eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com
www.XtremePapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

General Comments and Key Messages

A 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 fewer rubric errors this year. However, there were still a number of candidates who attempted all twenty five questions on the paper.

Candidates should read the questions carefully and ensure they are actually answering the question set, rather than writing lots of facts about the given area of the syllabus. It is also important that candidates look carefully at the dates given in questions, to ensure that they include material that is relevant to that particular period.

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. Some candidates constructed a clear hypothesis in response to a question but then needed to go on and use their factual knowledge to support this hypothesis.

Comments on Specific Questions

The following comments do are intended to help Centres in the preparation of their candidates.

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 3

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

Question 4

(a) Some candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the Triple Alliance, with answers focused upon the names of the countries within the alliance, the development of the Triple Alliance from the Dual Alliance and the support countries offered to each other. Candidates are expected to know the details of the Triple Alliance. Some candidates wrote about the Triple Entente instead of the Triple Alliance.

(b) Many candidates were able to state reasons why tension was increased by the arms race of the early twentieth century. Reasons stated included Britain feeling threatened by the growth of the German navy, the stockpiling of weapons and the increasing number of Dreadnoughts. More candidates could have developed these reasons into explanations. A number of candidates answered in very general terms only, with reference to the desire of all nations to be the most powerful.

(c) Candidates demonstrated detailed factual knowledge of events in Morocco and events in Bosnia in the years before the First World War. Many candidates only described events, rather than explaining why these events were a threat to peace. Part **(c)** questions require candidates to analyse events.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 5

(a) Many candidates displayed detailed knowledge of the successes of the League of Nations in the 1920s. Successes described included the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia and various humanitarian issues. This question specifically asked about the successes of the League in the 1920s. Some candidates wrote solely about the failures of the League in the 1920s and 1930s, which was not relevant to this question. Some candidates gained maximum marks by describing the successes of the League in the 1920s, but then wrote at some length about the failures of the League, which was not required, using up time that could have been spent on another question.

(b) Some candidates explained clearly that the absence of the USA had a detrimental effect upon trade sanctions and also explained the problems facing Britain and France due to the absence of the USA. Other candidates explained why the USA failed to become a member of the League, rather than why the absence of the USA caused problems for the League. Candidates must ensure they answer the actual question.

(c) This question was answered well by some candidates. The role of Italy in the failure of the League was clearly addressed, with reference to both Corfu and Abyssinia. Answers were developed with explanation of the role of Britain and France in undermining the League in the Hoare-Laval Pact, and the slow pace of action in the Manchurian crisis. Many candidates adopted a purely narrative approach, and simply described the events surrounding Corfu, Abyssinia and Manchuria. These candidates often had very detailed knowledge of events, but needed to use this knowledge to link the actions of Italy, Britain and France to the actual failure of the League.

Question 6

(a) Most candidates demonstrated detailed contextual knowledge of Hitler's foreign policy aims, and were able to state at least four relevant points. These were usually focused on the desire to overturn the Treaty of Versailles, the desire for a Greater Germany, Lebensraum and the aim of achieving Anschluss with Austria. Candidates are expected to know the difference between Hitler's domestic policy and his foreign policy. Some candidates wrote at considerable length about Hitler's policies towards women and children. These areas were not relevant to a question on foreign policy.

(b) This question could be approached by explaining why the remilitarisation succeeded as an action and/or why it brought successful consequences. Answers focused on the overturning of a term of the Treaty of Versailles, the fact that Hitler was not opposed by the French and the strengthening of Hitler's position with the German citizens and the generals. Part **(b)** questions require candidates to explain reasons. A number of answers to this question described events in the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, and needed to explain why this was a success for Hitler.

(c) Most candidates were able to describe the increased militarism of Germany and to identify at least one other cause of the Second World War, such as appeasement, German resentment towards the Treaty of Versailles or the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Some developed clear explanations of how these other causes led to war. Fewer candidates were able to explain how increased militarism led to war. They tended to describe how countries were increasing armaments, usually referring to Germany alone. This needed to be developed into explanation of how this led to increased tension and made each country more likely to increase its own armed forces to ensure its own safety, thus making war more likely.

Question 7

(a) Detailed knowledge of decisions made at Yalta was used effectively by candidates. Most were able to state that Germany and Berlin were divided into four zones, and to detail the countries that were responsible for each zone. Some candidates also described decisions made about a Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe, the treatment of war criminals and the holding of free elections in countries freed from Nazi occupation.

(b) Some candidates gave clearly focused explanation of the Soviet Union's long held mistrust of the Western Powers, the lack of a common enemy and the Western Powers' belief that Stalin wanted to take over all of Europe. Candidates must ensure that they read the question carefully. The question clearly stated 'in 1945'; many candidates wrote about events after this date.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Increasing tension caused by the Berlin Blockade was clearly explained by some candidates. Other reasons explained included the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Some candidates adopted a purely narrative approach, describing the events of the Berlin Blockade rather than explaining how the Blockade increased Cold War tension. Candidates do need to be aware of the difference between the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall. A significant number of candidates wrote at length about the building of the Berlin Wall and its significance. This was not relevant to the question. The question asked about reasons for increasing Cold War tension in the years 1947-49. These dates were missed by some candidates.

Question 8

(a) The key features of the Bay of Pigs incident were clearly described by many candidates. Details included the training received by the exiles, their equipment, their numbers and events occurring when they actually landed at the Bay of Pigs.

(b) Some candidates developed clear explanations focused on Kennedy's desire to protect the USA and to be viewed as a strong president, coupled with the necessity to avoid reacting in a way that could be construed as an act of war. As in previous questions, a significant number of candidates only described events.

(c) Candidates were able to give a variety of identified points agreeing and disagreeing with the statement in the question. Identified points included the withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and from Cuba, Kennedy improving his reputation, the decline of Khrushchev's reputation and the setting up of a hot-line. A number of candidates developed these points into substantiated explanations. A small number of candidates answered this question in generalised terms only, making unsubstantiated assertions that both Kennedy and Khrushchev were winners and losers.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Some candidates were able to give at least two relevant points of detail, focusing on the Nazi Party's desire to ensure that only 'true' Germans were allowed to live in Germany, the desire to eradicate communism and also to ensure that all Germans would have jobs. This question clearly highlighted that candidates must look carefully at the date specified. Some candidates wrote very detailed accounts of Nazi domestic policy from 1933 onwards, which was not relevant to this question.

(b) Effective answers to this question explained that the Nazi Party's lack of success was directly linked to the success of the Weimar government between 1924 and 1929. Answers also highlighted that Hitler's term in prison left the Nazi Party without an inspirational leader. A small number of candidates wrote about Nazi success after 1929.

(c) There were a number of clearly focused responses to this question. Explanations referred to Hitler's skill as an orator and his appeal to the people of Germany. On the other side of the argument, candidates stressed the importance of the Depression and of Nazi propaganda. Some candidates devoted their answers solely to the period from 1933 onwards. The question asked about success between 1929 and 1932.

Question 10

(a) Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the powers Hitler gained from the Enabling Act. Other candidates wrote in general terms only. Candidates are expected to know the details of the powers Hitler gained from the Enabling Act.

(b) Developed explanations were given of the challenge from Röhm and the violence of the SA. A number of candidates wrote about Kristallnacht, rather than the Night of the Long Knives.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained the role of the police state in controlling the people of Germany by referring to the Gestapo, the role of informers and the role of the courts. These points were all clearly linked to controlling the German people. Propaganda was also clearly explained, with reference made to the control of the radio and press. Some candidates answered in general

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

terms, stating only that people were scared of the police state. Some candidates described the types of propaganda used in some depth, and would have improved their responses by then explaining how this controlled the German people.

Question 11

(a) Some candidates were able to state several relevant points, with a focus on land, the role of the Orthodox Church and the attitudes towards the Tsar. Other candidates wrote in generalised terms only, stating life was hard for the peasants.

(b) The 'carrot and stick' approach introduced by Stolypin was clearly explained, as were Stolypin's reforms to improve the life of the peasants. Some candidates appeared unaware of the role of Stolypin and therefore wrote in generalised terms about Stolypin helping some people.

(c) Candidates were able to explain that the Tsar's personal command of the armed forces meant that he was held personally responsible for military defeats and the suffering of the Russian troops. The explanation of other reasons for the fall of the Tsarist regime focused mainly upon the roles of Rasputin and the Tsarina. Some candidates wrote narrative accounts about Rasputin, without explaining how his actions contributed to the fall of the Tsarist regime.

Question 12

(a) There were many effective answers to this question, with details given of Trotsky's skill as an orator, his skills in organising the Red Army and his intellectual abilities. Some general statements about Trotsky being a marvellous leader or being an able man were also seen.

(b) Some candidates explained the various facets of Stalin's emergence as the main leader of the Soviet Union by developing reasons such as Stalin tricking Trotsky into missing Lenin's funeral, the withholding of Lenin's secret testament, Stalin's appearance as a man of the people and Stalin's skill at playing one group against the other. A number of candidates did not notice that the question stated 'by 1928', and made reference to events much later than 1928.

(c) Developed explanations were given of the role of the NKVD, the Purges and the labour camps in instilling fear in the people of the Soviet Union. Other methods explained were the use of propaganda, the cult of personality and also control through the positive aspects of Stalin's rule in giving the people work and improved transport and communications systems.

Question 13

(a) A variety of changes were specified in response to this question. They included the development of talkie movies, the changes in dance style, the development of Hollywood as the centre of movie making and the introduction of America's first radio station. A number of candidates wrote at some length about entertainment generally in the 1920s, without any reference to the changes.

(b) There were some well-developed explanations relating to the fear of immigrants and socialist ideas, the desire to protect true American values and the conviction that only WASPs were true Americans. Some candidates wrote about the nature of intolerance in American society, rather than why there was intolerance.

(c) The role of corruption in causing the failure of prohibition was effectively explained, with reference to corruption amongst prohibition agents, police officers, judges and government officials. Explanation of other reasons for the failure of prohibition focused upon the increase in crime and the fact that so many Americans did not agree with the prohibition law and therefore ignored it. A considerable number of candidates described the activities of Al Capone in detail, but they needed to go on to explain why this caused the failure of prohibition.

Question 14

(a) Candidates detailed a number of Roosevelt's actions, including the Emergency Banking Act and the support given to those banks designated as reliable and therefore allowed to continue in business. The answers of some candidates would have benefited from greater focus on the actual question, as they wrote about the Wall Street Crash and how it caused problems for the banks, rather than concentrating how Roosevelt dealt with the banks to prevent economic disaster.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) The effective answers to this question explained that Roosevelt set up the Tennessee Valley Authority to revive agriculture, to provide cheap electricity and to give much needed assistance to a poverty stricken area. A small number of candidates wrote about the Civilian Conservation Corps instead of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Candidates are expected to know the differences between the various alphabet agencies.

(c) Some candidates gave detailed explanations of the failure of the New Deal to help the poor, with focus upon the poverty faced by old people and by the unemployed. Arguments were supported by reference to the views of Roosevelt's critics such as Huey Long and Father Coughlin. This was followed by clear explanation of other weaknesses of the New Deal, such as the lack of benefits for Black Americans and women. A number of candidates described the various alphabet agencies without reference to the question set; others simply described the successes of the New Deal; in both cases, answers would have been improved by focusing on the actual question.

Questions 15 to 25

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

General Comments and Key Messages

Candidates should read each question carefully, assess its demands and plan their answer to meet those demands.

Candidates should have an awareness of the difference between description/narrative and explanation.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

(a) Generally, events relating to the Roman Republic were well known, with the roles of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Louis Napoleon being developed with varying degrees of success. The best answers showed a much wider picture of events, although reference to the Constitution, even in the better answers, was often missed.

(b) Most candidates were aware of the delay by Charles Albert and this was often developed into good explanation when linked with the advantages it gave to the Austrian forces. Here the role of Radetsky was emphasised. The failure of promised support could have featured in more answers.

(c) Most candidates used this question to show their knowledge of the roles of Garibaldi and Cavour. In some instances, Napoleon was added. In the better answers, the activities of these individuals were linked to the unification of Italy. In some instances, the answers remained one-sided, with candidates' responses lacking relevance about Piedmont.

Question 2

(a) Many answers displayed good factual knowledge about the Frankfurt Parliament, often placing this within the political support for a unified Germany. The increase in liberal reforms was noted by some. Less strong was information about events in Heidelberg and the Vorparlament.

(b) Answers to this question were less strong, often being limited to a description of the strength of the Austrian army and that there had been a Treaty of Olmutz.

(c) Most answers made some reference to Bismarck gaining French neutrality, whilst placing his reliance on British and Russian neutrality, thus enabling him to pick a war with Austria. Stronger were the links with the Prussian investment in the economy to produce weapons of war, which were used by Moltke.

Question 3

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

Question 4

(a) Many candidates were clear on the main purpose of the Schlieffen Plan, in that it was to avoid war on two fronts. A number developed their response to say what this meant, although some of these attempts were confused as to what the 'Two Fronts' were. The aim of defeating France quickly before the Russians mobilised was also well known. On occasions candidates strayed into the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

area of 'what happened'. As this was not part of the question, additional credit could not be awarded.

(b) The better answers went back as far as 1908 to identify the tension in the Balkans and the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina as being relevant factors, although in these responses the clarity of detail of events of 1908 was variable. The less successful answers showed variable quality of knowledge in relation to the participants, although one explained reason was usually given. The weakest answers showed a lack of knowledge of who Franz Ferdinand was or why he should be visiting Serbia. Some candidates just gave an account of the assassination and its consequences.

(c) There were strong responses to this question, though answers often concentrated more on Germany's responsibility, rather than the actions of other countries, giving an unbalanced answer. For those candidates who did attempt to explain others responsible, Serbia and Austria-Hungary featured strongly. Those candidates who were confident in their subject knowledge often considered events from the turn of the century, although for some this was more about describing, rather than explaining.

Question 5

(a) There were many responses about 'self-interest'. Candidates were strong in developing answers about the way Britain and France gained a reputation for putting themselves first, often quoting examples. Most candidates wanted to write about the absence of America, although the relevance of this in relation to the deficiencies of Britain and France was not always made clear.

(b) Most candidates explained why there were a number of successes in the 1920s. In the better answers, candidates were able to show a greater awareness of the period, bringing to their answer the relative absence of great power aggression, links back to war and the prevailing attitude of needing to avoid more bloodshed.

(c) Most candidates were aware of the Hoare–Laval Plan, although some to a greater extent than others. Better answers developed their knowledge of the reasons for the Plan, putting this in the context of Italy and Abyssinia. The best answers were quite clear as to how these impacted on the League. In other answers, some misunderstandings about the Plan were seen. Most were aware of the meetings, but were less secure of their status in relation to Mussolini. Also, many thought that Hoare and Laval were 'Prime-ministers' of their respective countries. On the other side, the increase in strong, non-democratic governments in Japan and Germany particularly, were well explained within the context of World Depression. Sometimes answers were unnecessarily detailed about the impact of the Depression on America.

Question 6

(a) The reasons for Hitler's involvement in the Spanish Civil War were better known by candidates than the actual involvement. Candidates were particularly strong on the involvement of the new German air force and its impact on Guernica. Less successful answers were less strong on the involvement of the Condor Legion. Other areas of involvement were rarely mentioned.

(b) The better answers were able to explain three or four reasons why Britain followed a policy of appeasement towards Germany and, in the best answers, gave examples of its practice. Some answers contained many reasons, with the candidate giving answers such as 'The Treaty of Versailles was harsh on Germany and so Britain followed a policy of appeasement'. This is clearly not an explanation. Weaker answers focused on 'not being ready for war' and 'the lack of support for war'. Few answers made reference to Hitler being seen as a bulwark against communism.

(c) Most answers demonstrated some knowledge of the Nazi-Soviet Pact but more in terms of what it was, rather than the benefits to the two countries who signed it. Better answers mentioned the significance of it being a non-aggression pact, and explained the importance of this for both sides. Less strong answers concentrated on the benefits to the Soviet Union, such as time to rearm, making an unbalanced answer. The relationship of events to Poland was not always developed.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 7

(a) Many answers started by saying that there were five options available to Kennedy. The best answers stated five options quite clearly. Other attempted to give five distinct options but in effect stated the same point, although in a slightly different manner. The answers became overlong as many candidates unnecessarily explained why each was not an option to be followed.

(b) Most answers included that the reason that Khrushchev wanted to threaten the US and Cuba was 'its close proximity to America'. Better answers argued for the removal of US weapons in Turkey and the idea of extending communist influence. The weaker answers often offered a number of reasons but neglected to develop those into explanation.

(c) There were a number of responses lacking in detail, with many candidates not moving beyond the destructive power of both sides' missiles, as to why the crisis was a great threat. This approach was more of a general discussion of how the crisis could have started a war, rather than started a war at that particular moment in time. The more considered responses often took each of Kennedy's options from part **(a)**, in addition to Khrushchev's reasons for placing the missiles on Cuba in the first place, to produce a balanced and well-reasoned argument. Several candidates explained, unconvincingly, how the setting up of the hotline and the Test Ban Treaty showed that the Crisis had not been a threat to world peace, rather than stating that the two events were indicative of the seriousness of the Crisis.

Question 8

(a) Those who considered the question carefully had little difficulty in giving a number of ways in which daily lives were affected. Free speech and censorship were common points made. Used less often were points relating to shortages of food, consumer goods and the expensive nature of clothes. The best answers showed how the impact could be violent in nature.

(b) Generally the changes proposed by Dŭbcek were well known by candidates; some needed to develop them in terms of the question. The better answers developed sound explanations as to why the Soviet Union opposed the changes. These answers looked at the wider picture, explaining the pressure on Brezhnev from Eastern European leaders.

(c) Most answers included reference to the chaos in the Soviet Union, 'glasnost', and 'perestroika' and in some instances, the cost of military deployment in Afghanistan. In some instances, candidates were unable to make the link to the decline of Soviet control in Eastern Europe. Solidarity was generally well known, yet the link was often not made. Most answers contained reference to the Soviet army not being available to prop-up communist East European governments. Here an explanation was often developed based on the influence of Solidarity.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Most answers made reference to Hitler becoming head of propaganda and then leader. Better answers indicated how Hitler had become more important and how he replaced Drexler. Other answers strayed into the Munich Putsch, for which credit was not given.

(b) Candidates wrote well about the about the SA disrupting opponents' meetings and their intimidation of the Jews. The discipline and sense of order offered by the SA featured in responses.

(c) The better answers developed the idea of the fear of communism, particularly citing big business. Many of these candidates were aware of the money put into Nazi campaign funds. Less strong answers concentrated more on other reasons for Nazi success. Here the value of Hitler's oratory skills and the promises made by the Nazis were generally well developed. Some went into the detail of the Reichstag Fire, despite this being outside the scope of the question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 10

(a) The better answers identified a number of areas where the Nazis changed the School curriculum and as an extension showed why this happened. Most answers included reference to biology with reference to the Aryan race and to the Jews.

(b) The best answers identified a number of reasons as to why the Nazis attempted to control young people and then proceeded to explain why this happened. Less successful answers tried to link everything to the Hitler Youth, rather than looking at wider Nazi control. More generally, the idea of 'good soldiers / more soldiers' remained unexplained, whilst the idea of loyalty to Hitler and the Nazis was sometimes over-developed.

(c) Some candidates appeared to rush into this question and would have benefited from more thinking about the answer. Answers tended to be descriptive. The benefits were often limited to the removal of unemployment and how this was carried out, rather than being explained in terms of 'why beneficial'. On the other side of the argument, the main point made was how some groups were persecuted. The best answers looked at the issues and explained these in the context of the way that Hitler and the Nazis were developing Germany.

Question 11

(a) Most answers described what happened at the time, particularly in relation to strikes and protests. Few mentioned why there was unrest or how order was restored. There was occasional confusion over the role of Lenin or what happened to him at that time. The better answers concentrated more on the part played by the Bolsheviks and the Provisional Government, which gave a sense of understanding.

(b) The importance of the Petrograd Soviet was often missed in the weaker answers, which just concentrated on the actions of Lenin. Better answers began to put the actions of Lenin within the context of the period, linking this to the growth in importance of the Petrograd Soviet. The best answers made clear in explanations how Lenin was a threat to the Provisional Government.

(c) Better answers concentrated on War Communism and the New Economic Policy, although some who used these areas were weaker on their understanding of the social consequences. The best answers looked at the wider picture, coming up with two or three points for and against the impact of Lenin. These were then developed into explanation. Some answers struggled to address the question as set.

Question 12

(a) Candidates would have improved responses by providing greater detail of the impact of Communist rule on women. Some did point out the changes in relation to marriage and the idea that women were expected to work but more detail was required. Few answers referred to the difference between the law and reality.

(b) The best answers developed their explanations using Stalin's policy of Russification, often linking this to Stalin's view that the people were Soviet citizens using one language. Weaker answers remained more generalised and lacking in explanation. A number of candidates were limited to the idea that 'he treated ethnic minorities badly'.

(c) Stalin's economic policies were generally well known, with better answers having detailed explanation about reaching targets, the use of Russia's natural resources and the building of new cities. This was balanced by good use of knowledge in relation to the human cost. Here, working and living conditions were detailed, together with the lack of consumer goods. Better answers included the fear of the discipline imposed by the secret police.

Question 13

(a) Those candidates who read the question carefully had little trouble in achieving good marks. Some candidates appeared to answer the following question, 'What were the benefits of mass production?' Here answers were often limited to 'cheaper, quicker, more'.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Most answers displayed an awareness of the policies of the Republican governments. The better answers explained how these policies were an important factor in the economic 'boom'. The impact of low taxation was particularly well explained. Whilst candidates were aware of the Fordney-McCumber tariff, they sometimes became confused when trying to explain how it had an impact. Some candidates thought 'rugged individualism' was an actual policy.

(c) Most arguments about farming in the 1920s were generally well known. There were many excellent explanations of the impact of machinery and the resulting over-production. Those who were stronger in this area explained the link between the ending of war, US tariffs and falling European demand. Most answers mentioned the impact of Canadian wheat but often this was not developed into explanation.

Question 14

(a) For many candidates, speculation was treated in a vague, general way as being something to do with the stock market or Wall Street Crash. The better answers saw speculation as a form of gambling, an opportunity for a quick profit. This approach brought detail of how speculators operated and even the dangers of this type of approach.

(b) Most answers gave two or three reasons for weakness creeping into the US economy. These needed to be developed into explanation in some responses. Less successful answers revolved around the fact that not as many products were sold, whilst better answers developed around specific areas of overproduction and the reasons for this. The best answers showed the wider picture with links to the world economy and the increasing difficulty of selling goods abroad.

(c) This question was about the Presidential election prior to the introduction of the New Deal and so candidates who wrote, sometimes extensively, about the New Deal could not be credited for this. The better answers as to why Roosevelt was elected showed how he was trying to help the people and how his relationship with the people of America was important. Better answers looked at Roosevelt's record regarding how he had already helped the poor. The opposite view concentrated on Hoover's lack of credibility, often based on Republican policies. Where these arguments were developed into strong explanation, candidates scored highly.

Questions 15-19

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

Question 20

(a) Better answers focused on both the USA and the USSR, showing the counties they supported and how. The best answers developed further by giving information regarding the concerns each superpower held.

(b) The better answers developed a number of causal factors relating to the PLO bases in Lebanon. These included the PLO bus attack, the 1982 invasion following the attempted murder of the Israeli ambassador, and to support Christians. Less strong answers showed knowledge of these factors, and other events, and these answers would have benefited by moving from a descriptive approach to an explanatory one.

(c) The better answers showed a clear thought process relating to the selection of exemplars to both support, and disagree, with the question. This material was dealt with in an explanatory manner. The roles of both the USA and USSR in hindering peace in relation to the provision of arms was well developed in these answers, as was the strong attempt by the superpowers to broker peace agreements such as Camp David and the Oslo Accords. Less strong answers provided a more chronological approach, with both aspects being inter-woven.

Question 21

(a) Often a chronological approach was used to answer this question, with the more violent aspects featuring. Whilst there is no problem in using this approach, it is important that the answer does not become too basic, for example, responses simply stating 'Fatah planted bombs'.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Most candidates cited the defeat of 'the Arab states' to exemplify a turning point. Better candidates used this and other valid examples to explain why they could be considered turning points. Less successful answers tended to identify and describe. Other points that were used included the need to become the voice of the Palestinian people and the use of terrorism to achieve this.

(c) Many candidates appeared to have thought and planned carefully before answering this question. This approach enabled them to consider opinions about the Palestinian cause in the early years against the views about Palestinians towards the end of the period covered by the syllabus. In the better answers, this change over time was even more subtle. Particularly good answers explored how some of the more violent activities could, at one and the same time, result in both support and condemnation.

Questions 22-25

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

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

General Comments and Key Messages

Many good responses to the questions on the paper were seen. They were characterised by secure knowledge and understanding, underpinned by clarity of communication and accurate recall of historical details. The significant majority of candidates were able to score highly on part **(a)** questions, providing short, descriptive answers, rather than explanation.

The best answers to part **(b)** and **(c)** style questions focused on explanation and selecting information to meet the precise demands of the question set. Less successful responses often featured just the identification of causal factors, while in better answers more credit was given for developing each identified factor more fully, within the context of the question.

In part **(c)**, it was pleasing to see much evidence of answers which argued both for and against the proposition offered in the question, followed by a good conclusion which went beyond just repeating points already raised in the answer and included an evaluation of 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Descriptive narrative should be avoided in part **(b)** and **(c)** questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1 to **3**

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

Question 4

Candidates were able to describe the more obvious aspects of the Anglo-German naval race in part **(a)**, referring to the building of the first Dreadnought and the British response to the German threat. More answers could have covered other aspects such as reforms to the army, which might have encompassed the setting up of the BEF, the creation of the territorials, OTC and the co-ordination of military planning by the General Staff. Part **(b)** was well answered, with good explanations of how the 1908 Balkan Crisis heightened tension between Austria and Serbia and then created difficulties between Germany and Russia. Many candidates were able to go beyond description and gain high marks for the developed reasoning of two or more identified aspects. The same was less true of part **(c)** answers which were characterised by narratives about the Kaiser, the arms race or events in Sarajevo; linking this information specifically to why the First World War broke out would have gained higher marks for a number of candidates.

Question 5

This was a popular question and it was rare to read poor answers to part **(a)**. The best included good knowledge about the work of the ILO, Health Committee and other agencies which dealt with refugees and prisoners of war. A common misconception was that the ILO reduced hours of work for children and adults, when in fact only recommendations were tabled. There was a recognition in part **(b)** that identified reasons such as the absence of the USA, the veto, the lack of an army or the slowness to take decisions, had to be developed, so the way each weakened the League of Nations was fully explained. Part **(c)** required an explanation of the responsibility taken by Britain and France in the League's failure, balanced against other factors, for higher marks to be achieved. Answers were detailed and used the events in Manchuria and Abyssinia to explain why the League was fatally undermined. Less successful attempts retold the events of the two crises and could not achieve higher marks.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 6

Responses to part **(a)** demonstrated secure knowledge of Hitler's preparations for war; some answers did stray beyond 1936 and could not gain credit for doing so. There were fewer good attempts to part **(b)** because candidates tended to include general points about Hitler's foreign policy when precise reasons about why signing Munich proved such an advantage were required. A focus on the acquisition of the Sudetenland's defences and resources without having to fight for them, was needed. Hitler was able to take advantage of a situation in which his army was not fully prepared to gain a key area necessary for the later occupation of the rest of Czechoslovakia. Candidates, on the other hand, were well prepared for part **(c)** and presented good arguments both for and against justifications for appeasement. Conclusions at the highest were carefully thought out and went beyond repeating what had already been stated in the body of the essay by analysing how far appeasement was a misjudgement by Britain.

Question 7

The best answers to part **(a)** referred to the 'iron curtain' as a guarded border dividing Europe between Soviet, communist-dominated states and the freer, democratic west. Some included inferences about Churchill's anxiety that much lay 'hidden' behind this 'curtain' so what were Stalin's real intentions? Part **(b)** proved challenging and needed a clear understanding of what had happened between Yalta and Potsdam to cause disagreements between the USSR and west. Nevertheless, there was evidence of secure and detailed knowledge about changes in leadership and therefore of attitudes, as well as about reactions to Stalin's take-over of Eastern Europe. Marks tended not to be as high on part **(c)**, as candidates described the USA's policies in 1945-49 such as the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan or retold the events of the Berlin airlift. The focus should have been on how far these policies and events were a success or failure – a clear example of where careful reading of the question would have helped candidates to perform more effectively.

Question 8

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

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Some part **(a)** answers could have been improved; responses were not always confined to the dates defined by the question. Credit was given for references to blockade, food shortages, the Kiel Mutiny, the Kaiser's abdication, the announcement of a Republic and the signing of the Armistice. Revolts such as that of the Spartacists and Kapp were beyond the scope of the question. Part **(b)** enabled good candidates to apply their knowledge and explain the problem of German recovery up to and including 1923, such as the effects of the war, reparations, inflation and the Ruhr invasion. Less successful answers did not concentrate on the economic situation, as required by the question, and found it difficult to move beyond description. Part **(c)** was well answered, characterised by many successful attempts to balance explanations of recovery against defects and the problems Weimar continued to face throughout the period.

Question 10

Part **(a)** posed few problems and was well done by those who attempted it. Many gained maximum marks for detailed knowledge of what happened on the Night of the Long Knives, although some explained why it had happened, which was beyond the scope of the question. Part **(b)** gave an opportunity to explain why there was little opposition to the Nazis and here there was evidence of secure reasoning about the effects of foreign policy successes, the police state, propaganda and the economic 'recovery', all of which might lead ordinary Germans to support the Nazis. There was a tendency for answers to part **(c)** to be more generalised because candidates tended to less specific about the effects of different types of propaganda. Some unbalanced responses were seen which concentrated on the impact of rallies and parades which brought a sense of 'belonging' and collective strength into the lives of the people who attended them. Better candidates did not leave it there, but went on to explain why radio, newspapers, posters and cinema had more impact because they reached more people, more often. When each factor was evaluated, this would attract higher marks.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 11

Most candidates were able to describe fully the events of Bloody Sunday in part **(a)**. Part **(b)** knowledge about the influence of Rasputin was generalised and in some responses drifted into narratives of his life, character and murder; more precise reasoning about why he undermined the reputation of the royal family might have included the appointment of incompetent ministers, his poor decision making and the Russian people's perceptions of the corrupting effect he had on court life. For part **(c)** higher marks were attained by answers which showed evidence of planning and organising a clear line of argument, as well as offering precise explanations of working class discontent on the one hand, and the role of the army on the other. Specific references to events in the years 1914-17 attracted more credit than general statements about bad working and living conditions, military defeats or army discontent.

Question 12

Those who attempted this question displayed some sound knowledge. It is worth noting that part **(a)** focused on political scheming and the way Stalin used his position as General Secretary of the Party to deal with rivals and Trotsky's supporters. There were good explanations of the importance of the Purges in part **(b)**, and a range of responses about his Party rivals, Show Trials and the impact of the Purges on the army was looked for; here, exercises which highlight the concept of 'significance' rather than just description, would enable good candidates to score well. Part **(c)** rewarded answers which were confined to either 'art and culture' or 'terror'. Candidates clearly knew a great deal about both of these topics.

Question 13

This proved a popular question. There were many good answers to part **(a)** about the 'production line' and candidates took the opportunity to relate many details of Ford's assembly process, as well as the benefits it brought to the company and its customers in terms of price, output and efficiency. It was also possible to gain high marks for part **(b)** for explaining the problems faced in the US in the 1920s by women, farmers, workers in more traditional industries, and by black Americans. High marks were available for dealing with two of these groups of people in detail, although many answers went beyond that. In contrast, part **(c)** was less well done because of a lack of balance; responses wrote at length about Republican policies, low taxes, tariffs and the application of technology which laid the foundation of the 1920s 'boom'. Quality explanations of this nature gained good marks. However, knowledge of advertising was very generalised and descriptive, rarely going beyond 'advertising made people aware of new products so they would go out and buy them'. More precision about mass marketing techniques used for the first time during the First World War and then applied in the 1920s through department stores and the use of (named) catalogues were all included in the better quality explanations.

Question 14

It was rare to see a poor answer to part **(a)**; there was evidence of much detail about the alphabet agencies. Part **(b)** proved more challenging to some, although it was possible to find good explanations of the inadequacies of the New Deal in providing permanent jobs for women, black Americans and share-croppers. The best answers referred to the cuts in government spending in 1937 which led to a jump in unemployment. Part **(c)** found some quality answers dealing in depth with Republican opposition on the one hand and opposition from the Supreme Court and radical individuals on the other – balanced explanations scoring high marks were, therefore, commonplace. Fewer answers successfully completed the evaluation required for the highest level by attempting to explain which provided the more serious opposition.

Question 15

Answers to part **(a)** focused on the way their campaign against the Japanese up to 1945 had weakened the Nationalists. Credit was also given for their lack of support amongst peasants, lack of popularity because of corruption, and the enhanced reputation of Mao and the Communists following the Long March. Opportunities to score highly on part **(b)** were sometimes missed as answers needed to focus more precisely on the problems of falling agricultural output and uneconomic farm practices at a time of rising demand, and the difficulties caused by unpopular landlords. Part **(c)** attracted better answers which included a range of reasons for the defeat of the Nationalists, assessed against the intervention of foreign powers; the latter saw a focus on the view that Chiang appeared to be a puppet of the USA which undermined his support. There were few references to the role of the USSR, which would have attracted credit.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 16

This generated some good responses overall. Candidates were secure in their understanding about the details of Mao's changing support for North Vietnam both before and after 1968 (part **(a)**). Better explanations of deteriorating relations between Communist China and the USSR,1956-60 (part **(b)**), included details of border clashes, China's atomic testing programme, a dislike of Khrushchev's policies towards the west and what Mao perceived to be a betrayal of Marxist principles. Candidates understood both sides of the argument in part **(c)** and were able to explain not only the advantages to China of improved relations with the USA, but also how the USA felt it could benefit too. As mentioned in the introduction, a balanced approach of this kind which goes beyond just identifying factors but fully explaining them, gains good marks.

Questions 17 to **25**

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

Key Messages and General Comments

This paper tests the skills of source analysis. The kinds of questions that occur on this paper involve source comprehension, interpretation and evaluation. The analysis is done in context; thus although no questions demand factual recall, contextual knowledge is vital in helping candidates to use the sources in the most effective ways.

As with all examinations, candidates receive credit for responding to the question asked. On this paper candidates sometimes write about the source(s), and lose sight of what they are asked. To prevent this, it is a good idea to begin each answer with a sentence responding directly to the question. So, for example, if asked 'Does this source prove?', candidates could respond immediately with 'I think this source does (not) prove because…..'

The last question always carries the most marks. It asks candidates to test a hypothesis against evidence offered by all the sources. There will always be evidence both to support and to question the hypothesis, so answering on one side only will not allow candidates to achieve higher marks. Candidates need to go further than asserting that a source does/does not support the hypothesis; the answer must show how the source content indicates support or not.

The strengths demonstrated by candidates included a good depth of factual knowledge, and a well-developed ability to comprehend and make sense of the content of the sources. The main area where improvement is needed is on source evaluation, with many candidates reluctant to question the reliability of the sources, or if they do, using generalisations about source types, rather than analysis of the specific claims being made in a source. For example, on questions demanding comparison of sources, some candidates would have benefited by showing more awareness that genuine comparisons can only be made where a common criterion is used as the basis for comparison. The comments below on **Question 1** on both the options provide more detail on this issue. There were also answers that showed developed source evaluation of source content in context, notably on both **Questions 5** (i.e. both the nineteenth-century and twentieth-century topics).

There were very few incomplete scripts, and rubric errors were a rarity. The numbers of candidates answering the twentieth century questions greatly outnumbered those opting for the nineteenth century.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

In general, candidates could identify some valid agreements or disagreements between the sources. There was also a lot of writing about the sources in which the answer struggled to establish a proper basis for comparison. Many stated, for example, that the sources were different because Source A said that *Reconstruction was not radical enough*, whilst Source B said that *the Civil War amendments brought some freedoms to black Americans*. One can see how this might be perceived this as a disagreement, but the two statements are not mutually exclusive. A disagreement would have to be on the issue of whether Reconstruction was radical enough, or on whether the Civil War amendments brought some freedoms. It is only by establishing the common criterion on which the comparison is based, that a genuine agreement or disagreement can be identified. The other main issue which arose was when candidates attempted to use the sources' overall judgements on Reconstruction in their comparisons. On this level, the two sources agreed that Reconstruction was a failure, though it had some achievements. Some answers differed from this, for example stating that Source A was negative about Reconstruction, whilst Source B was positive.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Whilst aspects of each source might lend themselves to this conclusion, the sources as a whole did not. To sum up, since the two sources contained few overt contradictions or agreements, candidates had to work more carefully on the source detail in order to make valid points.

Question 2

Most answers identified that both sources were about the Freedmen's Bureau, and many spotted that both indicated Johnson's opposition to it. Better answers went beyond what the sources showed and explored instead the messages that the cartoonists were trying to get across. Here there was a significant difference, in that Source C was critical of Johnson, and thus supportive of the Bureau, whilst Source D was hostile to it. Many were able to detect the opinion contained within Source D but did not operate on the same level on Source C. The very best answers showed awareness that the two artists had different purposes for what they drew, in that they aimed to produce different effects on their audiences. The artist of Source C was aiming to gain support for the Bureau, whilst Source D was using the supposed failings of the Bureau to stir up opposition to it.

Question 3

Ultimately, given an understanding of the context in which a source was produced, one should not be surprised by what it says or shows. Nonetheless, without this contextual understanding, it was easy to be surprised that, in the aftermath of the Civil War, Johnson should show such sympathy for the South, or that a newspaper editor should speak with such a lack of respect about the President. Once candidates started to use their contextual knowledge, though, the surprise could be explained. The weaker way of doing this was to check Johnson's claims about the South against the reality, which would still lead one to be surprised. A better route was to use knowledge about Johnson to show that what he was saying was entirely consistent with his career/beliefs. There was a final route which a few candidates took, which was to show how it was unsurprising that a radical Northerner would feel this way about Johnson.

Question 4

It was possible to misinterpret this cartoon and see it as mocking the ex-slave. However, most avoided this trap and were able to suggest some plausible messages of the source, such as that it was showing the deep desire for education amongst the freed slaves. Some answers could have been improved by exploring the opinion of the cartoonist. The picture was not just illustrating what was happening, but was approving of it. Thus the message was that what the 'old scholar' was doing was admirable.

Question 5

Utility questions frequently elicit the response that the source is useful for the information it provides –this can mean that information is taken at face value from the source. Some candidates took this approach, though the blatant mismatch between what Grady was saying and the reality of life in the South should have discouraged them. Indeed, many realised this and, having used examples such as the Jim Crow laws, or the Ku Klux Klan, rejected the utility of the source on the grounds that it was unbelievable. These were good answers but they still contained an essential misunderstanding – that an unbelievable source is not useful as evidence. The critical question is a matter of how one wishes to use it as evidence. Source G did not tell us anything factual about life in the South, but it did tell us what white Southerners wanted people in the North to think about the South.

Question 6

Some good answers were seen and most candidates were capable of working through the sources, finding evidence both to support and to question the hypothesis. Some wrote about the sources without making it clear which side of the hypothesis was being argued. Some appeared to suggest that this was self-evident, but it should always be spelt out. The least successful answers did not address the sources at all, writing instead on the lives of black Americans during Reconstruction. Some answers would have benefited from being aware that marks are available for evidence of source evaluation. Had they used, for example, Source G as an evaluated source, i.e. as evidence that the lives of black Americans had *not* improved, they would have achieved more marks.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

In general, candidates could identify some valid agreements or disagreements between the sources, and many found examples of both. There was also a lot of writing about the sources in which the answer was unable to establish a proper basis for comparison. Some stated, for example, that the sources were different because Source A said that *Clemenceau was under attack in France*, whilst Source B said *Clemenceau got the best possible deal for France*. One can see how this might be perceived as a disagreement, but the two statements are not mutually exclusive. A disagreement would have to be on the issue of whether Clemenceau was or was not under attack, or on whether he got the best possible deal or not. It is by establishing the common criterion on which the comparison is based, that a genuine agreement or disagreement can be identified. Many candidates attempted to find an aspect of overall judgement in the sources that could be compared, generally on whether the Big Three were pleased/succeeded, but the fact that Source B made no mention of Lloyd George prevented these attempts from working. To sum up, since the two sources contained few overt contradictions or agreements, candidates had to work more carefully on the source detail in order to make valid points.

Question 2

When the question asks why something has happened, a reason will be an essential part of the answer. Some candidates interpreted the cartoon and neglected to offer a reason for publication. The most common response was to provide a contextual reason – because this was the time when something, for example, the treaty negotiations, was going on. At this level, minor inaccuracies, for example from candidates who said that the cartoon was when the Versailles Treaty had been signed, did not harm responses. Other answers interpreted the cartoon in such a way as to cast the message as a reason for publication – to say/show/tell something about the treaties. The cartoon was full of sub-messages – valid points of interpretation that fell short of understanding the overall, 'Big Message' of the cartoon – such as explaining the bandage around Germany's mouth as a reference to the 'Diktat'. The 'Big Message' had to encompass all the defeated powers or all the treaties; for example, to show that all the defeated powers deserved to be treated harshly. The best answers, however, understood the specific purpose of the cartoonist in the context of May 1919 as the reason for publication. At this stage the Versailles Treaty had not been signed, and the British public were clamouring for a harsh treaty. The cartoonist was reflecting this feeling and putting pressure on the peacemakers not to relent and to make sure that all the treaties were tough on the defeated powers.

Question 3

This question gave candidates an opportunity to evaluate the sources, and more candidates could have taken it. The first task was to identify the way in which the sources differed. The crucial point here was Clemenceau's rhetoric of 'justice' being contradicted by House's admission that the Treaty was a bad one. Most candidates understood this difference, and concluded that the difference meant that one or the other must be wrong. This was not really an explanation of the idea of 'proof'. To make further progress candidates had to explore the credibility of what was being claimed – not at the level of fact checking, for example on whether or not Germany had destroyed industries – but on the essential matter of just/unjust that separated the sources. The most obvious route was to see Clemenceau's words as special pleading, designed to justify the harsh terms and to persuade the audience that they were 'just'. In this light his words could not disprove House's judgment. Evaluating Source E was also possible, and achieved by some candidates. Cross-referencing its claims to those in Source H would have provided some interesting insights, but more obviously Source A's claims about none of the peacemakers being satisfied would have been some confirmation for House's view.

Question 4

For most candidates Source G was more accessible than Source F, though some assumed that the figure leaning against the keystone was Wilson. The messages within Source F were more complex, but most could see the cartoon as evidence that Wilson was in charge, and was seeking international peace. There were lots of sub-messages to compare – on whether the USA was involved/important/would succeed or on how the other powers were represented as working for peace or not. To compare the 'Big Messages', candidates needed to see both cartoons as comments on the League of Nations. What they had in common was a belief that the League would not work. The best candidates saw this but also appreciated that the cartoons differed in their opinions on why the League would not work, or on who they blamed for its weakness.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 5

Ultimately, given a full understanding of the context in which a source was produced, one should not be surprised by what it says or shows. Nonetheless, without this contextual understanding, it was easy to be surprised here that Wilson seemed to be advocating a harsh peace, when what we know about Wilson would lead us to expect him to advocate a peace based on justice. Most candidates made this point, and some were more specific about Wilson's policies, making reference to the League or the Fourteen Points. These answers, however, missed the vital clue in the provenance. The speech was made by Wilson after the Versailles Treaty had been concluded, whilst he was on a speaking tour around the USA. The best answers were therefore unsurprised, as they understood that Wilson's tasks were to persuade the US Congress and the American people to accept the Treaty, so that it would be ratified. In effect, he was talking to an audience reluctant to accept the terms of the peace, so he had to represent it in this way. It was notable that a large number of candidates were capable of evaluating Wilson's speech in context and it seemed that the very obvious contrast between what he was saying, and what candidates would have expected him to say, sparked off this analysis.

Question 6

Most candidates were capable of working through the sources, finding evidence both to support and to question the hypothesis. However, there were some who didn't spot that it was asking specifically about the peacemakers, and not the victorious countries and their populations in general. 'Peacemakers' was interpreted as the 'Big Three' (or Four) and their delegations. Some wrote about the sources without making it clear which side of the hypothesis was being argued. Some appeared to suggest that this is self-evident, but it should always be spelt out. The least successful answers did not address the sources at all, writing instead on the peace-making process. This could not receive high marks. Some answers would have benefited from being aware that marks are available for evidence of source evaluation. Had they used Source G as an evaluated source, i.e. as evidence that the peacemakers had *not* got what they wanted, they would have achieved more marks.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

Key Messages and General Comments

As in previous sessions, the twentieth century option was far more popular than the nineteenth century alternative. The general comments that follow apply to both options.

The overall performance of candidates was strong. Most were able to produce answers that demonstrated high levels of skill, good conceptual understanding and excellent contextual knowledge. Most impressive was the large number of candidates clearly familiar and confident with the demands of this paper. There are, as always, some areas where further improvements could be made. These are explained in the first part of this report.

The better answers were those that provided direct and clear answers to the questions. These candidates think the question through and decide on their answer before starting to write. This enables them to directly answer the question in the first sentence of their answer. They can then spend the rest of the answer supporting this. Candidates should remember that it is always a good idea to know what your answer is going to be before starting to write it.

When candidates are asked to explain the message of a source, particularly a cartoon, they should try and ask themselves about the point of view of the author or artist. The best answers to these questions focused on, for example, whether the author approved or disapproved of what they are were about. This approach helped candidates to understand the big messages of sources, rather than their sub-messages.

The ability to evaluate sources where appropriate is a skill that characterised the answers of better candidates. The question will not always make the need to evaluate explicit, i.e. questions will not always say 'How reliable is this source?', and it is important that candidates can work out when a good answer to a question requires evaluation. For example, a good answer to a question that asks whether one source proves another to be wrong rests on the sources being evaluated. When evaluating sources, candidates should try and consider the possible purpose of the author or artist of the source. If this is explained in a valid context then it will lead to good quality evaluation worthy of a high mark.

Although many candidates scored high marks for the final question, there were still some who did not appear to understand that their answers needed to be based on the sources. It is also important that candidates do not just assert whether sources support the given statement in this question but carefully explain how they support or disagree with it.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

Many candidates were able to find agreements and disagreements of detail but the best answers considered the overall point of view of the sources i.e. they both consider that Reconstruction was a failure but Source A is a little more positive about it than Source B.

Question 2

This question produced a range of interesting answers. This was partly due to the fact that there are several different aspects of Source C that one could be surprised, or not surprised, about. For example, how well an ex-slave was doing, the fact that his former master wants Anderson back or the fear that Anderson has for his daughter's welfare. Some candidates used every-day empathy to argue that that they were not at all

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

surprised that Anderson was taking such an attitude to his former master. The best answers used contextual knowledge of slavery, attitudes towards black Americans in the South, and the fate of ex-slaves, to explain reasons for being surprised and/or not surprised.

Question 3

This question was generally answered well, with many candidates able to interpret at least valid sub-message of the cartoon, for example, Southern white men needed help or black Americans had their liberty. The best answers focused on the big message of the cartoon by considering the cartoonist's point of view of events. This led to candidates being able to explain that the cartoonist was being critical of the South's attitude towards Reconstruction.

Question 4

To be able to explain whether or not the two cartoonists would have agreed with each other, candidates had first to work out the big message of each of the cartoons. Once they were able to explain either that both cartoons show sympathy for black Americans or that Source E shows Reconstruction as being successful while Source F represents it as a failure, the step to explaining whether the two cartoonists would have agreed was a small one. Less successful answers either compared sub-messages or failed to compare the two sources.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. The weakest claimed that Source G was published to convey the information it contains. Slightly better answers explained the context of 1871 (Reconstruction or the Ku Klux Klan), or managed to explain a valid message of the cartoon, for example, ex-slaves were not faring well in the racist South. The best answers focused on a possible purpose of the cartoon and placed this in the context of Reconstruction.

Question 6

This question was generally well answered, with only a small number of candidates ignoring the sources. Most were able to explain how some sources support the statement while others disagree with it. The detailed comments on this final question for the twentieth century option are equally applicable to candidates for the nineteenth century option.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well Almost all candidates were able to find agreements and disagreement of detail, for example both sources state that Germany hated the Treaty, while they disagree over whether German reaction was justified. The best answers went further and compared the points of view of the two authors. The author of Source A, on the whole, approves of the Treaty, while the author of Source B disapproves. It was encouraging to see far fewer candidates simply summarising one source and then the other. Proper comparison involves taking a point from one source and comparing with the other source in relation to that point.

Question 2

There were many good answers to this question. The strongest candidates understood that the sources needed to be evaluated and that this evaluation should be based on the possible purpose of the sources. Thus, although Source C contradicts Source D about whether the Treaty of Versailles could be justified, this does not prove that Source D is wrong because Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau was trying to persuade the peacemakers to make the terms less harsh. The very best answers went even further and evaluated Source D as well. Here Lloyd George was trying to persuade the British parliament to accept the Treaty.

It is important to note that candidates who evaluated the sources only did this after explaining that the two sources do agree and/or disagree. They also reached a clear conclusion about whether Source C proves Source D to be wrong. Candidates who carried out valid comparison or evaluation but did not use it to answer the question received lower marks they could have achieved.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Candidates across the range were able to achieve at least reasonable marks by comparing what the sources have to say about the Treaty of Versailles. Generally, Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau thought that the Treaty was unjustifiable, while Lloyd George thought that it could be justified (although he also admits that it imposed 'terrible terms' on Germany).

Question 3

Both Sources E and F are about reparations. The best answers demonstrated an understanding of this and explained that both sources criticise reparations. They also went further and added a valid qualification, for example in Source E Germany is friendless, while in Source F Lloyd George is trying to help. Slightly more general answers argued that both sources criticise the Treaty of Versailles. These answers, which accounted for most of the candidates, still scored good marks.

It was encouraging to see most candidates able to interpret both sources at least reasonably well. Weaker answers either did not directly compare the messages of the cartoons or asserted that the cartoonists would have disagreed because one was German, while the other was British.

Question 4

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates needed to examine the cartoon more carefully and claimed that it was sympathising with Germany and criticising its harsh treatment by the Allies. Some focused on just the context of 1921 and neglected to interpret the cartoon. Most candidates, however, were able to infer at least a sub-message of the cartoon, for example Germany was not really suffering badly. Better answers were based on putting together the crucial elements of the cartoon to explain the big message - Germany was pretending to be suffering but the Allies were not helping because they were not deceived by Germany.

The best answers went beyond the message of the cartoon and considered both the possible purpose of the cartoon, for example to persuade the British public that German requests for help such as a reduction in reparations should be ignored, and why it was published in 1921 in particular - for example, this was the year that the reparation figure was fixed.

Question 5

Lloyd George made so many different comments about the Treaty of Versailles at different times that it is possible to be surprised and not surprised by what he says in Source H. The best answers had two vital ingredients: they read and commented on Source H as a whole, instead of focusing on individual sentences and they used specific contextual knowledge to produce a full explanation. Less successful answers tended to either focus on isolated parts of Source H, for example 'you may strip Germany of her colonies', or made general assertions about Lloyd George's views. Some candidates wrote good analyses of Source H and demonstrated specific and detailed knowledge of Lloyd George and his views, but didn't state anywhere in their answers if they were surprised or not.

Question 6

Many scored high marks by careful explanations of how individual sources support or reject the statement that German reaction to the Treaty could be justified. Other candidates did not make any use of the sources and wrote an essay about the Treaty, which could not score highly. .

This final question required candidates to explain how far the sources provided 'convincing evidence that the German reaction to the Treaty of Versailles could be justified'. It did not invite candidates to write an essay about their own views of the Treaty.

The word 'explain' is key here. It is not enough for candidates to identify or assert which sources support or reject the statement. They must explain how a source does this. For example, Source G rejects the idea that German reaction was justified because it shows that Germany was exaggerating the harmful impact of the Treaty and trying to deceive the Allies.

Extra marks can be gained in this question by evaluating the sources. This was done best when candidates explained that a source appears to support German reaction, for example Source E, but as one considers the possible purpose of the source, it becomes less convincing as evidence. Explaining the purpose of a source is always a good way of earning higher marks.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

Key Messages and General Comments

As in previous sessions, the twentieth century option was far more popular than the nineteenth century alternative. There were too few responses to the nineteenth century topic for meaningful comments to be made on specific questions in that option.

The overall performance of candidates was strong. Most were able to produce answers that demonstrated high levels of skill, good conceptual understanding and excellent contextual knowledge. Most impressive was the large number of candidates clearly familiar and confident with the demands of this paper. There are, as always, some areas where further improvements could be made. These are explained in the first part of this report.

The better answers were those that provided direct and clear answers to the questions. These candidates think the question through and decide on their answer before starting to write. This enables them to directly answer the question in the first sentence of their answer. They can then spend the rest of the answer supporting this. Candidates should remember that it is always a good idea to know what your answer is going to be before starting to write it.

When candidates are asked to explain the message of a source, particularly a cartoon, they should try and ask themselves about the point of view of the author or artist. The best answers to these questions focused on, for example, whether the author approved or disapproved of what they are were about. This approach helped candidates to understand the big messages of sources, rather than their sub-messages.

The ability to evaluate sources where appropriate is a skill that characterised the answers of better candidates. The question will not always make the need to evaluate explicit, i.e. questions will not always say 'How reliable is this source?', and it is important that candidates can work out when a good answer to a question requires evaluation. For example, a good answer to a question that asks whether one source proves another to be wrong rests on the sources being evaluated. When evaluating sources, candidates should try and consider the possible purpose of the author or artist of the source. If this is explained in a valid context then it will lead to good quality evaluation worthy of a high mark.

Although many candidates scored high marks for the final question, there were still some who did not appear to understand that their answers needed to be based on the sources. It is also important that candidates do not just assert whether sources support the given statement in this question but carefully explain how they support or disagree with it.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify and explain agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources. A few candidates were unable to make comparisons and tended to paraphrase, or wrote out sections of the sources, labelling them as agreements/disagreements. Some candidates identified agreements and/or disagreements without being specific, for example A says this, B does not.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

Although many candidates reached higher levels, more needed to explain the purpose of the cartoon within the context of May 1919 to gain the highest marks. Lots of candidates used suitable words to explain the purpose of the cartoon (for example convince, persuade the British public), and thus went beyond describing the 'big message' intended. Most candidates appeared to understand messages contained within the cartoon.

Question 3

Some good responses to this question were seen. Other answers struggled to organise a coherent, relevant answer. Often candidates chose extracts from Source E and then asserted them to prove Source D wrong without a clearly explained line of reasoning. When evaluation of the sources was attempted, it was often based on undeveloped provenance; an informed judgement of the sources' audience or purpose would have improved some responses.

Question 4

The majority of candidates understood the message and context of the two cartoons, Sources F and G. Almost all candidates recognised the 'big message' of 'Clemenceau the Vampire' but struggled more with Source F, 'The Reckoning', believing that both sources shared the same 'big message' of disapproval of the Versailles Treaty. Although comparison of the 'big message' of the sources was often missed, many candidates successfully compared sub-messages.

Question 5

There were mixed responses, with some candidates simply selecting parts of Lloyd George's secret document and saying it was either correct or not, or identifying that the document was secret and therefore, on balance, trustworthy. Impressively, many candidates cross-referenced other sources or used their own contextual knowledge to reach the top levels.

Question 6

Many candidates performed well and they were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A small number of candidates didn't use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source links to the question, instead paraphrasing from the text before moving on to deal with another source. Grouping of sources, for example 'Sources A, B, D and F do not provide convincing evidence the Big Three wanted to treat Germany harshly', rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another characteristic of weaker answers. Although the successful evaluation of sources for extra marks was seen, more candidates would benefit from picking out one or two particularly worthwhile sources to say something meaningful regarding purpose and audience.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key Messages and General Comments

The entry for the coursework option rose this year. There was also an improvement in the overall quality of the work, which was already very high. As a result of this the Moderators saw much interesting work, demonstrating a range of historical skills.

The relevant assessment objectives were tested appropriately and much of the centre marking was accurate. Many Centres produced detailed and helpful annotation of their candidates' work which was most helpful. Most Centres had their marks left unchanged but a small number had their marks adjusted. This was mainly for Assignment 1.

Comments on Specific Questions

Assignment 1

The number of Centres using essays for this assignment continues to increase. The best work was focused, with little irrelevant description or narrative, and with every paragraph contributing to the overall analysis. It was encouraging to see more candidates reaching, and supporting, substantial conclusions. However, this remains an area where there is some leniency in the marking. When candidates come to, for example, argue that one factor was more important than another, they do need to construct developed and supported clinching arguments. Repeating points already made will not justify high marks. The best work started with a clear argument which was then substantiated throughout the rest of the answer. This is to be preferred to answers that explain several factors and then add a rather weak conclusion on at the end.

Those Centres using the Board-approved assignments will often be requiring candidates to analyse short, and long term, causes. The best answers, and those justifying high marks, are those that explore the different functions of these different types of causal factors. However, this must be done through real causes and not in a purely theoretical way.

Assignment 2

Most Centres used the Board-approved assignments which comprise of a range of sources with a number of questions testing skills such as comparing, interpreting and evaluating. This ensured that candidates had to display a wide range of source skills and also served as a useful preparation for Paper 2. Much impressive work was produced and the marks awarded were rarely changed by Moderators.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

This paper requires candidates to use source material to answer source-based questions. Candidates need to ensure that they have responded appropriately to the prompts in the questions, for example, 'How far?' or 'To what extent?' at the beginning of a question invites the candidates to provide a balanced answer.

General Comments

The most popular choice for candidates was Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945. Also very popular was Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and C: the USA, 1919-1941. The least popular Depth Studies on this paper for this session were Depth Studies D: China, 1945-c.1990, E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century, G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society, and H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century.

In general the vast majority of scripts were clearly written and well set out. There were few rubric offences and little evidence to suggest candidates' performances were affected by time pressures.

There were many excellently crafted scripts which were a pleasure to read. Some candidates undermined their final mark by shortcomings in their answers to **Question (a) (iii)**. In order to gain a mark in the range of those available for the achievement of the highest level, candidates are expected to choose which source is more useful based on the sources' comparative reliability. Tests for reliability must be complete, relevant and argued. This can be achieved by testing provenance, date, tone, language, purpose, cross reference and by support from relevant contextual knowledge etc. Some candidates offer answers that just compare what the sources 'are about' and use no source content at all. Others produce incomplete or limited attempts at evaluation, for example, 'He was there so he will know what has happened' or 'it is a history book so the author will have had time to research' etc. These approaches will not score high marks.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Most candidates were able to achieve marks available to the highest Level for **Question (a) (i)** by drawing valid inferences about Hitler from Source A and supporting their inferences with reference to material found in the source. Candidates commented on his rapid rise in the Party from committee member to being in charge of propaganda, on his abilities to recruit new members, as well as establishing a newspaper and swastika flag. A few candidates drew valid inferences but didn't show where, within the source, evidence could be found. Many answers to **Question (a) (ii)** offered a balance of evidence as to whether Nazi ideas as shown in Source B were socialist. It was clear that some candidates would have benefited from a greater understanding of the word 'socialist'. These candidates sometimes thought that all the evidence in the source showed that the Nazis were nationalists or wanted a dictatorship. Even 'freedom of religion, better old age pensions, health care and education reforms' were quoted as evidence of nationalist/dictatorial ideas. Others omitted the socialist reforms altogether. Nevertheless, there were some well constructed and balanced answers gaining high marks. Many answers to **Question (a) (iii)** followed the examples detailed in the general comments. Few completed an evaluation of the comparative reliability – some attempted to compare the sources by way of tone, purpose, balance and some successfully did this. There were a good number of candidates who analysed the content of both sources and quoted source content in their answers. These answers, if well argued, can gain a good mark.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** requiring two features of the SA were often good, full and scored maximum marks. Perhaps some candidates spent a little too much time writing lots of facts about the SA when only

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

two marks were available for the answers. Some candidates confused elements of the SA and the SS. **Question (b) (ii)** asked 'What was the Munich Putsch, 1923?' Candidates wrote less well about the Putsch and the description of events, often preferring to write about the trial of Hitler, his lenient sentence and Mein Kampf. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** on reasons for increases in Nazi Party membership between 1925 and 1929 were mixed. Some candidates wrote about the release of Hitler, the unbanning of the Party, organisation, Youth groups, marches, financial support and 'catch-all' policies. However, some candidates missed the date constraints in the question. These candidates wrote about post-1929 events which lacked relevance. A similar weakness was seen in answers to **Question (b) (iv)**. Some candidates missed the date constraint of 1928 to 1932, and candidates wrote about Hitler's impact on voters, offering evidence about his achievement of the chancellorship in 1933, and even used the Night of the Long Knives as evidence of Hitler's improving Nazi popularity. Fortunately, there were many answers which acknowledged the date constraints, indicated they knew why the dates had been chosen, wrote balanced answers and scored well.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Answers to **Question (a) (i)** showed that candidates were able to draw valid inferences about Stalin's management style and indicated where, within the source, information could be found to support those inferences. Many candidates mentioned Stalin's paranoia. Most candidates who attempted this Depth Study were able to find evidence in Source B to provide balanced answers about Trotsky's popularity. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** followed the same trend as answers to this question across the Depth Studies. Some candidates completed a test for reliability by cross referencing from the statement that Lenin had thought Stalin was not the right man to lead the Party in Source B with the evidence of paranoia and making decisions without consultation in Source A. There were some good analyses of the content of each source to achieve respectable marks, although there were some who attempted an evaluation but argued superficially or did not complete the evaluation, while others wrote and described the sources' general focus without using source detail.

Many of the candidates were able to offer Kamenev and Zinoviev as members of the triumvirate (**Question (b) (i)**). Lenin's New Economic Policy was well known by many and comments were made about new arrangements in the countryside, small industries in towns and cities, but with substantial industries still under central control. Others were familiar with Nepmen and comments were made about the NEP being capitalist. Although there were some full and knowledgeable answers to explain why Stalin sent Trotsky into exile, there were some weaker efforts which showed candidates understood why Stalin and Trotsky were rivals and that Trotsky was murdered in Mexico. These omitted details of jealousy, character, personality, policies for the Party, Trotsky's power base in the Red Army and Stalin's personal need to destroy any possible opponent. Stronger candidates offered balanced and supported answers to **Question (b) (iv)** about the extent of benefit the Soviet peoples received from Bolshevik rule between the October Revolution and the end of the Civil War in 1921. However, many candidates could only provide evidence that the peoples had faced enormous problems of Civil War, War Communism, famine, invasion of foreign powers and the break down of order in the country. Better answers pointed to the removal of the Tsarist regime, leaving the First World War, the distribution of some land, the introduction of the NEP and changes to health and education as offering much benefit to the peoples.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Most candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from Source A about women in the 1920s. Candidates found it obvious that smoking and wearing swimsuits that revealed flesh were disapproved of by mothers. Some were so provoked by the source that mothers were criticised for their 'outdated' disapproval of smoking and new fashions, while other candidates were horrified that mothers should compare their daughters' habit to prostitutes, wild young things and chorus girls. Others too were affronted that the daughters could not smoke but would probably marry a man who did smoke at the time. Source B also provoked many who offered balanced arguments to show that although women had got the vote and were involved in politics, they were given minor roles and not considered sufficiently level headed to act as candidates for election. They were seen as troublemakers and too giddy to make important decisions. These two sources provoked outrage among some candidates. There were few candidates who knew enough about Eleanor Roosevelt's background to make evaluative comments about Source B. Others chose the cross referencing of the sources to show restrictions were placed on women for a variety of old fashioned reasons and thinking. Some showed similarities but these answers were more of the analysis of content type. There were examples of lower level responses on incomplete evaluation and comments about the general way women were treated in the USA – these answers lacked recognisable source detail.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Candidate usually scored well in their answers to **Question (b) (i)** about speakeasies. Many achieved a maximum mark. Some of the answers to **Question (b) (ii)** were disappointing. Most knew that those who sold alcohol could be arrested and imprisoned and that illegal stills could be smashed and bars closed down, although only a few could give adequate detail about Prohibition bureau agents, or coastguard activities. Less successful candidates often said in their answers to **Question (b) (iii)** that the 1920s were roaring because of all the singing, new dances and jazz music. Better candidates added to the previous information with comments about 'Roaring' referring to the whole economic scene, the economic prosperity, stock market speculation, extra leisure time provided by labour saving devices, the impact of the motor car and the changes in behaviour and morals. Whilst there were some weaker answers to this question, there were many full, detailed and argued efforts. The information provided by candidates for **Question (b) (iii)** was often used in answer to **Question (b) (iv)** about entertainment giving Americans greater opportunities. Most of these answers were valid and had used examples of entertainment creating opportunities but many of them offered one-sided argument. Stronger candidates could see that not only were other elements of the period that offered opportunities, for example divorce offering women an opportunity of escape from a violent marriage, and that there were many who did not receive opportunities at all. Here examples of Black Americans and Native Americans were cited, along with some of the migrants from Europe. Many commented that the motor car gave young people the opportunity to meet with friends away from the surveillance of their parents. Some very interesting answers were produced.

Depth Study D: China 1945-c.1990

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

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

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

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

Most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the frustrated Palestinian views of British rule in Palestine. Candidates felt that the Palestinians felt cheated and abused and were able to use the detail from the source as evidence. Most candidates scored well on this question. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** also saw candidates able to offer supported arguments that the Israeli refugee problem had been quickly solved whereas the Palestinian refugee problem had not been solved. Difficulties again occurred with **Question (a) (iii)** where some candidates attempted to write about the general focus of the source or attempted incomplete evaluation. There were some who compared the content of the detail in the sources to judge which of the sources was more useful as evidence about Palestine. A few candidates tried to evaluate by using the provenance of the sources of a Palestinian in a camp in 1979 and the former president of Israel writing in 1982. Successful evaluation was seen in the argument that the provenance did not matter and the sources supported one another that life in Palestine was miserable under both the British and the Israeli regimes.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** showed that many of the candidates knew at least one of the countries from which the PLO had been expelled. The events at Karemeh were not well known beyond 'heroic resistance' by guerrillas against a large Israeli force. Equally, the reasons why Israel thought it necessary to invade Lebanon in 1982 were not very much known beyond the need to attack the PLO and defend the northern Israeli border. Little comment was made on the Lebanese Christians' original alliance with the Israelis or the general chaos and international criticism that forced the Israelis to withdraw in 1985. There were some interesting and informed answers to whether it was the actions of the PLO or resolutions of the United Nations Organisation that proved the more effective means of advancing the Palestinian cause (**Question (b) (iv)**). Stronger candidates were able to balance their knowledge of Palestinian attacks and activities against a number of United Nations resolutions. Generally, and especially with weaker candidates, the resolutions of the United Nations were discounted as not achieving any goals. Many knew of the activities of the PLO but candidates said that the rest of the world saw them as terrorists. Some candidates suggested that American presidents offered more, while again others suggested superpower rivalry or the efforts of OPEC, or the discussions leading to the Oslo Accords were more important. Some of these answers impressed by sophisticated argument.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

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

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

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

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

When attempting to answer source-based questions candidates should endeavour to use detail from the sources in their answers.

Candidates should be prepared to take note of the prompt phrases in the questions and answer accordingly, for example the prompts 'How far?' and 'To what extent?' invite candidates to offer a balanced and supported answer.

General Comments

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945 remained the candidates' favourite option. There were also many Centres opting to prepare for Depth Studies B: Russia, 1905-1941, C: The USA, 1919-1941, and F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994. There were some attempts at other Depth Studies but the numbers choosing them were very much smaller.

A very high proportion of the scripts were easily legible and well set out. There were very few rubric infringements. There were few examples where candidates' performances were undermined by time factors.

There were many scripts that were excellent in all aspects tested. These were a joy to read, showed much knowledge and understanding, and demonstrated command of the subject matter. However, **Question (a) (iii)** remains a problem for some candidates. To be awarded a mark in the range of those available for the achievement of the highest level, candidates would be expected to choose which source was more useful by testing for reliability. This evaluation could be achieved by testing the provenance, tone, language, purpose, date, cross reference of supporting information or contextual knowledge in support of source detail etc. These evaluations must be argued, supported from the source and complete. Some candidates offered incomplete evaluations, for example 'He was there so he would know' or 'It is a text book so the author will have had time to research'. Other candidates write what the sources are 'about' without using any recognisable source material.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from Source A about Hindenburg. These inferences about his hostility to the Treaty of Versailles were supported by his comments that 'We do not accept that Germany is responsible…' and his popularity from 'Cheered wildly by the crowd of over 100 000'. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** often found at least two sides to the question as to whether Source B showed that the Weimar Republic was weak. There were many interesting arguments over the source detail. Some argued that the assassination of Rathenau showed weakness as the Republic had no law and order, while others argued that the death showed swift and direct action. Again, the secret negotiations with the Soviet Union showed strength in dealing with a major power and securing arms despite the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, while others thought it showed weakness as the negotiations were secret from the rest of the Weimar government and the German people. Surprisingly, some candidates did not understand the word 'mourn' and used that detail as a criticism of Rathenau and the Republic. Wherever the arguments were logical and supported from the source, the candidates were rewarded. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** reflected some of the examples listed in the General Comments above and did not score as well. Many argued that Source B was more useful as it 'talked about many things but Source A only talked about one man'. These answers lacked supported by source detail and could not score higher marks.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Most candidates understood the armistice of November 1918 was a ceasefire and not a treaty, a cessation of war to allow discussion, signed by Ebert and involving the abdication of the Kaiser. Some candidates asserted that the armistice was 'the unconditional surrender of the Germans who accepted war guilt and reparations'. Most candidates scored well on **Question (b) (ii)** on the limits placed on German armed forces by the Treaty of Versailles. Indeed, many scored maximum marks, with a few candidates being confused as to the limits placed on the German Navy. Also, a small number of candidates did not realise that the question was about military limits and they gave many limits in all areas. The most obvious problem with the answer to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reduction of German reparations during the 1920s was the concentration on the Ruhr invasion and hyperinflation before getting to the point when reparations began to be reduced. Better answers concentrated on Germany's inability to pay, the need for all countries to have Germany as a trading partner, the work of Stresemann and the increasing trust in a peaceful Germany, the Dawes and Young Plans etc. These were clearly focused on the question asked and scored well. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on the extent to which the Weimar Republic had been successful by 1929 were well balanced and used most of the expected areas of information. Stronger candidates were able to demonstrate that there had been successes and weaknesses, supported by examples on both sides of the argument. A few candidates concentrated on the period of 1919 to 1923, with comments on risings against the Weimar Republic and hyperinflation.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Some candidates found it possible to draw valid inferences from Source A about the enthusiasm of young workers building the Moscow Metro, the inexperience of the workers and the poor equipment. Candidates appeared to be fascinated by the 'size eleven boots' when the young worker's feet were much smaller. Some were surprised to find a young female attempting such arduous work, while others berated the Soviet authorities for exploiting child labour. Many candidates found it possible to argue that the statistics offered in Source B showed that the First Five-Year Plan was both successful and unsuccessful. In the end, they concluded it was a success as there had been considerable increases in production in all commodities. Some candidates wrote in general terms about the commodities, for example 'pig-iron production doubled' – it is always better on the first reference to the doubling to show that it doubled from '3 to 6 million tons'. Thereafter, the reference to 'doubling' is clear to the reader. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** ranged from those that wrote 'Source A is about young workers while Source B is about how much Soviet industry produced' to other responses such as 'Source A is an old lady remembering so she could have forgotten things while Source B was just statistics'. These types of answers could not score high marks. Many compared the detail of the two sources and chose which they found the more useful. Others evaluated the sources by cross reference to show enthusiasm and massive increases in production. Whatever the reason, candidates wrote that the workers showed motivation in both sources – one by language, the other by outcome. A few candidates gave a full context of why Soviet production statistics should be doubted during the Five-Year Plans. This was evaluation by contextual knowledge.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** showed that many candidates knew about the city of Magnitogorsk, its construction, its purpose and placement. Others appeared unaware of the city as their answers were either guesses or the question was left unanswered. Most candidates scored well on **Question (b) (ii)** on the incentives used by the Soviet government to encourage high production from its workers. Most concentrated on positive rewards and wrote about Stakhanov. A smaller number of candidates offered balanced answers mentioning negative punishment as well. It was unusual to find a mention of gulags in these answers. Many scored well on **Question (b) (iii)** about the reasons that Stalin felt that the modernisation of industry was urgent. They were able to list his fear of invasion from the West, his need to rid the USSR of the capitalist NEP, the need to establish central (his) control of industry, and its role as a propaganda tool for communism and for himself. Many quoted Stalin's speech about how far behind the USSR was compared to the West, the need to build industry far from western borders etc. Some answers were very well crafted. While there were excellent and balanced answers to **Question (b) (iv)** showing that collectivisation had improved agriculture but only after a difficult beginning and with issues still to be resolved by 1939, some wrote general, assertive answers that lacked specific detail. For example, some candidates asserted that 'some peasants did not like the change' but they did not mention why. Others wrote that the ordinary peasant 'did not understand the new methods' without describing what confused them. Mention of tractors was common in better answers but more could have mentioned higher yields because of fertilisers. Most asserted that the yield of grain had increased by 1939, with few mentioning by how much, while only a very few mentioned that much of livestock production took until the 1950s to recover from the destruction of livestock by the kulaks and other peasants at collectivisation's inception.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Many candidates found valid inferences in Source A about Roosevelt's kindness, his attention to detail, and his belief that the state must intervene if private industry could not provide jobs. Candidates also pointed to Roosevelt's references to businesses having caused the Depression through lack of justice and fairness. All were more than adequately supported by evidence from the source. A minority of candidates drifted from the task at hand to compare Roosevelt's approach to the crisis with that of Hoover. This often involved considerable contextual knowledge about the two presidents. Candidates should adhere to the question which has been set. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** about the extent to which the cartoon in Source B showed that people supported the New Deal often concentrated on the figures running away from the steam roller and quoted the words on the figures and on the papers they were carrying. The majority of candidates stated that the farmers 'were obviously' in support of the New Deal, but it was very rare for candidates to mention the actual vehicle, its weight and its speed as significant to the cartoonist's message. Some of the answers to **Question (a) (iii)** said that 'We can't trust Source A because Roosevelt is trying to persuade his audience'. Further clarification or explanation was needed. Equally, Source B was sometimes dismissed as 'a mere cartoon'. Several suggested a photograph would have been more convincing! Better answers cross referenced to say that both sources demonstrated that Roosevelt was determined to drive through reforms against all odds and against any group or criticism. These evaluations were supported by detail from both sources.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** on the measures to deal with the Depression for which Huey Long campaigned were mostly well known and candidates offered much detail and scored well. A small number of candidates appeared not to have heard of Huey Long at all. Equally, the work of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was also well known (**Question (b) (ii)**), with better candidates offering specific detail in their descriptions. Weaker candidates often spoke in general terms of helping farmers and raising prices without further qualification. In their answers to **Question (b) (iii)** most candidates specified the need to restore confidence after the banking crisis and the establishment of Alphabet Agencies. Superior responses gave detail of the actions with banks, listed the Alphabet Agencies and commented on the need for speed to restore confidence and to show Roosevelt had a plan and would meet his election pledges. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were almost all balanced, showing evidence that many had been put in work but that often the work was short term. Groups that were not well helped by the New Deal were given, as was the impact of the 1937 budget which cut back aid funding. Many asserted that it was only when the Second World War broke out that the problem of unemployment was solved. There were many full and detailed answers that scored highly.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

This Depth Study was chosen by a small number of candidates and Centres. Candidates drew valid inferences from Source A by saying that the code of conduct demonstrated that the Red Army soldiers were trying to prove themselves more courteous and honourable, honest and friendly than those of the KMT. Their purpose was to win local support to help them win the Chinese Civil War. Candidates were also able to use the detail in Source B in their answers as to whether American aid was useful to the KMT, and they mostly produced balanced answers. They saw that the source showed that the Americans were generous with their aid but the corrupt KMT officials often diverted the aid for their own benefit. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were mostly a comparisons or contrasts of the content of both sources, thus scoring reasonable but not outstanding marks.

Candidates answering **Question (b) (i)** knew that land was taken away from the landlords but they struggled to add to that assertion. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** on reforms which benefited women were better known, especially the marriage reforms of 1950 giving equality and the banning of child marriages, infanticide etc. The candidates used some of the information found in Sources A and B to explain why the Communists were able to win the Chinese Civil War. This was perfectly acceptable but most would have gained higher marks if they had used specific detail beyond assertions that the Red Army was better disciplined, had better generals and were supported by the peasants. Equally, the corruption of the KMT officials and commanders could have been better quantified and explained. Many of the answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were one sided, claiming universal welcome for the victory. Some candidates would have benefitted from stating that that landlords, business men and the upper classes were not so happy with the outcome of the war.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

A small number of candidates answered on this Depth Study. Candidates drew valid inferences from Source A that the letter showed that the Englishman who wrote it thought that Britain was bullying the small number of whites in South Africa, and that it might be possible to overcome the antipathy between Boers and British with some diplomatic effort. These inferences were supported by source detail. Most candidates were able to understand that Source B showed that the Orange Free State would support the Transvaal in some matters but not in others. Some of these answers were mainly lists of data taken from the source and needed further argument and development. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were largely comparisons or contrasts of the sources' content. Some candidates tried to evaluate for reliability, although these were not complete or supported from the source.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** showed that candidates were not completely at ease with the term 'Randlords' or, if they were, that only Rhodes or Barnato were known. **Question (b) (ii)** on the growing strength of the Transvaal government in the 1890s would have been improved by greater knowledge of this area. German support and Kruger were mentioned but their contributions needed identifying and development. Generally, candidates knew that the issue of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal was because the 'Uitlanders were treated badly' and 'it was to lead to war' (**Question (b) (iii)**). Many of those answering on this Depth Study agreed that the Jameson Raid was the main cause of the war but they needed to add to the assertion. Some answers were one-sided, and it appeared that other causes of the Anglo-Boer War of 1889 were not well known.

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

Candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from the population chart in Source A. They could have also used the source detail in support of their inferences more often. Assertions such as 'the population almost doubled' should be accompanied by the actual numbers from the source on the first occasion the assertion is made. Also statements that said that the 'Jewish population increased steadily', understated the reality. Nevertheless, candidates scored high marks on this question. Candidates also scored well on **Question (a) (ii)** where they saw a balance of information and Examiners saw 'excellent and reasoned assessments of 'success' in these answers. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were the least successful aspect of the first section of the paper, with many candidates offering incomplete and superficial attempts at evaluation for reliability. However, other candidates did appreciate that cross reference could be made on the nature of migration and the statistics in Source A and both could be assessed in the light of the candidates' own contextual knowledge to come to a reasoned judgement about utility.

Most candidates were able to define precisely Britain's obligations to Palestine under the League of Nations Mandate of 1922. Many also gained maximum marks on **Question (b) (ii)** describing the actions of Irgun and the Stern Gang – usually commenting on the King David Hotel and Deir Yassin – although which action related to which group was not always secure. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were largely impressive with candidates able to give many reasons for Britain's withdrawal from responsibility in Palestine. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** could have been improved. Some candidates wrote long answers but, almost invariably, they would have benefited from greater balance. Most were able to offer valid reasons for Israel's strengths but were weaker on the primary focus of the question of 'disunity among Arab nations'. Some candidates did not mention Jordan's involvement, and those that did mention it, sometimes referred to Hussein, not Abdullah, as the ruler. Few could precisely name Arab nations and their precise objectives. The few candidates that mentioned Egypt's participation in the 1948-9 war believed Nasser to be the leader. Palestine itself was not mentioned as a factor in the war, and some candidates chose to consider the actions of the Six Day War.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

A number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. The sketch in Source A offered much scope for candidates to draw valid inferences and gain marks. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** were usually one-sided, with candidates finding evidence in Source B that companies did not care about their passengers. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were, at best, comparisons of the detail of the two sources; complete evaluation of the sources for reliability was required for higher marks.

Answers to all Part **(b)** questions could have been improved, some being based on the information available in the two sources. Whilst some marks had been gained in answers to the Part **(a)** questions, candidates struggled more in their Part **(b)** answers.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from edurescourceza.com

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

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

Downloaded from edurescourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

Source-based questions require direct support from the sources in responses, as well as clear focus on the demands of each question.

Candidates should also appreciate that evaluative questions are intended to ensure balanced and supported answers which reach a logical conclusion.

General Comments

Depth Study A (Germany, 1918-1945) was the most popular topic followed by Depth Study C (USA, 1919-1941) and Depth Study B (Russia, 1905-1941). A small number of candidates had prepared for Depth Studies D (China, 1945-c.1990) and F (Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994). Too few responses were seen to other topics to make comment worthwhile.

Almost all scripts were well presented and written in excellent English, and many displayed very secure historical knowledge in ***Section B*** answers. The majority of candidates approached **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)** effectively, although they were not as successful in addressing **Question (a)(iii)**. Generalisations on reliability, no matter how long, cannot achieve high marks. Such points need to be substantiated with specific reference to the content of the sources in relation to the issue presented in the question if candidates are to progress to higher marks. Some candidates, in answers to Part **B** questions, used bullet points - perhaps understandable when time is running out but such an approach does not work well when trying to deliver an argument as in **Question (b)(iv)**.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

(a) (i) Most candidates made valid inferences from Source A about Nazi aims in education and supported them with specific detail from the source to attain the highest level marks. An inference about the determination to denigrate Jews was always well explained, although the highest mark was achieved by candidates who appreciated that a second inference could be made, for example on the aim of indoctrination of the young or blaming Versailles for all Germany's woes.

(ii) Most candidates focused their responses securely on teachers' support for the Nazis and gave reasoned answers for their judgments, although these were often one-sided. Those candidates who appreciated that a balanced analysis was necessary for the highest level of reward compared aspects such as: few teachers lost their jobs even by 1945 and took an oath of loyalty to both Hitler and the Nazi State which implied support against teachers not having to be party members; all Jewish teachers had been dismissed and the threat of pupils reporting them to the Gestapo, which did indicate that support was not always voluntary.

(iii) Most candidates did make the necessary shift to the issue of Nazi methods of control, rather than simply restating the information in earlier answers, and they appreciated that control of education, both in terms of syllabus content and the restrictions placed on teachers, formed highly significant aspects of Nazi policy. Some did make cross-reference on these issues between the four weeks spent on 'Germany's Youth in charge!' of Source A and the role of pupils from Source B in ensuring this 'official teachers' instruction' was pursued. The Gestapo's role in enforcement was another major aspect of control, as was the significance of sixteen weeks spent on Nazi education as the method of indoctrination as a means of control. Such answers could attain high marks, whereas,

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

although few were seen, generalisations on the issue of reliability, such as 'A was from the Nazis, so was biased and Source B was British and written later so was trustworthy and so more useful', could not. The best candidates assessed the importance of 'official' as an indicator of reliability and the sources' content against their own knowledge of the context to demonstrate their ability to draw reasoned judgment on utility.

(b) (i) Almost all candidates gained full marks for the social groups listed here.

(ii) There were a number of excellent answers detailing the specific content of the Nuremburg Laws which deprived Jews of German citizenship and all political rights and made both marriage and any sexual relationship between them and Germans a criminal offence. That they were entitled as for 'The Protection of German Blood and Honour', Jews could not employ female German domestic servants under the age of 45 and were forbidden to fly the German flag, were less well known. Although it was not essential in gaining the highest marks, some pleasing answers pointed to the extension of the Laws to cover both other racial groups and a range of restrictions, although the wearing of the Star of David was not, directly, one of them.

(iii) Heinrich Himmler's role in Nazi Germany was well-known and a range of reasons were developed on why this was important. The highest marks were awarded for such answers so long as three such reasons were developed, even though fewer candidates pointed to his importance earlier in the Party's history such as his participation in the Munich Putsch and his significance in the Night of the Long Knives. Only a small number of candidates confused Himmler with other leading Nazis such as Goebbels or Heydrich.

(b) (iv) Candidates who appreciated the period specified was 1938 to 1945 developed secure answers which compared the impact on life in Germany of aspects of a war economy such autarky, the focus on armaments, rationing and the change in the role of women as workers, with the extension of conscription to younger and younger Germans and the importance of bombing later in the war as factors within the set period. In these answers the continuation of factors such as propaganda, indoctrination, the lack of workers' rights and the intensification of the persecution of the Jews and other minorities added further strength to assessments. This question was often the least well-answered on this topic, as many candidates appeared to have limited knowledge of any impact of the war on Germany. The weakest responses were those which focused on rewards for workers, women being restricted to domestic roles and life in Germany becoming better and better, instead of focusing on knowledge of 1938 to 1945.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

(a) (i) All candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A on hunger and the breakdown of law and order, particularly in the army; some responses would have been improved by supporting these with specific examples from the source.

(ii) The majority of candidates appreciated the balance in this source and some went beyond just quotation to explain why the patience of workers and soldiers was wearing so thin that they were willing to turn towards the more radical politicians whose policies were, perhaps, more relevant to their concerns than the gradualism of the Provisional Government.

(iii) A number of responses gained only limited marks for claims, often lengthy, that 'A was contemporary so it must be biased and B had hindsight so is more trustworthy'. Better candidates did focus on Russia in 1917 and supported their consideration from the sources on aspects such as the problems of society and the military as well as government, and some did appreciate that March in Source A was of particular importance and linked this to their own knowledge of the Revolution. The best answers were those which supplemented this with the importance of the Provisional Government's (in Source B) failures in dealing with land and peace as factors in causing the second Revolution led by the 'more radical politicians'. Few candidates made a link between this and the 'bread' implied in Source A.

(b) (i) All candidates knew of Rasputin's lifestyle but some did not explain why this was a reason for the distrust of members of the court. The majority did ensure that this was linked to his influence over the Tsar and Tsarina in the governing of Russia, as causes for suspicions.

(ii) The importance of the Petrograd Soviet, with its support from workers in key industries and soldiers, in its initial role of co-operation with the Provisional Government which declined as the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Bolsheviks gained prominence and its major role in the October Revolution, would have benefited from more detailed description in responses and a number of candidates displayed only a hazy awareness of what the Soviet was.

(iii) Candidates were on more secure ground in explaining the reasons for the Tsar's abdication. Most considered the problems of Nicholas's military command, the weaknesses of the Tsarina's government and shortages caused by the war as the major factors and gained good marks. More candidates could have pointed to the more specific influences on his abdication such as the Duma and his brother Michael's refusal of the Crown.

(iv) Sound responses to this question were seen from candidates who focused securely on the lifetime of the Provisional Government and had some knowledge of the war during that specific period, as well as the importance of Lenin in the overthrow of the government. Whilst aspects of the war were clearly continued and still relevant, a number of candidates, in essence, repeated much of their answer to **Question (b)(iii)** and lacked real awareness of what the end of the Provisional Government was.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

(a) (i) A large majority of candidates gave excellent answers to this question as they ensured valid inferences were supported from Source A on the evident wealth of Americans, the range of goods they purchased and the cut-throat nature of businesses in pursuit of every dollar. A small number did, however, not appreciate that the source was written in 1927, and thus could not be referring to the 1930s, so that attempting to link its content to the Depression's miseries lacked validity.

(ii) There were many very secure responses to this question which explained why aspects of the source could be seen to demonstrate America's power and security, such as its protected market and increasing wealth, as well as its isolationism, indicating its self-confidence. Many candidates ensured that a balanced argument was provided by contrasting this with what could be seen as over-confidence, limiting the opportunity to recover of those countries indebted to America and thus the security of its position.

(iii) A number of responses were limited to generalised assertions on reliability but most candidates did consider the content of both sources and made the necessary transition to the specified focus on the American economy. The wealth of citizens and demand demonstrated in Source A could be linked to the prospering industries in Source B, all indicating the Boom of the 1920s which better candidates assessed against their own knowledge of the period. The most astute made the point that the free competitiveness of Source A was not supported by the international protectionism of Source B and the restrictions on immigration.

(b) (i) Almost all candidates gained full marks for their accurate definition of speculation on the stock market, often developing this with explanation of how it was fuelled by 'buying on the margin'.

(ii) Every candidate was aware that 'it crashed' and most were able to develop this to some description of the specified period. Many answers were very secure in their grasp of the day by day development of the crisis from the large investors' sales on 21 October through Black Thursday to the bankers' attempts at rescue and then the outright panic of Black Tuesday, and some were able to further this with detail of the number of shares sold and the scale of losses.

(iii) All candidates pointed to reasons for Hoover's lack of popularity and many supported these well to achieve high marks. The most frequent reasons put forward were that he was 'a do-nothing President' and held responsible for Hoovervilles, as well as the mistreatment of the Bonus Marchers. Some candidates furthered this with explanation of the specific measures took being seen as insufficient and the appeal of Roosevelt to the electorate.

(b) (iv) The majority of responses were clearly focused on the factors involved in the causation of the Depression and some were able to indicate the differing views of historians on the issue which was impressive. Most candidates pointed to the effects of the Crash on confidence and the failure of so many banks worsening this, leading to the fall in demand creating increasing unemployment and thus spiralling into Depression. Balanced responses then contrasted this with the fact that few were directly affected by the Stock Market crash and share prices began some recovery by 1930, and then went on to consider longer term causes already evident by the end of the 1920s. These

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

included over-production, the weakness of international trade, the inequalities of income and lack of social security which continued well into the 1930s. Such answers were worthy of high marks.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

(a) (i) The majority of candidates appreciated, and supported from Source A, that in 1950 Mao's view of the land issue was in favour of some maintenance of the status quo so that rich peasants could aid production. This conservative view was not grasped by some candidates who wrote that the content of the source was evidence of Mao's radical aim of the elimination of the rich peasantry at that point in time.

(ii) Almost all responses were balanced, and supported from Source B, on Mao's attitude towards the intellectual and educated Chinese and gained good marks.

(iii) There was a tendency to repeat the material from earlier answers in response to this question and a number of candidates considered 'bias' without any supporting evidence. More effective answers did use the content of the sources to show that Mao was both pragmatic and devious when it suited his purpose, although measuring this against contextual knowledge or offering cross-references would have improved responses.

(b) (i) Reforms which improved the position of women were well known by candidates and many gained full marks.

(ii) Some sound knowledge of reforms in education and health was demonstrated by many candidates and, so long as both areas of policy were considered in a valid way, resulted in full marks.

(iii) Some candidates knew which reforms were introduced after 1958; the tendency was to describe these, rather than focusing on the reasons for them, such as the desire to concentrate more fully on agriculture.

(iv) Many candidates had knowledge of the Great Leap Forward, although there was a tendency to concentrate on the Chinese economy, with a great deal of emphasis on backyard furnaces, rather than broader aspects which also directly affected the people of China. A degree of balance was achieved by some candidates who argued that there were both positive and negative effects of the Great Leap Forward, so that it was not wholly a mistake. What also could have been pursued was the issue of 'most', which invited consideration of other policies which could be seen as 'damaging mistakes', such as the Cultural Revolution.

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

(a) (i) Almost all candidates saw and supported valid inferences on President Sadat from Source A. Interestingly, candidates were fairly equally split as to whether he was foolish or brave. Given appropriate support from the source, both were valid and rewarded.

(ii) The focus of this question on the prospects for a peace settlement was pursued by most candidates from the material in Source B, and there was some well-explained balance in a large number of responses.

(iii) Many answers, as in other Depth Studies, were the least effectively developed, as candidates tended to be rather general on bias. Support from the sources is essential to demonstrate the validity of such points and contextual knowledge, as well as cross-references, can be used as important measures of the utility of the sources.

(b) (i) Most candidates were able to name one or other of the Israeli leaders during the Yom Kippur War, although fewer were correct on both Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan.

(ii) In answer to this question, a number of candidates pursued Israel's relations with Egypt – often using material from the sources – rather than the required focus on the Palestinians and the West Bank settlements. Those with more secure grasp of the focus and knowledge scored well.

(iii) A wide range of reasons, such as the domestic Egyptian motives, was deployed effectively by many to gain sound marks for this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(iv) Knowledge was evident in many responses to this question - if vague in places. In some cases, more awareness of what the Camp David Agreements were would have helped to ensure that answers were less brief and assertive. Those with a more secure grasp on material were able to give a degree of balance to their answers although, again, the Palestinians received only limited attention.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013