eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

General Comments and Key Messages

Whilst good progress has been made by many with regard to explanation as part of developing an answer, some candidates need to demonstrate the skill of turning a relevant point into an explained response.

Some responses gave general answers about a period rather than focusing on the question set. Candidates who apply their knowledge and understanding to answering the set question score more highly than those who focus more generally on the topic.

Candidates should to be able to demonstrate an overview of a period and thus show an understanding of how events are linked together to bring about an outcome. Candidates need to realise that historical events are interlinked rather than compartmentalised.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

In part **(a)** the better answers clearly differentiated events between 'creation and collapse'. Here the actions of the Pope and the importance of Mazzini to the foundation of the new Roman Republic were well documented. Some mentioned the role of the triumvirate. Weaker answers were more general in nature with more limited mention of personalities. The significance of Napoleon III was rarely seen. Responses in **(b)** were mainly at a general level with comments being made in relation to 'disunity among the Italians' and the 'Italians were defeated in battle'. Candidates needed to develop these points into explanation if higher marks were to be achieved. For **(c)** stronger answers showed good awareness and understanding of Cavour's diplomatic activity as well as the role of Mazzini in the formation of the Young Italy movement. Less strong answers were unbalanced by the disproportionate concentration on Cavour to the expense of other reasons for the creation of the Kingdom of Italy.

Question 2

In response to part **(a)** there were accurate references in the better answers to Grossdeutschland and Kleindeutschland. Mention was made of the Vor-parliament, and its role, as well as the rejection of the crown by Frederick William. Weaker responses were briefer, concentrating more on failure. Many answers to **(b)** drew on the detail from **(a)** but in some instances were unable to develop this into explanation. Answers to **(c)** were more of a general nature. Where Bismarck's role was better known answers moved into explanation levels. Generally less well explained was detail about the removal of opposition to unification.

Question 3

The better answers to **(a)** were wide ranging. The idea of civil rights for all with the abolition of slavery featured in many answers. Reference was made to increased educational opportunities and the right to vote. The best answers mentioned the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the 14th Amendment. Some answers lacked the specific nature of the better ones and contained information in a more general or descriptive nature. Answers to **(b)** tended to concentrate on the clothes worn by klansmen and, in addition, their activities such as lynching. This approach effectively missed the thrust of the question. Those who were prepared to deal with the 'why' of the question produced answers of a higher quality. Answers to **(c)** were often descriptive in nature about the destruction of the south and the loss of life. Where carpetbaggers were mentioned their impact needed to be explained. Even better responses were often one-sided in their approach with little being seen that was explained in positive terms.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 4

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

Question 5

The better answers to **(a)** often contained more valid detail than the number of marks to be awarded. Specific limits on the army and navy together with the demilitarisation of the Rhineland formed the basic of many of these quality responses. Less strong answers showed awareness in relation to the branch of the armed forces which suffered but were often inaccurate with the detail. Some candidates lost time by writing about other aspects of the Treaty in addition to military ones. The better answers to **(b)** started with the terms of the Treaty with which Clemenceau was disappointed. This approach then gave a clear opportunity to explain why this was the case. Other answers invariably started with what Clemenceau wanted. This approach allowed little more in terms of attempted explanation than 'and he was disappointed he did not get it'. Other candidates wrote more about 'Why did Clemenceau want to be harsh?' than the question set. It is important that candidates try to answer the question set. Part **(c)** answers varied considerably in quality. The most successful answers considered carefully the situation at the time in making a judgement on specific terms of the Treaty. This approach gave opportunity for clear explanation. Particularly well explained was 'deserved' in relation to Germany's treatment of both Russia and France and 'undeserved' in relation to the impact on the 'ordinary' German people. Less successful answers concentrated too much on the detail of the terms without making a judgement. A significant number of candidates mistakenly thought the question was about the causes of the First World War with this approach bringing little reward. Some candidates adopted a personal approach rather than one based on historical fact.

Question 6

The best answers to **(a)** focused fully on the question describing briefly but clearly events in the Rhineland in 1936 including the lack of action by Britain and France. Less strong answers spent much time writing about the activities of the League of Nations particularly in Abyssinia. Some candidates were confused by the demilitarisation term of the Treaty having the understanding that Germany had 'lost' the Rhineland and was therefore 'invading'. In **(b)** the better answers went further than 'to avoid war' and 'build up armed forces' to explain why appeasement allowed Britain to benefit. Other reasons were also explained to varying degrees of depth and understanding. Some answers would have benefited from a greater understanding of the policy of appeasement. Often it was referred to as a policy of the League or even an agreement 'signed by Britain and Germany'. The weaker responses lacked awareness of the significance of the policy in relation to the threat of Communism. In **(c)** whilst many knew of the Munich Conference and the areas of discussion, the significance of the decisions taken was not as well understood. Candidates of all abilities would have benefited from a greater awareness of the related nature of events from 1936 that a clear overview would have given. This was even more evident in the nature of the responses in relation to 'other reasons for war'. Knowledge was sound in most instances but candidates often saw each event in isolation.

Question 7

In **(a)** most were aware that the Soviet Union sent tanks into Hungary and that there was heavy street fighting. Better answers provided extra detail regarding deaths and casualties and also about the fate of Nagy. Some candidates spent time giving details of the actions of the Hungarians despite the thrust of this and the **(b)** question. In **(b)** the best answers showed good understanding regarding objections to Soviet rule and the wish to leave the Warsaw Pact. Most included the 'payment for Soviet forces' in their reasons for the uprising. Less strong answers included most of the main points but identified, rather than explained, reasons. In part **(c)** answers from all abilities concentrated on description at the expense of explanation. In addition to Solidarity, the work of Gorbachev was well-known, but to gain higher marks required this information to be developed as an explanation as to why Soviet control over Eastern Europe declined.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 8

In part **(a)** little was known beyond 'voting'. Answers to **(b)** were similarly limited with the focus in the main on the increased potential for dissention. Many responses to **(c)** lacked specific detail of humanitarian actions. Some answers showed an awareness of specific agencies but presented roles and description in a narrative format. Some answers developed the idea of the peacekeeping role rather than that of humanitarian work as required by the question.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

The better responses were characterised by the amount of detail they included. Content included detail about Kapp, location, the Freikorps and reasons for the outcome. Less strong answers confused the Freikorps with either the army or the communists. Others thought the government called the general strike. In **(b)** answers across the ability range were more general mentioning the harshness of the Treaty and the state of living conditions for many Germans. Better answers explained why the Communists were partially responsible whilst the best explained the issue over democracy. Whilst the vast majority of answers showed an awareness of developments in art and culture few for **(c)** were able to explain why this was an achievement. The opposite was much stronger in terms of explanation with the achievements of Stresemann featuring strongly. Less strong answers showed some confusion between the Dawes and Young Plans.

Question 10

Good answers to **(a)** showed specific knowledge about the Act and its benefits to the Nazis. Almost without exception the ability to make laws without the Reichstag was mentioned as was the fact that the Act effectively made Hitler a dictator with other political parties being abolished. Weaker answers wrote more about impact in terms of the way Nazis put the Act into practice rather than being more specific in relation to the initial impact of the Act. Most answers to **(b)** narrated the story of events over the weekend of 29-30 June. Better answers concentrated on the threat of Röhm in relation to the power he would hold if the SA became a second German army and the ruthlessness displayed by Hitler. Weaker answers confused the roles of the SA and SS. Weaker answers to **(c)** showed a lack of clarity as to the meaning of repression. Thus everything that brought change was classed as repression. Better responses showed good understanding as to why repression was an effective method of control and balanced this against other methods used by the Nazis. Particularly strong was explanation of the impact of propaganda although in many answers School and the Hitler Youth figured prominently.

Question 11

Most answers to **(a)** contained information about the living and working conditions of the peasants, the aristocracy and the autocratic rule of the Tsar. Generally only better answers mentioned the Okrana or the Orthodox Church. Use of statistics relating to the size of different groups also featured in many of the better answers. In **(b)** weaker answers considered what the revolutionaries failed to achieve rather than what was being asked. Better responses developed basic explanation around the October Manifesto and the loyalty to the Tsar of the army. Most answers to **(c)** included reference to the Duma, often with explanation as to how the Tsar exploited it. Better answers considered the part played by Stolypin and Rasputin. In the best answers candidates recognised that Stolypin could exemplify both success as well as failure.

Question 12

Most answers to **(a)** mentioned that the Russian language was imposed. Some candidates were aware of Russians being encouraged to migrate into non-Russian areas. The concept of ethnic minorities was often not known, even by better candidates. The best answers to **(b)** showed an understanding of the outdated Soviet Union compared to the West. Within this context the idea of increased food production to secure hard currency was known. However, the idea of spreading communism or to deal with the kulaks was rarely seen even in better answers. Most responses to **(c)** commented on the fact that machinery could be used under a collective system. In better answers the plight of the kulaks was explained but the impact on agriculture of this purge was rarely commented on. General statements about increased production sat uneasily against statements that there were famines.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 13

Most responses to **(a)** showed some awareness of the changing lifestyle of some American women although the concept of 'shorter' rather than 'short' skirts was not understood. In **(b)** there was more emphasis on description rather than explanation. The better answers explained how certain events showed intolerance whilst others linked immigration with the fear of communism. The Ku Klux Klan was written about almost without exception but only better answers moved away from a description of the activities of klansmen to explain why they might be considered intolerant. Answers to **(c)** went down the route of description rather than explanation. Descriptions of police corruption, speakeasies and gangster violence featured heavily. Better responses considered the limited achievements of Prohibition in creating an argument for its ending. A limited number of answers were enhanced by making an explained link to the Depression and the opportunity to raise funds for Roosevelt's policies.

Question 14

The majority of answers to **(a)** showed an awareness that Roosevelt closed the banks and that some re-opened. Better answers stated why some banks did not re-open. Only the best wrote about restoring public confidence and the fact that Roosevelt broadcast to the public to reassure them. Reference to the Emergency Banking Act was rarely seen. For **(b)** many candidates produced good descriptive work, often preceded by an overview of economic and environmental problems. Relatively few went on to explain why the TVA was important. In **(c)** the best answers emphasised both the relevance of the judges' political philosophy as well as the constitutional issue about the National Recovery Administration. Most had knowledge of at least one other factor. In less strong answers this often related to the views of Republicans. Some answers just mentioned Huey Long and Father Coughlin whilst others showed good understanding of their stance.

Questions 15 to 19

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

Question 20

In **(a)** most were aware of immigration restrictions and exemplified this with the turning away of the 'Exodus'. Many wrote about the desperation of many Jews to escape from Europe rather than answering the question. Most answers were limited in relation to **(b)**. References to the 'Promised Land' and Old Testament Judaism were made. Generally knowledge about Jewish claims was greater than those of the Arabs. For **(c)** candidates often went into detail about the refugee problem rather than writing about its creation. Even in better answers little was seen about the establishment of Israel and the defeat of the Arab states.

Questions 21 to 25

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

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. There were only a very small number of candidates who were unable to complete the paper.

There were significantly fewer rubric errors this year. Where rubric errors occurred this was usually due to candidates omitting to complete the requisite number of questions rather than attempting too many questions.

Candidates must read the questions carefully and ensure they are actually answering the question set, rather than writing everything they know 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 question.

Many candidates are still adopting a narrative approach to answering part **(b)** and **(c)** questions. These questions do require candidates to demonstrate their understanding by explaining factors, rather than just describing them. Some candidates constructed a clear hypothesis in response to a question but did not use their factual knowledge to support this hypothesis.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

(a) Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of France's gains from the Treaty of Versailles, describing the return of Alsace-Lorraine, reparations, the right to mine coal in the Saar and also points related to the security of France, such as the reduction in Germany's armed forces and the demilitarisation of the Rhineland. A minority of candidates gave a list of terms of the Treaty of Versailles, including a number that were not actually related to the security of France. Some candidates wrote extremely long answers to this question; the time spent writing over a page to a question with a maximum mark of 5 could have been more effectively used elsewhere.

(b) Effective answers to this question explained that Germany signed the treaty as they were unable to continue with the war due to diminishing supplies of raw materials, food and ammunition; they also stressed the huge death toll amongst German troops. Further explanation focused upon the turbulence within Germany. Less effective answers stated that Germany had no choice other than to sign the treaty but this statement was not developed into explanation. Some candidates listed the terms of the treaty and stated why Germany was dissatisfied with these terms; such answers were not actually focused upon the question set.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Candidates identified a number of reasons why the peacemakers at Versailles were both successful and unsuccessful. Points made included success in creating the League of Nations, placating the public in each country and giving France security. Lack of success focused on the power vacuum left in Europe and the severity of the punishment's effects on Germany's economy. Some candidates developed these points into well-argued explanations, demonstrating a clear understanding of the difficulties facing the peacemakers at Versailles. A number of candidates wrote at some length about the aims of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson at Versailles; however, answers needed to address whether these aims were translated into action and whether or not they were successful. Many candidates wrote about successful achievements in very generalised terms only.

Question 6

(a) Some candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of how Hitler made use of the Spanish Civil War, highlighting the opportunity to test his weapons and armed forces, the opportunity to fight Communism and how he hoped to gain raw materials from the Spanish Nationalists in exchange for his support. A few candidates wrote in very general terms only.

(b) There were some clearly focused explanations of why Britain and France allowed Germany to re-militarise the Rhineland; explanations developed reasons such as worries that opposing Hitler could lead to war, British concerns that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh on Germany, British and French involvement in the events unfolding in Abyssinia and France's concern about acting without British support. A number of candidates answered the question as if it asked why Germany re-militarised the Rhineland; the question's focus is clearly upon the role of Britain and France in allowing Germany's action.

(c) Candidates developed explanations of other reasons for war breaking out in 1939; reasons such as appeasement and the legacy of the Treaty of Versailles were clearly explained. Explanations of the Nazi-Soviet Pact were rarely focused on the outbreak of war. Candidates demonstrated excellent contextual knowledge of the terms of the Pact, but they needed to use their contextual knowledge to explain how this led to the outbreak of war in 1939.

Question 7

(a) Some candidates displayed excellent contextual knowledge of events in Czechoslovakia, detailing the events surrounding the death of Jan Masaryk, rigged elections and the banning of all parties other than the communists. A significant number of candidates wrote about the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia, rather than how Czechoslovakia became communist-controlled in 1948. Candidates are expected to be aware of the differences between events in 1948 and 1968.

(b) There were some clear explanations of Stalin's reasons for setting up the Berlin Blockade; these focused mainly upon the Western Allies reforming the currency, the forming of Bizonia and Stalin's desire to ensure that western Germany remained economically weak. A number of candidates adopted a purely narrative approach to this question and wrote at some length about the actual events of the Berlin Blockade. Candidates should be aware that questions asking why always require explanation of events, rather than description. A significant number of candidates wrote about the Berlin Wall rather than the Berlin Blockade. Candidates are expected to know the difference between the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall.

(c) Candidates gave substantiated explanations of the aggressive nature of Stalin's policy in Eastern Europe; these focused mainly upon the role of the Red Army in spreading communism. Candidates were able to identify policies that were defensive in nature, but did not develop these points into explanations. Candidates did need to look carefully at the wording of this question. Some wrote about events in the 1950s and 1960s, and some gave explanations of events outside Eastern Europe; these are clearly not relevant to a question asking about Eastern Europe from 1945 to 1948. Some candidates answered in generalised terms only.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 8

(a) There were a number of well-developed answers to this question; candidates demonstrated extensive contextual knowledge of events in the Congo immediately following the granting of independence.

(b) Candidates displayed comprehensive contextual knowledge of the difficulties faced by the United Nations in the Congo, and used this knowledge to construct clear explanations. These explanations focused upon the refusal of the Belgians to leave Katanga, the USSR's support for Lumumba, the USSR's disregard for United Nations policy and the support given to Mobutu by the US government.

(c) There were some clearly argued answers to this question. Candidates constructed effective explanations of why the Korean War was and was not a success for the United Nations. A number of candidates described reasons for the Korean War and events in the Korean War, without actually addressing whether the Korean War was a success or not for the United Nations. It is essential that candidates read the question carefully.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Candidates displayed comprehensive knowledge of the events of the Munich Putsch and some used this knowledge to describe how the Nazi Party was able to benefit from the Putsch. Some candidates wrote extensively about the events without addressing how the Nazi Party benefitted. It is important that candidates read the question carefully to ensure that they are actually answering the question as set.

(b) Answers focused on the protection given by the SA to Hitler at his meetings, their disruption of meetings of other parties and the impression of discipline and order given by the SA. Some candidates were able to use these points to construct explanations of why the Nazi Party was dependant on the SA.

(c) There were some well-argued responses to this question, with candidates explaining both Hitler's strong personality and other reasons such as the Depression, propaganda and Hitler's anti-communist policies. A number of candidates were able to identify several reasons why Hitler became Chancellor of Germany but were unable to develop these identifications into explanations.

Question 10

(a) Candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the actions taken in 1933-4 to create a one-party state. The Decree for the Protection of the People and State, the Enabling Act and the Law against the Establishment of Parties all featured in answers. Candidates do need to be aware that part **(a)** questions require an in-depth knowledge; many candidates are still writing in very generalised terms only.

(b) This question gave candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of the motivation behind Nazi persecution of the Jews in Nazi society. Effective answers concentrated upon Aryan supremacy, jealousy of the success of Jewish businessmen and the belief that the Jews were to blame for any problems faced by Germany. Many candidates described the actual persecution of the Jews, rather than explaining the reasons for this persecution.

(c) There was much excellent explanation of the role of propaganda as a method of control in response to this question. The role of the Gestapo and the role of education were also explained with a clear focus on the question. Some candidates explained positive methods of control, such as the provision of jobs. There were a number of responses that adopted a purely narrative approach; such answers did not actually explain the effectiveness of a given point as a method of control.

Questions 11 and 12

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 13

(a) Candidates were able to give details of a number of developments in popular culture. These focused upon developments in the movie industry, the new styles of dancing, the widening of the appeal of jazz music and the developments in radio. Less effective answers described popular culture rather than the developments in popular culture during the 1920s. It is essential that candidates look carefully at the exact wording of the question.

(b) Answers to this question showed that candidates had a detailed knowledge of the lifestyle of the young American woman. However, this knowledge was not always used to explain why this lifestyle was controversial. Effective answers explained that the lifestyle was controversial because it was so different from the traditional lifestyle of an American woman, that it went against accepted religious beliefs and it was against the views of most men.

(c) Candidates were able to explain the impact of prohibition on American society, detailing in particular organised crime, bribery and corruption. Explanation of racial intolerance detailed the impact of the Jim Crow laws and the intolerance of the Ku Klux Klan. It is essential that candidates look carefully at the dates in the question, and ensure that their answers are actually relevant to the actual question. A number of candidates wrote at some length about Rosa Parks and Martin Luther-King and events from the 1950s and 1960s; these are clearly not relevant to a question about the 1920s.

Questions 14 to 25

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

General Comments and Key Messages

A significant majority of candidates were able to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. Many candidates communicated their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for events in the past, or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement.

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

However, **parts (b) and (c)** demand explanation. Few marks are awarded for narrative or long introductions which do no more than 'set the scene'. Candidates who score highly are able to stick to the point, by applying their knowledge to the precise requirements of the question, and developing fully each identified factor. In **part (c),** responses should argue both for and against the focus of the question to reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated, by addressing 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Weaker responses will tend to rely on retelling the story and often include irrelevant information.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

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

Question 5

In part **(a)** candidates demonstrated good knowledge of Lloyd George's aims at the peace negotiations of 1919-20. Many answers went beyond general points about his aim of avoiding severe punishment of Germany by including specific references to the importance of trade, the Empire and the navy to British interests after the First World War. Better responses encompassed not only the negotiations about German losses but also the terms applied to Germany's allies. The challenge in part **(b)** was to make the link between Clemenceau and Wilson clear and explain why they disagreed on each issue. For instance, on the issue of revenge, better responses made it clear that Clemenceau was conditioned by the two invasions of France which had taken place in his lifetime, while Wilson's ideas were formed by a desire to avoid German resentment, and by the fact that his country had neither been invaded nor ravaged by a war that the USA had only joined in 1917. Less successful answers described Clemenceau's aims in a separate paragraph from those of Wilson's and made no links between the two.

There were some good answers to part **(c)** because candidates were able to explain both sides of the argument about 'fair' treatment of Germany at Versailles. There were fewer examples of candidates justifying 'how fairly' by explaining why they had chosen one side of the argument and then why they had rejected the alternative view. Credit was given to responses which compared Germany's treatment at Versailles with the terms imposed on her allies, thereby drawing conclusions about 'fairness'.

Question 6

The focus of part **(a)** was just on the terms of the Pact, not on what happened to Hoare and Laval after news of the agreement leaked out. There was a lack of clarity about exactly what the Pact said because of inaccurate answers which claimed that Britain and France were willing to give all of Abyssinia to Mussolini to

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

stop the invasion. Part **(b)** attracted better answers which explained why the League wished to maintain Mussolini's friendship, using him as a potential ally against Hitler. A second developed point explained why the League's failure to impose oil sanctions and to close the Suez Canal enabled the Italian conquest to continue because vital supplies were uninterrupted. Balance was achieved in part **(c)** by arguing, on the one hand, that the League's humanitarian work was a success. Good answers then posed counter arguments about the League's efforts to settle disputes; it was equally valid to use examples of successes or failures from either the 1920s or 1930s. It is worth noting a common misconception that the League did impose changes to labour conditions and hours of work when, in reality, these were only recommendations.

Question 7

A significant majority of candidates scored well on part **(a)**. They were capable of identifying Stalin's territorial gains in Germany and Berlin, and in addition to reparations, they recognised that eastern Europe was to be a 'Soviet sphere of influence'. Care was needed when answering part **(b)** which took 1945 as the focus of the explanation 'Why did the USA-USSR alliance begin to break down?' References to later events gained no credit. Despite this, there were some good responses which developed the themes of the USSR's mistrust when the USA successfully tested the atom bomb, and the USA's anxiety when Truman felt Stalin had gone beyond the agreement made at Yalta. The change of US Presidency was often identified as a relevant factor but remained undeveloped; candidates needed to show why this led to a breakdown of the USA-USSR alliance, thereby answering the question. In part **(c)** answers some candidates tried to apportion blame for the outbreak of the Cold War by including the Cuban Missile Crisis and the war in Vietnam. The parameters can be defined in terms of events up to around 1949 and 1950 when most commentators agree that the Cold War was fairly well established. Candidates who confined themselves to the period 1945-50, and developed an argument explaining and analysing the USA's contribution to the outbreak of the Cold War and then the USSR's contribution, gained the highest marks.

Question 8

Part **(a)** was a popular question about which candidates clearly knew a great deal. Sometimes there was too much detail and time was spent writing an explanation as to why the Soviets took action against Czechoslovakia, instead of focusing on the question. The focus of the question was what the Soviet Union did, rather than why they took action. There was evidence of quality answers to part **(b)** with sound knowledge about Soviet fears of, and reactions to, events in Hungary in 1956. Many focused on the perceived threat to the Warsaw Pact as well as the way Nagy's liberal reforms were seen to be undermining the grip of communist rule in eastern Europe, which the Soviet Union felt it could not tolerate. With reference to part **(c),** many candidates wrote at length about such factors as Gorbachev and his policies, the impact of Solidarity, the invasion of Afghanistan and the failing Soviet economy, however, all too often the responses were descriptive. To improve, candidates should have asked themselves, 'Why then did this factor lead to the collapse of Soviet control in eastern Europe?'; hence the explanation would meet the demands of the question.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Candidates had good knowledge about hyper-inflation to score well in part **(a)**. They recognised that Stresemann introduced a new currency, gained an agreement that French and Belgian troops should leave the Ruhr and signed the Dawes Plan. Part **(b)** gave an opportunity to explain the Ruhr invasion and hyper-inflation; many candidates occasionally lapsed into narrative. There is a common misconception that the payment of reparations on its own caused hyper-inflation rather than the government's response of printing money to pay the strikers as a result of the invasion of the Ruhr. Credit was also given for explaining the impact of the collapse of trade which led to rising prices. There were many secure responses to part **(c)**, with good explanations of both foreign and domestic failures and successes. Many candidates explained the end of hyper-inflation alongside the Dawes and Young plans (which could be used in either a foreign or domestic context), the Locarno Pact and admission to the League. Candidates could link each feature to the idea of whether or not Weimar was a disaster, and explain both successes and failures. Many could also deal effectively with the cultural freedom of Weimar while also explaining why part of the political class continued to despise the new Republic. Some responses dealt well with the illusory nature of the economic recovery, with reference to events surrounding the Wall Street Crash.

Question 10

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Part **(a)** posed few problems and was well done. Part **(b)** tended to attract descriptions only of the role of women as child-bearers. The question focused on why the Nazis tried to limit the role of women, i.e. why were they so important to the state. The better answers explained why the Nazis felt it important to remove women from the workforce, to boost the birth-rate and to promote the traditional role of women as housewife and mother. Answers to part **(c)** were often lacked balance because responses needed to convey a sense of the benefits (or lack of them) to specific groups of people. Hence 'popularity' was linked to which people felt they gained most from the Nazi state on the one hand, and which people suffered most on the other.

Question 11

Answers to part **(a)** tended to be generalised and lacking specific detail. Two developed points might have included the arming of the Petrograd Soviet during the Kornilov Affair and the powers which the Soviet exercised as an alternative to the Provisional Government. There were better answers to part **(b)** which included developed explanations of the failures of Kerensky's government, of Lenin's promises and the advantages held by the Bolsheviks after the July Days. Candidates used their knowledge well to deal with part **(c)** arguing both for and against the view that it was divisions amongst the Whites which led to Bolshevik success in the Civil War. It is perhaps worth reminding candidates that references to Trotsky's leadership should be qualified and explained; i.e. what was it about his qualities and strategies which contributed to the Red Army's victory?

Question 12

Candidates' knowledge about the status of women in the USSR under Stalin in part **(a)** was less secure. Good answers recognised that, in theory, women were equal partners; while their domestic responsibilities were considered important, they found more equality in the world of work, say as teachers and doctors. Part **(b)** responses tended to focus on Collectivisation as a solution to inefficient farming methods. Stalin's aim to tighten his grip on the countryside by destroying the Kulaks was a second explanation which could have been developed. Part **(c)** attracted some sound arguments which sometimes lacked specific detailed knowledge, particularly about the industrial advances made in the USSR under Stalin's rule. Candidates seemed stronger when explaining the failures of industrialisation in terms of harsh working and living conditions.

Question 13

There were many strong answers to part **(a)** detailing overproduction, foreign competition, falling demand in Europe and difficulties farmers had repaying loans.

Knowledge in part **(b)** of those sections of US society which did not benefit from the 'economic boom' seemed entirely secure with good explanations about the plight of farmers, native Americans, workers in traditional industries and those Americans who suffered discrimination. Answers to part **(c)** tended to be unbalanced; candidates were able to explain 'alternative factors' such as the impact of Republican policies and the introduction of tariffs, but were less clear when explaining why the automobile industry contributed to the 'boom' of the 1920s. Such points as the impact of mass production and the growth of industries associated with car making are areas which could have been developed.

Question 14

Part **(a)** responses tended to be generalised; specific supporting detail about unemployment, banking and getting the US out of the Depression through 'relief, recovery and reform' would have gained higher marks. Part **(b)** proved challenging for many candidates who sometimes just described the problems caused by the banks rather than explaining why the banks were so important to rebuilding public confidence. A focus on the key word of the question can often help candidates stick to the point. On the whole, answers to part **(c)** explained the failures and successes of the New Deal. There was evidence of sound knowledge about the work of the Alphabet Agencies balanced against an understanding of the limitations of Roosevelt's policies which were exposed in 1937 and when the US became directly involved in the Second World War.

Questions 15 to 19

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

Question 20

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Part **(a)** was well answered with many details of the Anglo-French intervention in the Suez Canal zone in 1956. There were many quality answers to part **(b)** where candidates were good at focussing on 'importance' rather than merely retelling the events of the Six Day War. The impact on Israel's strategic position, the problems faced by the Arabs and the changes to the role of the USA and USSR in the Middle East were all recognised and explained. Part **(c)** was also dealt with effectively by many candidates who focused on the relevance of the date. They were able to explain the problems both solved and left unresolved by the Camp David Agreement.

Question 21

Of the two Arab-Israeli questions, this one attracted weaker responses. Better answers to part **(a)** included PLO activities in Palestinian refugee camps, Israeli retaliation and interventions, for example supporting 'Free Lebanon' under Major Haddad. It was important in part **(b)** to avoid general comments about the use of terrorism. Good responses were able to be quite specific about the advantages the PLO felt they could achieve through terrorist activities such as the hijackings of the early 1970s, and all this against a background of lack of progress towards achieving a united Palestinian state. There were better answers to part **(c)** which ranged over the period from the late 1960s up to the 1990s, although most used the period from the Camp David Agreement up to the 1993 Peace Accord as well as the Oslo Agreement to support their arguments about PLO success (or lack of it).

Questions 22 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

General Comments and Key Messages

Most candidates answered questions on the 20th Century option although there was an increase in the number of candidates answering the 19th Century option. There was the full range of answers on both options but answers on the 20th Century option were generally more confident.

The overall standard of answers was similar to that in previous years. There was a wide range of answers and the majority of candidates were able to make sensible use of the sources to produce worthwhile answers. Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the Cuban Crisis and the causes of the First World War and this was often used relevantly when interpreting and evaluating the sources.

There were many good answers to comparison questions. They were good because they were (i) based on an overall reading of the point of view of the authors of the sources rather than focusing on details, and (ii) they compared the sources directly rather than writing about each source separately.

Reading sources as a whole, whether written sources or cartoons, always leads to better answers to every type of question. Candidates should be encouraged to always ask about a source -'What is the point of view of the author or artist?'

When candidates are asked to explain why a source was published on a particular date it is important that they explain the message of the source, the intended impact of this message (purpose), and the historical context. The best answers always cover these three areas while less good answers only focus on one of them.

Candidates also do much better if they know how to evaluate sources, and if they understand which questions require them to evaluate. Questions that contain terms such as 'prove', 'surprise', 'reliable', 'trust' and 'useful' require candidates to evaluate. This can be done in a number of ways e.g. by comparing what the source says with what other sources say, by considering the tone or language of the source, or by using the provenance of a source in a developed way by considering the possible purpose of the source.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th Century option

Question 1

There were some good answers to this question where the candidates compared the overall points of view of the two sources about the causes of the First World War. Both sources argue that it was fundamental and long-term causes that were most important. Most candidates were able to compare details in the sources e.g. they both say that Germany allowed Austria to act and that nationalism was an important factor, while they disagree about whether the alliance system was strong. Some candidates struggled because they summarised each source without ever comparing them.

Question 2

The best answers realised that the cartoon is about the Entente Cordiale between Britain and France in 1904 and went on to explain the message (a warning to Germany about the alliance), the purpose e.g. to stir up anti-German feeling in Britain, and the context e.g. ending of Britain's isolation, of the cartoon. These answers achieved higher marks. Many candidates were able to explain the message of the cartoon but needed to go on and address purpose. A number of candidates thought the cartoon was about the alliance between France and Russia, despite the words 'Entente Cordiale' that appear on the cartoon.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 3

Candidates demonstrated a good understanding of Sources D and E and the better answers correctly focused on the issue of how far Source E explains why the author of Source D was uncertain about Germany's plans. How good such a response was depended on how Source E was read. If Source E was read as simply showing Williams's good intentions then the answer that resulted was not as convincing. A much better reading of Source A was either that it contains inconsistencies, or that William was really threatening Britain. A number of candidates did not use their understanding of the sources to such good effect. They needed to focus on the crucial issue of how far Source E explains the uncertainty in Source D. Instead they explained how you can tell that the author of Source D was, or was not, uncertain about Germany's plans.

Question 4

This question was generally answered well. The best candidates read the overall point of view of both sources and realised that they were both about the causes of the First World War. They explained that Source F blames the alliance system while Source G blames Germany. This again shows the benefits of reading sources as a whole. Less good answers tended to describe Source F in detail rather than make inferences from it, while some candidates struggled to identify the Kaiser (or Germany) in Source G.

Question 5

A good number of candidates managed to do well by cross-referencing to either contextual knowledge or other sources, to explain that they were surprised because Bethmann Hollweg had allowed Austria to go ahead against Serbia. There were a number of answers that made the same point but in a very general way. The reference to other sources, or to the use of contextual knowledge, was not precise enough and they received lower marks. There were also a number of weaker answers based on 'everyday empathy' e.g. 'he would be upset that war has started because war is a terrible thing'.

Question 6

This question produced a range of answers. The best answers carefully explained how some sources support the hypothesis that Germany was to blame for rising tensions, and then explained how other sources disagree with it. The best explanations were those that focused on one source at a time e.g. 'Source D supports this statement because it says that Germany was threatening the independence of neighbouring countries and even the existence of England. This was bound to cause tensions to rise if countries like France were being threatened by Germany. Less good answers wrote about the sources in groups but too generally so that little was said about individual sources, or they provided quotations from sources but needed to explain the significance of the quotations in relation to the question.

Option B: 20th Century option

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to compare the two sources for agreements and/or disagreements. Many explained that both sources say that missiles were put into Cuba, that there was a quarantine and that the US agreed not to invade. Disagreements were a little harder to find but a good number of candidates realised that the sources disagree over whether the Soviet ships stopped and whether Khrushchev's plan was 'crack-brained' or logical. Far fewer candidates attempted to compare the overall point of views of the two sources. The best candidates did do this and scored higher marks. To be able to understand and compare the overall points of views of the sources is a higher level skill than just comparing points of detail.

The weakest candidates summarised the sources without comparing while others wrote complicated explanations of the sources without focusing on specific points of disagreement or agreement. The candidates who give good answers spend some time planning their answers. They go through each source carefully making point-by-point comparisons e.g. Source A says the Soviet ships turned round because of the quarantine – what does Source B say about this particular point? The best candidates read the sources as a whole and ask themselves about, and look for, the overall point of view of the sources. In this case the sources have different views about who won the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

There were many good answers to this question. The best focused on the big message of the cartoon and interpreted this as one that is critical of the Kennedy because he was being hypocritical - he is annoyed by Soviet missiles in Cuba while the USA has far more missile bases around the world. The best answers about cartoons are always those ones where the candidate has inferred the attitude or the point of view of the cartoonist. This cartoon has plenty of sub-messages and most candidates were able to at least explain some of these. Sub-messages are valid but based on incomplete readings of sources e.g. The USA was stronger than the USSR or Kennedy was annoyed about Soviet missiles in Cuba.

Question 3

This question was answered well. An encouraging number of candidates explained that they were surprised by Source F because Kennedy appears to be prepared to remove the missiles from Turkey while in Source E he made no mention of this. These answers achieved higher marks. The best answers made this point but went further and evaluated Source F. Many raised the issue of the authorship of Source F and argued that Robert Kennedy was trying to make his brother look as reasonable as possible. Weaker answers wrote about Source F without using Source E or used the provenance of the sources to make assertions about bias without using the content of the sources.

Question 4

Source H was better understood than Source G. Some candidates thought the latter suggests that Kennedy and Khrushchev were doing their best to avert a crisis. However, many candidates did compare valid sub-messages from the two cartoons. Many explained that Source G shows them making the situation worse while Source H shows them trying to improve the situation, while others explained that both sources show a nuclear war was close. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that Source G is criticising Kennedy and Khrushchev, while Source H approves of them with the qualification that they were responsible for creating the problem in the first place. Weaker answers were based on the provenance of the sources without any interpretation of the messages of cartoons, or were based on good readings of the cartoons without any direct comparison.

Question 5

The best answers to this question were based on an understanding that evaluation is required when deciding about the usefulness of sources. Some candidates simply rejected the source because of its provenance. Many either accepted Source I for the information it contains, or rejected it because it fails to tell us much about what happened during the Crisis. The latter type of answer must give examples of events or developments not mentioned in the source. Vague assertions do not produce high marks. Better candidates carried out more valid evaluation and cross-referenced to other sources (usually Source A) to evaluate Source I, or explained how Source I is useful because it shows how the Kennedy version of events was established. It is important that candidates remember that biased sources can be useful.

Question 6

Many candidates scored high marks by providing clear and direct explanations of how some sources support the hypothesis that Kennedy acted responsibly, and how other sources disagree with the claim. The key to these answers was the quality of the explanation e.g. 'Source A supports the idea that Kennedy acted responsibly because it explains that he was careful to consider a wide range of options and finally used a quarantine rather than an air-strike. This was responsible because it did not escalate the crisis and gave the Soviets a way out.' Some candidates quoted, often relevantly, from sources but failed to use the quotations as a basis for explanations related to the question. It is not enough just to quote from sources. Other candidates grouped the sources and then made vague claims about each group but needed to make use of the actual content of the sources.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

General Comments and Key Messages

The best answers are those that directly answer the question. A concise but relevant answer will often outscore a lengthier but less focused response. Some candidates spend much time repeating what the sources say and so they lose sight of the question. For example, if a question is asking whether one source proves another wrong, then eventually there must be a conclusion about proof and not, say, on whether the two sources agree or disagree. A good idea is to start each answer with a sentence that refers specifically to the question – 'I think Source A does prove Source B wrong because….' – as it is then much harder to stray away from the proper question focus.

The 19th century option was chosen by a minority of candidates. Some candidates seemed unaware of the contextual relationships between the sources. For example, Sources F and G were rarely interpreted as responses to Lloyd George's Mansion House speech, despite the provenance of Source F including this information. This lack of contextual awareness made a considerable difference to the quality of the answers on several of the questions.

The 20th century option remains popular. Candidates experienced little difficulty in comprehending the sources and providing positive responses to the questions. However, interpreting the sources in context proved more of a challenge, with the messages of Sources F and G, in particular, sometimes being missed. Contextual knowledge on the Vietnam War was generally good, though the very frequent efforts to use My Lai or the Tet Offensive in the answers to several of the questions were often chronologically invalid.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th Century option

Question 1

Candidates appeared well prepared for questions that require the recognition of similarities and differences (or agreements and disagreements) between sources. The two sources on which this question was based offered some clear points on which valid comparisons could be made. Most candidates could spot at least one valid agreement, and many identified disagreements too. However, there were two factors which limited the quality of the answers. First, the tendency to repeat what the sources say, before moving on to making genuine comparisons between them. Only the direct matching of points of similarity and/or difference from the two sources will count as valid comparison. Summarising first one source is not required. The second factor was that candidates needed to compare the overall messages of the sources on the issue of who was to blame for the 1911 crisis. Source A clearly blamed the Germans, whilst Source B blamed the French. Appreciating the fact that the two sources had this overriding difference of opinion was clearly operating at a higher level of understanding than merely matching points of detail.

Question 2

The question explicitly mentioned the 'cartoonist' rather than just the cartoon, as a prompt to candidates to focus on what the artist was aiming to say to his audience. The nature of the cartoon, and particularly the fact that it was German, proved challenging to some candidates, but those candidates who dealt with issues of opinion, and not just with the interpretation of points of detail, showed the highest levels of understanding. The cartoon is obviously saying, for example, that Germany is powerful, or that Germany wants to intervene in Morocco – and saying these were the messages of the cartoon earned some reward - but did the cartoonist think Germany's intervention was a good or a bad thing? Arguments from candidates suggesting that the cartoonist wanted to express approval of Germany's actions seemed slightly less plausible than the idea that he was criticising them. The depiction of the Kaiser suggests lack of respect, and overall there is a sense of the disproportionate nature of the demonstration of German power. Using the source content in this

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

way, rather than simply assuming that a German cartoonist would naturally want to celebrate the use of force, was the most successful approach.

Question 3

Successfully explaining whether or not something in a source is surprising will almost always involve awareness of the historical context. There was an obvious surface difference between Sources D and E; in D Grey says Britain will not intervene, and in E Lloyd George says Britain will intervene. Most candidates were simply surprised by this difference, without explaining it in context. It was not strictly a matter of contextual knowledge being required, since Sources A and B had both dealt with the Mansion House speech, and made clear the point that between April 1911 (Grey's speech) and July (Lloyd George's speech) much had changed, most importantly Germany's intervention at Agadir. Using this information, the difference between Sources D and E should not have been a surprise.

Question 4

With regard to being able to explain what sources are saying, this question posed similar challenges to **Question 3**. In Source G the Kaiser is shown as being absolutely determined that his government must not respond strongly during the 1911 crisis without him being present in person to take control. The question asked how far the warlike speech made in the Reichstag (Source F) helped to explain his attitude in Source G. Crucially a judgment on this matter depended on what the candidate understood to be William's attitude – did he want peace or did he want war? This awareness could only come from one of the other sources or from contextual knowledge, since neither Source F nor Source G made it clear. Thus those candidates who understood what was going on in July 1911 had a major advantage – as was also the case in **Question 3**. Most candidates worked only with the content of Sources F and G, assuming that F did explain William's reaction as it talked about the possibility of war and so did Source G. Going outside these two sources to find material that would account for William's alarm, in relation to what he was aiming to achieve in 1911, was rarely done.

Question 5

When a question asks why something was done at a certain time, the answer must contain reasons. There were some candidates who focused only on interpreting the cartoon, without saying why it was published. Nonetheless, the cartoon was not hard to interpret and most candidates could use this to suggest that the cartoonist wanted to transmit certain messages to the audience. Suggesting that the cartoonist wanted to say that the Kaiser had made a mistake by underestimating the strength of the Entente was a popular response. Other approaches were also possible; the context alone could provide a reason – '…because of the Moroccan crisis' – as could the intended impact on the audience – '….to boost public support for the Entente'. The best answers put both the context and the intended impact into an explanation of why the cartoon was published at that particular time.

Question 6

Given the number of marks that **Question 6** always carries, it is important that candidates focus on the demands of the question and technique. For example, there will always be material in the sources that can be used both to support and to question the given hypothesis, and high marks will not be earned by answers that deal with only one side. It was surprising therefore that a number of responses answered on the basis that all of the sources showed that Germany was to blame for the 1911 crisis. Another vital aspect is that the source content must be used to show how the sources relate to the hypothesis – in this instance *'*Germany to blame - yes or no?*'* Candidates could simply work through all the sources in turn, applying the hypothesis to them, and selecting something from the source that illustrates how it points to Germany being to blame or not. A final point is that is that it is no use focusing on a different hypothesis – *'*Was Germany to blame for the First World War?*'* This is one question where a methodical, even mechanical, approach to the sources will pay dividends.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Option B: 20th Century Option

Question 1

Candidates appeared well prepared for questions that require the recognition of similarities and differences (or agreements and disagreements) between sources. The two sources on which this question was based offered some clear points on which valid comparisons could be made. Most candidates could spot at least one valid agreement, and many identified disagreements too. However, there were two factors which limited the quality of the answers. First, the tendency to repeat what the sources say, before moving on to making genuine comparisons between them. Only the direct matching of points of similarity and/or difference from the two sources will count as valid comparison. Summarising first one source, then the other, is not required. The second factor was that candidates needed to compare the overall messages of the sources, or the opinions of the authors about US involvement – in other words to find something to match in the two sources other than details. It was possible to discern disapproval of the US in both sources – in Source A the commitment to South Vietnam taking on 'validity aside from any rational basis it might once have had', and in Source B the USA's concern with its own 'exceptionalism', and being 'singled out by God for the salvation of the planet'. Appreciating the fact that the two sources had this overriding similarity of opinion was clearly operating at a higher level of understanding than just matching points of detail.

Question 2

When a question asks why something was done at a certain time, the answer must contain reasons. There were some candidates who focused only on interpreting the cartoon, without saying why it was published. Nonetheless, the cartoon was not hard to interpret and most candidates could use this to suggest that the cartoonist wanted to transmit certain messages to the audience. Suggesting that the cartoonist wanted to say that the Americans were being hypocritical in pretending to care for the human cost of the war was a popular response, though some missed this critical aspect and simply suggested that the cartoon was aiming to show people how much the war was costing. Other approaches were also possible; the context alone could provide a reason – '…because of the escalation of US bombing in 1965' – as could the intended impact on the audience – '….to encourage opposition to the Vietnam War'. The best answers put both the context and the intended impact into an explanation of why the cartoon was published at that particular time.

Question 3

Whether or not Source D could be seen as disproving Source E depended on two aspects. First, what candidates thought Source E was claiming and what Source D said about these claims, and second, given these claims, whether Source D could be seen as reliable refutation. The first aspect was, for many candidates not all that straightforward. In comparing the two sources, some apparent agreements existed – for example, they seemed to agree that the US was in Vietnam to defend the freedom of the South. Some candidates left it at this, concluding that D did not disprove E because it agreed with it. However, most candidates saw a deeper disagreement – that D was making claims about the nobility of US motivation which E rejected, saying that US involvement was essentially a matter of pride. The usual conclusion was that because of the disagreement, D proved E wrong. It was relatively rare, however, for Source E to be properly and fully understood. Fulbright was arguing not just that involvement was a matter of pride, but that the involvement was unnecessary and unworthy. There was, then, a sense in which Source D could not disprove E because it was an example of exactly what Fulbright was talking about – a somewhat paradoxical conclusion which nonetheless some candidates were able to argue. The second aspect was to test the reliability of Source D, and to explain the difference between the two sources in relation to Johnson's purpose in saying what he did. There were many successful evaluations of Johnson's words explaining why he would want to represent the struggle in Vietnam in this particular way at that particular time.

Question 4

This question was clearly found difficult by candidates, who generally could make little of the two cartoons. Both were misinterpreted in many ways. In Source F the soldiers were often communists, forcing the Vietnamese peasant to vote for them. In Source G communism was trying to take over the world and the US soldiers were struggling to prevent it. The misunderstandings undermined any attempted comparisons on whether or not the cartoonists would have agreed with each other. Nonetheless there were some successful answers from those candidates whose contextual understanding enabled them to discern valid messages in the cartoons. Some spotted the play on words used in Source F – the 'general' election – to suggest that US commitment to democracy was a sham. Others understood the irony used in Source G to illustrate US

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

paranoia about communism. Ultimately the cartoonists would have agreed because both were critical of US involvement in Vietnam, and a reasonable number of candidates worked their way through to this conclusion.

Question 5

This question was answered well by most candidates. The source offered a straightforward reason for being surprised – Johnson writing secretly to Ho Chi Minh asking for peace at a time when the US was still publicly committed to fighting. The quality for the explanation offered for being surprised (or not) was what mattered. At its weakest the explanation might be generalised and unspecific – 'Yes, I am surprised. He's asking for peace and I thought he wanted to win the war' – but better answers were often detailed, using both contextual knowledge of the war by 1967, and/or cross-references to other sources on the paper. The best answers could provide this quality of explanation, but to explain both why they were surprised and not surprised.

Question 6

Given the number of marks that **Question 6** always carries, it is important that candidates focus on the demands of the question and technique. For example, there will always be material in the sources that can be used both to support and to question the given hypothesis, and high marks will not be earned by answers that deal with only one side. It was surprising however that a number of responses answered on the basis that all of the sources showed that US involvement in Vietnam was to save the South from communism. Another vital aspect is that the source content must be used to show how the sources relate to the hypothesis – in this instance 'Was it to save South Vietnam from communism – yes or no?' Candidates could simply work through all the sources in turn, applying the hypothesis to them, and selecting something from the source that illustrates how it points to communism being the motive or not. A final point is that is that it is no use focusing on a different hypothesis – 'Was the USA successful in Vietnam?' This is one question where a methodical, even mechanical, approach to the sources will pay dividends.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

General Comments and Key Messages

As usual most candidates answered questions on the 20th Century option but there were a higher number of candidates answering on the 19th Century option. There was little difference in the standard of the two sets of answers. The overall standard was high with many candidates able to interpret the sources, make inferences from them and carry out appropriate evaluation.

A minority of candidates managed to write a lot without addressing the questions directly. It is important that candidates answer the question set. Failure to do so is often the result of candidates writing their answers before they have fully thought through what their answer is going to be. The better candidates plan their answers first so that when they start writing they can state what their answer is in the first sentence e.g. 'I am surprised by this source because...' or 'These two cartoonists would have disagreed because...' they then use the rest of their answers to support these opening statements.

To achieve high marks it is necessary to read sources, whether written or pictorial, as a whole. Candidates should always try and go beyond details and ask themselves 'What is the point of view of this author or artist?'

The best candidates understand what different questions are asking them to do. For example, if a question begins 'Why was this source published in?' they know that they need to explain the message of the source, its purpose and the context in which it was published. If a question contains a word such as 'prove', 'useful', 'trust' or 'reliable' then it is likely that evaluation of the source(s) is necessary e.g. **Question 4** in both 19th Century and 20th Century options.

Finally, it is important that candidates understand exactly what they are being asked to do in **Question 6**. This question always asks whether the sources in the paper support a hypothesis. This means that answers must be about the sources, and each source should be used individually. Vague statements should not be made about groups of sources, and the sources should certainly not be ignored.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th Century option

Question 1

A good number of candidates were reading the sources as whole and comparing their big messages. Both sources suggest that the First World War started in 1914 because the system that had preserved peace until then broke down. Less successful answers compared details e.g. both sources claim that the Schlieffen Plan contributed to the start of war and that neither side wanted war, or Source A claims that an increase in armaments helped peace while Source B claims that it increased the chances of war. Weaker candidates summarised both sources without making any proper comparison.

Question 2

As with the written sources in **Question 1**, these cartoons also need to be read as a whole. Both cartoonists have a point of view and these need to be explained and compared for high marks. The cartoonist in Source C clearly disapproves of the growth of the German navy while the cartoonist in Source D approves of the German navy or disapproves of British attitudes towards the navy. Most candidates understood Source D but some struggled with Source C. A good number of candidates, however, were able to compare valid sub-messages.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 3

Most candidates rightly focused on the issue of secrecy and produced a range of answers. Some wrote general answers stating that it is never a good idea to tell your enemy when you are going to attack. A good number of candidates used their contextual knowledge to explain either no surprise that they wanted to keep this from Russia in particular or, surprise because everyone knew that Germany would support Austria. Less good answers ignored either the secrecy issue or the need to state whether they were surprised or not. When a question asks candidates if they are surprised, they must give a clear response.

Question 4

Most answers compared what the sources said and then stated that Source G does prove that Source F is wrong. To go further than this, evaluation of one, or both, of the sources is needed. There is plenty of scope to evaluate both of these sources, either by considering their purpose or by cross-referencing to other sources, which the better candidates did.

Question 5

This question was answered well with most candidates able to explain that Bethmann Hollweg was trying to place blame for the war on Britain. The best candidates went beyond and made valid suggestions about purpose e.g. to bolster the morale of the German people or to justify his, or Germany's actions, in the years leading up to the war.

Question 6

There were many good answers to this question with candidates explaining first how some sources support the hypothesis that Germany was responsible for causing the First World War, and then explaining how other sources disagree with this view. The crucial aspect of these answers was that sources were used individually with clear explanations about each one e.g. 'Source F disagrees with this statement because it blames Britain for the war. It claims that if Britain had made its support for France and Russia clear from the beginning this would have deterred Germany from supporting Austria, thus making war much less likely.' Some candidates grouped the sources and made some general comments about the group rather than focusing on each source in its own right.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

Candidates did well in finding and explaining similarities between the two sources e.g. the Communists made mistakes, Tet was a surprise, Tet had a bad impact on the American public, the US underestimated the enemy. There are fewer differences and some candidates found it harder to find these e.g. A says Tet continued a trend but B says it was a tipping point. The better answers were those where candidates had clearly gone through the sources annotating and compared them point-by-point. Only when they knew what their answer was did they put pen to paper. Less good answers summarised both sources and only after doing this attempted a comparison. These were more likely to be vague and general and lacked the point-by-point approach of the better answers.

Question 2

This question produced many good answers but few of these obtained the very highest marks. Most candidates understood that Source C is criticising American methods in Vietnam. There were some excellent explanations of how the cartoon does this. However, few candidates went on and considered the possible purpose of the source i.e. its intended impact on the audience. This is essential for high marks in this type of question. Weaker answers tended to concentrate on the context without exploring the message of the cartoon.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 3

There were many good answers to this question. They explained whether they were surprised or not by cross referencing to other sources or to specific contextual knowledge e.g. the use of napalm in Source C makes us not surprised by the description in Source D. Some explained they were surprised because the soldier is willing to admit he was involved in the kind of behaviour described in the source, while others said they were not surprised that this account was written and published at this time because of the growing anti-war movement in the USA. Weaker answers tended to be based on everyday empathy e.g. 'I am surprised that they would do such dreadful things' or wrote perfectly good analyses of the source without saying whether they were surprised or not. It is crucial with this type of question that candidates make clear whether they are surprised or not. Ideally, they should have thought through their answer before they start writing. They can then begin their answer with a clear statement about whether they are surprised or not. The rest of the answer can then be used to support this opening statement.

Question 4

This question was also answered well with many candidates able to both compare and evaluate the sources. The evaluation was often done with some good discussion of the possible purpose of one or both of the sources. Weaker answers tended to refer to the provenance of the sources but were unable to do more than make assertions about reliability.

Question 5

A good number of candidates read the cartoon as a whole and were able to work out the point of view of the cartoonist. They realised that he is criticising Vietnamisation or suggesting that it is not working. Weaker answers tended to give a sub-message of the cartoon e.g. the US was trying to use a policy of Vietnamisation. A number of candidates did not know what Vietnamisation was and this lack of contextual knowledge led to a failure to interpret the cartoon in a valid way.

Question 6

The better answers carefully explained how some sources support the hypothesis that America lost because it failed to win the support of the South Vietnamese people, and how other sources disagree with it. This was done well because the candidates analysed one source at a time and provided clear explanations focused on the question e.g. 'Source E disagrees with the statement because it claims that America lost, not because it did not win over the South Vietnamese people, but because the Americans failed to bomb Laos, Cambodia and North Vietnam. It claims that this bombing would have “broken” the enemy.'
Less good answers grouped the sources and then made some very general statements about the groups without using the content of individual sources. A number of candidates did not use the sources and wrote what amounted to an essay about why the US lost in Vietnam. This is not what the question asked candidates to do.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

The overall quality of the work is very impressive. The moderation of coursework proceeded very smoothly. Nearly all centres submitted the correct sample of candidates' work and also included mark schemes, sources and helpful information about the conditions under which the work was completed. Most of the marking was accurate and although the moderator did make some changes to marks, these were usually very modest. The detailed annotation of much of the work explaining why certain levels and marks were awarded was accurate and very helpful. Most centres still use the Board-approved assignments from CIE, however, many of the most interesting and effective assignments were those constructed by the centres themselves.

Assignment 1

More centres are moving to an essay approach for this assignment. This usually worked well and allowed many of the candidates a real opportunity to show what they could do. The best answers were those that stated their answer to the question early on and then spent the rest of the response supporting it. These answers contained supported argument, made every paragraph count and were free from irrelevant description and narrative. Candidates should be encouraged to directly address the question in every part of the answer. Many of the questions involved candidates, in one way or another, having to compare the importance of two factors. The best work compared their importance all the way through rather than leaving any comparisons to the conclusion.

It should be remembered that complexity of analysis is required for high marks. This will involve skills such as comparing relative importance, good causal explanation and using concepts such as short and long term causes, triggers and preconditions.

Assignment 2

The best assignments allowed candidates to show a range of source skills e.g. interpretation, making inferences from, evaluating and using historical sources. Good assignments will be comprised of a range of about six or seven different types of sources, with between 4 and 6 questions. This ensures that a range of skills will be tested. Candidate performance was often high with many taking full advantage of the opportunity that coursework provides to write developed and thoughtful analyses of the sources.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

Candidates should answer source-based questions with source-based answers. Further, it is urged that, in knowledge-based questions, candidates respond to the prompts in the questions. Where description is required the answer should be descriptive; where the prompt in the question is 'Why?' candidates should explain with reasons supported by relevant detail.

General Comments

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945, was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941, and then Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941. There were few attempts at any other Depth Studies so that it is not possible to make relevant and helpful comments from the evidence that was seen.

Most scripts were clearly written and well set out. There was little evidence of candidates facing serious time issues. However, candidates need to consider deployment of time carefully, as there were some long answers for low tariff questions, which did not leave sufficient time to deal adequately with **Question (b) (iv)**. This question has the highest mark tariff in the whole paper and it is essential that candidates leave time to deliver a two-sided argument, supported by relevant detail, and come to a reasoned conclusion.

It is important to candidates that they show where, within the source, they have found evidence to support any valid inferences in answers to **Question (a) (i)**. The same technique should be employed in answers to **Question (a) (ii)** where evidence should be quoted in support of both sides of the argument. Many answers to **Question (a) (iii)** describe the general area of a source e.g. 'Source B tells us about all the people who benefited from Nazi rule'. Another group of answers spent much time speculating about the provenance of both sources. The dates and writers of the sources preoccupy many candidates and answers like 'Source B is from a British historian writing in 1986 so he will have had time to thoroughly research' would not attract high marks. In order to evaluate thoroughly, candidates must deal with the provenance and argue why their assertions about the source, by tone, date, motive etc. are important, and then show how these factors impact upon the source's reliability. There were several examples of 'The sources are saying the same things' but the similar things needed to be quoted. Assertions needed to be fully explored to complete an evaluation.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945

Question (a)

(i) Most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from the cartoon in Source A. Those candidates that did not draw valid inferences described the content of the cartoon. Most said the Nazis were militaristic, strict, based on discipline. Candidates often believed that any character's placement on the platform signified his place in the Nazi pecking order. The very best answers described the 'irony' or 'the cartoonist's sarcasm' in Hitler claiming to have delivered 'honour and freedom to the German people' when the figures, bound and gagged, under the platform proved the exact opposite had happened. One comment of caution should be made at this point. Some candidates are so keen to show their knowledge or are so interested in the source that they write long paragraphs of relevant contextual knowledge. While contextual knowledge is always welcome it cannot replace references to the source in source based questions. Extra time used at this juncture often limits the time for questions later in the paper.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(ii) Most candidates were able to find evidence in Source B to show that there were groups that benefited as well as those that did not. However, some candidates could only find evidence of groups that benefited. The very best answers saw candidates noting that the Nazis paid lip service to the German people's opinions by holding plebiscites after events had taken place. There were examples of succinct argument.

(iii) A few candidates wrote about the general areas of each source. Also, some candidates speculated that as the cartoonist was American and the author of Source B was British, they were both against Hitler and the Nazis because they had fought against the Germans in World War One. Other candidates compared and contrasted elements of the content of both sources. Some even saw that both sources had similar elements but needed to explore or identify them further. However, the fact that both sources mention 'trade unions' and both show a lack of democratic interest – the bodies under the platform and the after the event plebiscites – could have provided fertile ground for an evaluation by cross reference.

Question (b)

(i) Most candidates understood what the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 were and scored well. However, many guessed that they were either how Germans had to behave at rallies or that Hitler wrote rules so he must be obeyed.

(ii) The events of Kristallnacht were well known and fully described with many candidates scoring well. Candidates were often keen to display their knowledge.

(iii) Some candidates knew well why the Nazis adopted the Final solution and they gave good reasons for it. These ranged from Hitler's antipathy towards the Jews, the general acceptance by most Germans that the Jewish race was inferior, the ever growing numbers of Jews in conquered lands, to a need to destroy the evidence when the war began to turn against Germany. However, some candidates did not recognise the policy and offered answers about total war and acceptance of Nazi rule.

(iv) Candidates used a variety of methods to answer this question. Those with knowledge chose to answer by showing that life did not change at the start of the war but it definitely changed by the end. All of this was supported by relevant detail. Another method was to contrast pre-war (beginning of the war) life in Germany to how it was perceived at the end. In the best answers candidates argued it was a progression from normality and victory to disastrous defeat. Answers which needed development were often very short and contained very little relevant detail. These answers merely asserted that life was good at the start of the war and life was bad at the end of the war.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Question (a)

(i) Candidates were easily able to draw valid inferences from Source A that collectivisation was unpopular among the peasants who felt that, as their animals would be no longer their own property under the new system, they may as well eat them. Candidates scored well on this question.

(ii) Many candidates were able to support both sides of the argument with evidence from Source B. They saw the short term tragedies of famine and loss of life was more than compensated by the increase in production and the transformation of the countryside. There were examples of one sided answers. Candidates must appreciate that **Questions (a) (ii)** will always have evidence to support more than one side of the argument.

(iii) As with other Depth Studies, some candidates dealt with this question by defining the general area of information e.g. 'Both of these sources tell us about conditions during collectivisation'. Another group considered how much the communist author might have forgotten by 1935 or how 'he had personal knowledge' and so must be reliable, while others speculated on how 'the English historian would have had plenty of time to research collectivisation'. Most candidates compared and contrasted the content of both sources.

Question (b)

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(i) Candidates were able to offer groups that were purged by Stalin, some giving lists of names of the Old Guard members. However, some were not able to specify the required groups and wrote that he purged 'Anyone he hated'.

(ii) Stalin's Cult of Personality was far better known with candidates performing well with tales of his God-like status, his father figure or avuncular warmth, street names, towns and cities, pictures, statues and art in his image. All these areas were supported by the Soviet propaganda machine. There were some full and high scoring answers to this question.

(iii) Most candidates appreciated the narrower reasons for the introduction of collectivisation in Stalin's need to rid the state of the kulaks and to remove the more capitalist New Economic Policy introduced by Lenin after the 1921 famine. Other candidates linked the introduction to the changes in industry and the transfer of some of the peasant population to cities, the need to increase grain production to feed the industrial workers and the need to sell surplus grain to buy in Western technology. There were some impressively detailed answers showing understanding and command of the subject matter.

(iv) Candidates were often able to list all kinds of practices used in Stalinist USSR to generate fear and foreboding in workers and members of the Soviet society. These aspects were well known and described in detail in many cases. Some candidates described other factors in the changes that Stalin made in both areas of agriculture and industry ranging from sheer enthusiasm and support for the communist system, to rewards, and a general support as areas like education, health and the position of women etc. had changed for the better. There were some very lengthy and well-argued answers. Some single, short paragraph answers suggest some candidates are struggling with either time management and/or lack of knowledge.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Question (a)

(i) Candidates were clearly able to draw valid inferences for Source A and support them with references to the text. The source provided evidence of the depth of unemployment and that charitable funds were unable to meet the demands and needs of the unemployed at that time. Source A was clearly a text that touched a number of candidates.

(ii) Source B contained sufficient information for many candidates to argue that, although banks were affected badly by the Great Depression, there were other individuals and companies that suffered greatly as well. There was a minority of candidates which offered one sided arguments that the source only showed that bankers had been affected. These candidates had missed the references to 'food prices', 'businesses', 'customers' etc.

(iii) A few candidates wrote that both sources were about the economic problems of the Great Depression without expanding further. Others wondered how much the plumber in Source A would have forgotten by 1968, or how full a research would have been conducted by the American writer of Source B. Many contrasted and compared the content of the sources, and this might have been a fruitful area to establish a full evaluation. Both sources showed little by way of state intervention with charities unable to support so many unemployed and the Secretary of the Treasury thinking no intervention was needed as 'the economy would right itself'.

Question (b)

(i) Most candidates scored well on this question and were able to identify Hoovervilles and put them in a context.

(ii) Candidates often made reference to the reduction of taxes and the introduction of tariffs when describing two policies introduced by Hoover to deal with America's economic problems. Some went further and mentioned 'dams' and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Some others listed some of Roosevelt's Alphabet Agencies and other measures of the New Deal.

(iii) Candidates often answered this question by explaining how Hoover lost the election rather than how Roosevelt won it. Others had a good balance between the two men – Hoover's failures, Republican laissez-faire, 'a do nothing president', 'too little to late' against Roosevelt's record as

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

governor of New York, his promises and his dynamic campaign. Many made the issue of the treatment of the Bonus Marchers the crucial issue of the campaign.

(iv) Some candidates struggled with this question, as they could not tease out the stock market crash from other areas of the American economic system to decide whether the crash was the most important cause of the Great Depression. Those with good detail and knowledge of the crash often asserted that it was the main cause but others offered a more balanced answer. They felt the crash was just one of many causes and used source material and their own knowledge to cite other issues like over production, poor distribution of wealth, lack of controls on the economy and investment. The fully balanced answers were both impressive and well argued.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

Candidates should answer source-based questions with source-based answers. Further, it is urged that, in knowledge-based questions, candidates respond to the prompts in the questions. Where description is required the answer should be descriptive; where the prompt in the question is 'Why?' candidates should explain with reasons supported by relevant detail.

General Comments

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945, was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941, and then Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941. There were few attempts at any other Depth Studies so that it is not possible to make relevant and helpful comments from the evidence that was seen.

Most scripts were clearly written and well set out. There was little evidence of candidates facing serious time issues. There were occasions when candidates had not deployed their time sufficiently well to allow them to respond to **Question (b) (iv)** adequately. This question has the highest mark tariff in the whole paper and it is essential that candidates leave time to deliver a two-sided argument, supported by relevant detail, and to come to a reasoned conclusion.

It is important to candidates that they show where, within the source, they have found evidence to support any valid inferences in answers to **Question (a) (i)**. The same technique should also be employed in answers to **Question (a) (ii)** where evidence should be quoted in support of both sides of the argument. Many answers to **Question (a) (iii)** describe the general area of a source e.g. 'Source A tells us what the SA looked like, sounded like' etc. Another group of answers spent much time speculating about the provenance. The dates and the writer preoccupy many candidates and answers like 'It is 1939 and he is making a speech so it would be reliable' would not attract high marks. In order to evaluate thoroughly, candidates must deal with the provenance and argue why their assertions about the source, by tone, date, motive etc. are important, and then show how these factors impact upon the source's reliability. There were several examples of 'The sources are saying very similar things', but the similar things needed to be quoted. Assertions needed to be fully explored to complete an evaluation.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945

Question (a)

(i) Candidates were easily able to draw valid inferences from Source A, verses from the Horst Wessel song, and also used the information in the attribution, to show that the SA was militaristic, anti-communist, uniformed, loyal etc. Candidates quoted the source liberally in their answers to this question which they did not do quite so often in their answers to the other source-based questions.

(ii) Most candidates were able to find evidence in Source B to support and counter the argument that it was economic factors that helped the Nazis win support in the 1930 election. Evidence about inflation, swindlers and international banks, foreign competition and taxes was countered with evidence of a change of attitude to defence and foreign policy, and emphasis on national pride. A few candidates only found evidence of economic factors.

(iii) Answers to this question showed the whole range of abilities and techniques. There were weaker responses limited to writing what the source 'tells about' the Nazis, from incomplete evaluations to

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

comparisons of the source content. There were others who saw that both sources were Nazi in origin, recognising that Source A was 'sung at Nazi parades and part of the national anthem' and that Source B was part of the Nazi election manifesto for the 1930 election. They quoted the strong tone and language of both, 'bold and determined steps' 'slavery will last a short time longer', from Source A and showed similar language and tone in Source B, 'thieves and traitors to justice', corrupt parasites' etc. The candidates knew of the aggressive nature of the Nazis, stated that both the sources were aggressive, used contextual knowledge of some other Nazi aggression, and asserted that they were both typical Nazi instruments and would be aggressive and exaggerations of the truth. While evaluations could be more developed, the argument was clear and the significance understood.

Question (b)

(i) Most candidates were able to name at least one party other than the Nazis in the Reichstag in the early 1930s.

(ii) This question about Bruning's policies between 1930 and 1932 produced varied responses. Most candidates did know that he lacked support in the Reichstag and relied on Hindenburg's support. These tended to describe Bruning's problems rather than his policies. However, there were a good number who mentioned cuts of benefits and wages, increases in both direct and indirect taxation and the giving of land to the rural unemployed.

(iii) It is important that candidates recognise the date restrictions in the question. Hence, some commented on events prior to 1930 and after 1933. Nevertheless, many were able to tell the story of events between the two dates, with some giving good reasons supported by detail.

(iv) The same recognition of date restriction is also relevant in this question, as some candidates wrote about events outside the question's focus. However, many candidates were able to offer an argument which balanced 'threats and violence' against other factors which carried Hitler from Chancellor to Fuhrer between January 1933 and August 1934.

<u>Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941</u>

Question (a)

(i) Candidates were able to draw inferences about the strict and brutal repression shown by the Bolshevik regime in 1918. These were supported by evidence from the source. Most candidates achieved good marks. A few felt compelled to explain the 'the Bolsheviks had to be strict' to maintain themselves in power.

(ii) The majority of candidates found that there was a balance of evidence about the benefits brought to the people of Russia. They countered the problems caused by the Civil War and the disruption of economic life caused by the First World War with the genuine delight of the peasants and workers at the passing of the tsarist regime. Some candidates found evidence only to support one side of the argument while others embellished their answer with contextual knowledge. Contextual knowledge is always welcome as long as it is not used as a substitute for source detail.

(iii) There were similar types of response as those described in the same question for the German Depth Study. There were some incomplete evaluations, concentrating on the fact that both sources had a British provenance, but with little or no consequential argument. Some mentioned that both sources showed strict and harsh conditions and disruption to everyday life but did not progress further with the argument to complete the evaluation.

Question (b)

(i) Many of the candidates were able to name one of the White commanders during the Russian Civil War. Others struggled to respond to this question.

(ii) Almost all candidates recognised the term 'Red Terror' and were able to describe in outline the impact and ferocity of the actions. Some candidates offered accurate and graphic detail. These candidates achieved good marks and had command of the subject.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(iii) Again, with this question, candidates understood why the peasants disliked War Communism and offered much detail of the confiscation of grain in their explanations. Quite clearly, this policy had an impact on the candidates during their studies.

(iv) Candidates recognised the contribution of Trotsky to the success of the Bolshevik Revolution during the period 1917-21. There were comments on the planning and leadership of Trotsky during the Petrograd uprising, his contribution to the negotiations for the Brest-Litovsk treaty, his leadership during the Civil War. Some candidates wrote one-sided answers but better answers not only mentioned Trotsky's contribution to quelling the Kronstadt rising but also balanced this by discussing the contributions of other Bolsheviks, especially Lenin's contribution. Other aspects mentioned in balanced answers were the lack of unity and purpose of the White commanders, the control of transport and industry by the Bolsheviks and even the foreign armies' interference which gave the Bolsheviks the moral high ground. They were fighting for Mother Russia while the Whites were fighting with foreigners. There were high quality answers to this question.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Question (a)

(i) Candidates were easily able to draw valid inferences from Source A about Coolidge's and the government's philosophy regarding the economy. Some candidates made valid points and asked questions about the philosophy of not taxing the rich, pointing out that if the wealthy were not to be taxed, the poor could not make up the shortfall in government income. However, most candidates adhered to the set question and scored well, with many valid and supported inferences.

(ii) This question was often answered with a balance of evidence about the strength of the American economy supported by details from the source regarding the new products, the security of the economy, the investors and the factories working at full speed. This success and strength was countered by the evidence in the source of unemployment being at six per cent. Candidates often commented on the 'ironical' tone in the statement 'who cared about a little unemployment?' Also, comments about American economists' complacency were made. The content of this source had caught the imagination of many candidates.

(iii) Having commented on the complacency of American economists in answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, it was surprising that more candidates did not use this in answers to this question where comments on the complacency shown in both sources could have led candidates to complete a full evaluation. This was only done successfully by some candidates. Most candidates compared and contrasted the content of both sources. Again, there were comments about the provenance and dates of the two sources which led to incomplete evaluations, while other candidates offered generalisations that the two sources were 'about taxation and the economy'.

Question (b)

(i) Most candidates were able gain marks when defining hire purchase, although some of the definitions showed confusion between 'hire purchase' and 'buying on the margin'.

(ii) Candidates also performed well in descriptions of changes in the entertainment industry in the 1920s with film, sports and radios often mentioned, along with a variety of film stars and sports stars. These were all very impressive. Some answers could have been improved further by spending less time on trying to explain why the changes had taken place.

(iii) There was also good knowledge shown of the rapid expansion of the car industry, with Ford most mentioned among the manufacturers. Many candidates demonstrated shrewd judgement and logical reasoning in explaining the change and its speed. Some candidates need to recognise the prompt word in the question to improve further, as they offered more descriptive answers.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(iv) There was a wide range of quality in the answers to this question about agricultural workers benefiting least from the prosperity of the 1920s. Some wrote briefly that rural communities in general did not benefit, whereas city dwellers did benefit. Also seen were some impressively detailed and argued answers which contended that a variety of agricultural workers failed to benefit from the prosperity but they were not alone. Candidates listed and explained the failure of Native Americans, black Americans and immigrants to benefit. Various contexts for each group were given. Others argued and defined the context of agricultural workers against the many groups that benefited.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

Candidates should answer source-based questions with source-based answers. Further, it is urged that, in knowledge-based questions, candidates respond to the prompts in the questions. Where description is required the answer should be descriptive; where the prompt in the question is 'Why?' candidates should explain with reasons supported by relevant detail.

General Comments

Depth Study A: (Germany, 1918-1945) was the most popular choice whilst Depth Study B: (Russia, 1905-1941), Depth Study C: (USA, 1919-1941) and Depth Study F: (Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994) were almost equally popular alternative topics chosen by candidates in this session. There were few attempts at the other Depth Studies so that it is not possible to make relevant and helpful comments from the evidence that was seen.

Scripts were well presented, legible and written in excellent English. Candidates appeared to have allocated their time wisely in relation to the number of questions and their marks. Some very secure historical knowledge was displayed in **Section B** answers and the majority of candidates tackled **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)** in line with the criteria. However, **Question (a)(iii)** was not addressed as effectively and many candidates restricted their award for generalisations on reliability.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Question (a)

(i) All candidates made valid inferences from Source A about the Ruhr in 1923 having been invaded and its economic importance to Germany. Almost all were supported with specific detail from the source and thus achieved well. It was not necessary to supplement this with a wealth of own knowledge on the Treaty of Versailles, as a few candidates did, at the expense of developing later answers.

(ii) Most responses focused securely on how far the Versailles settlement could be said not to have weakened Germany in the view presented in Source B, as it had not lost its industrial heartlands and was choosing not to pay its debts. Many candidates ensured a balanced response by appreciating that 'some of the wealth' had been transferred to France. They recognised that the author had only a 'suspicion' that Germany could not meet the bill as indicating weaknesses and that its politicians fear of imposing taxation gave further evidence of this. The creation of inflation was not as often considered as a factor of weakness.

(iii) There were many responses to this question that made the problems of Germany the explicit focus and made an informed choice on the sources' utility based on their content. Very few made any cross-reference between the sources on the role of France and the Ruhr as significant problems or supported comment on reliability. Those candidates who had disputed the view of the French politician in their answers to **Question (b)(ii)** could so easily have deployed these points to effect in this answer instead, if supported with specific reference to the language and content of both sources.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question (b)

(i) That the November Criminals were the politicians associated with the end of the war, and so named by those resentful of its settlement as a 'stab in the back', were known by many candidates. Only a small number of candidates appreciated that it was, specifically, the Armistice that was agreed in November and not the Treaty of Versailles of the following summer although they are clearly linked.

(ii) Many candidates displayed sound knowledge of the Kapp Putsch's participants and its ending to perform well in their answers. In some cases, the Kapp Putsch was confused with either the Spartacist Revolt or the Munich Putsch.

(iii) Most responses developed a good range of reasons for the importance of the Dawes Plan for the German economy and the resolution of hyperinflation, if fewer considered its effect on the occupation of the Ruhr and foreign affairs. A small number of candidates chose instead to describe the situation before the Dawes Plan.

(iv) The violence of internal political opponents of the Weimar government was considered and supported by most candidates as a major difficulty in the period and a number added the confrontations in the Ruhr occupation as further evidence in agreement with the statement. The range of other problems, such as negotiation of the peace settlement, those inherent in the Constitution and hyperinflation, were less securely considered, which led to answers tending to be unbalanced.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Question (a)

(i) Most candidates were able to draw and support valid inferences on the impact of the Great Terror on the gulag system. Some answers could be improved if candidates avoided simply quoting the source.

(ii) Almost all candidates saw the balance in this source and some went beyond just quotation to explain why Stalin was Lenin's candidate in the use of terror and then surpassed his master by extending it to fellow communists and the kulaks.

(iii) **G**ood responses to this question concentrated on the broader focus of 'evidence about the Soviet Union' whilst weaker answers repeated points made in earlier answers. Although some answers did consider the inhumane conditions of the gulags as possibly indicative and the violence shown in Source B as a significant factor, some candidates could have benefitted by cross-referencing the sources or commenting on the length of time covered by them.

Question (b)

(i) Many candidates saw Vyshinsky as the judge in the show trials rather than the Chief Prosecutor but most did appreciate that he ranted at the accused.

(ii) Most were on more secure ground in describing how a show trial was conducted and its predictable outcome. Some well-developed answers were seen.

(iii) All answers indicated Stalin's determination to impose his will on Russia as a major reason for the purges and there were some which indicated further more specific reasons, such as his targeting of Zinoviev and Kamenev, the response to the killing of Kirov and 'terrorism' even by NKVD and army officers. Some answers would have benefited by focusing precisely on the purges.

(iv) Many balanced responses were seen and some candidates deployed sound detail on industrialisation and other policies in support of their evaluation of Stalin's contribution. Less effective answers made generalisations without appreciation of the need to consider what other developments there were or the terminal date of 1939.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Question (a)

(i) There were many excellent answers to this question in which candidates supported a number of inferences from the source, including the point of the provenance indicating that it was a very lucrative trade. A small number of candidates did not fare as well as they neglected to focus on the source's content and chose to write all their knowledge of Prohibition or Al Capone.

(ii) All candidates were secure in agreeing that there was strong opposition to Prohibition from immigrant communities and the upper-class who simply ignored the ban. A small number pointed to the major gangsters' rivalries and control of the trade, displaying their enthusiasm for Prohibition as it increased their wealth through speakeasies, bootlegging and illegal distilleries.

(iii) Many sound responses made good use of the sources' content to focus on the effects of Prohibition. This could have been extended to make cross-references between the sources on, for example, the effects on criminals and their involvement in bootlegging or the agreement on the limited effects on 'the best people'. It was pleasing to see that on this topic fewer candidates restricted their answers to generalities on reliability.

Question (b)

(i) Some candidates were able to identify the temperance movement as those who had campaigned for Prohibition, such as the Anti-Saloon League, and who upheld it enthusiastically in a number of rural states. On the other hand a substantial number of candidates claimed that it campaigned against Prohibition.

(ii) There were some full answers to this question which achieved well as they considered the specific measures taken by the government, such as the Customs Agents and border controls, the setting up of the Prohibition Bureau and the actions of its Agents. Others were less secure, and could have been improved by considering prosecution and imprisonment as means of enforcement.

(iii) All candidates appreciated that the sheer scale of avoidance was a factor leading to the repeal of Prohibition. Many good answers also went on to develop other reasons, such as the insufficient funding for enforcement and that legalising alcohol could increase tax revenue and create jobs, together with the importance of Roosevelt's campaign promises.

(iv) The Roaring Twenties, providing many Americans with progress through the development of the automobile industry and the labour-saving devices which became available, were considered by all candidates. Some went on to detail other aspects of progress such as votes for women, new entertainment and the new wealth available to some through investment and job opportunities.

The majority of candidates developed some balance by contrasting this with others who did not fare as well such as farmers, black Americans, immigrants and the working class whose wages, in the main, did not develop in line with company profits, whilst their trade unions were restricted. Interestingly, responses tended to be more assured on the details of these aspects in disagreeing with the proposition than those in support but there were many excellent arguments.

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

Question (a)

(i) All candidates were able to draw sound inferences from the source on the differing initial plans of the Syrians and Egyptians with the negotiations leading to a compromise. Some candidates needed to support this with specific detail from the source to improve further.

(ii) Most candidates saw the balance in this source on the strengths and flaws in the Israelis' ability to resist attacks. A number of excellent answers went beyond mere quotation to explain why military preparation and intelligence were so significant. The best ones appreciated that time to mobilise the reservists was a major factor if they were to strengthen the small standing army.

(iii) There were some good answers which assessed the value of the content of the two sources in light of the candidates' own knowledge to reach a sound judgment. Many candidates, however, offered

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

generalisations on reliability, in this case such as 'A British military historian would have the benefit of hindsight whilst the Israeli President is biased'. Without specific support from the sources this limited the marks available, no matter how long the answers. Evaluation of the content of the sources is essential to gain higher level marks.

Question (b)

(i) Almost all candidates knew that Sadat was the leader of Egypt but only some were aware that Assad was the Syrian leader.

(ii) The majority of candidates were able to give some description of the actions of the Black September Movement at the 1972 Olympics and the best answers offered accurate detail.

(iii) The reasons for both Israel and Egypt's desire for peace, as a result of their changing military fortunes, as well as the influence of America and the USSR, were considered by almost all candidates, many of whom developed these with commendable detail to ensure good marks. Syria's concern, the importance of oil and the United Nations' role were less frequently considered as important factors but, on the whole, this was the best answered part on ***section (b)***.

(iv) In this answer, some candidates tended to repeat the material considered in answer to **Question (b)(iii)**. Relevant though this was, further aspects did need to be developed across a wider time period to reach an evaluative conclusion on the issue of the possibility of a permanent peace settlement. Candidates needed more than brief assertion or speculation to achieve good marks. This was attained however by those candidates who gave evidence of the tensions which continued between Israel, Syria and other Middle Eastern states as well as the unresolved Palestinian issue.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2013