available for the achievement of the highest level for this question, candidates would be expected to test for the comparative reliability of the sources. Some candidates are aware of this but offer incomplete or 'stock' evaluations e.g. on Depth Study A, Source A, 'It was written by an historian in 1995 so he would have had time to research' and, of Source B, 'It was Goebbels speaking so he would know what he wanted to say'. Candidates should use source detail to explain which point of reliability they are trying to demonstrate. Also, some candidates achieve lower marks than they could obtain when they write of what the source 'is about', rather than in detail e.g. Depth Study A, Source A, 'Is about what Goebbels was like as a speaker' and Source B, 'Is about how the Nazis used the radio in Germany'. Source-based questions require source based answers.

The above comments are designed to help candidates, and many candidates had already appreciated this examination technique and produced good responses.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Candidates were able to draw valid inferences about Goebbels from Source A, and supported their inferences with detail and evidence from the source, many scoring maximum marks. Equally, candidates were able to find evidence in Source B to show that radio was a medium for controlling German people but it also had other uses of entertainment, games, jokes and music. Some candidates would improve their marks if they appreciated that **Questions (a) (ii)** require a balance of argument and evidence. Comments about the answers to **Question (a) (iii)** have been made above. Most candidates answered by comparing and contrasting the content of the sources, and those who developed an effective comparative evaluation received marks at the highest Level.

In answer to **Question (b) (i)**, most candidates were able to give details of the Nuremberg rallies and were well rewarded. In answers to **Question (b) (ii)** on how Goebbels controlled art and literature, candidates often commented on the concepts of patronage and censorship. Candidates could have improved marks by mentioning details of the Ministry of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment, subsidies, licences going to Culture Chamber members only, and the removal of Jews and their works. Some candidates found **Question (b) (iii)** a little more challenging. Most commented that, after the Night of the Long Knives and the death of Rohm, the SA would no longer be Hitler's favourite group, but the candidates could have mentioned the army's opposition, the introduction of conscription, the distrust of industrial backers of the Nazi Party for any 'socialist' policies that Rohm embraced, or even compared the qualities of the new leader of the SA, Lutze, against those of Rohm. Some of the answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were of high quality, with reasoned

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

and balanced arguments, supported by relevant and thorough detail, leading to a logical conclusion. Candidates contrasted the effectiveness of the control of newspapers and radio in keeping the people's support for the Nazis with other policies which were generally popular and created work, and reduced unemployment. Other factors often mentioned were the use of fear and the indoctrination of young people. Some candidates could increase their marks for this question if they either allowed sufficient time to deal with it fully, or appreciated that a one-sided argument will not score as well as a two-sided argument.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates found it relatively easy to draw valid inferences from Source A about the government's preparations to deal with Father Gapon's march. Most said that the government had underestimated the need for preparation, but the candidates reserved their harshest comments for Nicholas' departure for a quiet weekend of walks and games of dominoes. Candidates found it more challenging to appreciate both sides of the argument from the content of Source B on how far Nicholas II understood the needs of his people. They saw his dismissal of the comments of the zemstva as an extension of his determination to continue with upholding the principle of autocracy. Better candidates also commented that Nicholas was devoting his strength to the welfare of his people, but often said that political change was required as well. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were most often comparisons of the content of the sources, with a few repeating the issues mentioned in the General Comments section.

Question (b) (i) produced variable responses, some candidates writing that 'Soviets' were the citizens of the USSR. In the context of the sources and questions in this earlier period, the question referred to the workers councils and their functions during the 1905 and 1917 revolutions. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)**, requiring a description of the events of Bloody Sunday, were full and candidates often scored highly. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were equally impressive, with candidates giving full and developed reasons why Nicholas was able to survive the 1905 revolution. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** often agreed with the statement that the First World War caused the collapse of Tsarism in Russia in 1917. However, others were able to support ideas that all the underlying causes were present in disputes over land, lack of involvement in ruling the country, revolutionary groups, and very vivid descriptions of the impact of Rasputin's behaviour and his rule with a German Tsarina. Many felt that the defeats, deaths, shortages and conditions caused by the war were the catalysts for the final collapse. The arguments were often sophisticated, interesting and well argued.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from Source A and were not affected by the source being an example of lyrics form a song of the 1930s. Indeed, it appeared that candidates enjoyed drawing many inferences about the life and life styles of the poor and unemployed. Many candidates scored well in **Question (a) (i)**. Candidates were often split in their opinions over the issue of whether the Bonus Army (Source B) was a threat to Hoover's government. Some saw the sheer numbers of ex-servicemen as a threat and supported this with the detail of deaths on both sides. The very fact that Hoover ordered the camps to be closed and called for military support was quoted as extra evidence that the Bonus Army was a threat. However, some candidates felt that, as the servicemen had their wives and children with them, the threat was minimal as the Bonus Army would not want to place their families at risk. Some candidates felt that the Third Cavalry with 'fixed bayonets, machine guns, tear gas canisters' were more of a threat to the Bonus Army. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were often comparisons of the content of both sources, although there were some good comments about the provenance of both sources. A few candidates understood how the medium of music could be used or abused to portray poverty in the 1930s, while others commented on the dangers of relying on websites, however well intentioned they appeared to be.

Most candidates were able to identify Roosevelt's Fireside Chats and gave good context for them. Most of the answers to **Question (b) (ii)** showed that candidates understood what Roosevelt had done to improve the situation regarding the Banking Crisis in 1933. Some of the fine detail given was impressive. Candidates were less secure when giving reasons in answers to **Question (b) (iii)**, for the short lives of many New Deal Agencies. Many saw that the agencies were only intended to give employment in the short term but they were less confident in pointing out opposition from Republicans, rulings of the Supreme Court, and more general opposition from Americans to any measures that smacked of socialism. Many candidates agreed in answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, that the main success of the New Deal measures was to reduce unemployment. They gave detail of agencies that provided employment. However, some candidates showed that measures to deal with the banking crisis, the establishment of trade union rights, pensions etc. were equally important, while other candidates showed that unemployment actually rose in the late 1930s and that the unemployment problem was only really solved by the onset of the Second World War. There were well informed and thoughtful answers to this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

There were too few attempts at the questions set for this Depth Study to make relevant and useful comments.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

There were too few attempts at the questions set for this Depth Study to make relevant and useful comments.

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

Candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from Source A regarding efforts to make peace between the Arabs and the Israelis. Many commented on the protracted and difficult negotiations and entrenched positions, supporting their inferences with detail from the source. There were many comments about how little had been achieved by 2010. Candidates were also able to see that the cartoon (Source B) showed that Sadat was making the trip to Jerusalem in hope but he was surrounded on both sides by enemies depicted as sharks. Most candidates found a balance of information. As with other answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, candidates tended to compare and contrast the content of the two sources. However, there was some good comment about the use of cartoons to create an exaggerated or emphasised message. Here, the biblical message of the parting of the sea and a very small Sadat, surrounded by enemies, had candidates suggesting that Sadat's task was going to be very difficult in the eyes of the cartoonist.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** showed that candidates knew what Camp David was, and answers to **Question (b) (ii)** showed that some candidates were well versed in President Carter's facilitating role in Israeli-Egyptian negotiations in 1978. Candidates could have been better on the reasons for President Sadat's readiness in 1978 to recognise the right of state of Israel to exist. Candidates wrote about the several heavy defeats by Israel but they could have developed the financial constraints facing Egypt at home, how the decline in relations with the USSR affected Egypt, and how the political and economic support of Kissinger for Egypt affected Sadat's view of the West. Answers for **Question (b) (iv)** on the subject of how far problems between Israel and its neighbours had been settled, were often quite brief and generally one-sided. Candidates scored well when they pointed out that Israel had come to an accommodation with both Egypt and Jordan but the state of Israel's existence was still opposed by Iraq, Iran, Syria and Lebanon. These answers were accompanied by examples and sustained detail.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were too few attempts at the questions set for this Depth Study to make relevant and useful comments.

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

There were too few attempts at the questions set for this Depth Study to make relevant and useful comments.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

General Comments

As with all recent seasons of examination, Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945 was the candidates' favourite Depth Study. There were also significant numbers of attempts at Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941. There were some attempts at other Depth Studies, but these were not numerous.

Most scripts were clearly set out and the handwriting, for the most part, was easily legible. Most candidates had clearly taken pride in how they presented their work. There were a few examples of candidates not planning the use of their time well, with short answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, or questions omitted so that more time could be spent on answering **Question (b) (iv)**, which has the highest mark tariff of any question in the paper. There was an increase in rubric infringements, with candidates often attempting more than one Depth Study.

As in other recent examination sessions, answers to **Question (a) (iii)** could have been stronger. Some candidates are limiting their marks by responding to this question in one of three ways. Firstly, some candidates need to appreciate that the prompt in the question of 'Is one of these sources more useful than the other?' is an invitation to write about the merits of both sources. Currently, these candidates decide which source is more useful and write about one of them. There can be no comparative discussion of utility in these circumstances. A second group try to tell the Examiner what the source says in general e.g. Source A in Depth Study A is 'about what the NSDAP want to do if they get into power' and Source B 'is about what Hitler was like as a leader'. Candidates should appreciate that the Examiner is looking for a comparison of source content at this level. A third group of candidates appreciate that an evaluation of the sources is the best test of their comparative utility. These candidates would benefit by not using 'stock' or incomplete evaluation, and ensuring that they use details from the source. Examples of the sorts of response currently offered by these candidates include the following: Source A of Depth Study A 'is written by members of the NSDAP and so they should know what they want to do' and of Source B they comment 'This is written by a British professor who would have had much time to research' or 'This will be biased as the source is written by a British professor and the British do not like the Germans'.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A, the extracts from the Twenty-Five Point Programme of the NSDAP, 1920, and pointed out that they showed racism, a need to overturn some of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in order to re-unite Germans, and many saw that policies on company profits and pensions were attempts to gain the support of the workers and the elderly. There were also some interesting observations about the contrast between demands for the workers and the elderly, which were seen as socialist demands, and the authoritarian demands for 'a strong national government with complete authority' which was seen as fascist. Most candidates were able to find a balance of evidence in Depth Study B to show that there were differing views and times regarding Hitler's effectiveness as a leader in the 1920s. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** have already received comment in the General Comments section. However, most candidates answered this question with a comparison of the content of the sources. Few ventured beyond this level, although a few candidates did offer good evaluations of the sources. To gain more than the most modest marks, candidates must provide evidence from both sources.

Most candidates were able to offer at least one example of the main political parties, other than the Nazis, in the 1920s, and a significant number of candidates scored well when explaining the powers that the President had under the Weimar Constitution. This was impressive but not as impressive as were the answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on why Ernst Rohm was important to the Nazis before 1934. Much relevant knowledge

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

was deployed, although some did not respond to the time limit in the question of 'before 1934'. Candidates did not lose marks for describing events and their importance in 1934, but they could have used this time more profitably. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were usually of three types. Firstly, some candidates agreed or disagreed that the Enabling Act was the most important factor leading to Hitler becoming the Fuhrer in 1934, and wrote solely about the Enabling Act. A second group of candidates compared the importance of the Enabling Act to the Night of the Long Knives and/or the death of Hindenburg, whilst a third group compared the importance of the Enabling Act to almost any event that happened between 1920 and 1934. There were some sophisticated arguments about the relevance and importance of many factors, and these efforts were good to read.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from Source A about peasant life during the Civil War. Others either copied out the source with no further comment, or placed the source in a larger context from their own knowledge. Contextual knowledge is always welcome but not as a substitute for source detail and, of course, it must be correct. A number of candidates gave both Source A and Source B the context of the Civil War being between the Bolsheviks and the Provisional Government. There were some one-sided answers to **Question (a) (ii)** where the candidates were asked to comment on the assertion that the key to Bolshevik success was the ineffectiveness of the opposition. Candidates often quoted that 70 per cent of the population, the peasantry, remained inactive and that 15 percent of the population was divided against itself by way of monarchists, liberals and socialists. However, only the more astute candidates saw that Bolshevik energy and discipline were important factors in their success as well. Most answers to **Question (a) (iii)** compared and contrasted the content of the two sources and more candidates could have completed an evaluation of the sources' comparative utility.

Most candidates knew what the Cheka was and what it was supposed to achieve. Many candidates were able to describe the main elements of War communism and scored well, but a few candidates were clearly unsure and answers ranged from assertions regarding the Russo-German Front to forcing the peasants to accept the Bolsheviks as the 'new masters of Russia'. Many of the answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons for the Bolsheviks winning the Russian Civil War were full and detailed, although a significant minority would have benefitted from mentioning the skills of Trotsky in this context. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on the degree of success achieved by the New Economic Policy were either full, balanced and well-informed, or brief, and gave outlines of what the New Economic Policy was. Another group of candidates would have benefitted from more information about the New Economic Policy. Common misunderstandings had Stalin as its main supporter and some placed it in time ahead of War Communism.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Candidates drew valid inferences from Source A about stock market investors in the 1920s. The most common inferences were that the investors had more money than sense, that they were easily fooled by persuasive advisers, and that they were over-confident in the system. The most common misunderstanding was to think that the reference in the source to 'the Republic' was a reference to 'the Republican Party'. Many commented on the ironic/sarcastic style and language of the piece. This would have been better placed in answers to **Question (a) (iii)**. Comments in answers to **Question (a) (ii)** on the issue of whether over-confidence was responsible for the problems of the stock market showed that candidates thought it was the main culprit and gave evidence from Source B to prove the case. Better candidates also found evidence to show that both lack of proper regulation and criminality were responsible as well. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** had most candidates commenting on both sources but, as with other Depth Studies, many of them needed to go beyond the comparison of source content.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** showed that candidates understood what the term 'buying on the margin' meant, or they guessed at the meaning of the term. A few worked out for themselves that it must mean something along the lines of hire purchase of stocks and shares. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** and **Question (b) (iii)** often used the same general material about measures taken by Hoover. However, there were a number of excellent and detailed descriptions of Hoover's measures and also excellent explanations of why Hoover's policies had a limited effect on the American economy by 1932. These answers were clearly superior and impressive in their specific knowledge and understanding of the subject matter. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** ranged from brief and very general observations on the banking crisis, to observations about the seriousness of that crisis compared to another consequence – single issues like unemployment – to even deeper analyses comparing the banking crisis to many other consequences. These latter answers again were very impressive.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

There were too few attempts at questions set for this Depth Study to make general observations and helpful comments.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

There were too few attempts at questions set for this Depth Study to make general observations and helpful comments.

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

The few candidates who attempted this Depth Study in this season of examination were easily able to draw valid inferences from Source A that Israel had won the war easily, that it was now in a much stronger position in dealings with its neighbours and the country had increased in confidence. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** on whether Source B showed that prospects for peace were good in 1968, generally found no cause for optimism, although this was sometimes tempered by the evidence that the United Nations Organisation had become involved with Resolution 242. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** followed the previously described pattern of comparing source content.

Candidates found it easy to nominate two areas occupied by Israel during the Six Day War, and all recognised and were able to describe the devastating impact of the Israeli air force during the war. Equally, the reasons for Nasser's increase of threat to Israel were well known and comments were largely about the impact on Nasser of disagreements in the Israeli government, his status as a leader of the Arab world, criticisms by other Arab states of his inaction, and misguided intelligence from the Soviet Union. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on how far the Israeli victory in 1967 changed the attitudes of Arab states and the Palestinians were often one-sided, with the conclusion that as Arab states and Palestinians still hated the idea of a state of Israel, nothing much had changed. Candidates could have explored the change that the Palestinians now believed increasingly that Arab states were not going to solve Palestinian problems, and they would have to rely on their own actions. They could have also explored the idea that, although some Arab leaders saw the inevitability of some kind of agreement with Israel, they were prisoners of opposition in their own countries or opposition from their neighbours.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were too few attempts at questions set for this Depth Study to make general observations and helpful comments.

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

A few candidates had prepared to answer questions set for this Depth Study. Candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the Berlin Conference, and these largely consisted of comments about the pompous and unrealistic claims and ambitions of Bismarck. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** on the how far Source B showed that the Belgian colonisation of the Congo was motivated by economic gain usually chose evidence to support the proposition that economic gain was the only reason. Candidates could have appreciated that there was evidence in the source for other motives. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** consisted of comparisons of the source content and detail.

Candidates were insecure in their efforts to name two colonies established by Germany in Africa in the second half of the nineteenth century, and were equally unsure of how the Congo came under the control of King Leopold II of Belgium. Answers to why Britain had more African possessions than other European countries usually provoked comments that Britain got there first, had mopped up all the worthwhile territories before others saw the benefits of empire, or that Britain had 'a big navy'. Almost invariably answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on how far the Scramble for Africa was a disaster for Africa agreed that it was a disaster. These answers would have benefitted from looking at more than one side.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

General comments

Depth Study F (Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994) was the most popular choice in this session, followed by Depth Studies A (Germany, 1918-1945) and B (Russia, 1905-1941). A smaller number of candidates had prepared for Depth Study C (USA, 1919-1941). Too few responses were seen to any other topic to make comment appropriate.

No rubric infringements were seen and scripts were well presented and written in excellent English. Secure historical knowledge was displayed by many candidates in *Section B* answers and the majority tackled **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)** in line with the criteria. **Question (a) (iii)** was not addressed as effectively, as many candidates offered generalisations on reliability. To improve, candidates need to substantiate such points with examples from the sources in relation to the issue presented in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1 Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

(a) (i) All candidates made valid inferences from Source A about the Freikorps' military appearance and their seeming popularity. It is particularly pleasing to report that almost all of the inferences were supported with specific detail from the source and thus candidates could attain the highest level marks.

(ii) Most responses focused on weaknesses of the Weimar government and explained why a particular aspect was a weakness rather than offering just quotes. The comparative strengths of the government were addressed less securely by many candidates, or not at all. It may be advisable to remind candidates that a balance will be found within a source if it is given sufficient consideration. In this case, the fact that the army did not 'actively attempt to overthrow the Republic' offered at least some counterbalance, whilst there was a genuine strength in the workers' support for the government, forcing the collapse of Kapp's Putsch.

(iii) On this Depth Study fewer candidates offered generalisations on reliability such as 'Source A is useless because it's only a photo'. The more common approach was to reiterate earlier points on government weakness, usually from Source B. A small number of candidates did offer clear cross-reference on the Freikorps shown in Source A, with Kapp's Putsch in Source B, as one measure of the problems facing the Weimar government. 1920 in both sources was a clue which some missed. The best responses explained that 'one of the Freikorps Brigades' in Source A signified that there were more and that this was particularly threatening in the capital, which Source B confirmed as the government had been forced to move from Berlin to Stuttgart. That the Freikorps, so evidently armed, had been used by the government to deal with left-wing risings and had then turned against it, might have been considered as evidence of the turmoil in the early years and the fragility of the new democracy.

(b) (i) Rosa Luxemburg had clearly made an impression on almost all candidates, although far fewer knew of Karl Liebknecht. The spelling of his name was highly variable.

(ii) The majority of candidates named proportional representation and Article 48. Explanation of how these could be weaknesses would have improved some responses. A small number did also indicate that the federal nature of government was a problem, although other aspects could have been considered. Some candidates ignored 'Constitution' and wrote about general weaknesses of the government – often from Source B.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(iii) A number of excellent responses developed a good range of reasons for the army's resentment. All candidates pointed to some aspect of the Treaty of Versailles, usually the reduction in the size of the army, or the myth that the army had not been defeated, leading to antipathy towards the 'November Criminals'. A smaller number considered why many in the army sympathised with the Freikorps or remained staunch elitists.

(iv) Well - developed responses offered some balance, usually pointing to the benefit for those in debt, including the effect on reparation payments, in comparison to the disaster for those on fixed incomes, and the contrast with Stresemann's policies was also made. Other candidates needed to avoid over-description of wheelbarrows of money in favour of considering a range of effects and, in particular, what could be seen as the benefits resulting from hyperinflation. Candidates might also have compared hyperinflation with what could be argued to have been even greater disasters, such as the Treaty of Versailles and political extremism, and made something of the distinction between Germany and its people.

Question 2 Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

(a) (i) Most candidates were able to draw and support valid inferences on Kerensky's ability as a passionate speaker to inspire crowds, as well as his lacklustre career up to 1917. A small number would have benefitted from doing more than just quoting the source.

(ii) Almost all candidates saw some balance in this source and a number went beyond quotation to explain why wearing red ribbons could be seen as support and that some must have been active revolutionaries if the level of violence is considered. More attention tended to be given to disagreeing, citing spectators who fled once fighting began.

(iii) The majority of candidates offered generalisations on reliability such as 'they are British so must be biased' or simply repeated points made in the earlier answers. Focus on the wider issue of 'Russia in early 1917' was needed, as was explanation of why one source was more useful than the other which should rest on direct comparison. Some answers would have benefitted from indicating that Russia faced both violent and political unrest and that 'crowds' were significant in the period.

(b) (i) The majority of candidates named one political party. Answers would have been improved by offering two. The main examples given were the Socialist Democrats or the Cadets, although some did include the Octobrists and Nationalists.

(ii) In the main candidates here gained full marks for excellent knowledge of the Kornilov Affair or they struggled due to the lack of an answer, or writing about another event.

(iii) A number of candidates pointed to a good range of general reasons for the second 1917 revolution and usually developed these, although there was rarely any reference to the actions of the Bolsheviks and the Petrograd Soviet. Less successful answers had used the 1905 revolution as the first in 1917.

(iv) All candidates considered some range of aspects in the conduct of the war but these were often very general and not balanced against any other factors. The most secure responses contrasted the effects of the war with the longer-standing political, economic and social factors to reach a balanced judgement on which contributed most to the fall of the Tsar. Knowledge of revolutionary groups and their actions was an aspect that could have been considered, as was when exactly in 1917 the fall of the Tsar occurred and why this was significant.

Question 3 Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

(a) (i) This question elicited some good responses, supporting a number of inferences from the source focused securely on 'the influence of the film industry' both on young women, and its potential challenge to accepted social patterns.

(ii) Here, too, many candidates used the content to develop explained balance, rather than simply quoting the source. That cinema-goers enjoyment of many of the blacklisted aspects led to the industry bending the censorship rules was appreciated, as well as the variation in state controls.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(iii) This proved the most challenging source-based answer for candidates. Assertions that 'Source A is more reliable because it was in 1923' or 'an historian has hindsight' can gain only limited marks, however lengthy. The focus of the question on 'life in the USA' needed to be pursued, and points on this from both sources, explained. For example, though limited to the film industry, both demonstrate that the industry is growing, popular nationwide and seemed to be contributing to changing moral standards and the roles of at least some women. The utility of the sources can, thereby, be assessed and reliability brought into the test to reach a reasoned conclusion on comparative utility.

(b) (i) Not all of the responses to this identified Al Jolson's 'Jazz Singer' as the correct answer.

(ii) A number of candidates gained full marks for their knowledge of the St. Valentine's Day Massacre, and all had some awareness of its gang-related nature.

(iii) The significance of Prohibition was known by all as a reason for the increase in organised crime. More candidates could have explained the profit motive or other factors, such as the corruption of police and politicians and reasons for the growing strength of the Mafia.

(iv) It was pleasing to see that candidates focused clearly on the issue of 'Roaring' Twenties and almost all attempted some balance between young and old or another aspect, such as the rapid development of the economy as more deserving of the title, although most concentrated on the increasing freedom for women. Some also made the distinction between urban and rural aspects. Other responses would have benefitted from fuller responses and better time management.

Question 6 Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994

In general on this Depth Study candidates gained good marks on the source-based **Questions (a)(i)** and **(a)(ii)**, but were less successful on (**a)(iii)** and, in particular, the *Section B* questions.

(a) (i) Several valid and supported inferences were drawn on President Nasser and better candidates appreciated that 'to direct the canal company and undertake its operation' related to nationalisation. Some mistakenly claimed that the canal was being built in 1956.

(ii) Most were on surer ground with this question and almost all gave balanced consideration of Israel's success and relative failure to gain good marks. The best answers explained support for their points, rather than simply quoting the source.

(iii) There were some sound answers which made use of the content of the sources to assess their utility in relation to the Suez War. The majority of candidates – often at length – offered only generalisations such as 'radio broadcasts are not as useful as history books' or on 'bias'. More specific support from the sources would have improved such answers. Those candidates who pointed out that Source A was published before the war had real potential to develop good answers if only they had not claimed the source was useless as a result. There were clear opportunities to cross-refer, for example, on A's 'foreign Canal Company' and 'the combined attack of Britain and France' and test this to assess utility.

(b) (i) Some candidates had accurate knowledge on the Accords and achieved full marks. Others offered incorrect guesses or no answer.

(ii) Most responses offered some awareness of American pressure on Israel to end the war and later Soviet arms for Egypt. Other responses would have benefitted from some specific examples of their immediate reaction, particularly towards the French and British.

(iii) American pressure on Israel was clearly of relevance here but why this was so significant for Israel could have been explained by more candidates. Few went on to give other reasons, such as the problem created by the French and British withdrawal or the significance of the UNO proposals for Israel's security. A number of candidates had clearly confused this war with one or other of the later ones –which was also evident in their answers to **(b)(iv)**.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(iv) Some responses would have been improved by developing a range of relevant and supported aspects against which change could be assessed. Brevity and vagueness characterised some answers. Accurate examples and clear explanation are essential to develop the necessary depth of analysis and draw a valid conclusion. For example, that 'hatred of Israel' increased needs some explanation of why it was there already and evidence of its increase. Similarly, 'Nasser became a hero' without explanation or its results, is insufficient. Candidates should appreciate that Arab countries cannot be considered as a single entity.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© UCLES 2010