eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are focused and relevant. It is important that candidates note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly; sometimes candidates write about the topic the question at considerable length and in great detail, but without any focus on the question. It is also important that dates given in a question are duly noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

In **part (c)** questions the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond restating what has already been stated in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important', 'how successful' or 'to what extent', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

A number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the question set. **Parts (b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions; they then needed to develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers to these questions. Candidates need to ensure that they then use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make. Candidates do need to focus carefully upon the question set; in some instances candidates wrote in considerable depth about the main topic of the question, but would have improved their responses with a clear focus on the actual question.

There were a few rubric errors; some candidates answered fewer than the required number of questions, and some answered three part questions, rather than the required three questions, each with three parts. A few candidates answered more than the required two Core Content questions and more than the required one Depth Study question. On the whole candidates used the time allocated effectively, with the majority completing the paper. A small number of candidates wrote extended answers to a **part (a)** question; this is not required and clearly impacted upon the time then available to answer the remaining questions on the paper.

Comments on specific questions

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Section A: Core Content

Question 1

(a) There were some effective answers to this question, with candidates stating four discrete and relevant points. These were usually focused upon the uprising against the Pope and his subsequent flight from Rome, Mazzini and the declaration of the Roman Republic and the role of France in recovering Rome for the Pope. Some candidates answered this question in very general terms only; points made need to be specific to the place and dates given in the question.

(b) Explanations given in response to this question focused primarily upon Garibaldi and the conquest of Sicily and Naples. Many responses were a list of identified points only; these needed to be developed into explanations. Some candidates wrote about Mazzini and attributed his role in Italian unification to Garibaldi.

(c) Explanations in agreement with the question hypothesis focused primarily upon the role of Austria in delaying Italian unification. On the other side of the argument, focus was placed upon divisions between personalities such as Cavour and Garibaldi, and the divisions more widely within Italian society. A number of candidates gave numerous identified points; these responses would have been improved if the points had been developed into explanations.

Question 2

(a) Most responses to this question gave at least two relevant points, with focus upon the abolition of censorship, a written constitution for the whole of Germany and a unified Germany. Some responses were generalised in nature without any focus upon the specific hopes of German liberals and nationalists in 1848.

(b) Some candidates were able to give one explanation focused upon the Schleswig-Holstein crisis ultimately giving Bismarck the opportunity to orchestrate a war with Austria. Most candidates gave a list of identified points relevant to the question, which needed to be developed into explanations. A small number of candidates wrote about Bismarck generally, without any focus upon the Schleswig-Holstein crisis.

(c) Some candidates gave at least one clear explanation on each side of the argument, arguing that the Austro-Prussian War meant that any German unification could now take place under Prussia, and that the Franco-Prussian War meant that France was now so weak it could not stand in the way of German unification any longer. Some candidates wrote descriptions of the events of both the Austro-Prussian War and the Franco-Prussian War; these descriptions needed to be developed into explanations showing how they linked to the achievement of German unification.

Question 3

(a) Some candidates were aware that the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 divided the Nebraska territory into two: Kansas and Nebraska, and that it allowed settlers of a territory to decide if slavery would be allowed. A number of candidates who opted to do **Question 3** omitted this **part (a)** question.

(b) A number of candidates gave one detailed explanation focused upon slaves being viewed as essential for the South's economic development. Further relevant identified points were also made, such as the US Constitution recognising slavery and Southerners believing that slavery was morally right. Some responses to this question were descriptions of the conditions in which slaves lived, which lacked focus on the question.

(c) A small number of responses gave an explanation on both sides of the argument. Agreement with the question hypothesis was focused upon the work of the Freedmen's Bureau, and disagreement upon former slaves still being subjected to racism and discrimination. A significant number of responses stated that life for former slaves did not get any better; this statement needed to be substantiated and developed with specific reference to the effects of Reconstruction on the lives of former slaves.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 4

(a) There were many effective answers to this question, with candidates giving four clear and focused details of the Alliance System. These usually focused upon stating the names of the two major alliances at the time – the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente – and giving details of the membership of these two alliances, and stating that countries in an alliance promised to support each other if they were attacked. A small number of candidates gave incorrect details of which countries were in each alliance.

(b) There were some clear and detailed explanations focused upon Austria's annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia's claims to these two territories. A number of candidates wrote about one or both of the Moroccan crises in response to this question.

(c) There were some effective answers to this question, with explanations on both sides of the argument. The role of Austria in the outbreak of the First World War was explained with reference to Austria being determined to deal with Serb nationalism and the subsequent ultimatum given to Serbia in the wake of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. On the other side of the argument, there was explanation of Russia's ambitions in the Balkans and Russian support for Serbia. A significant number of responses detailed wider reasons for the outbreak of the First World War; the question asked specifically about the roles of Austria and Russia. A number of candidates wrote in considerable detail about the events of the day upon which Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated, rather than focusing upon the question set.

Question 5

(a) There were many effective answers to this question, with candidates giving four clear and detailed terms of the Treaty of Sèvres. The terms detailed included restrictions on the armed forces, the various land losses and the Allies being given control of Turkey's finances. Some candidates wrote about the Treaty of Lausanne rather than Sèvres, and some detailed the Treaty of Versailles.

(b) A number of candidates were able to give one clearly argued explanation why the Treaty of Versailles caused difficulties for Germany up to 1923. This explanation usually focused upon the War Guilt Clause and reparations. Most candidates were able to give a list of identified reasons in response to this question; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations. A number of candidates missed the date given in the question, and therefore wrote about difficulties faced by Germany after 1923.

(c) There were a number of carefully considered responses to this question. In agreement with the question hypothesis, responses explained the difficulties of constructing a treaty that was acceptable to all the Paris peacemakers and the compromise needed to ensure this. Explanation also focused upon the hope for future peace in the form of the League of Nations, and how France's future security was considered. In disagreement with the question hypothesis, explanation focused upon the Treaty of Versailles leaving Germany with many grievances, and the inconsistent application of the idea of self-determination. Some responses listed terms of the various treaties and/or the aims of the Big Three at Versailles, without explaining these points in terms of the question.

Question 6

(a) A considerable number of responses gave four precise and relevant pieces of information about one failure of the League of Nations in the 1920s. Responses were usually focused upon either Corfu or Vilna. Some candidates wrote about weaknesses of the League, rather than about a specific failure as required by the question. A number of candidates missed the date given in the question and wrote about a League failure in the 1930s. A small number of candidates wrote about the Treaty of Versailles, which was not relevant to this question.

(b) Some responses gave clearly focused explanations, with the emphasis usually being upon Japan's increasing militarism and the adverse effects of the Depression upon Japan's economy. A considerable number of responses described the events and outcomes of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in some detail, rather than explaining why there were hostilities between Japan and China as required by the question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) There were a small number of responses that explained that the League's response to the Italian invasion of Abyssinia was justified, with focus upon the League being anxious to ensure that Italy did not become too close to Germany as a result of League action against them. Answers were stronger when explaining that the League response was not justified, with consideration being given to important materials such as coal and oil being omitted form the sanctions, the actions of Britain and France regarding the Hoare Laval Pact and the Suez Canal being left open. Some responses focused on why the Italians invaded Abyssinia. Other responses adopted a mainly narrative approach, without commenting on whether the League's response was justified.

Question 7

(a) A considerable number of responses gave four relevant and concisely expressed pieces of information. The information given usually focused upon the Berlin Airlift being a response to Stalin's blockade of Berlin, details of how supplies were flown in, and the number of flights taking place. Some responses confused East and West Berlin in their answers. A number of responses wrote about the Berlin Wall rather than the Berlin Airlift.

(b) A number of responses gave at least one explanation why it was harder for the Allies to reach agreement at Potsdam than it had been at Yalta. Explanations given included the changes in leadership and the ensuing disagreements, and the Soviet Union's actions in Eastern Europe. A considerable number of responses described what happened at Potsdam and Yalta, rather than explaining why it was harder to reach agreement at Potsdam than at Yalta.

(c) There were some effective answers to this question. Responses focused explanations upon the USA being to blame for the Cold War by keeping their atomic bomb testing secret, Truman's attitude to Stalin and communism, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. On the other side of the argument, explanations of the role of the USSR were focused upon Stalin and rigged elections in Eastern Europe and the Berlin Blockade. A number of responses focused upon the later events of the Cold War, rather than the initial development of the Cold War, with very detailed narratives of the events of the Vietnam War and the Cuban Missile Crisis; this was not relevant to this particular question. Some responses gave a list of identified points relevant to both sides of the argument; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations.

Question 8

(a) Some candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of Operation Desert Storm, giving a number of relevant and concisely expressed points. Points made included the USA attacking Iraq because of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, when Operation Desert Storm took place, details of both the ground assault and the aerial bombardment and details of casualties and destruction of Iraqi military equipment. Some responses were focused on Operation Desert Shield rather than Operation Desert Storm.

(b) There were some clear explanations focused upon disputes over the Shatt al-Arab waterway and the long standing rivalry between Iran and Iraq. Some responses gave a narrative of the events of the war between Iran and Iraq, rather than explaining its causes.

(c) Some responses gave an explanation on both sides of the argument, with the reforming aspect of the Shah's rule being explained through details of the White Revolution and reforms within education and the health system. On the other side of the argument, explanation focused upon the secret police, censorship and brutality towards any form of protest to demonstrate the repressive nature of the Shah's rule. A number of responses gave numerous points identifying both reform and repression during the Shah's rule; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Some responses gave at least two relevant points, detailing that the Germans attacked the French at Verdun, that the French were greatly outnumbered, the intensity of the German bombardment, and how, in spite of overwhelming odds against them, the French managed to defend Verdun

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

successfully. A number of responses to this question contained only generalised statements or factually inaccurate details.

(b) A small number of responses explained how trench warfare had emerged in the wake of the Battle of the Marne, with the war becoming a defensive war and one of attrition. Most responses to this question focused on describing in great detail the conditions in the trenches, rather than explaining why fighting on the Western Front was based around trench warfare.

(c) There were a few effective answers to this question, with explanations of the physical effects of gas meaning that many soldiers could not continue to fight, and the demoralising effects that gas had on troops. On the other side of the argument, explanations of the psychological effect of seeing tanks for the first time and the use of tanks in breaking down barbed wire and clearing the way for the infantry were given. There were many responses which gave very detailed descriptions of both gas and tanks; these responses would have benefitted from linking the points made to the impact on the course of the war.

Question 10

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

Question 11

(a) Responses to this question demonstrated that candidates had a detailed knowledge of what happened in the Kapp Putsch, with a significant number of responses giving at least three relevant points. Relevant points made included the aims of the participants, the number of Freikorps taking part, the German army refusing to shoot at the rebels, Kapp setting up a provisional government and the occurrence of a general strike. A number of responses were focused upon the events of the Munich Putsch and/or the Spartacist Uprising.

(b) Some responses gave a clear explanation of how the French occupation of the Ruhr led to hyperinflation in Germany and the resulting devastating effects for ordinary German people. Many candidates clearly had a detailed knowledge base of events during and after the French occupation of the Ruhr; however, this knowledge was often used to describe events rather than explaining why this was important for Germany.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained agreement with the question hypothesis by considering the adverse effects of proportional representation on government action and the instability of economic recovery as it was built on American loans. In disagreement with the question hypothesis, responses focused upon cultural achievements, the ending of hyperinflation and the acceptance of Germany into the international community. A number of responses would have been improved by going further than simply listing events and explaining whether or not these were achievements for the Weimar Republic.

Question 12

(a) Relevant points made in response to this question included women joining the army in administrative jobs, working on farms as part of Labour Service, working in factories and also working as nurses. A substantial number of responses were lengthy descriptions of women working in the home and of the medals awarded to women for having large families.

(b) Some responses identified that a war economy was introduced to deal with food shortages and with the need to produce more military equipment; these identified points were occasionally developed into explanations. Many responses were generalised in nature and/or focused on the economy in its widest sense, rather than on the specific war economy.

(c) There were a number of effective answers to this question. Responses postulated agreement with the question hypothesis by explaining that the Nazis gained support from young people by running popular activities as part of the Hitler Youth programme, by indoctrinating young people within the Hitler Youth by constantly stressing Nazi beliefs, and presenting the Nazi Party as a positive and dynamic force within Germany. Disagreement with the question hypothesis was explained with reference to the various sections of opposition from young people such as the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates. Some responses also argued that rather than the Hitler Youth ensuring the Nazis won the support of young people, it was the Nazi education system that ensured support

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

from young people. A substantial number of responses described the activities taking place within the Hitler Youth, and described the various groups available to both boys and girls, and then gave a list of youth groups which did not support the Nazis; such responses needed to be developed into clear explanations demonstrating whether or not the existence of the Hitler Youth ensured the Nazis were successful in winning the support of young people.

Question 13

(a) Some candidates stated that freedom of speech and freedom of the press formed part of the reforms introduced by the Provisional Government in 1917. A few responses also included that there was now equality of all people before the law, and that strikes were allowed. A number of responses were generalised, without any specific reference to the reforms of the Provisional Government in 1917.

(b) There were a number of well-constructed and relevant answers to this question. Explanations were focused upon Trotsky instilling discipline and order into the army, Trotsky appointing skilled and experienced ex-Tsarist officers and Trotsky's measures to inspire the troops by travelling in a special train to where fighting was taking place. Some responses were a list of identified points; these needed to be developed into explanations.

(c) There were many effective explanations in agreement with the question hypothesis. Explanations were focused upon the Provisional Government's mistake in continuing the war, their mishandling of the Kornilov affair, and their mistakes in failing to deal with problems in Russia over land ownership and food shortages. On the other side of the argument, there were well developed explanations of the appeal of the Bolsheviks, including the role of Lenin. Some responses would have benefitted from a greater focus on the mistakes of the Provisional Government and produced one-sided arguments only.

Question 14

(a) A number of responses gave four clear and concisely expressed relevant points of detail. Points made included that collectivisation meant large state farms where peasants were told exactly which work they had to do, details of the sovkhoz and the kolkhoz, and also reasons why collectivisation was introduced. Some responses were generalised in nature, simply commenting that collectivisation was part of Russian policy. A small number of candidates were unaware of the distinct details of collectivisation, and wrote about the work of the secret police instead.

(b) There were many effective explanations demonstrating a clear understanding that Stalin moved against the kulaks because he saw them as enemies of the people and a serious opposition to his plans for development. A few responses gave a second explanation, usually focused upon Stalin moving against the kulaks because they were against communist ideals. A number of responses were generalised, stating only that Stalin did not like the kulaks, without any attempt to explain why.

(c) Effective answers to this question carefully explained agreement with the question hypothesis, demonstrating a sound knowledge and understanding of the issues arising from collectivisation and how these ultimately led to a catastrophic famine. On the other side of the argument, explanations were focused upon how collectivisation meant that Stalin could proceed with industrialisation, and grain was sold abroad to enable the USSR to buy industrial equipment. Most responses were more effective in explanation of agreement than disagreement. A number of responses lacked focus on collectivisation and wrote about whether Stalin was a success or not generally.

Question 15

(a) Some candidates were able to demonstrate detailed knowledge of the new industries that developed in the USA in the 1920s, and gave four discrete and relevant pieces of information. Emphasis was placed on the development of mass production techniques, especially with reference to the car industry, and to the new consumer industries producing consumer goods such as refrigerators and washing machines. Some responses also referred to new types of materials such as rayon.

(b) There were some highly effective responses to this question, with clear explanation of the problems facing farmers and how this meant they did not benefit from the boom, and also how workers in

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

traditional industries faced wage cuts or unemployment, meaning they could not benefit from the boom. Some responses focused on the 'bust' rather than the boom.

(c) As with **Question 15(b)**, there were a number of highly effective responses to this question. In agreement with the question hypothesis, responses gave detailed explanations of a variety of government policies such as laissez-faire, low taxation and high tariffs. On the other side of the argument, explanation of other reasons for the boom focused upon developments within the car industry, the legacy of American involvement in the First World War, advertising and the use of hire purchase. Less effective responses gave a very detailed narrative, rather than explaining how a given factor was a reason for the American economy booming in the 1920s. Some responses gave very detailed descriptions of prohibition and the flappers; this was not relevant to the question.

Question 16

(a) A significant number of responses gave four focused and relevant points of information describing how the AAA benefited farmers. These points included the government buying millions of piglets for slaughter to keep prices up, giving farmers compensation when surplus agricultural produce was destroyed to stop prices falling too much, and paying farmers to take part of their land out of cultivation and reduce their livestock. Candidates demonstrated a clear and detailed knowledge of the work of the AAA and how this benefited farmers.

(b) Some responses gave one explanation why Roosevelt introduced the Second New Deal; explanations were usually focused upon there still being a need for more help for certain sections of the American population, such as tenant farmers and sharecroppers, the poor and the unemployed. Some responses were focused upon why Roosevelt introduced the First New Deal, rather than focusing upon the Second New Deal as the question asked.

(c) There were some effective responses to this question, with explanation in agreement with the question hypothesis focused upon how many people had been helped by the New Deal, and it therefore being surprising that it was opposed by some. On the other side of the argument, it was explained that opposition was not surprising in some sections of American society; for example, Republicans opposed the New Deal because it went against Republican beliefs. A number of responses described the opposition to the New Deal, but did not address the 'it is surprising' aspect of the question.

Questions 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21

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

Question 22

(a) A number of responses to this question gave at least two relevant pieces of factual detail, with the hijacking of planes by the PFLP and the actions of the Black September group at the Munich Olympics being mentioned. Some responses were generalised, without any points specific to the actions of the Palestinian terrorists in the 1970s being made.

(b) Responses to this question were mainly lists of identified reasons, such as Palestinians fleeing during the 1948 war and the Six-Day War. Such identifications needed to be developed into explanations. Many responses were generalised in nature.

(c) Some responses demonstrated an awareness of both sides of the argument, with brief explanations of agreement with the question hypothesis focused upon Arab states refusing to give refugees citizenship, and in some cases expelling the refugees. On the other side of the argument, brief explanation relating to the admission of the PLO to the Arab League was given in some responses. Responses to this question would have been improved by being fuller and by including specific details in some cases.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

There were many well organised answers in which candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge. These candidates were able to use their knowledge to good effect in writing well developed explanations and arguments in answer to their chosen questions. Less successful responses, whilst demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to select the relevant facts needed to effectively to answer the question set.

It is important that candidates read the question carefully (especially where dates are involved) in order that they understand and focus on exactly what is being asked, so that only relevant information is included in their responses.

There were very few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

General comments

Part **(a)** answers should focus on description and only include relevant details. Most candidates realised that answers to **(a)** questions can be short and concise and that there is no need to include background information.

Parts **(b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events, rather than using a purely narrative or 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'Why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than provide a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, often using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narratives or long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

Part **(c)** produced many good responses which contained detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Weaker responses could be improved by including more contextual examples and detailed arguments in explanations. To achieve the strongest answers, candidates must argue both for and against the focus of the question in order to reach a valid conclusion. Successful conclusions included analysis and addressed 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Less successful conclusions tended to rely on summarising the reasons already included in their essay.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most widely answered questions in the Core Content section.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 5

(a) This question required simple recall and description and, therefore, only a short answer was needed. There were mixed responses to this question. Many candidates gained high marks with brief relevant answers including points such as, 'It wanted to abolish slavery worldwide' , 'It tried to stop slave trading', 'It worked to abolish the trafficking of women and children', 'It fought against forced prostitution'. The most successful responses tended to provide examples of places where the Slavery Commission had been successful, such as in Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ethiopia, Burma, Iraq and Nepal. Weaker responses included irrelevant information on the reasons for the formation of the League of Nations and its general aims. Many candidates lacked understanding of the work of the Slavery Commission, apart from that it tried to abolish slavery. Some candidates shifted the focus of the question, which was the work of the Slavery Commission, and wrote at length on various aspects of the League, including the role of the Refugee Commission, the Health Organisation or the International Labour Organisation.

(b) This question was well answered. Two explained reasons are needed. The focus of the response must be why Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935. Most candidates were able to identify two reasons for Mussolini's actions, such as wanting to build up an empire, to distract from economic problems at home, to test the League of Nations, to gain fertile land or to gain revenge for Adowa in 1896. These answers achieved good marks. To achieve the strongest responses, candidates needed to explain the reasons, for example: 'the Great Depression had caused Italy economic problems and Mussolini was losing popularity; in order to distract the peoples' attention at home, he needed a successful foreign policy, therefore he chose to invade Abyssinia for its fertile land and mineral resources.' Weaker responses included information about events after the invasion, including the actions of Britain and France and the League of Nations, which lacked relevance.

(c) Successful responses to this question included contextual examples to produce a well- balanced answer, by arguing for and against the focus of the question. Most candidates were able to explain at least one reason for Britain and France contributing to the failure of the League of Nations. The most common factor concerned their self-interest, revealed through their actions over Abyssinia. These candidates correctly explained that they didn't want to alienate Mussolini as they needed him as an ally against Nazi Germany, so they didn't close the Suez Canal and only half-heartedly imposed sanctions. They correctly explained that Britain was concerned over British coalminers' jobs so did not make coal one of the sanctions against Italy, whilst many explained the Hoare-Laval Plan, which was revealed to the press and was a fatal blow for the League. As a result of explanations such as this, candidates achieved answers explaining one side of the argument. The other side of the argument was less convincing, and weaker responses tended to include a 'list' of other factors that led to the failure of the League, including the structural weaknesses of the League, the lack of the USA membership and the effects of the Great Depression. Many candidates lost time in explaining the reasons why the USA did not join the League, which was lacking in relevance to this question. Some responses could have been improved by identifying that the USA's lack of membership was a serious blow to the League, as they needed USA's military might and ability to make economic sanctions effective, and then by using a contextual example to emphasise the point, that if USA had been a member, it could have used its Pacific forces to make Japan comply with the League of Nations in the Manchurian Crisis or economic sanctions would have been no use, as USA would continue to trade with Japan.

Question 6

(a) This question worked well for most candidates who had noted the dates in the question. Many achieved full marks by stating Hitler's actions and also giving accurate dates for these actions. There were many examples that they could have chosen to describe how Hitler's policies between 1935 and 1938 broke the Treaty of Versailles. They gained credit for stating that Hitler rearmed, reintroduced conscription, sent troops into the Rhineland and achieved Anschluss with Austria. Common misconceptions were that Hitler reunited with Austria and that he invaded the Saar region. Less successful responses were characterised by general comments on Hitler's aims and reasons why he carried out his actions which were not relevant to this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Good understanding was often shown of at least one reason for Germany's involvement in the Spanish Civil War. The most common reason identified was to test his new armed forces, especially the Luftwaffe. Successful responses were able to support this with examples, including the development of Blitzkrieg and dive bombing at Guernica. Some candidates encountered challenges explaining a supported second reason, although some good answers were seen linking the desire to have closer relations with Mussolini in order to achieve Anschluss. However, in some responses the reasons were identified with no supporting evidence.

(c) This question achieved good differentiation across the answers seen. Successful responses were characterised by an explanation of how the Nazi-Soviet Pact was responsible for war breaking out in 1939 and then explaining other reasons why war broke out such as, the failure of appeasement, the effects of the Great Depression, Hitler's foreign policy aims and the failure of the League of Nations. These responses did not just describe the factors, but clearly linked them to the outbreak of war, i.e. they clearly showed the effect of that particular factor. Good examples seen, for example, linked the invasion of Czechoslovakia to the acquirement of the Skoda armament factories or to the British and French guarantee to Poland in March 1939. Less successful responses described the factors accurately, without connecting them to the outbreak of war, or finished with generic statements such as: 'and this made war more likely'. Weaker responses were characterised by the inclusion of irrelevant details, such as the reasons why the Soviet Union signed the Nazi Soviet pact or why Britain and France followed a policy of appeasement, rather than linking the pact to the invasion of Poland and the outbreak of war. A common misconception in weaker responses was that at the Munich Conference Chamberlain allowed Hitler to take Czechoslovakia. Weaker responses, whilst including the key events, often confused the chronology of events, for example the war started after the invasion of Czechoslovakia, or that the guarantee to Poland happened after the Nazi-Soviet Pact. It is important for candidates to have a good understanding of the chronology of events in order to write a successful answer.

Question 7

(a) This question was well answered by many candidates who had a good understanding of the achievements of Lech Walesa in Poland. They were able to describe the successes of Lech Walesa, both in respect to his involvement with the Solidarity trade union movement, and in his later role as President of Poland. Four accurate factual statements were often provided by strong candidates, such as: he founded the Solidarity movement; he led the strike in the Lenin Shipyard; he secured reforms from the Polish government through his 21 demands: he became President of Poland.

(b) Responses to this question varied significantly in quality, with the strongest answers identifying and explaining why Gorbachev decided not to intervene when countries in Eastern Europe moved towards democracy in 1989. The most common reason explained was Gorbachev's own beliefs, which were much more open than those of his predecessors, and he believed in more open democratic, social and political systems based around his policies of 'Glasnost' and 'Perestroika'. A second reason explained was his improving relationship with the West, particularly with Reagan and the USA, which was making the need for a protective sphere less vital.

(c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates explaining both how the Soviet Union was successful in maintaining control of its satellite states between 1956 and 1968, but also how it was not so successful. However, a significant number of responses did not keep to the date band in the question and focussed on events post-1968, especially Poland and Solidarity in the 1980s, and the pulling down of the Berlin Wall. The three main incidents that candidates successfully referred to were Hungary 1956, Berlin in 1961 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Credit was also given for the demonstrations in Poland in the summer of 1956. The best responses were able to explain how each of these events could be regarded as being successful and unsuccessful examples of the Soviet Union keeping control. For example, the success of Soviet troops in putting down the Hungarian Revolt and the Prague Spring were explained alongside the counter argument that communist regimes only managed to exist because of the strength of Soviet military intervention and that despite being successful in in defending communist control in these countries, they had not solved the problem of the unpopularity and failure of communist regimes in Eastern Europe.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 8

(a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of the rule of the Shah of Iran. Maximum credit was achieved for identifying four accurate features of his rule. Examples included: the westernisation of Iran; corruption issues surrounding himself and the ruling elite; the Communist Party was banned; use of the SAVAK to put down political dissent.

(b) Good understanding was shown of at least one reason why the West got involved in the Iran-Iraq War. The most common reason explained was the importance of oil in the region and the urgency of keeping the supply of oil going as there was fear in the West that if the war was prolonged the price of oil would increase, which would have a knock-on effect on western economies. Some candidates encountered challenges explaining a second supported reason, although some good answers were seen linking the concern over the balance of power in the region to Iranian ambitions in the Gulf, their close relations with the Soviet Union and their hostility to Israel.

(c) This question produced mainly one-sided answers. Most candidates agreed that the actions of Iraq caused the outbreak of war in 1991 because of their invasion of Kuwait. They supported their argument by explaining why Saddam invaded Kuwait, including details such as the economic problems inside Iraq, the increase in unemployment and the importance of victory to increase Saddam's popularity at home. Weaker responses did not provide convincing arguments as to how far the USA was to blame for the outbreak of war, which could have included: 'that in April 1990 April Glaspie the US ambassador to Iraq gave Saddam the impression that the USA was not particularly interested in Kuwait. This made him think that if he invaded there would be no reaction from the USA. If they had made it clear from the beginning that they would not allow Kuwait to be invaded, then Saddam may not have attacked Kuwait.'

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most widely answered question of the Depth Studies.

(a) The majority of candidates performed well on this question and showed a good understanding of how the SA contributed to the Nazi Party. Successful responses included accurate contributions of the SA. They included: they disrupted opposition meetings; they were Hitler's private army; in elections they intimidated other parties. Less successful responses confused the role of the SA with that of the SS or the Gestapo, and some wrote at length about Rohm and The Night of Long Knives.

(b) Many very good responses contained two detailed explanations of why the Munich Putsch was important to Hitler. Most identified the same two reasons, firstly that the trial gave Hitler publicity and secondly that he realised that if he wanted to gain power, he would have to change political tactics. Successful responses were able to support these reasons with accurate details such as the trial gave Hitler a national platform where he could put forward his views about the weaknesses of the Weimar Republic which were reported in the newspapers and he became well known throughout Germany; his lenient sentence showed that he had impressed the judges. Weaker responses could have been improved by ensuring that they were focussed on the question, rather than including details on the events of the Putsch and reasons for failure which were usually accurate but lacking in relevance to this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) This question produced some one-sided answers. Some candidates struggled with linking the deal between Von Papen and President Hindenburg to Hitler becoming Chancellor in 1933. Some candidates found it difficult to explain 'the deal'. These responses included general details of events in late 1932/early 1933 and even though many did mention 'control', there was little mention of Cabinet membership and the creation of a coalition within it which satisfied von Papen and President Hindenburg. Weaker responses also included events after he became Chancellor, including the Enabling Act and the Reichstag Fire, which were not relevant to this question. Stronger responses offered some very well explained alternative reasons for Hitler becoming Chancellor in 1933, including Hitler's promises to deal with the effects of the Great Depression, Goebbels' propaganda campaign, Hitler's charisma and his hatred of the Communists.

Question 12

(a) The focus of this question was how the Nazi Regime used informers. Successful responses showed a good understanding of the role of informers, candidates noting that: the Nazis created a network of informers across the country; they contributed to a climate of fear or suspicion; people were used to spy on their neighbours; and to report anti-Nazi behaviour. Some common misconceptions were that informers were the Gestapo and weaker responses wrote at length about the role of the Gestapo in clamping down on opposition and their punishments. Others assumed that the informers were people who spread the Nazi message through propaganda or simply to inform the public about the Nazi Regime.

(b) This question was well answered, with the majority of candidates being able to explain two reasons. Successful responses focussed on how easy it was to manipulate and indoctrinate young minds to produce future generations of loyal Nazis, and then used contextual examples to explain their point. They referenced specific changes in the school curriculum to support their responses. An example being in Biology, they were taught that they were one of the Aryan race, they were special and superior in intelligence and strength to other races, especially the Jews. These lessons instilled anti-semitism into the minds of German children. In History, they were taught how Germany had been 'stabbed in the back' by the weak politicians who had made the Treaty of Versailles. Other well-developed explanations were built around the fact that the Nazis wanted to ensure that the boys would be strong enough to fight in the army and that the girls would understand their future domestic role.

(c) There were many very good responses that contained detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Others needed to develop thoroughly more detailed arguments in order to explain the opposition and lack of opposition to the Nazi regime to enable them to achieve high marks. Most candidates were able to explain the opposition from the youth, including the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement. Another form of opposition explained was that from the Church. Candidates named religious leaders such as Bishop Galen and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the latter who was well known for his opposition to Hitler's euthanasia programme and persecution of the Jews. He was sent to a concentration camp and later executed. Successful responses then included details on why there wasn't much opposition and two of the most common factors explained were the 'fear factor' and the reasons why people actually supported the regime. Candidates explained that the Nazis kept control using the SS and the Gestapo and how the Gestapo tapped telephones and intercepted mail to catch and arrest people who were showing disloyalty towards the Nazis. This resulted in people being intimidated into obedience because they were afraid of being sent to a concentration camp. Numerous reasons were identified as to why people supported the regime, including the popular Nazi policies, for example their solution to the unemployment problem, improved conditions in the workplace through the Beauty of Labour and the return to traditional values. Candidates then gained more credit for explaining these points with supporting relevant details.

Question 13

(a) Candidates were familiar with Rasputin's role in the Tsarist regime and performed well on this question. Most candidates gained very high marks for identifying four features of his role including that: he was an advisor to the Tsar and Tsarina; he advised on the appointment of government ministers; he had a leading role in running the country when the Tsar was leading the troops in the First World War; he got the Tsarina to appoint his friends to top jobs in the government.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Good understanding was shown by the candidates of the continuing opposition to the Tsar between 1906 and 1914. The most common reason identified and explained was that the Tsar did not allow the Dumas to operate properly. In the 1905 October Manifesto the Tsar had offered the people of Russia a Duma, the right to free speech and the right to form political parties. However, the Tsar continued to rule without taking any serious notice of them and dismissed the first two very quickly. He had issued the Fundamental Laws in 1906 which agreed to the existence of the Duma but put so many limitations on its powers that it could do virtually nothing. The people of Russia were disappointed that the Tsar had not kept to his promises. Weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons, for example people were living in dreadful conditions, but with no supporting evidence.

(c) There were a number of one-sided answers to this question because although most candidates were able to describe the social and economic distress, as cited in the question, they found it a challenge to explain the impact of the social and economic distress and its link to the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution. Candidates found it easier to offer explanations on the other side of the argument, for example, the events of Bloody Sunday or the impact of Russia's defeat in the Russo - Japanese war. Successful candidates were able to use supporting evidence to explain why these two events caused the 1905 Revolution.

Question 14

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

Question 15

(a) Successful responses identified the beliefs of the Ku Klux Klan and gained maximum credit for including four relevant facts. For example, they believed in white supremacy; they were anti Catholic; they believed that black Americans were inferior; and that communism was threatening the country. Weaker responses included the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, especially their violence towards black Americans, rather than focussing on their beliefs, thus gaining no credit.

(b) The responses to this question revealed that the question had been clearly understood. Successful responses explained about the American fear of the influx of immigrants, especially in the context of growing American isolationism after the First World War. They highlighted the fear of communism as a result of the Russian Revolution and the potential threat to American values. Weaker responses were able to identify reasons for the 'Red Scare', for example the bomb attack on Attorney-General Palmer or the Sacco-Vanzetti Case, but these responses lacked clear explanation. Supporting evidence was needed to convert the identification to an explanation such as, it was the Americans themselves who fuelled the 'Red Scare' by their actions against immigrants, as in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, emphasising that the focus was not on their crime but on their political beliefs.

(c) Successful responses were characterised by at least two well explained arguments on both sides of the debate. They stated that it was surprising that Prohibition failed as it had been strongly supported by temperance groups, leading political and business figures, and it was an actual law. They used supporting evidence to substantiate their case. Candidates were more familiar with reasons why it wasn't surprising that Prohibition failed, including the influence of gangster culture, enforcement difficulties and widespread corruption. Weaker responses were often one-sided and focussed entirely on why it was unsurprising that Prohibition failed, thus gaining no credit for the other side of the argument. A small number of candidates wrote descriptive accounts of the St. Valentine's Day Massacre, gang rivalries and Al Capone's career, without linking these to the question.

Question 16

(a) Candidates had a good understanding of the term 'Dust Bowl'. Successful responses included relevant facts such as: land had been over-farmed; soil lost its fertility; in the 1930s there were hot summers and the soil had turned to dust. Candidates also gained credit for giving locational details and the effects that it had on farms and farmers.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) This question was well answered, many offering two well-explained reasons. The focus of the question was why Hoover was accused of not doing enough to deal with the consequences of the Depression. The most common reason used was that he was doing nothing to relieve the suffering of the poor. Successful responses were able to explain that unemployment was rising and homelessness was increasing as people could not pay their mortgages. He believed in laissez-faire and that businesses should be left alone to bring back prosperity. He also thought that the Depression would not last and that 'Prosperity was just around the corner'. He believed that too much help would make the people less self-reliant, so despite trying to restart the economy in 1930 and 1931 by tax cuts, he was accused of not doing very much. Other reasons identified were Hoover's dispersing of the Bonus Marchers or the limits of the Hoover Dam Project and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Weaker responses included irrelevant information on what Roosevelt did to improve the situation, which was not relevant to this question

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, with many answers being one-sided. Weaker responses, although showing an understanding of how the Stock Market worked and of terms such as 'buying on the margin', encountered challenges when trying to link this information to the cause of the Wall Street Crash. Strong responses explained how the Depression was caused by the greed of speculators in buying and selling shares as the stock market seemed a quick and easy way to get rich. Buying on the margin made things worse. Confidence is important and if people are confident that prices are rising there will be more buyers than sellers; when prices stop rising there will be more sellers and that caused the crash in 1929. Other reasons for the Wall Street Crash were more clearly understood, such as underlying weaknesses in the economy, overproduction and the 1920s depression in agriculture. Weaker responses also tended to be disorganised and included a mixture of causes and results of the Wall Street Crash. This question was purely focussed on the causes, and not on the results of, the Wall Street Crash.

Questions 17–22

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Paper 13

Key messages

- Candidates should read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted so that only relevant material is included in responses.
- Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

In **part (c)** questions the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond restating what has already been written in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important', 'how successful' or 'to what extent', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

Generally, answers reflected sound understanding and knowledge. Candidates expressed themselves clearly, provided a great deal of information and were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions which require straightforward recall and description. Most candidates answered these questions in the appropriate form of a short paragraph.

The best answers to **part (b)** and **(c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the questions were asking, avoiding lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information which was lacking relevance. Candidates receive credit for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but the best responses go further and develop each factor fully. In other responses, candidates clearly possessed accurate knowledge but struggled to use it to answer the question set.

A significant number of responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue on both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given hypothesis), but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Candidates should avoid repeating points already made in the answer but, instead, should explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions were limited to just asserting 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument is stronger than the other.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

Candidates were able to write in detail about changes to Germany's armed forces at the Treaty of Versailles, whereas answers to **part (b)** tended to produce general responses rather than specific knowledge about Turkish disarmament and territorial losses. Better candidates were able to explain what it was about these terms to which Turkey strongly objected. One example was the wholesale destruction of their Empire which was resented because the British and French used the opportunity to expand their own influence in the Near

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

East. **Question (c**) attracted some strong answers about how far Wilson was disappointed with the peace settlement, precisely dealing with both sides of the argument. Credit was given for explanations linking the Fourteen Points with particular terms of the Treaties. Some answers tended to merely assert or describe without explaining why Wilson might be pleased or disappointed, for example, 'He was pleased that Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia had been created'. Judgements made in the strongest responses showed an understanding of Wilson's priorities and how far they were achieved.

Question 6

There was some good knowledge about the Corfu dispute in **part (a)**, with the best answers showing an appreciation of how the Conference of Ambassadors undermined the League's efforts to settle the problem. **Part (b)** was also answered well by those candidates who understood the demands of the question, focussing on why the League was able to succeed in the 1920s rather than describing those successes. Credit was given for expanding identified reasons such as the legacy of the First World War, a willingness amongst participants to make the League a success and the impact Britain and France were able to have in resolving disputes between less powerful nations. The League's humanitarian work gained marks when linked to the agency/committee structure which enabled it to make a positive contribution. Many answers to **part (c)** effectively debated the Manchurian crisis and how far the League's response was justified. Stronger answers balanced the weakness of the League's response which allowed Japan to get away with aggression, with the view that it did the best it could in difficult circumstances. More than one developed point about each side of the argument characterised some of the stronger responses, with the best answers being those that included a substantiated evaluation of 'how far' the League's responses were reasonable in the circumstances.

Question 7

Part (a) answers were stronger when candidates were clear about the chronology and changing attitude of the Polish authorities to Solidarity, i.e. in the 1980s initially they negotiated, then Solidarity was suppressed and finally legalised. 'Describe' questions of this nature do not require an explanation about why these changes took place. In **part (b)** candidates clearly knew a great deal about Gorbachev and his policies of Glasnost and Perestroika. However, in order to achieve higher marks, a direct approach which explained the impact of these policies on Eastern Europe was effective. In **part (c)**, it there was an appreciation of both similarities and differences, encompassing explanations of leadership, aims, events and their consequences. The clearest approach was to identify one of these features and make comparisons between Hungary and Czechoslovakia within the same paragraph, instead of writing a paragraph about Hungary, then one about Czechoslovakia, which meant that points of similarity and difference were less clearly drawn out. Good judgements were seen which went beyond repeating or summarising points already made, by addressing the 'how far' element in the question.

Question 8

The scale of the destruction, both physical and human, linked to the ruined economies of both countries, was included in many answers to **part (a)**. Some of these comprised two descriptive points which were then developed. For example, a common developed descriptive point was, 'the death toll on both sides was enormous – about two per cent of both populations'. In **part (b)**, good responses were seen which comprised explanations which showed understanding of Iraq's long term claim to Kuwait and short term problems such as writing off Kuwait's loans to Iraq during the war of 1980 – 88. In **part (c)** there were well argued analyses of the economic problems which fuelled the Iranian Revolution of 1979 (such as the widening gap between rich and poor) on the one hand, and alternative factors on the other such as the repressive rule of the Shah, his Westernisation policies and the intervention of the Ayatollah Khomeini. Better responses not only described each factor but also said why they contributed to the Revolution.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

Part (a) posed few problems and there was good knowledge of the use made of aircraft in the First World War. Focussing on 'importance' was helpful in drawing answers away from description and towards explaining impact in **part (b)**, which asked about the importance of the Battle of Verdun. As it was, answers tended to be generalised, making broad references to the war of attrition, the threat to French morale and how to break the stalemate on the Western Front. However, candidates who were able to make more specific points and explain them achieved good marks, for example linking Verdun and the Somme or discussing the symbolic significance of the fortress. In **part (c)**, candidates generally avoided straightforward

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

narrative of the Somme by constructing arguments which precisely met the demands of the question. It is advisable to tackle the stated factor first, i.e. neither side won as it represented a stalemate; from here answers would progress to considering the Somme as a victory for Germany or for Britain.

Question 10

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

Question 11

Candidates had sound knowledge about Goebbels in **part (a)** and were able to show how he had contributed to the rise of the Nazi party, particularly with reference to the 1932 elections. Two developed points were provided by many. In **part (b)** and notwithstanding general points about Hitler's rise to power (such as propaganda, unemployment and political violence), there were numerous examples of detailed explanations related to the political plots in which Papen and Schleicher were involved. Such answers gained good credit. Most answers confined themselves to the correct chronology of 1929 – 33. Candidates seemed less secure in their understanding of the positive and negative impacts of the Munich Putsch in **part (c)**. A balanced answer explained how Hitler turned the event to his advantage on the one hand, with the humiliation of arrest and failure on the other. Each part of the narrative must be linked explicitly as a setback or otherwise. Judgments tended to take the long view and explained the benefits of changes in strategy and organisation to eventual Nazi success.

Question 12

It was rare to see a poor answer to **part (a)**. Candidates knew a great deal about 'Strength Through Joy', describing a range of activities and stating that they were designed to win support for the Nazis by motivating the workers. Responses to **part (b)** often included two developed explanations, which focused on racial policies (gypsies) and why the mentally ill were regarded as a burden on the state. Candidates wrote at length in **part (c)** about terror and persuasion but it is worth noting that while the descriptions were very detailed, some answers fell short of explicitly explaining what it was about each feature which contributed to keeping the Nazis in power. Judgements assessed which was the more important, with candidates favouring terror as the key feature and explaining why it had the potential to have more impact than persuasion.

Question 13

In **part (a)** features identified by candidates usually included autocracy, the lack of a parliament, the secret police and divine right. Answers to **part (b)** revealed good contextual knowledge about Stolypin, and the impact of his policies, referencing land reform for the peasant class and repression. There was evidence that candidates are adapting their thinking by considering and prioritising 'importance' which helps them link narrative description to explanation. This approach also applies to **part (c)**, which asked about the importance of the Tsarina in relation to the March Revolution of 1917. Good responses balanced attitudes to the Tsarina (and Rasputin), with alternative factors such as social and economic dislocation and the Tsar taking the blame for military defeat.

Question 14

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

Question 15

Answers to **part (a)** would have been stronger if they had dealt with 'impact' more precisely. Better responses focused on peoples' access to news, companies boosting sales as they could advertise goods and the new types of music and sports which were brought to a wider audience, thereby creating celebrities who became national figures. Similarly, **part (b)** aimed to encourage candidates to consider what made it possible for women's lives to change in the 1920s (and less about describing those changes). The impact of mechanisation, labour saving devices and changes in social attitudes featured in answers. There were some strong arguments put forward in **part (c)**, which analysed the relative impact of religion and racial intolerance in the USA during the 1920s. Candidates knew a great deal about the Jim Crow laws, the KKK, discrimination and Christian fundamentalism, quoting the Monkey Trial. Judgements about 'importance' were often soundly based on how many people were affected, linking this to where people lived.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 16

In **part (a)**, there were many good examples of candidates describing precisely how jobs were created by the 'alphabet agencies'. **Part (b)** found weaker answers describing Roosevelt's clash with the Supreme Court; these could have been improved by explaining the President's quarrel with Republicans about whether some New Deal reforms were unconstitutional. **Part (c)** required an explanation of the arguments for and against the popularity of the New Deal in 1936. Responses were unbalanced as they focused on 'success'; they could have been improved by placing more emphasis on criticisms of Roosevelt's measures which originated from Republicans and radical politicians.

Question 17

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

Question 18

The power struggle which took place after Mao's death produced some generalised responses in **part (a)**. The best answers referred to the arrest and trial of the Gang of Four and the differences in policies between Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping, with the Communist Party eventually indicating a preference for Deng. Responses to **part (b)** were stronger and there was some good reasoning about the importance to Mao of reviving the revolutionary spirit, as well as maintaining his political power. In **part (c)** candidates were asked to consider if Deng Xiaoping's reforms only changed China 'on the surface'. They applied their knowledge well by explaining and contrasting the broad scope of economic modernisation on the one hand, with continuity exemplified by the political control exercised by the Communist Party, on the other.

Questions 19, 20, 21 and 22

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

Candidates should read through the sources before answering any of the questions.
Many of the questions ask candidates to use two sources, and this inevitably requires comparison of what they say or show. Comparison is the identification of similarities and differences, but genuine comparisons can only be made on the basis of a criterion that is common to the two sources – for example, do they agree or disagree about a *particular issue*? Direct comparisons of the content of the two sources are what is required, rather than a summary of first one source and then the other.
Time management is important. Candidates should try to make some attempt at all of the questions, rather than leave a question out in order to try and answer others perfectly.

General comments

Surface comprehension of the sources – that is, understanding what they say – is generally good. What some candidates appear to struggle with is to understand what the sources mean in context. Thus, the significance of particular statements or claims can be missed, with the consequence that evaluation of sources, in particular in relation to the purpose behind what is being said, is relatively uncommon. Where it is clear that the reliability of a source needs to be checked, this will generally be done by cross-reference, either to another source, or to contextual knowledge.

Some scripts are surprisingly lengthy. Sometimes this is caused by repetition, or by description of what sources say or show. Answers need to be focused on the requirements of the question, and often scripts contain at least some sections that lose this focus.

Despite the comments above, the general standard of scripts is good. Most scripts are complete, most answers constitute positive responses to the questions, and the level of contextual knowledge is sound.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify some agreements between the two sources. Most often these related to the annexation of Oudh, the intention of the British to convert Indians to Christianity, and the grievances of the sepoys. However, there was an overarching difference between the sources over the extent to which the mutiny represented a genuine stirring of nationalism. Source A explicitly rejected the idea that it was a war for independence, yet Source B claimed that it was a patriotic awakening. This disagreement could have been spotted by more candidates.

Question 2

A number of responses would have been improved if more candidates had realised that the Emperor mentioned in Source C was the same person who issued the proclamation in Source D. This would have helped candidates in their attempts to explain whether or not they were surprised by Source D. Where candidates did understand the sources, the clearest cause of surprise was that the Emperor's attitude towards the soldiers had totally changed from Source C to Source D. Some candidates left this without any further development, though others did try to provide some explanation of why the change had happened in

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

order to show lack of surprise. Many candidates would have benefited from applying some contextual knowledge of these particular events.

Question 3

In answering this question, it was vital to see the central point being made by Source F – that Christian teaching was not responsible for the Mutiny – in order to compare this with what Source E had to say on the matter. Depending on what part of Source E was used, it was possible to argue both that the sources agreed, or that they disagreed. Most candidates made this surface comparison in order to reach their conclusion about the issue of proof. A small number of stronger responses speculated about the possible purposes that might lie behind the claims in Source F – a missionary magazine insisting that the Mutiny had nothing to do with Christian teaching.

Question 4

Some candidates thought Source G showed the British fighting sepoys. This misunderstanding inevitably affected answers. For those who understood that it showed sepoys fighting amongst themselves over division of the spoils, answers fell into two broad categories – those that thought the picture was showing what actually happened, and those that understood the picture was a British representation of events. The first group thought the reason why the picture was used was to show what happened. The second group knew that the reason was to send a message to the audience about the sepoys – for example, that they were behaving like savages. Amongst this second group, there were some answers that took the argument further, by exploring why the British might want to represent the sepoys in this way at that time, and concluded that the reason was a matter of shaping British public opinion.

Question 5

As always with questions about the utility of sources, this invited an evaluation of the source in order to cast light on the value, not just of what it said, but of what could be inferred from what it said. There were many answers that took the source at face value and stated that it was useful for telling things about the Mutiny – for example, that it was organised in secret. For others, aware of the need to evaluate, the source was not useful because it was unreliable, produced long after the events, by an Indian revolutionary imprisoned by the British. The best responses, though, understood that the value of the source was in the insight it gave into the view of the Mutiny from the perspective of an Indian nationalist, and into the purposes he would have had in representing events in his book in this particular way.

Question 6

In **Question 6** the sources will always contain evidence that can be used both for and against the hypothesis. It was then surprising to find that a good number of candidates simply agreed that all the sources did, indeed, provide evidence that the events of 1857 constituted a war of independence. Typically this was based on identifying a cause of the Mutiny in a source – for example the annexation of Oudh in Source A – and then stating that this supported the hypothesis. Often such answers would work through all the sources without finding any valid support for the hypothesis, but using each source in an invalid way. There was, however, a small number candidates who understood that some sources offered support for the hypothesis, whilst others did not, and could use the sources to show how.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

Candidates responded well to this question. Almost universally they recognised that Source A was North Korean and Source B was South Korean. The quality of the answer was determined by the explanation provided. At the lowest level this consisted of identifying language that indicated the appropriate side. Better answers would develop this by suggesting how such language would be specific to that particular side – for example, Source A calls the South Koreans 'puppets' of the Americans, so it must be North Korean because South Koreans wouldn't call themselves that. The best responses used the language but added ideas of audience and purpose to the argument – why would the North/South Koreans have wanted their schoolchildren to read these accounts?

Question 2

The essential disagreement between the two sources was over who was the aggressor: Source C claimed that North Korea was being forced to fight a defensive war, whilst Source D said Kim wanted to launch an attack. A significant number of answers missed this difference, and assumed instead that the sources agreed that there would be a war. In that case, Source C could be seen to prove what Source D said. Most of those that spotted the difference assumed that this proved the Soviet Ambassador wrong. This ignored the important issue of whether you could believe Source C, which was arguable. The best answers, then, noted the disagreement between the two sources, but concluded that this did not prove the Soviet Ambassador wrong, because Source C was clearly an attempt by Kim to ensure the North Korean people were behind the war effort

Question 3

This was well answered, though there was one curiosity about the responses. Almost all candidates could provide a reason based on the message of the cartoon – for example, it was distributed to say that the Americans did not care about the Koreans and just wanted to make money from the war. Perhaps a majority of the answers went on to provide a purpose for this message, such as undermining support for the Americans amongst the South Koreans. The one surprise was that few candidates recognised the probable true audience for the poster. The fact that the language used is English is a strong indication that the intended audience was US troops in Korea, and that the leaflet was North Korean and intended to undermine the morale of those troops.

Question 4

Generally, candidates struggled to interpret the cartoon used in this question. Many answers were restricted to descriptions of what the cartoon showed, and the irony of the cartoonist escaped them. Often, they reached face-value conclusions, such as the Soviets wanting peace. At best, such answers used features of the cartoon (peaceful tanks, upside-down version of truth) to reach a limited, though valid, conclusion, such as the Soviets not wanting peace, or Stalin being a liar. What the better answers saw was the element of pretence in what the Soviets were doing – saying they wanted peace when they did not.

Question 5

Given what happened in Korea after Source G was produced, there was plenty in the source by which to be both surprised and not surprised. Most candidates used contextual knowledge to test claims made in the source, usually to support either surprised or not, but many did both. There were one or two minor misunderstandings of the source: some suggested that it said North Korean troops trained the South Koreans, and others thought that it claimed the North Koreans would have difficulty dealing with South Korea. These misunderstandings tended not to matter as candidates generally tried to test several points in the source, some of which were valid. What was seen less was for the provenance to be used, though when it was done properly, answers clearly benefited. For instance, given that the source was produced by British experts, and Britain was an ally of the US and subsequently fought in the UN forces in Korea, is it not surprising that they thought the Americans would not get involved in a Korean conflict?

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 6

Most candidates had little difficulty finding some sources which they could use to test both sides of the hypothesis. The essential point in this question is that sources must be 'used', which means that answers must explain how the content of the source supports or undermines the hypothesis, and this was a feature of the better answers – answers in which candidates did more than just to identify whether or not a source offered support. Some answers attempted to use sources on the basis of an evaluation of their content; a number of these attempts did not work, either because the evaluation was just by source type (i.e. not by looking at the author's purpose), or because the evaluation was not used in relation to the hypothesis.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Candidates should read the questions and sources carefully, think about them, and then decide what the answer is going to be before writing it down. This will enable candidates to focus directly on the question.

Candidates should directly address the question in the first sentence of the answer, for example, 'Source F does not show that Truman was lying in Source G because…'

Some questions for a comparison of sources. When answering these questions, candidates should compare the sources about the same point or issue, rather than explaining how the sources say things that the other source says nothing about.

The most effective way to evaluate a source is to consider the purpose of the author and his or her intended audience. This must be done in an informed way, using contextual knowledge.

When considering the purpose of a source, candidates need to be specific about the intended audience.

When explaining whether they agree with a source, or are surprised by it, candidates should clearly state which claim being made by the source you they are writing about.

When are asked about the message of a cartoonist, the point of view of the cartoonist needs to be explained. In other words, candidates should not just explain, for example, that the message in Source D is that the UN and the US were working closely together; they should add that the cartoonist approves of this.

When candidates are asked whether they trust a source or are surprised by a source, they must provide a clear answer stating whether they do trust it, or are surprised it. It is not enough to produce an excellent analysis of a source if this analysis is not used to state the answer to the question.

General comments

The majority of candidates attempted the twentieth century option but a good number answered on the nineteenth century option in this examination session. The general standard of scripts was good. Most candidates answered all the required questions and demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding of the historical topics. This knowledge was often used to effectively interpret and evaluate the sources.

Some scripts were very long. The best ones were often comparatively brief because the candidates had focused on answering the questions from the first sentence. They did not repeat the question, provide lots of unnecessary background information or paraphrase the sources.

A number of otherwise strong scripts struggled to answer **Question 6** well. They often simply stated that sources did or did not support the hypothesis. Some explanation, related to both the hypothesis and the content of the sources, is required.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well, with many candidates explaining agreements and disagreements. The comparisons need to be direct and specific, for example, 'The sources agree that the Chinese boarded the Arrow on 8 October' or 'Source A claims the Arrow was not flying the British flag, but Source B says it was.' Some less successful answers summarised one source, and then the other, without making any direct comparisons. Others evaluated the sources, instead of comparing them.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

This question also produced many good answers. Most candidates were able to explain how the source is being positive about the British or negative about the Chinese. Some went further and explained the purpose of this, for example to persuade the British audience to support British action in China. Less successful answers tended to describe what was happening in the illustration without considering the impression the artist wanted to create.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to explain that they were surprised by the fact that in one source Bowring claims the Arrow had no right to hoist the British flag, while in the other source he says that the Arrow bore the flag legally. Better answers suggested plausible reasons why this is not surprising. For example, some argued that he was able to admit the truth to Parkes because he was a British colleague, while he needed to lie in E because he was writing to the Chinese, with whom they were in dispute.

Question 4

There were some very good answers to this question. Some evaluated Palmerston through the extreme language he uses, while others checked his claims by cross-referencing to other sources or to contextual knowledge. The best answers focused on the fact that this was an election speech and there was a good number who went back to the Background Information to emphasise how crucial the election was to the British government and Palmerston. A number of candidates analysed the source perfectly adequately but neglected to make clear whether they trusted Palmerston.

Question 5

Questions about utility require candidates to evaluate sources. There was a tendency for candidates to dismiss this source as not useful simply because it was a British source and therefore biased. It is worth remembering that most sources can be useful in some way or another and that the bias of source is often what gives the source its usefulness. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that this source tells us a lot about British attitudes towards the Chinese and about the purpose of the artist and publisher. Another group of candidates saw the source as useful for information, for example it shows the British beating the Chinese, without going on to consider attitudes or purpose.

Question 6

This question was answered well by many candidates. They were able to focus on the hypothesis and Explain how some sources do support it, while others do not. The key to a good answer is to do this through proper use of the source, reference to the hypothesis and good and focused explanation, for example 'Source C provides evidence to show that China was to blame for the war. It shows the Chinese pulling down the British flag and threatening the British sailors on the Arrow who do not look as if they have done anything wrong. This aggression by the Chinese shows that they were responsible for the war.'

Option B: twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well, with many candidates explaining agreements and disagreements. The comparisons need to be direct and specific, for example, 'The sources agree that the attack was planned in advance' and 'The sources disagree over who attacked first. Source A claims South Korea did, while Source B claims that North Korea did.' Some weaker responses stated that one source said something that the other source said nothing about, or summarised one source and then the other without pinpointing actual agreements or disagreements. A number of candidates focused on the provenance of the sources and spent time evaluating them. This did not produce an answer to the question. Agreements include the dates of the attack and the meeting of the Security Council, the UN passing a resolution and South Korea having the support of the UN. The sources disagree over, amongst other things, whether the US was using or co-operating with the UN and whether US wanted peace or war. A small number of candidates achieved very high marks by explaining the overall disagreement – Source A blames the US for the Korean War, while Source B blames the Communists.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

Although this question produced a full range of answers, many were excellent. The best answers focused on the purpose of pamphlet. However, to get this right, candidates needed to understand that the intended audience was the US or South Korean troops (the reference in the source to 'every bullet you fire'). With this understanding, candidates were able to suggest that the pamphlet was, for example, trying to destroy the morale of the troops or trying to turn them against the war effort. Some less successful candidates thought the audience was the North Koreans. Other candidates produced reasonable answers by focusing on message, without getting as far as purpose. These candidates understood the points being made by the pamphlet about big business and peace, but did not realise that these were being used to make a bigger point about the war as a whole.

Question 3

This question highlights the point made earlier about comparison questions. The best answers looked for a major point that both sources are saying something about to use as the basis of their comparison. In this case, the sources disagree about the relationship between the US and the UN. Source D shows the relationship to be one of cooperation and equality, while Source E shows the US to be in control and dominating the UN. A reasonable number of candidates got his far, but very few went further by explaining the points of view of the two cartoonists – D approves of the relationship, while E disapproves.

Reasonable marks were achieved by many candidates by comparing sub-messages, for example the US looks to be strong and confident in both, or the UN looks strong in D but weak in E. However, some answers struggles because, although they interpreted the sources, they did not make any direct or valid comparisons. The most common error was to claim that both sources show that the US was dominating or leading a weaker UN. Source D does not show this.

Question 4

Most candidates were able to achieve good marks by using the disagreement between the two sources over Truman's motive for involving the US in Korea. In Source F, Truman claims this was because he wanted to prevent another world war and stop the advance of Communism. In Source G he claims he wanted to help the UN. A good number of candidates then tried to reconcile the claims of Truman. This was done best when candidates used their contextual knowledge to explain, for example how wanting peace and helping the UN could amount to the same thing. If this point was merely asserted, the answer was less successful. An alternative way of producing a very strong answer was to explain the apparent disagreement between the two sources and then evaluate one of them, for example use contextual knowledge to show how Truman did genuinely want to stop Communism.

Question 5

To produce a good answer it was necessary to read exactly what the source said and then to make clear which statement in the source was being used to explain surprise or a lack of surprise. For example, Source H claims that the Americans were keen to correct the impression that they were fighting a lone battle. It does not claim that the Americans were fighting a lone battle. Candidates tended to check the latter statement, rather than what the source actually says. Other candidates wrote in general terms about whether or not they were surprised by Source H. Their answers would have been improved by specifying what it was in the source that they were, or were not, surprised about.

Question 6

This question was answered well by many candidates, many achieving high marks. They did this by focusing on the hypothesis – that the US intervened because it wanted to uphold the authority of the UN – and by explaining how some sources support it and how others do not. There were a number of answers that did not go beyond making assertions. Answers should relate a source directly to the hypothesis through explanation. For example, the following answer would have produced reasonable marks: 'Source D supports the statement because it shows the US cooperating with the UN to ensure that it would be more successful than the League of Nations had been. By helping the UN be effective in Korea, it was upholding its authority. On the other hand, Source C shows that the US was in Korea, not to uphold the authority of the UN, but for its businesses to make lot of money.' As can be seen from this example, it is important to make clear which sources are being used. Some answers focused on a variation of the hypothesis, for example that the UN intervened in Korea. Such answers did not constitute strong performance. There are marks available for evaluating the sources (hence the reference to 'convincing evidence' in the question), but this evaluation

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

must be developed and detailed. It should contain either use of contextual knowledge to check the claims of a source or an informed and developed consideration of purpose.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

Candidates should read the sources carefully and plan their answers to questions.

Sources need to be considered closely, both in terms of context and provenance. It is important that answers respond directly to the wording used in questions.

General comments

There was a sound knowledge and understanding of the topics. Candidates were stronger on source interpretation than source evaluation. The contextual knowledge of many candidates was impressive but knowledge needs to be used selectively and appropriately so that it directly contributes to answering the question. The knowledge should help to explain a source. When asked to carry out evaluation, a candidate's knowledge can be used to consider the purpose and impact on an audience for the source, or to enable testing of claims made in the source.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

Some candidates copied or paraphrased the source without making successful moves to make inferences, about the British and the Chinese, in this case. Candidates also tended to write at length about the Arrow incident, using their contextual knowledge to make judgements, but in doing so neglecting to refer to the details of the source in order to support inferences made. The best answers recognised nuances contained within the extract and reached well supported conclusions which explained the evidence indicating that there were elements of wrong doing both in the British and Chinese behaviour.

Question 2

It is important, when answering this type of question, that candidates begin by identifying either an agreement or disagreement between the two sources as a reason for Source B meaning that the people of Canton are lying in Source C. For example, in Source B the extreme threats of violence made in the Cantonese leaflet against the British, while in Source C the people of Canton claim to be the victims of unprovoked British attacks. Candidates could then achieve strong responses by considering the provenance of the sources or by using contextual knowledge. The British decisions to wage war and bombard China made between 1856 and 1857 would be useful in evaluating the sources. Some candidates compared and evaluated the sources but forgot to state if Source B means the people of Canton were lying in Source C.

Question 3

Most candidates understood that Richard Cobden was an opponent of British policies against China, though many valid analyses of his views did not state whether these views were surprising or not surprising. His status as a member of the Parliamentary Opposition was often recognised as significant and contained within Cobden's speech there was internal evidence citing contradictions and irregularities in the British case. Cross references to contextual knowledge of the British political situation, or other sources to test Cobden's claims, were rewarded in the best responses.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 4

Most candidates compared Palmerston's indictment of Yeh as a 'savage barbarian', one 'guilty of every crime that could degrade and debase human nature' with Yeh's measured account of the Arrow incident in Source E, and found reasons to claim that Palmerston was lying. The best answers examined the provenance of the sources or contextual knowledge to argue their case. There were some accurate and impressive references to the situation in British politics at the time to aid evaluation.

Question 5

Less successful candidates wrote surface descriptions or offered perfectly valid interpretations of the cartoon without considering reasons for its publication in 1860. There were many messages that could have been inferred about how the British regarded China and what that suggests about approaches to foreign policy. The fundamental message that candidates might have offered was that the cartoon indicated the British believed that they were justified in dealing with China harshly. The best responses included an explanation of how the cartoon was drawn and published in Britain at that time to have an impact on the public, to convince them that Britain had every right to attack China and thus gain support from the British public for military action.

Question 6

It is vitally important that candidates base their answers around the sources. One way to approach a question like this is to tackle the sources in order and explain whether each supports or disagrees with the hypothesis that China was to blame for the violence between China and Britain. Many candidates were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A minority of candidates still neglect to use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source links to the question, instead copying lines from the text before moving on to deal with another source. Grouping of sources, for example 'Sources A, C and G do provide convincing evidence that China was to blame for the violence with Britain', rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them, was another characteristic of weaker answers. Successful evaluation of sources was rare. Candidates might consider picking out one or two particularly worthwhile sources in order to say something meaningful regarding purpose and audience.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

A question such as this requires that candidates offer a reason for the United Nations publishing the report in 1950. Often answers began with statements about the context of tension in Korea and then went on to interpret the source, without getting round to giving reasons for the report being published at that time. Better answers explained the context of events as reason for publication before explaining messages about where the United Nations apportioned blame and thus justified their intervention. The highest level answers recognised that the purpose of the report was to encourage member states to support the United Nations in Korea.

Question 2

Agreements and/or disagreements between the sources which caused surprise were present and there were many good attempts to explain disagreements through evaluation of one or both of the sources. Most frequently answers identified the surprising disagreement between Truman's robust declarations that the USA defended South Korea against Communist aggression and Eisenhower maintaining that there had been a failure of US policy due to the withdrawal of their military forces, leaving South Korea vulnerable to attack. Evaluation of Sources C and D was often perceptive and explained Truman's public position defending anti Communist policies, while Eisenhower was judged to be unsurprisingly critical of the Democratic President as he himself was running as a Republican candidate in the elections.

Question 3

Some candidates struggled with their answers to this question, providing assertions after simple surface descriptions of the sources. Often the details that accompanied Source D, explaining 'It shows UN troops being squeezed out of a tube and into a cannon where they are fired northward', was missed and it was not recognised that this was Communist propaganda against the United Nations actions. The content of Source E was more frequently understood as being an anti-Communist forces cartoon. There were many sub-

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

messages contained in the sources commenting on the leaders' disregard for sacrificing soldiers' lives, the willingness to expend both lives and finance on war, and on who was actually making the vital decisions. The best answers explained the differences in who was to blame for the unnecessary slaughter and recognised that the cartoons criticised the United Nations in Source D and criticised the Communist leaders in Source E.

Question 4

Low's cartoon, Source F, commented on Stalin's support for North Korea and how this could be seen as evidence of attempted Communist expansionism. The cartoon clearly disapproved of the lack of public recognition of the Soviet role. Source G was a record of the British government's willingness to overlook Soviet involvement in Korea. Thus the crux of better responses was an explanation of the main disagreement that Source G was in favour of Soviet involvement in Korea being hidden, while Source F disapproved of any such Soviet cover up. Less successful answers misinterpreted the sources or gave valid interpretations of one but not both sources.

Question 5

It is important that candidates approach sources of evidence looking for ways that they might or might not offer useful information. Cross-reference can also enable judgements to be made about the importance of the information source within a broader context such as the outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950. This was a particularly interesting source. The fact that candidates are told the telegram from the Soviet Ambassador to North Korea to his Soviet government was sent on 30 May 1950 in code suggested that the contents were extremely sensitive and not to be read by anyone other than the intended recipients. The evidence enables useful conclusions to be made about Soviet involvement in the North Korean plans for an attack on South Korea and helps clear up speculation on the Soviet role.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A minority of candidates did not use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source linked to the question. Instead, they repeated lines from the text before moving on to deal with another source. There also was a growing trend for candidates to forget the wording of the hypothesis being tested in the question. It was quite common for candidates to 'rewrite' the question so that they answered 'Who Started the Korean War?' Grouping of sources, for example 'Sources A, C, D E and H do not provide convincing evidence that the Soviet Union was to blame for the Korean War', rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was a characteristic of weaker answers. Successful evaluation of sources was rare and some candidate responses would be improved by just picking out one or two particularly worthwhile sources in order to say something meaningful regarding purpose and audience.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

Candidates should focus on assessing significance all the way through their coursework.

Titles should be written in such a way as to encourage assessment of significance.

Candidates need to use a range of criteria to allow them to consider different ways in which their subject might be significant.

Candidates should try and reach an overall judgement about significance taking into account, and weighing up, all the arguments and counter arguments in their response.

General comments

Much excellent work was produced. The overall standard of work was high and many candidates demonstrated a mature and sophisticated understanding of the concept of significance. It was clear that many candidates had put much care and thought into their responses.

The administration of coursework by centres was generally good and many produced much useful information for moderators. Many centres sent carefully organised sets of coursework where everything was laid out clearly for moderators. Many centres also produced very helpful comments on each candidate's work. In a few cases, the candidates' details (name and number) were not present on the candidates' work. Also, some centres could have made it clearer whether internal moderation had taken place.

Comments specific questions

Many centres set excellent titles that gave their candidates full opportunities to analyse significance at a high level. It is nearly always a good idea to use the word 'significance' in the title. However, simply asking how something was significant will encourage just explanation or description. Asking how important something was in causing a particular development or event, for example, 'How far was the rule of the Tsar the most important reason for the Russian Revolution?' will encourage causation answers that are limited to one outcome and where candidates will spend a lot of time on other factors. The most successful approach adopted was through titles such as 'Assess the significance of X'. This leaves the exercise as open as possible and allows candidates to use a range of criteria to investigate how far their topic was significant in different ways and for different reasons. An alternative to this is to focus on the concept of a 'turning point', for example, 'How far was X a turning point?'

The best answers used a range of criteria to assess significance. This was seen at its best when candidates had decided on their own criteria and where they were not used mechanically. In such responses, candidates demonstrated independent thinking and judgement. Some candidates considered political, economic, social and cultural significance. Others focused more on the significance of their subject for different groups in society or for different geographical areas, while others considered how far significance changed over time. Some of the strongest responses considered how far their subject was a turning point, with some concluding that it some ways it was, but in other ways it was not. Others considered short and long term significance.

Many candidates also performed well by not confusing significance with success. Failure can be very significant indeed. The best answers also made clear that judgements about significance are provisional and can depend on the question asked. Looked at from different perspectives, an individual or event can be both significant and not so significant.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

There were also different ways demonstrated in this year's answers of bringing in assessment, rather than just explanation or description. Some excellent use of argument and counter argument was seen. Other candidates argued that significance changed as one went from one criterion to another and reached careful conclusions about the way in which their subject was most significant.

An increasing number of candidates showed understanding that an individual or event was not significant simply because of what they had caused or brought about, even less what they did. What matters is the importance of what they brought about.

Some centres have found it worthwhile to focus on the meaning and use of ideas such as significance and turning point while covering other parts of the syllabus. This has meant that, when candidates come to their coursework, they have a good grasp of these ideas and know how to approach it.

Much of the marking was accurate and fewer marks needed to be adjusted in this examination session. Answers need to be assessed holistically and the judgements about which level an answer falls into need to be made by summing up all the varied attributes of an answer. The strengths and weaknesses of a response need to be balanced against each other, and the response placed in the level it matches best. In other words, a 'best fit' approach. The decision about which level is a summative judgement to be made after the whole answer has been considered. This is why moderators find the summative comments on answers so useful, especially when they identify the key attributes of a response and match them to the appropriate level.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

Candidates are required to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and conclusions.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken, with Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45 the most popular. Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41 and Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-41 also attracted a number of responses. There were some attempts at Depth Study A (The First World War), and a few candidates answered questions from Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians).

Overall, answers showed a good level of knowledge and most candidates attempted balance in their answers. Some candidates produced brief plans. Successful answers used these plans to select relevant information which could be used to specifically answer the question. On occasion, however, plans showed a lack of understanding of the question, as material was included which was not relevant.

The best responses analysed the question and selected the information required before writing. This was often shown in a brief introduction. Such answers were balanced and addressed the question directly, using contextual knowledge to support a line of argument. They were able to make judgements and come to conclusions which were well explained and supported with evidence. There were however, a number of responses where candidates picked up on only part of the question and wrote a narrative response, sometimes with limited links. At times candidates missed the chronological parameters of the question altogether. Candidates need to analyse the question and know exactly what it is asking, recognise the time parameters set and organise their work through planning. The selection of relevant information is key in writing successful responses.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918

Overall, this Depth Study did not attract many responses. There were too few responses to **Question 1** to make meaningful comment. Successful responses to **Question 2** demonstrated a good knowledge of how the Naval Blockade by Britain led to Allied victory. Such responses were able to focus on the end of the war, rather than write a general description. There were also some generalised descriptions of the importance of the navy to Britain, as well as descriptions of the arms race before the war.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This was the most popular Depth Study, with responses to **Question 3** and **Question 4**.

Successful responses to **Question 3** were those which understood the difference between inflation and hyperinflation. They were able to make links between hyperinflation and the Munich Putsch, for example. Generally the sources of instability were well known, with many detailed descriptions of the Spartacist Revolt, Kapp Putsch and Munich Putsch, although in some cases these were not developed to show how they created instability. There was some general confusion around the workings of Proportional Representation and the Constitution.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Answers to **Question 4** demonstrated a good level of knowledge regarding the problems of Weimar. Sometimes, however, this led to a lack of focus on how these helped the Nazis. There were a number of responses outlining all the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, rather than referring to the relevant clauses. Successful answers were those which selected relevant information and made the link between these problems and what the Nazis offered as an alternative. Some candidates continued their response well into the Nazi Regime, which resulted in answers describing methods of control, rather than reasons for popularity.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Most candidates attempted **Question 5**, rather than **Question 6**. Successful answers to **Question 5** demonstrated a good knowledge of the impact of the First World War on Russia with a few, recognising the general reference to the impact of war, going back to the Russo-Japanese War. On the whole, answers were balanced and understood the reasons behind the collapse of the Tsarist Regime.

There were too few responses to **Question 6** for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

Question 7 was the most popular, with fewer responses to **Question 8**. There were many detailed and focused responses to **Question 7,** demonstrating a good knowledge of the period. Successful answers were able to connect economic changes to the changing lives of women during the period. Such answers were able to describe how certain changes impacted specifically on women, rather than the general population. There were also answers which described the boom generally and ignored the impact on women. Less successful responses were those in which candidates inverted the question and described how women had brought about economic change, for example by destroying the textile industry by wearing shorter skirts.

Question 8 attracted fewer responses but successful answers showed a good knowledge of Roosevelt's New Deal, with some also referring to Hoover's attempts to end the Depression.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940–c. 1994

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were very few responses for this Depth Study but there were some to **Question 13**. Candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the foundation of the State of Israel and the British role in this. Successful answers focused on the role of superpowers in influencing events, rather than generally describing why Israel was successful in wars.

There were too few responses to **Question 14** for meaningful comments to be made.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This is a one-hour paper that requires candidates to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

A wide range of Depth Studies were undertaken in this examination session. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945 was the most popular choice this session, followed by Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941. Some also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918, Depth Study E: China, c.1930–1990 and Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945. There were too few attempts at Depth Study F to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses had been well planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but many would have been improved by providing a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were a few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These responses contained much information about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates should read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918

Both questions were attempted by candidates this session, although **Question 1** was more widely answered.

Question 1 was generally well answered. The strongest answers demonstrated a strong knowledge and understanding of the role played by the British Expeditionary Force in 1914, particularly in the Battle of Mons and the Battle of the Marne. Details and explanations tended to be good and linked well to the question of how important the BEF was in halting the German advance. This was then balanced with other factors such as the rapid Russian mobilisation on the Eastern Front, the changes made to the Schlieffen Plan and the 'race to the sea' and the development of trench warfare. Weaker responses sometimes went outside of the parameters of the question and examined battles in 1916 and beyond such as Verdun and the Somme campaigns, which were not relevant to this question, and led to material which lacked relevance being used.

Question 2 was generally well answered when candidates understood the meaning of the term 'superior resources'. The best responses examined the resources provided by the USA such as munitions, raw materials and food and later, after US entry into the war in 1917, fresh troops from January 1918, the provision of tanks and aircraft, as well as other essential war supplies from the Allies and their colonies. This was then balanced by examining other significant reasons for the German surrender such as the British blockade of German ports, war weariness in Germany and the events surrounding the German Revolution in October 1918 and the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive. Knowledge tended to be detailed and the breadth of different factors provided added weight to the answers. A few candidates attempted conclusions by prioritising the different factors, though some fell short of substantiating their judgements adequately. Weaker

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

responses tended to misinterpret the meaning of the term 'superior resources' and ended up giving one-sided answers to the question.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Question 3 was the most popular question for this Depth Study, but there were also a good number of attempts at **Question 4**.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to have a solid knowledge and understanding of the Dawes Plan and its importance in the recovery of Germany, 1923–29. Candidates tended to focus their answer on the provision of US loans, the evacuation of the Ruhr by French and Belgian troops and the short-term easing of reparation payments. This was then balanced most commonly against Stresemann's foreign policy achievements such as the Locarno Treaties, Germany's admission into the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Explanations were often well substantiated and examined various aspects of recovery from the improvements in the economy, cultural life and foreign relations. The very best answers were able to draw conclusions and make judgements about the relative importance of the Dawes Plan by evaluating its long-term impact when considering the Wall Street Crash in 1929. Weaker responses commonly spent much time on giving a narrative of the causes of the Ruhr occupation and the hyperinflation, rather than answering the question, which was focused on the recovery. A few candidates also went beyond the parameters of the question and examined Hitler's rise to power from 1930–33.

Question 4 was, in general, answered less competently than **Question 3**, although there were some strong responses. The best answers were able to focus very clearly on how significant the Munich Putsch was for the lack of Nazi electoral success by 1928. These answers examined and assessed the impact the Putsch had on Nazi fortunes and most commonly cited Hitler's arrest and trial for high treason, his imprisonment and the banning of the Nazi Party and SA and the alienation effect the violent coup attempt had on potential moderate voters. This was then balanced against other factors such as Stresemann's economic recovery and Germany's 'Golden Years', the lack of support for violent right-wing extremism and nationalism/anti-Semitism among many middle-class Germans and the election of Hindenburg which appeased many on the right. A few answers attempted conclusions, but these were often summative and lacked evaluation linked to significance. Less successful responses tended to lack effective knowledge of the consequences of the Munich Putsch for the Nazis or focused more on how the Putsch helped the Nazis develop the party and later win seats in 1930, which was not the question. While it was valid to counter-argue that the Munich Putsch did help the Nazi party gain publicity, the period up to 1928 did not see the Nazis' gain seats in the Reichstag but, in fact, lose them.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

A good number of candidates answered from this Depth Study. **Question 5** proved to be a slightly more popular choice among candidates than **Question 6.**

Question 5 was well answered in most aspects, though a lack of knowledge or a more narrative approach to this question prevented some potentially good answers from achieving higher marks. The best responses had a clear focus on the importance of Trotsky in Stalin's emergence as leader by 1928. Most commonly cited were Trotsky's attitude and arrogance, which alienated him from other leading party members in the Central Committee and Politburo, the fear of his leadership over the Red Army and distrust of his previously held Menshevik credentials before November 1917. This was then balanced by assessing the importance of Stalin's political manoeuvrings with the left and right of the Communist Party, his position as General Secretary to appoint supporters in the Party Congress and Conference, his cunning in terms of telling Trotsky the wrong date for Lenin's funeral and persuading other leading party members to not publish Lenin's Testament. Some candidates attempted to reach judgements, but these were often lengthy summaries that offered little in terms of substantiation. The weaker responses lacked knowledge or gave a narrative-style response, which often included pre-1924 material. A few candidates gave material about Stalin's use of the NKVD and the censoring of media, which was not relevant until after 1928.

Question 6 was answered well in some aspects, especially when candidates got to grip with the focus of the question, which was the development of the Soviet Union after 1928. The strongest responses focused on Stalin's Five-Year Plans and gave precise and accurate examples of how these developed the Soviet Union economically in terms of raw material production and the build-up of Soviet defences. This was then compared with collectivisation and often aspects of censorship and repression in the development of the Soviet Union as a totalitarian state. A few candidates were able to draw conclusions by linking all the different factors together, most notably how the system of repression went hand-in-hand with industrialisation and collectivisation. Weaker responses often did not focus on the element of recovery and described the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Five-Year Plans, collectivisation and the system of repression. This led to descriptive answers or narratives, which lacked the vital assessment to push the answers into higher levels.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was the second most widely answered topic, with **Question 7** proving much more popular than **Question 8**.

Question 7 was more popular with candidates and was generally well answered. The strongest responses had a sound knowledge of the policies of the Republican presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover. Most commonly cited was the importance that the policies of laissez-faire, low taxation, tariffs and the encouragement of trusts had on the prosperity in the 1920s. Explanations tended be well substantiated in many cases and explicitly linked to how this led to economic growth in the USA. A few of the best answers evaluated the overall impact these policies had on different groups in US society and noted how farmers, immigrants, black Americans and workers in older industries did not benefit. Some also made the valid assessment that these policies were factors in the Crash of 1929 and the Depression. Balance was provided by examining the relative importance of alternative causes such as mass production, advertising, the impact of the First World War on the US economy and consumer confidence. Several attempts were made at drawing conclusions and judgements, often by prioritising the different factors or developing the links between them to assess relative importance. This was often completed skilfully and convincingly. Weaker responses lacked the wide-ranging knowledge to tackle this question or lacked knowledge of who the Republican presidents were in this period, with a few citing Roosevelt as a Republican. This led to answers that lacked factual depth or lacked historical accuracy.

Question 8 was less well answered in general, although there were some candidates that understood well what was meant by the term 'social reforms'. The strongest responses focused mainly on the legislation of the Second New Deal, namely the Wagner Act and Social Security Act, and explained how these new laws helped ordinary Americans survive the worst effects of the Depression. Some also examined the role played by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) and the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) as part of the first New Deal – as these had a social aspect to them, they were acceptable examples to use. This was then balanced by examining the significance of other aspects of the New Deal such as the Emergency Banking Act, Alphabet Agencies created by the First and Second New Deal that dealt with agriculture, unemployment, homeowners and poverty, as well as Roosevelt's 'fireside chats'. When done well, explanations of how significant were well substantiated, with plenty of statistical examples. Many of the weaker responses did not correctly comprehend the term 'social reforms', which led to one-sided answers that examined the New Deal in general. These responses often included all Alphabet Agencies and New Deal legislation as a social reform, and missed the fact that many of the reforms were economic in focus.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c. 1990

On this Depth Study, only **Question 9** was attempted in any significant numbers.

Question 9 proved challenging for candidates in general. A small number of responses were able to assess the importance of the First Five-Year Plan to China's economic progress by giving some statistical material on the increases in production of raw materials such as iron, steel and coal. Some candidates developed this further by explaining how it also led to the growth of urban areas, electrification, transportation links and other forms of communication, much of this aided by Soviet loans and other forms of Soviet economic assistance. This was then compared to the Great Leap Forward, agrarian reform and the creation of collective farms and cooperatives and some even went as far forward as the 1970s and examined the trade deal with the USA and Deng Xiaoping's economic reforms. However, most responses would have benefitted from greater depth and detail, and were light descriptions of the period as a whole. A few candidates incorrectly examined the period pre-1949 before the Communists had gained power in China, which was outside of the parameters of this question.

Question 10

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

Depth Study F: South Africa, c. 1940–c. 1994

There were too few responses to **Question 11** and **Question 12** for meaningful comments to be made.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

Question 13 was well answered by most candidates, with a majority of responses demonstrating a thorough knowledge of the importance of President Nasser in shaping events in the Middle East. Candidates carefully examined his role in the 1956 and 1967 wars, his actions promoting pan-Arab unity and his hand in the creation of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO). Explanations of his importance were well substantiated, often with very precise and in-depth material used to support. Candidates most commonly provided balance to their responses by assessing the relative importance of other factors that shaped events in the Middle East. There was a large variation of counterarguments provided by candidates, though most frequently cited were the impact of the 1948 war, the role of other significant individuals such as President Sadat and Yasser Arafat, the actions taken by the superpowers and the United Nations, as well as the Israeli military. A few also looked at social issues such as the refugee crises and the intifadas. Many candidates attempted conclusions. Some fell short of fully substantiating their arguments, but the strongest provided a sustained line of argument throughout their essay and assessed the relative importance of the different factors. A small number of candidates focused too much on providing a huge amount of contextual knowledge and this led to these responses becoming overly descriptive or narrative in style, as they did not evaluate the importance this material had on shaping events in the Middle East.

Question 14 was less popular, although still well answered when opted for. Candidates had a strong knowledge of the significance that Gaza and the West Bank have played and still play in the Arab-Israeli conflict since 1945 and most commonly cited the wars of 1948, 1967 and 1973 in their answers. Many examined the impact of Israeli expansion in these areas and the conflicts with extremist groups and Arab neighbours. This was then compared with other factors that were significant in the Arab-Israeli conflict such as the actions of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) and the extremist activity associated with them, the role of the USA and the United Nations in peacekeeping and diplomacy, and the actions taken by the superpowers during the conflict. Explanations were frequently supported by well-chosen and precise examples and the best answers formed substantiated judgements by comparing and sometimes linking the evidence together. As in **Question 13**, the strongest responses were able to give a sustained line of argument throughout the essay, often developing and stating judgements at the beginning of the answer and then returning to the focus of the question in each paragraph. Very few weaker responses were seen, but those essays that did not tend to explain or assess significance explicitly or in a developed way often gave more descriptive answers.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This is a one-hour paper that requires candidates to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

A narrow range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was by far the most popular choice this session, followed by Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41. There were some attempts at Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. There were too few attempts at Depth Studies E, F or G to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses had been well planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but many would have been improved by providing a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were a few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These responses contained much information about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates should read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918

There were some candidate responses to **Question 1**, but too few responses to **Question 2** to make any meaningful comment.

Question 1 was generally well answered by candidates. The strongest answers examined the importance of the introduction of tanks on the Western Front and focused on their impact at the battles of the Somme and Amiens, for example. Good levels of detail were included in descriptions and explanations about how the tank helped develop a combined arms approach to warfare and its psychological effect on the enemy. This was then balanced by addressing the shortcomings of the tanks on the battlefield such as issues with their reliability, their vulnerability to new anti-tank weapons and the lack of effective combined arms tactics in 1916. The best answers also examined the importance of other weapons and features of fighting on the Western Front to add breadth and depth to their conclusions – most commonly cited were the machine gun, artillery and gas weapons. Weaker answers tended to have little in terms of contextual knowledge, included factual and chronological errors or wrote too little to give a meaningful response to the question.

Question 2

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Question 3 was the most popular question for this Depth Study, but there were also a good number of attempts at **Question 4**.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 3 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to have a solid knowledge and understanding of political extremism in Germany, 1919–23 and its importance in causing weakness in the new Republic. Strong answers examined the threats from the extreme left and right, most commonly the Spartacist Uprising in 1919, the Kapp Putsch in 1920 and the Munich Putsch in 1923. Descriptions and explanations tended to be precise and accurate in terms of factual detail and some of the best answers evaluated the extent of their threat to the Republic based on how easily they were dealt with by the government. Breadth was included by examining other factors that led to weakness in Germany such as the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the Ruhr invasion and the problems caused by hyperinflation in 1923. A few responses were able to link factors together and reach conclusions about which was most important in causing weakness in Germany. Less well-developed responses tended to lack specific knowledge or be narrative in style – these often came in the form of telling the story of events since the end of the First World War, through the crises of 1919–23 and sometimes beyond, up to the Depression years of the early 1930s. It is vital that candidates keep to the parameters set by the question in order to not give irrelevant material in their answers. Also, a good number of candidates confused the different extremist groups of the left and right.

Question 4 was, in general, answered less competently. Some stronger responses got to grips with the focus of the question and were able to cite many of the key policies the Nazis adopted to gain the support of business and industry between 1933–39 such as the banning of trade unions and left-wing parties such as the SPD and KPD, rearmament and the use of forced labour from the concentration camps. This was then balanced by examining the significance of winning support from other groups in German society such as the workers, German youth, women, families and farmers. A few candidates also wrote paragraphs on how significant propaganda and the control of the media and culture was, which was valid. Many responses, however, would have benefitted from fuller factual knowledge and more examples when examining the different groups; these answers lacked depth and breadth and were overly short. Some candidates confused businessmen and industrialists with the workers and therefore cited inaccurate material in many circumstances. A few responses also drifted towards writing an essay on Nazi control and looked at the role played by the SA, SS and Gestapo – the violence and intimidation these groups caused did not lead to support but rule by fear and so were examples lacking relevance to this question. It is vital that candidates carefully read the parameters and focus of the question to aid the planning and writing of their answer.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Few candidates attempted this Depth Study. Both **Questions 5** and **6** were attempted with varying degrees of success.

Question 5 was generally well answered. Most responses had a good grasp of the events of Bloody Sunday and could explain how important it was as a cause of the 1905 Revolution. Details about the Bloody Sunday protest tended to be accurate, with plenty of key terminology used in the descriptions. The best responses examined a wide variety of alternative factors such as the Russo-Japanese War, the peasants' land issue and the living and working conditions in the cities, as well as political opposition from liberals and the left. Some candidates tried to reach conclusions about which cause was the most important by linking the causes together or prioritising their relative importance – these were the strongest answers. A few weaker responses tended to be one-sided or narrative in style and often neglected to explicitly address the question. One or two candidates confused the 1905 Revolution with the revolutions of 1917, which led them to citing irrelevant material.

Question 6 was also well answered overall. Strong responses had a good grasp of the significance of Kerensky and his actions and commonly cited the Summer Offensive, the July Days and his actions during the attempted Kornilov Coup in their explanations. Assessment of how this led to the downfall of the Provisional Government varied in quality, with some being implicit or descriptive. This was then balanced by comparing the significance of Kerensky with other factors such as Russia's continued participation in the First World War, the actions of Lenin and Bolshevik agitation, Trotsky's role in organising the storming of the Winter Palace, the impact of dual power and the fact that the Provisional Government had failed to deal with either the peasants' land issue or the effects of the war efficiently. Some candidates reached conclusions by linking factors or prioritising their relative importance, but these were often unsubstantiated or just repeated the main body of the answer. Less successful responses tended to lack factual depth or confuse contextual knowledge- a small number went beyond the November 1917 date implicit in the question and examined the Russian Civil War after the Bolshevik seizure of power, which lacked relevance to this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was the second most popular topic, with both **Question 7** and **Question 8** attempted by candidates. However, there were more **Question 7** responses.

Question 7 was more popular with candidates and was generally well answered. Stronger responses were able to examine how important mass entertainment was to the lives of Americans in the 1920s by citing examples such as the film industry, the radio, nightlife in the cities and the increasing popularity of jazz music and sports. Explanations were given on how it changed the way Americans dressed, behaved and spent their money. This was then balanced by comparing its importance with other factors such as the motor car, increasing intolerance towards immigrants and ethnic minorities, the Red Scare and Prohibition. Good conclusions were reached by linking some factors together such as how the increased sales of the motor car helped fuel access to certain aspects of the entertainment industry such as the cinema or sports. Weaker responses tended to sway from the question and answered a question on the causes of the economic boom instead. The question set this session asked candidates to examine the different factors that changed the lives of Americans and while it was perfectly acceptable to examine the boom as a factor, the question was not asking for a response that explained the causes of the prosperity enjoyed by some; the focus was social rather than economic.

Question 8 was generally less well answered. A few strong responses were able to cite a range of examples as part of Hoover's attempts to deal with the effects of the Depression and explain their significance. Most commonly mentioned were the lowering of taxation, new tariffs, the setting up of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the building of the Hoover Dam. Balanced assessment of the significance of each of these actions was given based on how far they dealt with the effects of the Depression and a few candidates were able to provide substantiated conclusions. Some candidates also examined the significance of Hoover's actions by explaining the negative impact they had, such as the new tariffs and how he dealt with the Bonus Marchers, which was equally valid. Most candidates provided balance by comparing Hoover with Roosevelt and his New Deal legislation. Weaker responses overall lacked factual knowledge about Hoover and his actions and tended to regard him solely as a 'do nothing' President. This limited the responses and omitted much relevant material.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

There were too few responses to **Question 9** and **Question 10** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study F: South Africa, c. 1940–c. 1994

There were too few responses to **Question 11** and **Question 12** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were too few responses to **Question 13** and **Question 14** for any meaningful comments to be made.
.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com