eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

Key Messages and General Comments

Many candidates were well prepared for the examination, displaying relevant historical knowledge. These candidates produced answers clearly focused on the demands of individual questions. Candidates who had a sound understanding of the historical topics they had studied were able to order their knowledge to meet the requirements of the questions.

In some instances candidates demonstrated misunderstanding in relation to historical knowledge and would have benefited from an awareness of the techniques required to present a successful answer. These responses were characterised by a display of historical knowledge related to the area of content of the question and an inability to relate this material to the question as set.

It is important that candidates answer the question as set, rather than writing lengthy narratives of the general area of the question.

This year saw the return of many extended answers to part **(a)** questions. To gain maximum credit does not require lengthy description but more a clarity of thought that identifies four pieces of relevant information. Full marks can also be achieved by the development of two of the pieces of information. In answering part **(b)** of a question, candidates' attempts generally produced an appropriate style of response. It is worth noting here that full marks can be gained through four correct explanations. Alternatively, the maximum can be achieved by the production of two well-developed explanations which contain significant supporting detail. Answers to **(c)** parts of a question require an explanation of the issues, with the explanation being linked to the question. The nature of these questions requires candidates to construct an argument to support and challenge the hypothesis. To this end it is commendable that some Centres encourage candidates to plan responses before writing the final version. This does produce more coherent arguments with a logical flow through each inter-related argument. Good candidates often explain one reason per paragraph. This approach appears to encourage the movement from narrative to good explanation. In some instances, candidates neglected to challenge the question, writing only about one side of the argument. This approach limits the mark which can be achieved.

The vast majority of candidates used their time wisely and finished the paper. A few candidates contravened the rubric. Usually this involved attempting more questions than required on the Depth Study.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1 - 3 received too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 4

In **(a)** the majority of candidates were aware that the Moroccan Crisis was a dispute between France and Germany. Most commented that the Kaiser was flexing his muscles with a wish to test the recent Anglo-French friendship. Many knew there was a conference to settle the issue, although relatively few mentioned Algeciras. At this point some candidates became confused with the later Moroccan crisis and wrote detail about such events as 'the Kaiser sent a gun boat'.

The better answers to **(b)** explained the significance of the Crisis in terms of both Serbia and Austria increasing ill-feeling towards each other, caused by Austria taking Bosnia and linking this to the importance of Russia's involvement. This was then linked to later events putting the period into a sound historical

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

context. Less successful responses were characterised by a lack of detail, being more descriptive in nature and lacking the vital link of 'importance' within the context of the period.

Answers were wide ranging in **(c)**. Some candidates wrote analytically about the counter-arguments, whilst others concentrated on whether Germany was responsible. Better answers combined these two approaches, with additional explanation to make secure the links to the reasons why war broke out. Some weaker answers, whilst showing limited awareness of some factors, did not progress beyond the descriptive stage.

Question 5

In **(a)** the role of the Assembly was sometimes confused with the work of the Council of the League of Nations. Others described the make-up and the holding of meetings, despite the question asking for 'the roles'. Some better answers to the Mandates Commission part gave examples, although the lack of valid examples offered by some candidates, did not help responses.

The less successful answers to **(b)** did not respond to the demands of the question - describing events, whether a success or not, rather than addressing the reasons for success. Some candidates showed their awareness of successful League action over border disputes, although why the League was successful was sometimes limited to 'the decision of the League was accepted'. The explanations offered needed to be put more firmly in the context of the time. The best answers did look at the League within the context of a recent war, the absence of some countries and attempts to maintain peace.

Part **(c)** was an opportunity for candidates to show their ability to think differently about the demise of the League of Nations. Better answers showed a good understanding of the role of Britain and France, often exemplified by reference to their attitudes towards events in Manchuria and Abyssinia. This approach produced some good explanations for a one-sided argument. These better candidates then produced explanation relating to the Depression and the rise of dictators, together with a good understanding of the impact of the absence of the USA. Less thoughtful answers were still relatively strong on Britain and France but were restricted to identification that 'America was not a member' and the 'Depression brought extremists to power'. Weaker answers were characterised by a lack of understanding, particularly of Hoare-Laval, and over concentration on description of the reasons for the USA's absence from the League.

Question 6

There were many factually correct, detailed answers to **(a)** which scored full marks. In these answers details of the Treaty terms were given, together with events in 1935. To gain maximum marks it was necessary to include detail of both aspects in the answer. There were also many factual errors. In terms of the Treaty, candidates often thought the Saar had been 'given to France' for fifteen years. The Saar itself was sometimes confused with the Rhineland, resulting in answers about remilitarisation.

In **(b)** some candidates wrote descriptive accounts of events in Austria in 1938 which needed to include more about Britain and France. Those who read the question more carefully considered the wider picture in Europe at that time, bringing into their discussion the impact of both Hitler and Mussolini relative to the actions of France and Britain, producing a valid answer within the context of Europe at that time.

The best answers to **(c)** explained how the different aspects of Hitler's foreign policy and Hitler's actions after 1933 contributed to increasing European tension and eventually war. This was balanced against other reasons such as appeasement and the lasting impact of the Treaty of Versailles. Less successful answers concentrated on similar areas but neglected, in most instances, to explain how they contributed to the outbreak of war. Some candidates knew of the Nazi-Soviet Pact but saw its significance more in relation to the outbreak of war with Russia in 1941 and not the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939. Some candidates mistakenly thought of 'appeasement' as some sort of treaty and so by breaking it, Hitler caused war.

Question 7

Some candidates in **(a)** would have improved their responses by differentiating between decisions taken at Yalta and those taken at Potsdam. Others stated that the decisions were all made at Yalta, whilst Potsdam just saw disagreement, and then went on to explain why this was the case. The better answers showed some awareness and did at least state that decisions about Germany were 'confirmed' at Potsdam.

At the very least in **(b)** most candidates were able to use the 'communism' v 'capitalism' argument. Stronger responses sought out a number of events during the period to use as the basis for their argument. The best

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

answers considered many of these arguments from the point of view of the two sides. In questions such as this, it is important to observe the date limits.

Part **(c)** saw some candidates producing answers which went beyond the boundaries required. If specific factors are given, those are the ones that should be considered. However, there were many good answers, with the best of these characterised by an understanding of why the Truman Doctrine was introduced, how it operated and why it contributed to the Cold War. This was set against the West's perceived threat of the consequences of retaliatory action against the Blockade. Less successful answers missed the link to the 'increasing Cold War tension' of the question. These answers were characterised by their descriptive nature of both factors. There were some one-side responses where the Truman Doctrine was explained but not the Berlin Blockade. A small number of candidates confused the Blockade with the Berlin Wall.

Question 8

Many valid answers to **(a)** centred around sugar, trade and diplomatic relations but were often characterised by events after the Bay of Pigs invasion. Thus material on invasion, missiles, etc. was outside the scope of the question.

Good answers to **(b)** often referred to poor planning, inadequate resources and superior Cuban power. These were well-developed into explanation and scored highly. Weaker answers were characterised by limited explanation of these main points or no explanation. Some responses referred erroneously to 'US soldiers'.

Part **(c)** produced some good responses, with strong explanation both for and against the question hypothesis. Most referred to missiles in Turkey as a bargaining tool, the establishment of communist country close to America, together with the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs invasion. These were often argued in different ways to meet the demands of the question. Less strong answers tended to miss the question stem, instead writing about events during the Crisis.

Section B – Depth Studies

Germany, 1918-45

Question 9

Some answers to part **(a)** required a greater focus on the question, which was about Germany 'at the end of the First World War'. Some answers related to the period up to 1923, whilst others concentrated on the impact of the Treaty which had not yet been signed. Those candidates who got to grips with the demands of the question scored well by citing inadequate diet, high unemployment, shortage of food and a flu epidemic.

Part **(b)** answers were characterised by reference to the new Weimar Republic, threats from left and right-wing activists through to the problems in the Ruhr and the Munich Putsch. What was evident in many answers was the strong factual knowledge base held by candidates which aided the production of sound explanation, producing quality answers. Less successful answers still mentioned many of these reasons, although the explanation in terms of instability needed to be strengthened or, in some cases, introduced.

The Weimar government's activities post-1923 were generally well-known in part **(c)**, with the significance of American loans to the German economy and German international recognition being developed into good explanations. The other side of the argument was based on the fragility of an economy built on loans, the lack of approval for the new arts and the ignoring of areas of German society. Where these factors were embraced, a balanced answer was produced. Other answers were stronger on the positive side, and not as well balanced. Some candidates were aware of the factors but were unable to convert description and identification into explanation.

Question 10

In **(a)** most answers were detailed in terms of the role expected of women in Nazi Germany. Often the 'Three Ks' were quoted to establish the answer. Some indicated the reason for the role, i.e. to increase the size of the army.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

In most instances in answer to **(b)**, public works including the building of autobahns, conscription and the removal of women from employment, were cited as reasons. Some candidates were able to offer valid explanations as to why these, and other factors, contributed to a reduction in unemployment.

The answering of **(c)** required a consideration of 'how successful'. Some candidates interpreted the question as requiring a description of Nazi policies for the young in terms of schools and youth organisations. The better answers could explain the achievements in relation to women and the family, or the lack of achievement, of these policies.

Russia, 1905-41

Question 11

Some good answers to **(a)** were seen which used examples such as Social Revolutionaries and the Social Democratic Party, as well as the more straight forward answer of wanting a constitutional monarch. These examples were enhanced in the best answers by knowledge showing that, for example, the SDP was split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

In answering **(b)**, some candidates simply told the story of Bloody Sunday, resulting in lower marks than could have been achieved. These answers contained passing references to poor living and working conditions, but this descriptive approach limited the quality of the answer. Those who produced better responses realised that the answer lay in the causes of Bloody Sunday and these candidates did identify some causes. These answers used the main causes to develop explanations – the main causes being the failure in war, conditions and the repressive control of the Tsar.

Many answers to **(c)** which looked at the difficulties facing the Tsar, and which considered the Tsar's response, would have been improved by evaluating 'how well'. Thus the idea of a Duma was a positive notion, as was the work of Stolypin. It was often only when Rasputin was addressed that Examiners saw an explanation of failing. The better answers made evaluative judgements throughout by using the same evidence but questioning the relative success of each aspect. Some candidates missed the end date quoted in the question and went on to the war and wartime leadership of the Tsar.

Question 12

In **(a)**, candidates were able to describe the purges and in many instances mention the outcome for those affected. The best answers included 'the results', as required by the question. Some mentioned outcomes in relation to fear and distrust. Reference to the impact on the military and the loss of professional workers, would have benefited some candidates. Others did progress to suggesting Stalin was no longer in fear of threats to his status and position.

Less successful answers to **(b)** often described the Stalin 'cult of personality' without progressing to its impact. Better answers focused on its impact in terms of the creating a person loved by his citizens and being praised for his rule and achievements; the purpose of this was found in the best answers.

Most answers to **(c)** were able to indicate that the rule of Stalin did have both success as well as a more sinister side. The degree to which these views were developed varied, although many balanced arguments were seen at the highest level. Some answers were limited to one, or the other, point of view. Some were much stronger on the successes, whilst others saw only failings. Arguments at this level were usually limited to the lack of improvement in living and working conditions. Better answers explored the detrimental impact of collectivisation and / or the purges.

Question 13

There were many good answers to **(a)**. Generally, answers were detailed with references to the 'Red Scare', Sacco and Vanzetti, segregation and the Ku Klux Klan.

This question (part **(b)**) was confidently handled. Much was known about Prohibition and its introduction. Most were aware of reasons for its introduction, although some responses would have benefited fro an explanation of this. Much was made of the social aspects, with less concentration on German links. Some weaker answers drifted from the question to describe impact.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

In **(c)**, some responses concentrated more on descriptions of gangsterism, rather than explanation. There were candidates who put together factors like speakeasies, bootleggers and corruption in their discussion on gangsterism, without shaping them into a developed response. The best answers made clear what might be appropriate under gangsterism and what might provide a counter argument. This approach provided a more coherent argument.

Question 14

Most answers scored well in part **(a)**, as the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority was generally well known. Most put the work in the context of the New Deal.

In **(b)**, most candidates were able to present a number of factors, although the degree of explanation, required to access the higher levels, varied considerably. The unconstitutional accusations were generally well dealt with and together with the view held by some of Roosevelt's dictatorial attitude, formed the basis of the better answers. Equally valid reasons were not always developed to the same degree and so 'not helping the poor' or 'not helping black people' needed more explanation.

Often in **(c)**, answers were one-sided as candidates were less confident with the shortcomings of the New Deal, beyond the fact that it did not solve unemployment. Unemployment was more confidently dealt with in the better answers, with explanation regarding the temporary jobs created and the fact that the coming of war actually solved unemployment. The best answers produced an argument that the New Deal could not have been successful if a second one was required, or took the view that there must have been some substance in the objections that were being made. The positive side of the argument was supported by a variety of different examples.

Questions 15 - 17 received too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

Question 18

Answers to **(a)** demonstrated good knowledge of the impact of apartheid, with a variety of valid examples being given. Weaker answers scored marks with examples of separation.

In **(b)**, most answers identified at least two examples of why the Bantu Education Act was opposed, although some of these could have been developed into explanation. Better answers produced explanations and highlighted further the inequality that the Act produced with regard to the inferior education being offered compared to that received by whites. The best answers took a wider view by putting the Act fully into the context of apartheid and the purpose of inflicting a second-class education system.

In **(c)**, answers often concentrated more on the Pass Laws and what they stood for. This produced some good explanation. Weaker answers were characterised by the descriptive writing. As detail on the Separate Amenities Act was often no more than description, many answers remained one-sided. The better answers were able to develop this descriptive mode into explanation of relative impact.

Questions 19- 25 received too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

Key Messages and 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. Candidates used their knowledge effectively in writing well-developed explanations and arguments for their chosen questions. The majority of candidates managed the time available well, and were able to answer all the required questions. Only a small number of candidates were unable to complete the paper.

Candidates should ensure that they read and follow the instructions given on the paper carefully. There were more rubric errors than in previous examinations, with a small number of candidates attempting all 25 questions on the paper.

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 effectively.

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

Comments on Specific Questions

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

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1 to 3

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

Question 4

(a) Candidates displayed detailed knowledge of the Kaiser's role in increasing rivalry between the Great Powers. Most focused their answers upon military issues and the Kaiser's desire to expand the German Empire.

(b) There were many clearly explained responses to this question. Candidates used their knowledge of the Alliance System effectively to construct explanations of the development of two armed camps in Europe and of how major political disputes between countries could quickly escalate into large scale conflicts.

(c) Some candidates constructed clear explanations of Serbia's role in causing war, with the main focus being on Serbia's relationship with Austria-Hungary. Candidates also explained a number of other factors causing war in 1914, such as the arms race, the Alliance System and the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 5

(a) Many candidates demonstrated an in-depth knowledge of the events in Corfu in 1923 and used this knowledge effectively to gain full marks. Some candidates wrote about events in either Manchuria or Abyssinia during the 1930s, and therefore did not gain marks for this, since the question was about Corfu. Candidates are expected to know the details of events in Corfu in 1923, including the roles of Mussolini and the League of Nations.

(b) Candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of reasons why the League of Nations was weak from the start. The absence of the USA, the lack of an army and the inability of Britain and France to co-operate were explained in depth and arguments were related clearly to the question.

(c) Candidates explained both success and failure of the League of Nations, using their detailed knowledge effectively. Arguments focused upon success in the Aaland Islands and the Greece-Bulgaria dispute and failure in Vilna, Manchuria and Abyssinia. Some candidates identified that the Health Committee and the Drugs Committee were both successful, but they needed to develop these identifications into explanations. Some candidates wrote at length about the structural weaknesses of the League of Nations but these were not developed into a consideration of the success and failure of the League of Nations in practice.

Question 6

(a) Some candidates were able to achieve full marks on this question, giving details of the policy of appeasement and why it was in operation. A small number of candidates made the point that appeasement was a policy used to avoid war, and then reiterated this point several times. To gain further marks, candidates need to make more than one valid point.

(b) Explanations here focused on the ending of appeasement and Britain's guarantee to Poland. These two reasons were clearly and effectively developed. Some candidates wrote a detailed narrative of events leading to Hitler's invasion of Poland. The focus of the question was on the reasons why Britain went to war over Poland; a narrative of events will not lend itself to this focus.

(c) Effective answers to this question detailed Hitler's foreign policy aims and then explained how far these were achieved by 1939. Candidates explained Hitler's achievements in overturning the Treaty of Versailles, developing a Greater Germany and gaining some Lebensraum; lack of achievement focused primarily upon his inability to destroy communism. Candidates needed to link aims and actual events clearly here; some candidates wrote a narrative of events which did not allow for explanation. A minority of candidates wrote about Hitler's rule within Germany at this time and not about foreign policy; candidates should know the difference between domestic and foreign policy.

Question 7

(a) Some candidates focused clearly upon the problems at Potsdam, detailing the changes in the leaders attending, disagreements regarding policy towards Germany and the problems relating to Soviet policies in Eastern Europe. Many candidates wrote a list of what was agreed at Yalta and Potsdam and would have improved their responses by addressing the actual question. Candidates are expected to have knowledge of the distinctions between Yalta and Potsdam.

(b) Candidates used their knowledge effectively here, with detailed explanations focusing upon the desire to prevent the spread of communism, the need to help Europe recover from the war and the benefits for America. Some candidates wrote at length about Stalin's response to the Marshall Plan, without actually explaining why the Marshall Plan was introduced.

(c) Some candidates used their contextual knowledge well to explain the role of the USSR in starting the Cold War, detailing Stalin's policies in Eastern Europe after the Second World War and the Berlin Blockade. Explanation of the role of the USA focused upon the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the development of the atomic bomb. Some candidates made only general statements about different points of view - capitalist and communist, in response to this question. Candidates should pay careful attention to the exact wording of a question; this question referred to the starting of the Cold War and therefore detail relating to the Cuban Missile Crisis was not relevant.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 8

(a) Candidates displayed detailed knowledge of the USA's response to Castro's takeover of Cuba. Answers detailed the ending of trade and diplomatic relations and the Bay of Pigs events. Some candidates wrote about the USSR's response to Castro's takeover, which is not relevant.

(b) A variety of explanations was given in response to this question, mostly relating to the geographical proximity of Cuba to the USA, and to the security of the USA. Explanations could also have focused on American investment and business interests in Cuba, and the existence of an American naval base there.

(c) Many candidates were able to deploy their knowledge effectively here to explain the role of the USSR in causing the Cuban Missile Crisis and also to explain other reasons, primarily the role of the USA. Other candidates wrote a narrative account of events before, during and after the Cuban Missile Crisis and therefore did not address the question; answers needed to focus upon the apportionment of blame for the crisis.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Candidates wrote clear and concise accounts of the events in the Ruhr in 1923; many achieved full marks. Description focused upon the entry of the French and Belgian troops, the events of passive resistance and the response of the French to passive resistance.

(b) Candidates used their knowledge effectively here to explain complex economic issues. Explanations focused upon reparations, the effects of the events in the Ruhr and the German government's response to those events. Some candidates focused upon the impact of hyper-inflation rather than the reasons for hyper-inflation.

(c) Explanation of the Weimar Republic's success and lack of success in dealing with Germany's economic problems was very clearly explained. The role of Stresemann in negotiating the Dawes and Young Plans featured in many answers, as did the measures taken to tackle hyper-inflation. Explanations for the lack of success focused mainly upon the fragility of German economic prosperity and its reliance on American loans. Candidates should ensure that they read the question carefully; a number of candidates wrote at length about Germany's domestic and foreign policy generally, whereas the question asked specifically about economic problems.

Question 10

(a) Candidates showed a clear understanding of how Nazi rule affected women. Answers detailed the effects on job opportunities for women, constraints relating to dress and appearance, and the role of women in the ideal Aryan family.

(b) Explanations were given about objections to the lack of freedom and to rejection of the ideas of the Nazis. Effective answers developed these explanations with specific reference to groups such as the Navajo and Edelweiss Pirates. Some candidates wrote about opposition generally in Nazi Germany; this question asked specifically about young people.

(c) Candidates were able to explain that male workers gained employment through job creation on public works projects; answers demonstrated detailed knowledge of the various jobs available. The benefits of the Strength through Joy programme were also clearly explained. Lack of benefit was usually identified in general terms only, with statements about the standard of living not improving. Some candidates were able to explain the adverse effects of the Reich Farm Law and the problems ensuing from the lack of trade unions. In response to this question, candidates did need to focus upon economic policies in the years 1933 to 1939 and their effects on male workers; some candidates wrote about the effects of all Nazi policies upon all sections of society.

Questions 11 and 12

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 13

(a) Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the lives of black Americans in the southern states of the USA during the 1920s. Answers focused upon segregation, the inequality of educational provision and job opportunities, the Jim Crow Laws and persecution by the Ku Klux Klan.

(b) A number of candidates gave several detailed and well developed explanations in response to this question. Answers focused on the effect of the film, 'The Birth of a Nation', the promotion of white supremacy, the perceived influence of immigrants and the existing membership of the Ku Klux Klan. Some candidates wrote detailed descriptions of the Ku Klux Klan's activities but would have improved their answers by focusing on the reasons why they became powerful.

(c) Detailed contextual knowledge was deployed effectively to explain violence as a feature of organised crime, the Ku Klux Klan's use of violence against black Americans and violence towards immigrants. Disagreement was equally well explained, with focus on the flappers, the increase in leisure time and the improving standard of living for many.

Question 14

(a) Some candidates described the voluntary codes drawn up by the NRA and how businesses observing the codes could display the Blue Eagle. Many candidates made one point only about the NRA encouraging better working conditions. Candidates are expected to know the details of the work of the NRA.

(b) Detailed explanations were developed here, with most candidates explaining the importance of Roosevelt gaining the trust of the American people by explaining his actions and policies in an accessible way. Some candidates explained that the 'fireside chats' helped to restore economic confidence in the American people, thus encouraging them to invest again, and also gave them confidence in their new president's ability to deal with their problems.

(c) Explanations focused on the work of the Alphabet Agencies in providing work and the stabilising effect of the Emergency Banking Act. Lack of emergence from the Depression could have been more effectively explained; candidates usually identified that the American economy did not fully recover until the USA entered the Second World War, but this idea needed development into an explanation relating to the employment of men in the armed forces and the expansion of industries for the rearmament programme.

Questions 15 to 25

There were too few responses to these questions to make meaningful comments.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

Key Messages and General Comments

It is again encouraging to note that a significant majority of candidates have been able to apply relevant knowledge and sound understanding to answer the questions set. There was clear evidence of candidates' ability to communicate their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement.

Teachers are right to remind their candidates that **part (a)** questions require short, descriptive answers which are probably no more than a paragraph in length. The emphasis is on recalling accurate details and description, rather than explanation.

Moreover, most candidates understood that **parts (b) and (c)** demanded explanation. Candidates who achieve high marks are able to stick to the point, apply their knowledge to the precise requirements of the question, and develop each of the identified factors fully. Few marks are awarded for narrative or 'setting the scene'. In **part (c),** the mark scheme rewards those who argue both for and against the focus of the question, and reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated, by addressing 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Less successful answers were characterised by descriptive material which retold a story and, in some cases, included irrelevant information.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

This was answered by many candidates, and **part (a)** was well done. The majority were able to describe two successes of the League in solving disputes, thereby avoiding references to the work of its agencies, which was not the thrust of the question. **Part (b)** proved more challenging for some, and there was a tendency to rely on descriptions of the Corfu crisis, rather than explaining why the League had proved unequal to the task of stopping Italian aggression. Better candidates were able to explain why Britain and France were unwilling to upset Mussolini, and how Mussolini undermined the League by working behind its back through the Conference of Ambassadors to achieve his aims.

Responses to **part (c)**, on the whole, were quite strong, because identified factors which weakened the League were then linked to its eventual failure in the 1930s. For example, identifying the absence of major powers as a factor was developed into a full explanation of the way collective security was undermined and how aggressive states such as Japan and Italy were able to operate outside the rules of the League. Specific arguments were made about the USA on the one hand, balanced by a range of alternative reasons in order to reach high marks.

Question 6

A large number of candidates performed well on **part (a)**. They were capable of describing Hitler's measures to rearm Germany, such as the introduction of conscription in 1935 and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936. Care should be taken with the date in the question (1936), as some went beyond it and included the Anschluss or the taking over of the Skoda arms works in Czechoslovakia. Some candidates mentioned

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

the leaving of the League of Nations, but this did not directly lead to rearmament. General points about 'building more tanks' or 'making the army bigger' did not produce high marks.

Many made a good attempt at **part (b)**, explaining fully the reasons behind appeasement and relating these specifically to events at Munich. Some mistakenly thought that the agreement led to the occupation of all Czechoslovakia, rather than just the Sudetenland, missing the opportunity to argue that part of the reasoning behind Munich was to guarantee the remaining borders of Czechoslovakia.

Answers to **part (c)** were often well argued, with good attempts to put the case for and against the Treaty of Versailles as a cause of war. It was pleasing to see candidates who concentrated on 1939 and the specific outbreak of war, thereby balancing long term and short term causes.

Question 7

Part (a) was well done. Many gained full marks, although some answers drifted into the reasons for the building of the Berlin Wall, rather than confining their descriptions to the Blockade and Airlift.

In **part (b)** some very effective answers explained Stalin's aims immediately after 1945, and his attempts to create a buffer zone of communist states to defend the Soviet Union from attack, and the advantages he sought to gain from expanding communism into Eastern Europe, both economically and as part of the 'iron curtain'.

Part (c) required a precise focus on 1945 to 1949 and it was pleasing to see that most candidates adhered to the period set in the question. Many candidates were perfectly capable of arguing about the contribution of the Marshall Plan to the early Cold War and then develop alternative reasons, such as the role of Stalin, in establishing the Iron Curtain and the attitude of Truman at Potsdam. It is worth emphasising that those who avoided a narrative of each feature, but linked their knowledge to increasing tension, achieved better marks.

Question 8

This remains a popular topic and there were many good answers to **part (a)**, detailing the possible actions Kennedy considered on the discovery of the missile sites on Cuba. Many candidates provided three or four developed points and achieved high marks.

Candidates clearly possessed a great deal of knowledge about **parts (b)** and **(c)**. In **part (b)**, there were many sound answers which detailed Khrushchev's aims in putting nuclear weapons on Cuba, usually related to testing the will of Kennedy, protecting Cuban communism in the wake of the Bay of Pigs assault, and Soviet attempts to broker a deal with the USA about the removal of American missiles in Turkey. As is often the case with the style of question in **part (c)**, 'Who gained most from the Cuban Missile Crisis – Kennedy or Khrushchev?', the best approach was to construct separate paragraphs explaining the advantages gained by each leader. Some candidates had not planned a clear line of argument and answers became disorganised, interweaving both Khrushchev and Kennedy's successes and failures in the same paragraph.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Candidates knew the main points about the nature of the Communist threat to the Weimar Republic in 1919 and 1920, enabling them to score well in **part (a)**. They recognised its leaders, communist actions in Berlin, and understood its defeat. **Part (b)** gave an opportunity to explain why the Dawes Plan was needed by Germany in 1924; some candidates occasionally lapsed into narrative accounts of the Ruhr invasion and hyperinflation. The need to directly address the question was very important, particularly in this instance, by linking events precisely to what was agreed under the terms of the Dawes Plan. Candidates might explain the importance of the loans used as investment for German industry, the stabilisation of the German currency and the rescheduling of reparation payments so instalments could be paid.

Responses to **part (c)** would have benefited from a more balanced approach. It was evident that there was great deal of secure knowledge about the recovery of Germany in the years 1924-29, much of it related to the role of Stresemann, the Dawes Plan and foreign policy agreements. What the question required was an explanation of the responsibility of the introduction of a new currency to the Weimar Republic's recovery as the focus of the answer and it was here that some responses struggled. Better answers related the Rentenmark to the restoration of confidence in the economy, financial stability and the provision of US loans to support it; these factors provided the foundations of recovery.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 10

In **(a)** responses were very strong, as the activities of the League of German Maidens were well known. **Part (b)** brought good responses, although some tended to be descriptive. The key was to explain the importance of Nazi traditionalist views, male unemployment and concerns about the falling birth-rate. Candidates who just identified each factor limited the number of marks they could achieve; they needed to be developed for higher marks.

Answers to **part (c)** were characterised by either descriptions of the Hitler Youth or a lack of balance, because explanations focused too narrowly on groups who opposed the Nazi regime. For higher marks, good candidates were able to explain why the Hitler Youth, for many, provided activities or a culture which engaged young people and thereby created support for the Nazis.

Questions 11

There were relatively few answers to questions on Russia. Answers to **Question 11** reflected sound knowledge and understanding of the topic. Most responses to **part (a)** gave details of Stolypin's 'carrot and stick' approach, including three or four separate points to gain good marks. **Part (b)** saw some good explanations of why Rasputin was hated by many Russians, although some candidates were tempted to include excessive narrative, instead of linking their knowledge specifically to the question. **Part (c)** proved challenging for some and was only tackled effectively by candidates who had planned a clear line of argument, explaining the loss of support of the army and then introducing other factors to reach high marks. Some answers were dominated by a confused narrative which retold the story of March 1917 without separating out the causal factors.

Question 12

Again, there were relatively few answers to **Question 12**; the contents of Lenin's 'Political Will' could have been more widely known for **part (a)**, while answers to **part (b)** were unbalanced because candidates concentrated on Stalin's ambitions, while Trotsky needed fuller treatment. In **part (c)**, answers relied on lengthy explanations of Show Trials and Purges; fuller coverage of other factors which underpinned Stalin's control of the USSR such as the 'cult of personality' and state propaganda, was required.

Questions 13 to 19

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

Question 20

Generalised answers to **part (a)** were confined to references to attacks on the King David Hotel and vague points such as 'there was fighting' in defence of the Jewish cause. Answers would have been improved by more specific details of their activities, rather than just what the Irgun was. **Part (b)** attracted better knowledge of events in the years 1945-9, which led to conflict between Jews and Arabs. The dates are important here as regards the inclusion of general background information about the cultural and religious gulf between the two groups. Higher level answers included precise contextual details, such as the influx of Jews into Palestine after the Second World War, the activities of Irgun, the demands of Palestinians, the British departure from Palestine and the declaration of the creation of the state of Israel.

There were better answers to **part (c)**, as coverage was related to, on the one hand, the problems caused by Jewish terrorism and, on the other, the post-war problems faced by the British government at home and the attitudes and intervention of the USA and UN.

Question 21

Some candidates who attempted this would have benefited from more secure knowledge. Good answers to **part (a)** rewarded details of the clash between King Hussein and the PLO, including tensions caused by PLO activities, such as aircraft hijacks and the fighting which led to the PLO's expulsion from Jordan. In **part (b)**, many identified Israel's attempts to stop raids from Palestinian camps in Lebanon, as well as support for Christians within Lebanon, but these entirely valid points required further development to achieve higher marks. Good answers to **part (c)** focused on explaining the work of Carter and Clinton, balanced by changes of attitude in Israel and amongst the PLO, which led to a willingness to negotiate at Oslo in 1993.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Questions 22 to 25

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

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

Key Messages and General Comments

The overall standard of answers remained similar to that of previous years. The overwhelming majority of candidates were entered for the twentieth-century topic with a smaller number of candidates attempting the nineteenth-century option.

Candidates were generally better at interpreting and comparing sources, rather than evaluating them. There were many excellent answers to comparison questions where candidates studied the sources and found similarities and differences before beginning to write their answers. This allowed them to write answers that focused on explaining similarities and differences, rather than on summarising each source. It is always a good idea, whatever the question, to know what your answer is going to be before beginning to write.

The cartoons proved to be a challenging test for some candidates. Cartoons do need to be read carefully and interpreting them correctly will depend on using the information about their provenance, and contextual knowledge. For example, Source H in Option B is an English cartoon, so is likely to be gloating at Germany's misfortune, rather than criticising the treatment given to Germany. Sensible use of what candidates are told about 'Der Tag' helped lead many candidates to a valid interpretation. When asked about the message or purpose of a cartoon, candidates should ask themselves about what they think the cartoonist's point of view was.

It is important that in responding to questions about 'surprise', 'proof', or about possible reactions of the people involved (nineteenth-century option, **Questions 3** and **5**, twentieth-century option, **Questions 3** and **4**), it is important that candidates do tell the Examiner whether they are surprised or not, whether one source does prove another to be wrong, or how. Answers that contain perfectly good analyses of the sources but which don't reach a conclusion do not achieve the highest marks.

While many candidates did very well in response to **Question 6**, there were still some whose final mark was lower than it could have been because of not using the sources. **Question 6** carries more marks than the other questions. It is important that candidates understand that answers must be based on the sources. They are being asked whether the sources support the statement. Candidates can also be sure that there will always be some sources that support the statement, and some sources that disagree with it. This means that it is always possible to write a balanced answer.

The best answers to **Question 6** focus on testing the precise statement given in the question, rather than a similar one. For example in the twentieth-century paper, answers that wrote about whether the peace settlement was harsh did not receive many marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: Nineteenth-century topic

Question 1

This question was generally well answered. Many candidates were able to explain the main disagreement about Bismarck's role and whether he deliberately planned war with Austria. Answers that missed this big disagreement but managed to identify differences or similarities of detail were placed in a lower level in the mark scheme. Less successful answers summarised the sources and did not compare them point by point.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

There were many good answers to this question. Most candidates recognised that the cartoon shows Austria and Prussia competing for the support of the German states. Many were able to go beyond this and explained that the big point made by the cartoon is that Prussia was being more successful or that Prussia had more to offer. The top level, which some candidates reached, was reserved for answers that focused on the cartoonist's point of view - approval of the fact that Prussia was being more successful.

Question 3

The first step to a good answer to this question is to compare what the two sources say. Source D suggests that Bismarck was planning war against Austria while in Source E, Bismarck is arguing that Austria and Prussia must work together. Only a small number of candidates assumed that E proves Bismarck was lying in Source D simply because it says something different. Most candidates rightly evaluated one or both sources and then reached a judgement about whether Bismarck was lying.

Question 4

The authors of these two sources both agree and disagree in their attitude towards Bismarck. Many of the candidates were able to explain both and there was some good use of contextual knowledge to explain the difficulties the Prussian liberals had in deciding whether or not Bismarck should be supported. Weaker answers either didn't compare the sources or didn't get as far as attitudes and just compared details.

Question 5

The key steps in answering 'are you surprised questions?' are to understand what the source is saying, then to test this against contextual knowledge or other sources in the paper, and finally to reach a conclusion about 'surprise'. Most candidates were able to follow these steps. The most popular line of argument to follow was 'not surprised', supported by relevant knowledge of Bismarck's methods and/or the situation in Europe at the time. It is important that candidates do reach a conclusion about whether they are surprised or not. It is not enough just to analyse the sources.

Question 6

Most candidates left enough time to allow them to write a full answer to this question. Sources A, D, F and G can be used to support the view that Bismarck caused the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, while Sources B, E and H suggest otherwise. The best answers were those where the candidates wrote about sources individually and explained how each one does or does not support the statement. Candidates who grouped the sources and then made general assertions about the group as a whole, did not do so well.

Option B: Twentieth-century topic

Question 1

There was a wide range of responses to this question. The best answers made point by point comparisons, while weaker answers summarised the sources without making specific comparisons. Sources A and B both agree and disagree. For example, they both explain how the problem of Germany was not solved by the Treaty of Versailles. However, while Source A suggests the peace-makers had some success, Source B claims that the peace treaty was a complete failure. Candidates who read the sources carefully and identified the agreements and/or disagreements before writing their answers, did well. It is not a good idea to start an answer before knowing what the answer is going to be. This can result in candidates writing a summary of each source and then asserting that they either agree or disagree. Candidates needed to explain the agreements and disagreements. Full marks were reserved for candidates who realised that as far as the overall big messages of the two sources were concerned, there is only a disagreement - that Source B does blame the Treaty of Versailles for later trouble but Source A does not. It is important to note that Source A mentions claims that the Treaty was to blame, but makes clear that it does not agree with these claims by stating 'That is to ignore the actions of everyone for twenty years between 1919 and 1939.'

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

There were many good answers to this question, with candidates using their contextual knowledge and understanding to interpret the cartoon and to work out the purpose behind its publication. The cartoon used in this question needs careful study. It appears to be claiming that the reparations imposed on Germany were dreadful and cannot be justified. Candidates needed to realise that this would have been an unlikely argument for a British cartoonist in 1919. To reach the high levels in the mark scheme, candidates should understand that the cartoon is actually criticising or mocking Germany and supporting reparations. The key to this is in a careful reading of what Germany is saying. An encouraging number of candidates were able to explain that the reference is to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, when Germany imposed harsh terms of Russia.

The question is asking about the purpose of publishing the cartoon. This means that candidates were required to go beyond the message to explain why that particular cartoon, with its message, was published at that time. This involved good answers in explaining the intended impact of the cartoon on its audience and why that impact was required in 1919.

Question 3

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to explain how the views of Clemenceau and House differed, and supported their answers with detailed reference to the sources. House might have understood, and not been surprised by Clemenceau's views, but he would also have been worried by them. The best answers used the evidence in the sources and their contextual knowledge of the positions of France and the USA to explain their answers. For example, reference to Wilson's Fourteen Points or some explanation of his desire to promote self determination, help to understand what House's reaction was likely to be. It is important in questions such as this that candidates do state what they think House's reaction would have been. It is not enough simply to compare the two sources and explain how they differ. Such a comparison is just a stepping-stone to the final answer; it is not an answer in itself.

Question 4

There was a wide range of answers to this question. The best answers explained how the two sources differ in their views about the Treaty of Versailles and then went on to evaluate one or both sources to see if G actually proved that F was wrong. These candidates understood that G does not prove F wrong simply by disagreeing with it. The evaluation had to consider the purpose in context of either Lloyd George or Scheidemann. Answers which simply compared the sources achieved a lower level in the mark scheme. It was important that candidates used their comparisons and evaluations of the sources to reach a conclusion about whether Lloyd George was wrong. Answers that did contain valid comparison and /or evaluation, but neglected to reach a conclusion about whether Lloyd George was wrong, achieved lower marks.

Question 5

Answers to this question can be divided into two broad types: those that offered a valid interpretation of the cartoons, and those that misinterpreted them. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that both cartoons are mocking Germany and approving its harsh treatment. In Source H the clue was the explanation given of 'Der Tag!' under the cartoon. Less successful answers were based on the assumption that the cartoons are criticising the treatment of Germany. It was also important that candidates explicitly compared the two cartoons. Answers that interpreted each cartoon separately and did not compare them, achieved a lower level in the mark scheme.

Question 6

Many candidates achieved good marks on this question by carefully explaining how some sources (most obviously Sources A, B, E and G) support the claim that the Versailles peace settlement was unfair, and how other sources (A, C, D, E, F, H and I) disagree with the claim. It is important that candidates base their answers on the sources. Responses which don't make any use of the sources receive lower marks. It is also important that candidates avoid grouping the sources and making a general assertion about them as a group, without writing about each source individually. The best way to answer this question is to ensure that an explanation is provided for each source. This should not involve a summary of the source followed by a claim that it does or does not support the claim given in the question. Candidates need to explain how each source does, or does not, support the statement e.g. 'Source G supports the claim that the peace treaty was unfair because it says that seventy million Germans were enslaved by it. If it thinks that the Versailles Treaty made Germans into slaves then it clearly thinks that it was unfair.'

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Candidates should also make sure that they test the precise statement provided by the question. If candidates are asked to judge whether the sources support the statement that the peace settlement was unfair, they will not receive high marks if they test a different statement such as 'the peace treaty was harsh'. Candidates should also ensure that they do not use sources for their surface meaning. Sources C, H and I do not agree that the peace treaty was unfair because they all suggest that Germany fully deserved the treatment it received.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

Key Messages and General comments

Those candidates who provide focused, relevant answers to the questions are those who perform the best. Attempting to evaluate sources on the basis of generalisations about source type, rather than on the specific content and provenance of the source in question, will not produce high marks. Generally, teachers, and therefore candidates, seemed to adopt the former, rather than latter, approach, with a consequent improvement in the quality of work seen in the examination. Having said that, this year responses from some candidates did appear to show that the two key messages above had been missed. For example, **Question 1** asked *'How far do these sources agree?'* This type of question demands comparisons between the two sources, so candidates should know that writing about only one of the sources cannot be answering the question. Yet some approached the question this way, first repeating what Source A said, then what Source B said. Another example was **Question 5**, which asked *'Why was this cartoon published in 1919?'* Satisfactory answers would have to include reasons why the cartoon was published, although some candidates neglected to do this, perhaps providing instead an interpretation of the cartoon, or a discussion of the context of 1919, but without addressing the question as set. Such material could, of course, have been made relevant by presenting it as a reason, or as support for a reason, but this focus was missing. The lack of focus could also overlap with the problem of generalised source evaluation. **Question 3** asked candidates to compare the messages of two cartoons. This wording indicates that candidates needed to interpret the cartoons, and then compare the messages for similarity and/or difference. The question did not require candidates to evaluate the sources, i.e. assess their usefulness as evidence, judge their credibility etc. Some candidates based responses on generalisation – *e.g. 'These two sources are cartoons so they are primary so you can believe them'* – or even deflected themselves from a valid interpretation of one of the cartoons – *'Source E is American so it will support the American President'*. To sum up, candidate responses can be improved by a greater focus on the question set.

Comments on specific questions

Nineteenth-Century Option

There were too few responses to this option for any meaningful comments to be made.

Twentieth-Century Option

Notwithstanding the general comments made above, the majority of candidates coped well with both the sources and the questions. There were no obvious problems of comprehension, and the overall quality of answers was good. In particular, answers demonstrated a high level of contextual knowledge, which was especially valuable in helping to answer **Questions 2** and **4**.

Question 1

Almost invariably, the first question asks candidates to compare two sources and assess the level of agreement between them. This was no exception. The best answers were those that identified points of agreement and disagreement, and illustrated them with content from both sources. Agreements were much easier to spot than disagreements. Some were explicit – *e.g. 'the sources agree that Clemenceau was a realist and Wilson an idealist'* – whilst some were implicit – *e.g. 'the sources agree that the Big Three found it hard to get on with each other.'* Almost all candidates were able to spot at least one agreement. The most obvious difference was on where the sources placed the blame for the difficulties faced by the peacemakers. In Source A, the problem was the international situation, whilst in Source B it was the differences between the peacemakers themselves. Some answers identified this or some other valid disagreement.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

The key issue of focus on this question was that an explanation of Wilson's *reaction* to Poincaré's speech of welcome was required. Of course, this meant that the reaction itself had first to be identified, and some candidates who became so immersed in the (unnecessary) retelling of what Sources C and D said, forgot to do this. Assuming the candidate had decided how Wilson would have reacted, then the issue was how to explain it. There were three main approaches. First, and least valid, was the use of what might be termed 'everyday empathy', in other words judging the issue on the basis of how anybody in that situation might have reacted, but without using any historical understanding. Candidates who adopted this approach generally decided that Wilson would be outraged or upset by how brutal the Germans had been and would certainly wish to punish them as severely as possible. Alternatively, he might have been cross with Poincaré because of the hints that the US soldiers were unprepared. Second, Wilson's reaction could have been judged by comparing the difference in approach between the two sources; the desire for revenge of the French against Wilson's principle of justice. On this basis he would clearly have reacted by disagreeing with what the French said. Finally, and best, the difference between the two sources could have been further explained by reference to contextual knowledge about Wilson, or indeed the French, such as the Fourteen Points, the League of Nations, reparations etc. In the final analysis, of course, candidates might have been expected to know that there was no way in which Wilson would have agreed with the French demand for a harsh and punitive peace.

Question 3

The two cartoons that candidates were asked to compare shared a similar message – that Wilson was deluded in thinking that he had any chance of achieving a just peace. Some candidates managed to interpret both cartoons in this way, and thereby provide a top level answer. However, this still left candidates with plenty of interpretative work to do, as the cartoons shared many other similarities (as well as some superficial differences). Since candidates were asked to compare *messages*, comparisons of surface details or provenance would not achieve many marks. It was, of course, possible to misinterpret these cartoons, and think that Wilson was actually succeeding in achieving his aims. This alone would not score well, but within such answers could be valid sub-messages – for example, that Wilson was trying his best to achieve peace – that could be rewarded as telling part, but not all, of the 'big', overall message. Better answers could see that Wilson was failing in both cartoons, but some still missed the element of Wilson's self-delusion that was central to a full understanding of what the cartoonists were saying.

Question 4

There are three essentials to providing a successful answer to questions of this type. First, the answer must contain a statement of whether or not the candidate is surprised. Second, it must be clear what aspect of the content of the source is/is not found surprising. Third, there must be an explanation of why the candidate is/is not surprised that is *consistent with* whether or not they are surprised. It was relatively common to see answers that made an assertion about surprise, followed by a description of the relationship between the 'Big Three' that lacked any reference at all to the source – in other words, it was difficult to tell what in the source was surprising or not. Alternatively, the statement about surprise was followed simply by a retelling of the source, with no explanation, or more rarely, the retelling of the source was accompanied by no statement of surprise at all. These answers could not achieve high marks. Fortunately, a large majority of candidates were able to use contextual knowledge or cross-reference to inform a valid explanation of whether or not they were surprised. Here, those who claimed they were not surprised were slightly less successful in their responses than those who were surprised. This rested on what aspect of the source was/was not found surprising. The source provided indications that the 'Big Three' were finding it hard to reach agreement – *'baffling problems', 'peace will be postponed' etc.* – and, when judged against contextual knowledge of disagreements between the 'Big Three', candidates naturally found this unsurprising. However, the overall message of the source was that the 'Big Three' were *'hopeful of reaching complete agreement and (were) getting nearer'*. This was much more surprising, and candidates who used their contextual knowledge, or cross-reference to other sources to explain why, reached the highest level.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 5

When a question asks why a source was produced, three explanatory elements automatically come into play; first the *context* in which the source was produced (because of what was happening at the time); second, the *message* that the author was trying to transmit (because of what the author wanted to say); third, the *purpose* the author had in saying this (because of the intended impact of the message on the audience). It can be argued that all three should be present in a fully developed answer, but generally reasons using context only will be the weakest, since they are not directly engaging with the content of the source, and reasons based on purpose will be the best, since one cannot understand the purpose without understanding the message first. This question produced many answers based on context and message, but more answers based on purpose would have improved the overall standard. However, it is worth repeating that no amount of historical understanding could rescue an answer that did not provide a *reason* for why the cartoon was published. Context-only answers often gave good detail about the Versailles Treaty, or even the German reaction to it, but did not interpret the cartoon. Any number of possible messages could have provided the material for a sound answer based on the idea that the Germans wanted to criticise the Treaty, and this was, indeed, the most commonly achieved level of answer. Although the number of answers using the idea of purpose was limited, some were impressively sophisticated in using contextual knowledge to inform their answers, often suggesting not merely that the cartoonist wanted to stir up opposition to the Treaty, but also that a possible target could have been within Germany itself, as part of an emerging resistance to the 'November Criminals' and the new Republic.

Question 6

On the final question, candidates need to use the sources effectively. The task is to show how the source content does or does not support the given hypothesis. The best way of doing this is to go through the sources one by one, endeavouring to illustrate how the content relates to the hypothesis, keeping in mind that there will always be sources on either side of the hypothesis. This year, candidates' contextual knowledge often seemed to hinder their use of the sources. Candidates thought they knew that the Allies had fundamental differences so they set out to illustrate this from the sources. There were, in consequence, a greater number of one-sided answers than usual. Several of the sources could also be misinterpreted, and responses based on misinterpretation were not accepted. Good examples of this were the two cartoons, Sources E and F, which many candidates interpreted as showing the Allies did not have fundamental differences. A more subtle example was Source G, which clearly states that the Allies were close to agreement, so therefore did not show fundamental differences, though many thought it did. As in previous sessions, the marks reserved for source evaluation could have been achieved by more candidates. Generalisations about source type are not valid; there must be some genuine evaluation based on the source content. So, taking Source H as an example, many candidates rejected it on the basis that it was a German cartoon, so it would be biased against the Allies. This did not engage with the content, and could not score well. However, had the answer explained that the cartoon was representing the Allies in the way it did in order to arouse sympathy, or to protest against the terms of the Treaty, and could hardly be accepted as a balanced assessment, then a mark would have been earned.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

Key Messages and General Comments

In overall terms the standard continues to be encouraging. Candidates are responding well to the needs of paper. There were very few weak responses. The understanding of the context of the sources was good and there was considerable evidence of detailed background knowledge. Source use was intelligently approached, except in the case of one source which was frequently misread to the detriment of some answers. In terms of written communication, answers were clearly expressed and argued. Answers were, as a result, clearly thought out and intelligently argued. There was much evidence of good practise and a high level of candidate interest was apparent.

Whilst there were a large number of good and very good responses, there could be more outstanding ones, if the following points are taken into consideration. In the use of sources there was much evidence that candidates were familiar with the context in which sources were placed and they were often able to interpret the sources well. However, some candidates focus their main efforts on picking out details from the sources. Sources need to be viewed holistically to enable candidates to understand the big message behind the sources. To access the highest levels, candidates need to focus on what the author of the source is trying to communicate and in some cases what his/her purpose is in producing the source. This is particularly important in the case of cartoons and other visual sources. In the evaluation of sources, there are some candidates who, when asked to assess the reliability or unreliability of a source, respond with a comment such as 'this source must be reliable as it was written by a historian.' Candidates need to go beyond accepting sources at face value, or at the level of undeveloped provenance. Cross referencing needs to be used more in order to reach the higher levels.

Nineteenth-Century Option

There were too few responses to make meaningful comments.

Twentieth-Century Option

Question 1

This asked candidates to consider how far two sources agreed with each other. Here, some candidates could have improved their answers by avoiding a misinterpretation of Source A, particularly with regard to the second paragraph which began 'the standard view is that reparations stand as evidence of a vindictive, short-sighted and poisonous document'. This was taken at face value by many candidates, even though further reading shows that the author then challenges this interpretation. As a consequence, many used this to show A as agreeing with B. There were disagreements of detail and for sub messages, for example in A, it was clearly suggested that time was spent in trying to arrive at the final figure, whereas B suggested they were merely motivated by revenge. The big message of the two sources was either the concern of the peacemakers at Versailles as to the future of Europe, e.g. in A where they did attempt 'to build a better world', as opposed to B, where 'the future of Europe was not the concern of the Allies', or an overall judgement on whether the treaty was bad or not. More candidates needed to view the sources holistically, rather than spending time in looking at differences/ similarities in detail.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

Candidates were given two cartoons and asked whether the author of one would have agreed with the other. Here, the interpretation of the sources, particularly source D, could have been better. Some candidates accepted the source at face value and assumed that the source was sympathetic to the Germans. A developed use of the provenance, i.e. it was British, would have allowed candidates to develop British attitudes in 1919 and the mocking attitude if the cartoonist to show that the Germans were getting exactly what they deserved. This would have led candidates to the big message of the two sources; that C considers the actions taken as truly awful, whilst D shows agreement with what had been done. Some answers were based on this misreading which prevented entry to the highest level of the mark scheme.

More encouragingly, almost all candidates correctly interpreted Source C and very few candidates failed to address the question. Comparisons, whilst not always valid were clearly attempted.

Question 3

Here candidates were asked to look at two conflicting sources and to say whether the context of one made them surprised by the other. Encouragingly, there were very few responses where no attempt was made to address the question. In the vast majority of answers there were clear comparisons of context which were used to express surprise. Some candidates moved on further to cross reference the other sources to check surprise. Evaluation of sources was generally limited, particularly with regard to F when the man was simply seen as biased, and some rather fanciful answers speculated on a whole variety of reasons why he was.

An encouraging number of candidates moved to the highest level where they evaluated E and suggested reasons as to why the German delegation were writing as they did in 1919 i.e. to try to persuade the French to be more lenient. Here, many showed clear awareness of the provenance of the source in terms of the date and also a good knowledge of French attitudes, particularly with regard to Clemenceau.

Question 4

Here, candidates were asked to evaluate a source and respond to a question of how far Lloyd George could be trusted in this source. Some candidates adopted an approach displaying everyday empathy, thereby giving a whole variety of reasons as to why Lloyd George could not be trusted. Others did not get beyond internal details in the source and used these to decide whether he was or was not trustworthy. Both approaches limited the marks that could be achieved. Others looked at the provenance of the source and either left it undeveloped by stating he was Prime Minister or was speaking to Parliament, or developed it a little, but not along the lines demanded by the question. A number of candidates suggested that Lloyd George was seeking re-election, although the source was clearly dated 1919, and he had been re-elected in November 1918, thus making this an invalid argument.

Those candidates who accessed the higher levels looked to the purpose of the source in context, by showing that Lloyd George cannot be trusted as he is using the speech to show that the Treaty is really tough (more so than it was in reality) to justify himself.

Question 5

There were some very encouraging responses to the question, which in itself involved a number of differing strands. Firstly, all candidates needed to consider why this cartoon was published (that is, its purpose), and then why it was published in 1921 (that is, its context). There were also a number of valued sub messages applicable to this cartoon. Encouragingly, the vast majority of responses were Level 3 and above. Context was recognised by many, particularly in terms of Reparations, with 1921 being the date of their commencement. Many were able to go on and develop the big message of the cartoon that Germany was clearly being dealt with too harshly and, as a consequence, was finding it difficult to cope. A smaller number went on to develop the purpose of the cartoon i.e. that the aim of the cartoonist was to persuade people that reparations were too harsh and that something had to be done about it. This is an area where candidates need to develop an awareness - when asked why something was published, they need to look at what the motives of the writer or cartoonist were.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 6

Generally, this was answered well. Responses were clear, well written and in very many cases clearly focused on the question set. Few, if any, responses failed to focus on the sources, which continues to give encouragement. Candidates found it more straightforward to show the sources which supported the statement that Germany was punished too harshly. Some misinterpretation, particularly with regard to sources D and G, led them to be applied incorrectly. The evaluation of sources could be improved – some basic responses still involve the use of undeveloped provenance. Far more detailed evaluation, if valid, will produce higher marks. Some candidates approached the question by using sources grouped together either to support or challenge the question set. To avoid vague generalisations which are difficult to reward as valid source use, it is suggested that candidates deal with sources individually, as this allows their content to be viewed in appropriate detail.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key Messages and General Comments

The number of Centres using the coursework option remains lower than the number of Centres using the alternative to coursework option. The overall standard of work on the coursework option in June 2012 was high. Nearly all Centres used assignments that tested the appropriate assessment objectives effectively. Most of the marking was accurate and many Centres annotated their candidates' work in detail, explaining why certain levels and marks had been awarded. This was a great help to the Moderator. A few Centres neglected to send their mark schemes and copies of the sources used for Assignment 2. The Moderator does need to see these.

Centres can use established Cambridge coursework assignments on some topics but they are also free to devise their own assignments. Centre-devised assignments must be sent to CIE for feedback and approval, before being used with candidates.

Assignment 1

This assignment should assess the candidates' ability to describe, explain, and analyse historical events and people, and reach and support judgements about them. It can be set as an essay or as a structured exercise. If the latter approach is used, then the final sub-question should require candidates to make and support a judgement about significance. If an essay is set, then the essay title needs to be about significance. Some excellent assignments were seen, although some Centres awarded high marks for description. Other Centres over-rewarded analysis that was rather thin and needed more focus on the question.

Assignment 2

Generally, the work submitted for this assignment demonstrated that many candidates can interpret, evaluate and use historical sources to a high level. Some Centres used established coursework assignments from Cambridge and these worked well. The main area for improvement was in the final question where candidates should be required to test a statement against the evidence in all the sources. Sometimes candidates needed to make much more use of the sources. This final question should ask candidates to explain how far the sources support the statement. In a few Centres, the question needed a closer focus on the sources.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/041
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

When attempting all Part **(a)** Questions, candidates must make sure that all inferences, assertions, arguments and evaluations are supported by relevant and recognisable source detail.

When attempting all Part **(b)** Questions, candidates must make sure that all general descriptions, reasons, arguments and assertions are illuminated by relevant and valid examples and detail.

General Comments

As with previous seasons of examination, Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945 proved to be the most popular choice for candidates. Indeed, this choice was overwhelmingly the most popular. There were some Centres that chose Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941 but they were fewer in number. As far as the other Depth Studies are concerned, there were too few responses to draw conclusions about the candidates' overall performance, or to make helpful observations for future candidates.

For the most part, scripts were clearly written and set out so that Examiners could have access to all that the candidates wished to convey. There were very few rubric offences, but some weaker candidates did attempt up to four different Depth Studies. There appeared to be very little evidence that the candidates' performances were affected by time limitations.

As hinted at in the Key Messages section above, candidates performed well when they used source detail in support of their inferences, arguments and evaluations in answers to Part **(a)** questions, and used supportive and relevant examples and detail for their assertions and descriptions in answers to Part **(b)** questions. Candidates who performed at this level scored well and their scripts were impressive. Some questions did receive less successful responses - **Question (a) (iii)**, for example. Some compared and contrasted the two sources by writing about the general areas they covered. These general assertions were not supported with recognisable source detail. Other candidates appreciated that the provenance of each source may well have some bearing on an effective evaluation of the source, although some neglected to use source detail and provided only 'stock' or incomplete evaluations.

The overall standard, however, was maintained in this season of examinations, and candidates who scored well provided impressive scripts which demonstrated both knowledge of their chosen topic and also mastery of the techniques required.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

In **Question (a) (i)**, most candidates were able to draw valid inferences about politics in 1932 from Source A, supporting their inferences with comments on the number of votes cast and the percentages achieved by each of the candidates. Perhaps surprisingly, very few candidates made comments about the proximity of the two votes. Answers sometimes showed that some candidates believed the election to be a general election rather than a presidential election. A number of candidates drew valid inferences from Source A but needed to support them with source detail, and weaker candidates wrote out the results with no further comment. There were some very sophisticated answers to **Question (a) (ii)** on whether Source B showed that the Nazis were powerful by 1932. These candidates argued in a balanced fashion, and supported all sides with detail from the source. Some argued that the source had far more evidence to show that the Nazis were powerful by 1932, while others provided only arguments and source support to show the Nazis were not powerful. The clash with Hindenburg was interpreted in a number of ways. Some saw that Hitler must have been powerful to demand the Chancellorship and refuse to cooperate with other parties, while

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

others saw that Hindenburg was right to deny Hitler and his refusal to cooperate was a 'typical tantrum'. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were varied. Less successful answers said that Source A was 'about the number of votes candidates received in the presidential elections' and Source B was 'about a disagreement between Hitler and Hindenburg'. Those who used the provenance of each source to try to effect an evaluation wrote 'Source A is results so they must be right' and of Source B, 'It was from Hindenburg's chief civil servant at the Nuremberg trial so he was probably lying to save his life'. These responses lacked the inclusion of source content to help explain and develop, thus the effort was deemed incomplete or 'stock' evaluation. The vast majority of candidates compared or contrasted the content of the sources but some did so without considering that they were required to decide if one source was more useful as evidence 'about the importance of the Presidency'. Better candidates showed that the increase in the votes for Hitler in April gave Hitler more confidence or obstinacy to claim the Chancellorship in Source B, and as they were so close in the Presidential elections, and given Hindenburg's dislike of Hitler, there was bound to be a clash soon afterwards. These candidates showed some effective cross-referencing and contextual knowledge.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** showed that many candidates knew enough about Heinrich Bruning to gain full marks, while other candidates knew little of him. For answer to **Question (b) (ii)**, Examiners were looking for a description of events immediately leading to Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in January 1933. Good candidates mentioned Bruning's lack of support in the Reichstag, similar failings of Von Papen and Von Schleicher, behind the scenes negotiations, plotting and pressures etc. Less successful candidates began their answers in the 1920s, some even starting with the Munich Putsch and Hitler's imprisonment. There were also some good answers to **Question (b) (iii)**, with comments on and reasons for the Nazis winning the largest share of the vote in the March 1933 election. Intimidation was very much to the fore here, as were the banning of the Communist and Socialist press, anti-communist propaganda, the SA, Reichstag Fire and the Decree for the Protection of the People etc. Some saw the reason as being that the Nazi Party was now genuinely popular. There were some candidates who went little beyond intimidation as the reason for success. Candidates answered **Question (b) (iv)** in two main ways. They either tried to decide whether violence was effective or not, or they compared the impact of violence against other influential factors in consolidating Hitler's power between 1933 and 1934. There were some effective and high scoring answers to both interpretations, although some candidates strayed outside the date restraints of the question and included evidence which was not valid, such as thorough descriptions of Kristallnacht.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Most candidates answering **Question (a) (i)** were able to draw valid inferences from Source A to show that the manager of a collective farm was a great admirer of Stalin, and they were easily able to find evidence in the source to support their inferences. There were some interesting answers to **Question (a) (ii)** which either showed that Stalin was popular because of the length of the applause or were balanced between popularity and fear. Many understood the sinister nature of the applause in front of NKVD men.

Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** followed the pattern referred to in the General Comments section. There were general assertions regarding the content of the sources e.g. 'Source A is about how an ex-collective farm manager admired Stalin and Source B is about applause for Stalin in a factory'. Also seen was 'stock' or incomplete evaluation. Candidates who answer using this approach know that provenance is important to evaluation but they don't fully complete the task e.g. 'Source A is from an old collective farm manager who must have worked for Stalin and would know how great he was. Source B is by someone who had his Soviet citizenship taken away after his book was published so he must have lied'. Better candidates were able to compare or contrast source content e.g. 'Source A tells about the admiration the man had for Stalin, saying he loved him and still does. Source B is about a factory and praise of Stalin with a tribute and long applause'. Candidates should appreciate that the question is asking them if one source is more useful than the other as evidence about Stalin, so some sort of choice is needed but candidates must show they have considered both sources. The best-performing candidates made a choice on the grounds of reliability. Evaluation can be achieved by tests for reliability – the example given uses tone, cross-reference and contextual knowledge e.g. 'The tone of Source A is effusive and over the top and explains how he loved him and loves him still. He calls him a genius and says he inspired them all. He must have enjoyed being manager to be so grateful. Source B would seem to suggest Stalin was popular with all that applause, but the piece is very sinister in tone with the NKVD men waiting to see who stopped clapping first. So, they both appear to say Stalin is popular but the tones tell a different story. If the author of Source B lost his Soviet citizenship he must have been either lying or giving too much information that the Soviet Government did not like. The book was published in 1973, in the middle of the Brezhnev era, and he would not like the Soviet system to be criticised. I believe Source B because of the sinister tone which reflected much of what we know about the Stalin era and his secret police.'

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Many candidates showed in their answers to **Question (b) (i)** that they knew Sergei Kirov was Head of the Communist Party in Leningrad and that he was assassinated, probably on the orders of Stalin. Candidates scored well here, although some did not comment on the significance of the assassination with regard to the purges of the 1930s. Candidates also scored well when describing Stalin's Cult of Personality (**Question (b) (ii)**), and gave reasons for the establishment of this cult and its influence on the naming of towns, streets, impact on literature and art, statues etc. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** varied. While some candidates explained that Stalin's paranoia was the root cause of the purges, others stated that it was the only cause. Many candidates were able to list the groups who were purged, but the best-performing candidates were able to place these groups in a causal context. In their answers to **Question 9(b) (iv)**, candidates were able to find a balance of evidence and detail about the benefits or otherwise brought to the people of the USSR by Stalin's rule. Less successful candidates often gave a simple comment on both sides of the argument e.g. 'The USSR was a hard place to live during Stalin's time with bad working and living conditions but the USSR was able to defeat the Nazis because of industrial successes'. Other candidates listed many more areas like full employment, better housing, health care and education, increases in heavy goods production against negative areas like purges, poor working conditions, impossible targets, fear, punishment etc.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1019-1941

In **Question (a) (i)**, most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about enforcing Prohibition. They found it frustrating for the honest enforcers, dangerous because of guns, and difficult to enforce when the city police chief approves of actions taken against the enforcement agents. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** were usually balanced between beneficial evidence from the source concerning health and alcohol-related crimes figures reducing and efficiency at work improving and less beneficial evidence of the brewing industry being devastated, loss of jobs and seventy per cent of alcohol still being drunk after 1919. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** followed the pattern described earlier. Weaker candidates wrote that 'Source A told about trying to enforce prohibition, while Source B was about the effects of Americans drinking less alcohol'. 'Stock' or incomplete answers related that Source A was 'written by the Chief Federal Agent so he must have known what was going on' and Source B 'is from a web site of 2008 and so the writer would have had plenty of time to check his facts'. Most candidates related and contrasted the content of the two sources and tried to decide which source was more useful as 'evidence about Prohibition'. Attempts at evaluation and tests for reliability centred on the position of the Chief Federal Agent 'who resigned just a few months after the January 1927 incident.' Candidates speculated as to whether his resignation was from frustration or from being encouraged to resign. Either way, candidates felt that the circumstances might encourage him to exaggerate, but their knowledge told them that the January incident was common and there was much opposition to enforcement agents. Of Source B, candidate felt the tone was very matter-of-fact and even-handed, making it especially believable as it was taken from the history website of a major American brewery.

Candidates performed well on **Question (b) (i)** and on **Question (b) (ii)**, when defining the activities of moonshiners and describing the activities of bootleggers. However, some candidates confused the roles of the two groups. **Question (b) (iii)** posed more problems as it appeared from the answers that not all candidates had previously considered the concept that Prohibition had been more quickly accepted in rural areas than in urban areas. Knowledgeable candidates wrote about the greater influence in the countryside of the Anti-Saloon League and Women's Christian Temperance Movement, the greater influence of the churches in rural areas, that some states were already 'dry', and that people who lived in the countryside often had simpler, more conservative views and lives etc. **Question (b) (iv)** on the extent to which Prohibition was the least important type of intolerance in the 1920s, brought some interesting answers comparing the impact of Prohibition against other forms of intolerance, with racism against both black and Native Americans, against women and intolerance of immigrants, especially from Southern Europe. These responses demonstrated sustained and supported arguments and scored high marks. Less successful candidates appeared, at times, to struggle with the idea that Prohibition was a form of 'intolerance' and tended to write about the negative side of gangs and speakeasies etc.

Depth Study D, China, 1945-c.1990

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

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

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

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

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

When attempting all Part **(a)** questions, candidates must make sure that all inferences, assertions, arguments and evaluations are supported by relevant and recognisable source detail.

When attempting all Part **(b)** questions, candidates must make sure that all general descriptions, reasons, arguments and assertions are illuminated by relevant and valid examples and detail.

General Comments

As with previous seasons of examination, Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945 proved to be the most popular choice for candidates. Indeed, this choice was overwhelmingly the most popular. There were some Centres that chose Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941 but they were fewer in number. As far as the other Depth Studies are concerned, there were too few responses to draw conclusions about the candidates' overall performance, or to make helpful observations for future candidates.

For the most part, scripts were clearly written and set out so that Examiners could have access to all that the candidates wished to convey. There were very few rubric offences, but some weaker candidates did attempt up to four different Depth Studies. There appeared to be very little evidence that the candidates' performances were affected by time limitations.

As hinted at in the Key Messages section above, candidates performed well when they used source detail in support of their inferences, arguments and evaluations in answers to Part **(a)** questions, and used supportive and relevant examples and detail for their assertions and descriptions in answers to Part **(b)** questions. Candidates who performed at this level scored well and their scripts were impressive. Some questions did receive less successful responses - **Question (a) (iii)**, for example. Some compared and contrasted the two sources by writing about the general areas they covered. These general assertions were not supported with recognisable source detail. Other candidates appreciated that the provenance of each source may well have some bearing on an effective evaluation of the source, although some neglected to use source detail and provided only 'stock' or incomplete evaluations.

The overall standard, however, was maintained in this season of examinations, and candidates who scored well provided impressive scripts which demonstrated both knowledge of their chosen topic and also mastery of the techniques required.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Answers to **Question (a) (i)** showed that all candidates appreciated that concentration camps were strict and dangerous places for the inmates. Where candidates supported their inferences with recognisable source detail, they were awarded marks in the range of those available for the achievement of the highest Level. Most achieved this, although some candidates either drew inferences without supporting them with evidence from the source or wrote out sections of the source without relevant comment. In **Question (a) (ii)**, most candidates agreed that Source B showed that members of the SS were cruel and made comments about the treatment of Russians and Czechs, and the disinterest about the fate of 10 000 Russian women. Thus far, candidates had scored well as they had supported their views with evidence from the source. Candidates saw that the SS was instructed to be decent, loyal etc. to members of their own blood, but many had difficulty in deciding whether the SS members were cruel in dealing with 'human animals' after the assertion by

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Himmler that Germans were the only people who had a decent attitude to animals. Some interpreted that this was 'good' for the human animals, while others were outraged by the comparison. Here, Levels achieved and marks awarded depended on coherence of argument and support from the source. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** varied enormously. There were general assertions regarding the general content of the sources e.g. 'Source A tells you about the rules for concentration camps and Source B tells you how the SS are to treat people'. There was 'stock' or incomplete evaluation. These candidates know that provenance is important but the task is not fully completed e.g. 'Source A shows that rules were harsh in 1933 and Source B shows that prisoners were treated no better ten years later'. Better candidates conducted a comparison or contrast of source content e.g. 'Source A shows the harsh punishment of hanging or shooting, and Source B shows how little the Nazis cared that thousands of Russian women suffered.' Candidates should understand that the question is asking if one source is more useful than the other. Thus, some sort of choice is needed, but candidates must show they have considered both sources. Higher Level responses made a choice on the grounds of reliability. Evaluations can be achieved by tests for reliability – the example given is one of valid cross-reference e.g. 'Both sources are from Himmler. In Source A, at the start of the Nazi regime, he is detailing the strict rules and punishments to be applied to prisoners in early concentration camps. There is no evidence of human rights and the punishments are always death by hanging or shooting. They are savage. However, ten years later Himmler is equally savage about the treatment of Russian prisoners and women. Therefore, neither source is more useful than the other as evidence about the Nazis. The evidence shows they support one another completely in demonstrating that the Nazis saw non-Nazi and non-German life as little interest or value'.

In **Question (b) (i)**, some candidates could name concentration camps but the question specified 'in Germany'. Hence some gave examples outside Germany or left the answer blank. Nevertheless, there were also some concentration camps correctly named. **Question (b) (ii)** also proved challenging to some candidates. The question asked candidates to describe how Jews were presented in Nazi propaganda. Some candidates interpreted the question as asking for a description of the treatment of the Jews, and they went on to list details of Kristallnacht, wearing Stars of David, Nuremburg Laws and concentration camps. Answers should have contained how Jews were presented on propaganda posters, in films, in newspapers etc. Those candidates who understood the thrust of the question gave very full detail and scored well. Some candidates answering **Question (b) (iii)**) said that the Final Solution was to wage all out war (Total War?), while others said it was to kill all Jews. The question asked 'Why did the Nazis adopt the Final Solution?' Examiners were, therefore, expecting candidates to list reasons for its adoption. Better candidates mentioned the Wannsee conference and its brutal logic, so many Jews in occupied territories, the long-term goal in this area, the logical progression of earlier policies, Himmler's influence and the need to get rid of the evidence of brutality as the war turned against Germany. Many candidates spent time on different views of historians about paper evidence that Hitler had ordered the Final Solution. This last point is a good example to show candidates must answer the actual question that has been set. Apart from those candidates who answered **Question (b) (iv)** thoroughly and well, with high marks awarded, there were two areas which could have been improved on by candidates. Some needed to appreciate the broad date limits of 'between 1933 and 1945', while others who asserted that 'fear of the Nazis kept them in power', needed to offer more by way of detail or naming the agencies that caused the fear. Also, candidates wrote that there were other factors than fear but would have improved their responses by developing some sustained evidence. To score highly on this question, candidates should appreciate that two sides of the argument must be offered, supported by sustained and valid detail, and they should come to a reasoned conclusion.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates were able to draw valid conclusions from Source A to show that the March 1917 revolution was largely unplanned and that its very success depended upon whether the military units would join forces with the public to ensure the revolution's success. In almost all cases, candidates used detail from the source to support their inferences. At the superior end of answers to **Questions (a) (ii)**, there were some sophisticated arguments as to the control the authorities had by 9 March 1917. There were many differing interpretations of the secretaries' comments in the first paragraph – 'if you ask me, it's the beginning of the revolution'. Some argued that if gossiping secretaries recognised the change, the authorities must be losing control, while others saw the conversation as 'empty headed gossip'. Most candidates asserted that the first paragraph showed the authorities in control, while the second showed that control was being lost by the moment. Most candidates supported assertions with evidence from the source. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were as varied as those mentioned for the German option. Some candidates wrote what each source was 'about' e.g. 'Source A is comments by an Okhrana agent about the mood of the people on 11 March 1917'. Others tried to make evaluative comments about each source's provenance but these often needed to be more complete. The majority compared and contrasted the content of the sources, while a few attempted tests for reliability with regard to cross-referencing or against their own contextual knowledge.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question (b) (i) could have been answered better by some candidates. Answers to the question, 'Give two features of a soviet' saw comments ranging from a soviet being, 'Someone who lives in the USSR' to 'A country of the old USSR'. Fortunately, many candidates realised that the question was asking about the workers/soldiers' councils set up to organise strikes and demonstrations. Some had good knowledge about the relationship between the Duma and the St Petersburg soviet. **Question (b) (ii)** about Rasputin's role at the Tsar's court in the period 1907-1916 was embraced by candidates, although some would have been better advised to adhere to the set question about Rasputin's role, rather than to list many and varied rumours about his private life and relationship with the Tsarina. Nevertheless, there were some very good answers and many candidates scored maximum marks. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** varied enormously. At the better end, Examiners found answers that were reasoned, logical and supported by excellent detail to explain why the March 1917 Revolution was successful – these concentrated on the effect of the war, shortages, losses, dysfunctional royal family, rumours etc. Less successfully, there were confusions between the two revolutions of 1917, with some candidates referring to the impact of Lenin's April Theses and the impact of the Kornilov Affair. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** about the assertion that 'the Bolsheviks caused the November 1917 Revolution', varied in length and in quality. Good candidates contrasted the impact of the Bolsheviks and their actions against other forces that undermined the Provisional Government. These views were supported by relevant detail on both sides of the argument. Weaker candidates either agreed that the Bolsheviks were the main cause or stated that the Bolsheviks were one cause and dissatisfaction with the provisional government was another. These responses needed to be supported with much more detail to gain better marks.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Candidates who chose this Depth Study were able to draw valid inferences from Source A, mentioning the benefits of matching skills and jobs, raising the morale of the unemployed, and supporting women in work. All of these inferences were supported by evidence from the source. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** on how far Source B showed that the New Deal was a failure, often showed a balance of argument and source detail. However, most found that the evidence in the source was largely critical of the New Deal. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** followed the pattern described for the same question on the other Depth Studies, above. Weaker candidates tended to assert that Source A was about giving jobs to the unemployed and Source B was a description of the failings of the New Deal. Those candidates who wanted to use the provenance in attempts to evaluate the sources commented that the speaker in Source A worked for Works Progress Administration so 'he would know what the truth was'. The most comment 'stock' or incomplete comment for Source B was that 'the historian would have had plenty of time to do his research as he only published his comments in 2009'. Most candidates compared and contrasted the content of the sources. However, some tests for reliability were successful. Some candidates dwelt on the persuasive purpose and optimistic tone of Source A, and gave appropriate source detail in support, while Source B was thought to have 'a negative and critical tone', with even positive features like 'parks, schools, dams and sewers' being the basis of further criticism. Those who achieved this quality of answer were impressive.

Most candidates were able to score marks for **Question (b) (i)**, showing knowledge of the context and purpose of the Blue Eagle. Many scored well on **Question (b) (ii)** on the effects of the Wagner Labour Relations Act of 1935. Candidates knew that the Act gave workers the legal right to membership of a union, allowed collective bargaining and strikes. Some mentioned the rise in union membership and others told of employers' resistance to the effects. Weaker candidates said that it improved working conditions, without linking this assertion to union pressure. Others said the Act gave pensions and protection to the elderly. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons for many people moving to California in the 1930s were varied. Less successful responses indicated that people were looking for better lives/jobs but did not give further context or detail. However, many were able to list reasons of land acquisition, jobs in the fruit industry, tenant farmers being driven from their land in the 1930s, the impact of the Dust Bowl etc. Many mentioned the Okies and Arkies, their reasons for leaving and their, sometimes, hostile reception in California. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** also varied in length and quality. Brief answers often asserted that America was a better place because 'the New Deal had given jobs to many'. Very strong answers argued that the New Deal had made some difference but it had not cured all of America's ills. Considerable supporting evidence was deployed by these candidates, showing improvements made by the New Deal against failures, and then used other factors like racism against Black Americans and Native Americans, the position of women and the reactions to immigrants. These were well-argued answers which achieved high marks. All candidates should appreciate that all **Questions (b) (iv)** have the highest mark tariff of all questions, and sufficient time should be allotted to deal with it adequately.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

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

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

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

There were too few attempts at this Depth Study to make relevant and helpful comments.

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

When attempting all Part **(a)** Questions, candidates must make sure that all inferences, assertions, arguments and evaluations are supported by relevant and recognisable source detail.

When attempting all Part **(b)** Questions, candidates must make sure that all general descriptions, reasons, arguments and assertions are illuminated by relevant and valid examples and detail.

General comments

Depth Studies A (Germany, 1918-1945) and F (Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994) were the most popular topics. Smaller numbers were seen on Depth Study B (Russia, 1905-1941) and C (USA, 1919-1941). There were too few responses on the other topics to make comment worthwhile.

Almost all scripts were well-presented, written in excellent English and many displayed secure historical knowledge in **Section B** answers. The majority of candidates approached **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)** in line with the criteria, although many were not as effective in addressing **Question (a)(iii)**. Candidates who performed well used source detail and made cross-references relevant to the issue focused on in the question - in support of their argument and evaluation, rather than making generalisations on reliability.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

(a) (i) All candidates made valid inferences from Source A on the Nazi Party supporters' attitudes and most provided specific detail from the source to attain the highest level marks. Some candidates would have benefited from drawing inferences about the significance of university students being supporters and the 'huge crowds' applauding their actions.

(ii) Many secure responses offered explanation supported, rather than simply quoted, from Source B, in agreement that the popularity of the Nazis was the product of propaganda. Fewer made points of balance about there being those who disliked the regime and ignored the propaganda and others for whom Nazi policies in themselves created popularity. Hitler as 'a father-figure' was well-argued by one or two candidates as a product of both propaganda and his appeal. It is worthwhile for candidates to remember that a balance will be found within a source if it is given sufficient consideration.

(iii) Encouragingly, many candidates on this Depth Study avoided vague assertions on reliability and they were able to address the content of the sources to reach a sound judgment. Some candidates needed to appreciate that this question was focused on the 'aims' of the Nazis, rather than inviting reiteration of earlier points. The majority, however, did consider a range of aims evident in the sources, some making cross-references between them on issues such as Aryan supremacy, the aim of gaining support from the young and they linked the military preparedness of Source A to the solidarity against Germany's enemies. Evaluating such points against their own knowledge of the context enabled good candidates to demonstrate their ability to judge the merits of sources in relation to their provenance. For example, having compared the content of the sources, one candidate concluded, 'The evidence from the American journalist who saw the events in Berlin in 1933 can be judged the most useful for appreciating the response of students to the Nazi aim of appealing to the young which is indicated by the British historian'. It would be equally valid to argue - so long as evidence has been presented - that Source B reinforces the range of aims

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

indicated in Source A, yet goes further to consider the creation of 'the cult of the infallible leader' as a major aim which had been realised.

(b) (i) Most candidates knew of the Swing Movement, White Rose and the Edelweiss Pirates.

(ii) There were a number of excellent answers from some Centres whose candidates had knowledge of the issue of the Nazis and the Church. Such responses made clear the different relationships with the Catholic and Protestant Churches and how far these changed. They also indicated that those clergy who criticised the regime were sent to concentration camps and some, such as Bonhoeffer, were executed. Less successful candidates made general comments on persecution and the weaker responses saw Churches as synagogues, writing about the treatment of the Jews.

(iii) A good range of reasons for the fall in unemployment was considered in many responses and some were supported well with detail of state-funded projects beyond autobahns and rearmament. Candidates who included the dismissal of women from the workforce did need to explain why this reduced unemployment. It was difficult to see that the banning of Trade Unions was a factor leading to a fall in unemployment as some candidates argued.

(iv) Knowledge of Goebbels' role in propaganda was evident in most responses but why this could be deemed successful needed to be more securely demonstrated at times. Many candidates ensured some balance by contrasting the significance of Goebbels with that of other leading figures, such as Himmler, and, of course, Hitler himself. The best answers ensured that the whole period from 1933 to 1945 specified in the question was covered and made clear the significant differences between peace and wartime methods and success. For example, the lessening number of Hitler's public appearances and speechmaking during the war and the even greater extension of censorship presided over by Goebbels. Less successful responses saw Goebbels as Goering and considered no other leader.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

(a) (i) Some good responses were seen, although some candidates struggled to draw valid inferences from the picture of peasants, as they saw them as landlords or kulaks, rather surprisingly demanding their own liquidation. Others did appreciate that the peasants were poor, shabby, unhappy and favoured collectivisation but needed to give direct reference to the content of the photograph to attain the highest level of marks.

(ii) Almost all candidates were on surer ground with Source B, and the majority saw some balance in this source. Many did very well in going beyond simple quotation to explain why aspects such as the lack of planning and famine could be deemed as failure - yet the feeding of towns, export of grain and breaking peasant resistance was success – at least in Stalin's eyes.

(iii) Whilst, in general, answers gave supported consideration of the sources' content on collectivisation, some candidates scored low marks, making comments such as 'photographs cannot be trusted and the British are anti-Communists so will be biased'. Without any substance from the sources, this is insufficient as assessment. Better candidates did support - with both content and their own knowledge, points such as how far the peasants shown is Source A were likely to have the resources themselves to produce the poster, and thus their commitment to collectivisation might have been heavily influenced by the central figure as a government representative. Cross-reference with Source B and knowledge of the context lent credence to judgments of utility. Less successful answers were largely those which had already misinterpreted Source A in **Question (a)(i)**.

(b) (i) All candidates had some knowledge of who the kulaks were. The best responses indicated that they had power in villages through the Mirs and from employing the poorer peasants, and thus had most to lose through the policy of collectivisation.

(ii) Most candidates appreciated that a kolkhoz was a collective farm, although some responses would have been improved by expanding on this to show how it was organised.

(iii) This proved to be the question on which candidates had knowledge of a wide range of Stalin's motives in introducing collectivisation and some impressive answers developed this with secure detail.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(iv) Here, too, many responses considered a range of benefits and assessed these against the damaging effects of collectivisation and thus achieved some balance. Candidates who supported this with relevant detail were able to gain better marks than those who reintroduced points made in answer to **(b)(iii)**, as benefits without elaboration. The best answers balanced and explained the positive economic and political benefits of collectivisation against its social cost.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

(a) (i) There were some good answers to this question in which candidates gave specific support from the source for a number of valid inferences. Others, whilst making similar inferences, needed to provide the support necessary to attain the highest level marks. Some candidates appeared to have missed the headings of the columns and/or the dates. As a result, they made no inferences about the significance of the fall in value of production between 1929 and 1932 and did not appreciate that agricultural prices were variable and already falling before the Wall Street Crash.

(ii) A substantial number of candidates did well, with balanced responses which went beyond quotation into reasoned focus on the issue of the loss of confidence and economic problems. They assessed and supported the importance of unemployment and distrust of banks as factors frightening consumers and curtailing spending, even after the government took action, and balanced these against the direct responsibility of banks, speculation and debts before the crisis, as the causes of economic problems. Less effective were those answers which mainly quoted the source and left Examiners to infer their focus.

(iii) Success in approaching this question seemed in direct relation to candidates' earlier grasp of Source A. Those who had appreciated that it highlighted the fall in production of the whole economy and the weaknesses of agriculture throughout the 1920s could then relate this to aspects in Source B, such as unemployment and the disappearance of buying power. The best answers made clear such cross-reference and evaluated these against the other weaknesses shown in Source B, such as banks being unregulated and only a minority being in the Federal Reserve System, whilst government did not provide any assistance for the jobless. Thus they reached a reasoned conclusion on the utility of the sources and achieved higher marks than those offering such answers as 'Statistics cannot be trusted and websites can be biased.'

(b) (i) All candidates indicated greed as an incentive to speculation but fewer developed this to include encouragements such as the ease of obtaining loans, 'buying on the margin' and the false confidence inspired by rising prices in the 'Roaring Twenties', as well as the huge profits made by those already skilled in playing the market.

(ii) Some answers to this question were very brief and lacking in detail. Secure grasp of what the banking crisis entailed was evident in other, sound answers, which focused on the effects such as the collapse of many banks, businesses unable to gain loans cutting production and jobs, as well as the political effects on Hoover and Roosevelt. The latter's rapid banking reforms, after his election, could also be seen as a direct effect of the crisis.

(iii) Most candidates listed a number of reasons for Roosevelt's success in the 1932 election, although few explained these – for example, why Hoover was seen as a 'do nothing' President or why Roosevelt's promises of action appealed to voters.

(iv) Some answers to this question were brief and assertive, suggesting a lack of knowledge. Effective responses were from candidates who supported a range of effects on the poor, such as the scale of the loss of employment which had not recovered even by the end of the 1930s, wage cuts and even losing their homes, and balanced this against what could be argued as their benefits from the New Deal, which was a result of the Crash. Alternatively, some argued that other groups – politicians, businessmen and savers – paid an even greater price.

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

(a) (i) There were some good answers to this question in which candidates gave specific support from the source for a number of valid inferences. Others, whilst making similar inferences, needed to provide the support from the source necessary to attain the highest level marks. There were also some candidates who appeared to have missed the headings of the columns and/or misinterpreted the given figures. Although they easily saw that the population increased markedly over the period,

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

some wrote that this was the result of Jewish immigration, either ignoring the evidence in the second column or, claiming that it showed an increase - rather than a reduction, in immigration.

(ii) Most candidates saw the balance in this source between the successes and weaknesses of Israel's economy and there was an encouraging number of candidates who went beyond quotation to explanation of why the range of export goods to major markets such as the USA meant success, and reasons for weakness in finding Arab and communist custom.

(iii) There were some sound answers which made use of the content of the sources and assessed them in the light of their own knowledge to reach a reasoned conclusion on their utility as evidence about Israel as a flourishing economy but with hostile neighbours. Some candidates offered only generalisations on reliability, such as 'statistics cannot be trusted and both sources are British so are likely to be biased'. Without specific support from the sources, this limited the mark they could achieve. By considering only one of the sources, others limited the marks achievable as no choice was then possible.

(b) (i) Almost all candidates knew that a kibbutz is a collective farm and some developed this further on the community organisations, purpose and location, to gain both marks.

(ii) Many good answers showed a detailed grasp of the significance of Jerusalem to both the Jewish and Muslim faiths. More needed to develop this on specific issues such as the division of the city in 1949 and Israel's control of it after the Six Day War, as major factors influencing Arab-Israeli relations. A small number of candidates saw Israel as Christian.

(iii) American support and Israel's military skill were known by almost all candidates and some gave clear explanation of these factors and others such as the divisions in Arab opposition, as reasons for Israel's survival. Excellent answers backed up the latter reason, with a clear grasp of the specific issues dividing the Arab states over Israel and the Palestinians.

(iv) Some candidates struggled with this question and responses were often brief and assertive, even if attempting a degree of balance. Other responses developed a range of relevant and supported aspects, demonstrating unity or divisions in Israel over their relations with the Arabs across a wide period. That it was a complicated issue for all Israeli politicians to deal with, was given some specific support on Labour and Likud differences by able candidates who also backed up the unity demonstrated over the defence and survival of the Jewish state, with specific examples of wars and negotiations.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2011