eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully before they begin, in order to understand exactly what is being asked, and to give themselves the opportunity to write focused and balanced responses. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help ensure that responses only include relevant details.

In essay-type responses it is a good idea for candidates to practice writing evaluative, rather than purely summative, conclusions in which they make a judgement and justify this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their essay.

Successful responses were characterised by the inclusion of relevant, contextual examples.

General comments

Successful responses were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study questions. These responses included clear and accurate communication of ideas, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. Less successful responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended to be characterised by a descriptive list of facts with no explanation.

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

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question:

Part (a) responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. Most candidates now realise that answers to **(a)** questions can be short and concise and that there is no need to include background information.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and write in continuous prose rather than using a '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, usually using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that are being explained. Narrative or long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful'. Weaker responses often focused only on one side of the argument. These could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

(a) This question was answered well, with many candidates able to provide examples of the work of the League of Nations in both areas. Candidates were confident in their knowledge of attempts to help with leprosy and the development of vaccines, and work with refugees including the setting up of camps and the provision of Nansen Passports. A misconception from some candidates was to think that these actions were taken by the WHO rather than the League of Nations, or that malaria had been eradicated.

(b) Candidates were confident in answering this question and were able to identify and then explain reasons for the success of the League of Nations in disputes in the 1920s. Many were able to show that the disputes involved smaller countries such as Greece and Bulgaria, or that countries such as Sweden and Finland accepted the decisions that the League made. Some candidates either did not confine their answers to the 1920s, or explained about failures of the League, neither of which were relevant.

(c) This question produced many one-sided answers, with candidates able to explain why the actions of Britain and France were not justified, but less confident in explain how they were justified. Many answers also described what France and Britain did, rather than linking that to whether or not it was justified. Better answers were able to explain that the nature of the events in Abyssinia meant that Britain and France, as leading members of the League, should have supported taking action against Mussolini, or that the Hoare-Laval Pact demonstrated that Britain and France were undermining the League. Candidates who were able to produce balanced answers could explain that the public in these countries were reluctant to commit to a war, or more frequently that Britain and France were keen to have Italy as an ally against Germany.

Question 6

(a) This question was answered very well, with most candidates able to identify several aims of Hitler's foreign policy, such as to destroy the Treaty of Versailles, or to unite all German speaking people. A small number of answers included points of domestic policy, but these were rare. Some candidates also thought that Czechoslovakia had been taken away from Germany in the Treaty of Versailles.

(b) Two well explained reasons were needed for this question, and strong answers were able to demonstrate that remilitarisation of the Rhineland was important to Hitler in order to strengthen the border with France, and also to increase his popularity within Germany. Other responses followed on from the previous question and linked it to Hitler's aim of destroying the Treaty of Versailles. Very few errors were seen in the answers to this question, but many candidates were only able to provide one good explanation.

(c) This was a well answered question, with many candidates able to produce a balanced answer, although a good number would have benefited from being able to provide more than two arguments. The answers displayed good understanding that it was not surprising as Hitler wanted to ensure that he would not need to fight a war on two fronts when he invaded Poland. The most common responses to explain why it was surprising were based around an understanding of Hitler's anti-Communist stance. Less successful answers tended to describe of the Pact, or Hitler's intention to invade Poland, rather than linking these points to consider the issue of surprise.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 7

(a) There were mixed responses to this question, with some answers able to show a good level of knowledge about the Tet Offensive. These answers understood that it was an attack by the Vietcong on South Vietnamese cities, and also the negative impact on public opinion in the United States. Other answers, however, confused the Tet Offensive with other events during the Vietnam War, such as the incident at My Lai, or thought that it was an attack by the North Vietnamese.

(b) Some good answers were seen to this question, with candidates able to explain the importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for Cuba and the United States. Strong answers were able to explain that it was seen as a success for Castro, whilst also encouraging him to become closer to the Soviet Union, and that it was seen as a humiliation for Kennedy. Some candidates thought that the incident caused Castro to ask the Soviet Union to place nuclear missiles in Cuba, and a few candidates thought that the incident was an aspect of the Vietnam War.

(c) This question focused on whether the motivation for US involvement in Vietnam was an error, and some good answers were seen, although there were a significant number of candidates whose answers were more general, rather than specifically linked to 'the beginning'. Some balanced answers were seen which argued on one side that the Domino Theory justified intervention in Vietnam, but also explained that the corrupt political regime in South Vietnam was unpopular, and therefore the US were wrong to support it. Other answers, however, were less successful since they were based around the difficulties the US faced fighting against the Viet Cong during the Vietnam War, rather than focussing on the motivations for involvement from the beginning.

Question 8

(a) There were mixed responses to this question, with some candidates displaying a good level of knowledge about Saddam Hussein's rule in Iraq. These answers were often able to show both the negative elements of his rule, such as his dictatorship and attacks on the Shiites, but also were aware of some of the benefits he brought to Iraq such as new schools and electric power. Less assured answers were only able to highlight one or two aspects of his rule, mostly limiting comments to his rule through fear.

(b) There were some good responses seen to this question, and these answers were able to provide at least one explanation, with the importance of oil being the most common aspect explained. Other valid responses also considered how the Iranian Revolution led to the storming of the US embassy, and that the downfall of the Shah's regime resulted in the West losing an ally. There were also weaker answers which often misinterpreted the question and based their answers on the Iran-Iraq War, rather than the Iranian Revolution.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, and some would have been improved by more balance and more detailed supporting knowledge. Responses tended to be generalised, consisting mainly of statements expressing a lack of surprise, as Saddam Hussein was aggressive. Some candidates were able to provide support for such statements, or to explain that he needed a successful war to distract Iraqis from domestic problems, but they rarely managed to achieve balance by explaining why Saddam Hussein's involvement in the First Gulf War was surprising.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

(a) Some good answers were seen to this question, with most candidates able to describe the German anger and outrage at the occupation of the Ruhr by Belgian and French troops. Most candidates were also able to describe the passive resistance to the French, and that the German government had to print money, leading to hyperinflation. Most candidates were able to answer this question successfully.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) This question was well answered, with most candidates able to provide at least one reason why the Weimar Republic had made some recovery by 1928. These answers often focused on the actions of Stresemann to restore the economy, for example through the introduction of a new currency. Other answers were also able to explain the improvements in Germany's international relations, through their joining of the League of Nations, and the benefits of the Dawes Plan. A few answers strayed outside the timeframe of 1928 or also considered how the Weimar Republic had not recovered and included information about the Young Plan or the Wall Street Crash.

(c) Some successful and balanced answers were seen to this question. These responses were able to show the threat to the Weimar Republic from the Spartacists, since their aim was to overthrow the government and encourage other uprisings such as in Bavaria, but also to consider that the threat was limited since the Freikorps were willing to stop them. When considering the threat from the Freikorps, candidates discussed their nature as an armed group and the problems this caused the government since they struggled to get support from the army. Many answers also discussed the eventual overthrow of the Freikorps through the strikes by Berlin workers, and this was an argument that could be used either to show that the Freikorps were a threat since the government had to rely on the workers to defeat the Freikorps, or that they were not a threat since they had little support in Berlin. Some answers confused the two groups, and contextual knowledge to support explanations was could have been more evident in some responses.

Question 12

(a) Candidates could answer this question well, with general understanding of the roles of women in Nazi Germany, but were less confident in linking the roles specifically to the war years. Many answers were able to describe women as staying at home and bringing up children, and some were also able to show that during the war women were encouraged to work in armament factories, or that they worked as nurses.

(b) Some candidates struggled with their knowledge of the Four-Year Plan and were therefore unable to provide two reasons why it had been introduced by Hitler. The most common misconception was that it was a plan to rebuild Germany after World War I. Successful responses explained that the Plan was introduced in 1936 to ensure that the German forces were ready for war, or that it was introduced to make Germany self-sufficient. These answers were often well explained and supported.

(c) This question produced some very good responses which included well balanced, supported explanations on both sides of the argument. Successful answers were able to include successful examples of Nazi policies towards young people, often based around the changes made to education and the curriculum, or the establishment of the Nazi youth movements. On the other side of the argument, candidates produced strong responses centred around the existence of youth resistance groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the White Rose Movement. Candidates were confident in their knowledge of this aspect of Nazi Germany.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) This was a well answered question, with most answers able to provide a varied description of Republican economic policies during the 1920s. Candidates successfully identified that they followed policies of low taxation, high tariffs and laissez-faire, and were able to describe what these were. Good supporting detail was often included, such as the Fordney-McCumber tariff.

(b) This question was often answered very successfully, with many strong answers able to provide two good reasons why the prices US farmers received for their products dropped in the 1920s. Candidates could consider the negative effect of prohibition driving down the demand for wheat, or the competition from Canada and Argentina. Other reasons seen were the lowering demand from Europe after the end of the war as they no longer needed to import foodstuffs, and also the problem of overproduction as a whole. A few answers referenced the Dust Bowl, which was outside the timeframe covered by the question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question. Strong responses explained both sides of the argument - industries which boomed in the 1920s, and those that did not. These responses most commonly used the car industry to explain how manufacturing industries prospered. They explained how mass production and advertising had led to the rapid growth of the car industry and, because of the increased demand for cars, other industries such as steel, glass, and rubber also boomed. Some good responses also considered how government policies encouraged the boom since they were favourable to business. On the other side of the argument, strong responses addressed which traditional manufacturing industries went into decline and explained examples of such industries, most commonly, coal and textiles. Other responses were usually one-sided, often limiting their answers to the car industry.

Questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

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

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully before they begin, in order to understand exactly what is being asked, and to give themselves the opportunity to write focused and balanced responses. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help ensure that responses only include relevant details.

In essay-type responses it is a good idea for candidates to practice writing evaluative, rather than purely summative, conclusions in which they make a judgement and justify this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their essay.

Successful responses were characterised by the inclusion of relevant, contextual examples.

General comments

Successful responses were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study questions. These responses included clear and accurate communication of ideas, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. Less successful responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended to be characterised by a descriptive list of facts with no explanation.

It was pleasing to see that there were very few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question:

Part (a) responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. Most candidates now realise that answers to **(a)** questions can be short and concise and that there is no need to include background information.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and write in continuous prose rather than using a '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, usually using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that are being explained. Narrative or long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful'. Weaker responses often focused only on one side of the argument. These could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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 popular questions in this section.

Question 5

(a) This question was very well answered. The best responses demonstrated a detailed knowledge of how the Assembly and the Council of the League were meant to work and included a number of relevant, concisely expressed points. Points made included: 'the Assembly met once a year', 'one of the Assembly's roles was to set the budget', 'the Council consisted of four permanent members', 'the Council could issue sanctions'. Other responses did not include details on both the Assembly and the Council. Less successful responses did not distinguish between the Assembly and the Council and described the activities together. Some responses strayed away from the question and wrote at length generally on the setting up of the League of Nations, which lacked relevance to this question.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. The most effective were familiar with the events leading up to Mussolini's bombing of Corfu and the subsequent response of the League, and provided two explanations as to why the League's failure was important. They explained that the League appeared weak because Mussolini ignored the League's instructions and insisted that the demands for Greek compensation should be dealt with by the Conference of Ambassadors, which found in favour of Mussolini's demands. A second reason often explained was that the Corfu crisis showed that powerful countries, such as Italy, could just ignore the League of Nations. This would be a lesson for other powerful countries, such as Germany and Japan, in the future when they were attempting to acquire territory. Less successful responses identified reasons without any explanation, or with minimal reference to the Corfu incident, such as, 'its failure was important because it showed the weakness of the League' and 'this was important as it showed that powerful countries could ignore the League'. A small number of responses demonstrated no accurate knowledge of the Corfu crisis, often confusing the events and the countries involved.

(c) This question was well answered. There were a number of well-developed and balanced responses which discussed the extent to which the lack of an army explained the League's failure in the 1930s. Strong responses identified the problems caused by the lack of the League's own army, especially when moral and economic sanctions failed, and went on to explain where such an army could have been used such as in Manchuria or Abyssinia. These responses then explained other reasons for the failure of the League of Nations. The most common reason identified and explained was the lack of major powers such as the USA. This had an impact on the imposition of economic sanctions, candidates most often citing the Abyssinian crisis as an example whereby the USA, not being in the League, continued trading with Abyssinia, rendering the economic sanctions ineffective. Other reasons identified included British and French self-interest, and this was often explained using aspects of the Manchurian or Abyssinian crises to demonstrate this. Weaker responses included irrelevant details of why the USA did not join the League and/or wrote detailed descriptions of the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises without highlighting how the response of the League led to its failure. A few responses included events in the 1920s such as Corfu and Vilna which were not relevant to this question.

Question 6

(a) This question worked well for most candidates who had a good understanding of what happened in the Saar in 1935. Successful responses tended to include four precise and relevant pieces of information, for example: a scheduled plebiscite was held, identifying two of the choices available to those who voted (most were unaware of the option to remain as a League mandate) and knowing the outcome. Some left out the options and simply gave the result. Weaker responses

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

were characterised by a lack of factual knowledge, often confusing the Saar with the Rhineland and describing how German troops marched into the area.

(b) There were many strong responses which contained two explanations as to why the Anschluss was important to Hitler. The most common reasons identified were Hitler's own Austrian origins and his determination to overthrow the Treaty of Versailles. Candidates then went on to develop and explain these themes by linking them to Hitler's determination to create a Greater Germany and to strengthen German military resources, including manpower. Successful responses also included how the Anschluss would improve Hitler's more immediate ambitions regarding Czechoslovakia and confirmed his improved relationship with Mussolini's Italy. Weaker responses were often confused. For example, there was confusion between Hitler's aim for a Greater Germany and Hitler's quest for Lebensraum (which did not apply to Austrian territory). Some responses had no understanding of the term, 'Anschluss'.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Successful responses included contextual examples to produce a well-balanced answer explaining surprise and alternatively, not surprised, that Britain and France declared war on Germany in September 1939. Candidates were strongest on appeasement as a reason to be surprised. The rationale behind appeasement was well explained, with Anglo-French non action over the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and Anschluss, as well as the 1935 Anglo-German naval agreement, frequently cited and explained. Appeasement was also well used on the other side of the argument to indicate that that the patience of Britain and France with Hitler ran out after the occupation of the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 and in effect that the warning to Hitler over Poland after that could not have been clearer. The lack of British and French preparedness for war, though cited as a reason not to be surprised, was often identified, but less well explained, with many candidates arguing that both these countries were still recovering from the impact of the First World War (rather than the Great Depression), as was more accurately the case in the 1930s. Weaker responses tended to be superficial on much of the detail. They commonly identified appeasement as a reason why they were surprised but did not provide any contextual examples to support their supposition. These responses needed to include supporting examples such as: 'they were following a policy of appeasement and had let Hitler break the Treaty of Versailles by rearming Germany, remilitarising the Rhineland, achieving Anschluss and agreeing at the Munich Conference for the Sudetenland to be taken over. They took no action when he invaded Czechoslovakia in March 1939, therefore it is difficult to see how Hitler's invasion of Poland was any different, and so it is a surprise that they declared war on Germany in September 1939.' Weaker responses also tended to include a narrative of events leading to the outbreak of war in 1939 with no expression of surprised/not surprised.

Question 7

(a) This question was very well answered and most candidates very high marks. They demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the tactics used by the Vietcong. Points made included: they used guerrilla warfare, which often involved a network of tunnels for escape and surprise attacks. They blended in with the peasants and used booby traps. Other relevant tactics most commonly cited were the use of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, they retreated when the Americans attacked so that the Americans could not fight a conventional battle, and the use of ambushes.

(b) Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why the Tet Offensive was important for the USA and explained two reasons. The two most common reasons identified were that it showed the American people that North Vietnam was very far from being defeated and it led to the US seeking negotiations to end the war with North Vietnam. The first identification was explained by developing the idea that it was important for the USA because of the impact it had on the American people. Tet was a massive attack by North Vietnamese forces across South Vietnam in 1968. Despite being a military defeat for North Vietnam it caused a big shock in America. They even attacked the American Embassy in Saigon. The Americans had been told that North Vietnam was weak and incapable of launching large attacks. Tet showed that this was incorrect and support for the war in America declined and the opposition increased. Prior to this media coverage had been generally positive but, as a result of Tet, public opinion changed and there were several peace marches to end the war. Weaker responses usually readily identified reasons, but these needed to be fully developed into explanations. There was a minority of candidates who had no knowledge of the Tet Offensive and offered no response.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. To achieve high marks candidates needed to produce a well- balanced answer to explain which was more important for the USA, its involvement

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

in Korea or in the Cuban Missile Crisis. Successful responses showed good understanding of the events in Korea and identified that US involvement was important to stop the spread of communism. This was explained by adding, as troops from North Korea invaded South Korea and were supported by both China and the USSR, that there was a real danger that South Korea would fall to the communists. This would have been an important step in spreading communism to other countries in Southeast Asia. On the other side of the argument, candidates identified and explained that US involvement in Cuba was vital to stop a potential nuclear war. This is because Cuba was a communist country off the coast of the USA and the USSR missiles which were placed there were a real threat to the USA. Some responses were one sided; candidates tended to be more familiar with events in Cuba than with those in Korea. Weaker responses included much narrative on the background to the Cuban Missile Crisis, including the overthrow of Batista and the Bay of Pigs failure for the USA, which were not relevant to this question. These responses also often included detailed description of the Cuban Missile Crisis without stressing why it was important for the USA.

Question 8

(a) This question worked well for most candidates who had a good understanding of the Soviet Union's response to the uprising in Hungary in 1956. They expressed a number of concise and relevant points, including: Soviet tanks and troops moved into Budapest, fierce fighting followed and 3,000 Hungarian civilians were killed. Nagy and his supporters were executed. Other responses wrote about why the Soviet Union responded in this way which was not the focus of the question.

(b) This question was well answered. Strong responses were characterised by the explanation of two reasons why it was important for the Soviet Union to stop Dubcek's reform programme in Czechoslovakia. The most common reason explained was that the Soviets were afraid that Dubcek's ideas would spread to other Communist countries in Eastern Europe. His reforms included a free press, freedom of speech and reducing government control over industry. If these reforms were allowed in Czechoslovakia there was a worry that people in other communist countries would demand the same freedoms. Other factors identified and explained included the fact that the USSR would look weak if they did not take decisive action and they were worried this would weaken the Communist Bloc in the Cold War against the USA. Weaker responses shifted the focus of the question and described Dubcek's reforms, rather than emphasising why it was important for the Soviet Union to stop them.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses explained surprise that Gorbachev made little effort to defend Soviet power in Eastern Europe. This was because previous Soviet leaders had seen Eastern European countries as a protective barrier for the Soviet Union against the West. The Soviet Union had been invaded by Germany twice in the twentieth century and Stalin had been determined that this would not happen again. This had been the basis of foreign policy for decades and explains why the Soviet Union had put down risings in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. As a result of previous events, it is very surprising that when communist regimes began to collapse and the Berlin Wall fell, that Gorbachev did nothing. These responses often also expressed surprise, because The Brezhnev Doctrine had said that the Soviet Union would intervene. Such responses produced a balanced answer by then explaining why they were not surprised, most commonly expressing the fact that Gorbachev was a new type of leader in the Soviet Union who realised that the Soviet Union was in economic trouble and spending too much on arms in the unwinnable war in Afghanistan. He believed in different policies such as Glasnost and Perestroika. Less successful responses were characterised by a narrative of Gorbachev's reforms, with no reference to surprised/not surprised. It is important that candidates link the points that they make to the question.

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 popular question of the Depth Studies

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(a) The majority of candidates knew that Hitler took advantage of the Reichstag Fire by blaming the communists, which then gave him an excuse to arrest them. Successful responses had a good understanding of other immediate consequences, including how he was able to convince President Hindenburg that communists were plotting to overthrow the Government so that he would issue an emergency decree, thus he took advantage of the Reichstag Fire to consolidate his power. A common misconception was that after the Reichstag Fire he immediately passed The Enabling Act.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. The majority of candidates could identify reasons why the Depression was important to the Nazis, most commonly that the Nazis gained support because the Weimar Republic did not deal well with the effects of the Depression and the Nazis were able to win support by offering full employment. Successful responses developed such points into an explanation. They explained that, as a result of the Depression, millions of Germans had lost their jobs. This gave the Nazis the opportunity to do well in elections as they expressed contempt for Weimar's democratic system and said that it was unable to solve Germany's economic problems caused by the Depression. The Nazis organised soup kitchens and provided shelter in hostels for the unemployed. They promised them work, freedom and bread. This gave them lots of votes and they became the largest party in the Reichstag in the elections of July 1932. Less successful responses included generalisations as to how the Depression was important to the Nazis and how it enabled them to exploit the situation but did not say how, and also the points made were often not linked to the Depression. A small number of responses discussed the hyperinflation crisis of 1923 which was not relevant to this question.

(c) This question was well-answered. Candidates showed a very good understanding of the effects of the Munich Putsch and produced some good responses, with detailed arguments on either side of the debate. The majority of candidates began their responses agreeing with the hypothesis by using the events of the Munich Putsch to explain that in the short term it was a failure. Most commonly included were that it was not well planned, failed to win popular support, was defeated quickly, Hitler was later arrested and imprisoned and the Nazi Party was banned. Successful responses then examined the other side of the debate, including the long-term effects of the Munich Putsch. A common explanation was that Hitler was imprisoned in Landsberg Castle and whilst there he had time to re-think his tactics. He realised that he could not gain power by uprisings and violence and that he needed to win support and win elections. This made him re-organise the party and begin to use democratic methods. This was a turning point for the Nazis and contributed to their later success in elections. Weaker responses tended to be more descriptive, an example being that Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf* when he was in prison; the key themes were described in these responses, but little attempt was made to link it to the long-term success of the Nazis. Others were less selective in the details they included in their answers and wrote at length how the Germans gained power in 1933, with no link to the effects of the Munich Putsch.

Question 12

(a) The majority of candidates were very familiar with how the Nazis used the mass media. Examples included: cheap radios were made available so all Germans could buy one and hear Hitler's speeches. Goebbels controlled the newspapers closely and they were not allowed to print anti-Nazi ideas. Posters were put up around Germany showing images of the ideal Aryan family. Successful responses also highlighted that the Nazis used the media to promote Nazi propaganda and to make the Nazis look great. Weaker responses mis-interpreted the focus of the question and whilst being able to identify the different types of mass media, they did not focus on how the media was used by the Nazis.

(b) Strong responses identified and explained two reasons why Kristallnacht was important. The most common explanation was that it was a turning point in the nature of the Nazi persecution of the Jews. It was a change from the previous economic and social persecution to physical persecution, with Jews being beaten and murdered, and can be seen as a step towards the Holocaust. Other reasons explained included the increasing number of Jews leaving Germany and how Goebbels had used the event to try to improve his standing with Hitler. Less successful responses included details on why Hitler hated the Jews, which was not the focus of the question. A small number of candidates confused Kristallnacht with the Night of the Long Knives.

(c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. In agreement with the hypothesis, responses explained that there was no effective opposition to the Nazi regime. They explained this in terms of the terror and force used to suppress any opposition. Control was exercised through the Gestapo, who had

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

unlimited powers to search houses, arrest people on suspicion and send them to concentration camps without trial or explanation. Many Germans were frightened to speak out against the regime, even if they wanted to. Strong responses also gave consideration to ways in which opposition to the Nazi regime was effective. They explained how many young people believed in freedom of expression and values which conflicted with those of the Nazis. They used the Edelweiss Pirates as an example and showed how they shared a strong distaste of the strict regimentation and sexual segregation of the Hitler Youth, so they often beat them up. During the war they carried out acts of sabotage, helped army deserters and even assassinated a Gestapo chief. The activities of the Swing Movement, the White Rose group and members of the Church were also often used as examples of effective opposition. Some opposition could be used to demonstrate both sides of the debate, for example, groups like the White Rose, despite scattering leaflets and conducting an anti-Nazi graffiti campaign, were rounded up by the Gestapo and executed, thus reducing the effectiveness of the opposition. Other responses would have benefited from adopting a much less narrative approach on the effectiveness of the opposition.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) This question was well answered and candidates had a good understanding of the experiences of American farmers in the 1920s. Successful responses described the problems experienced by farmers at this time and gained very high marks as a result of identifying four points. These included: overproduction, competition from Canada, reduction in prices and the eviction of tenant farmers because they could not pay their rents.

(b) Successful responses were characterised by explaining how a specific traditional industry struggled in the 1920s. Two explanations were needed. The main industries identified and explained were the coal and textile industry. For example: The coal industry struggled and found itself producing too much coal because demand for it was going down. This was because electricity was increasingly supplied to more homes and factories, so they were changing from coal to electricity for their energy. They were also changing to other new forms of energy, such as gas and oil. Less successful responses only provided generalised answers with no mention of specific industries, for example, the main reason why traditional industries struggled was because of changes happening in American society. This could have been improved by identifying an industry and including more details as to why it was struggling in the 1920s.

(c) There were some very good responses to this question, which displayed an excellent knowledge and understanding of the US economy in the 1920s. These responses produced well supported arguments on both sides of the debate. Regarding the responsibility of the Republican Government for the boom, successful responses identified and explained policies related to low taxation, import tariffs, the formation of trusts and laissez-faire. The counter explanations most commonly focused on technical advances such as the assembly line and mechanisation of new industries, such as the car industry and its boost to other associate industries like rubber, oil and glass. Other examples included explanations of credit, advertising and the positive impact of World War I on the US economy. Less successful responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, were less selective in the details they needed to use to answer the question relevantly and often described the reasons for the boom, rather than explain their impact on the American economy.

Questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Paper 13

Key messages

- Candidates need to 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 they 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 question set.

General comments

Many answers reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and had a great deal of information to share and they were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions which reward recall and description. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

Strong answers to **part (b) and (c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the questions were asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or including information which was lacking in relevance. Credit was given for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but the best responses were those that went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the exact demands of the question.

Many responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation) but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Candidates should avoid repeating points already made in the essay and should try to explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Some conclusions just asserted 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was 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

This was a popular question. In answer to part **(a)**, answers included references to the League's support for Finland's claims to the Islands and details about the safeguards which were included in the judgement. **Part (b)** was answered well, as many candidates identified Soviet communism, the opposition from the US Congress and Germany's War Guilt as factors; explanation and development of these identified factors featured in stronger responses, for example, why did the context of Soviet communism mean that its membership would not be allowed? Many candidates showed good knowledge in **part (c)** of the crises the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

League was meant to deal with in the 1930s; valid descriptions of the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises, for example, gained credit. Better answers included explanations as to why Britain was responsible for not dealing with these events more successfully, for example the motives behind the Hoare Laval Pact and why Britain appeased Mussolini in order to avoid driving him into the arms of Hitler, were referenced in some responses. Stronger responses were better balanced, with explanations on each side, in this case providing alternative reasons for the League's failure in the 1930s. These usually included explanations of the impact of the Depression or the problems limited membership created when the imposition of sanctions was considered. The very best responses went on to substantiate a judgement on the hypothesis given in the question.

Question 6

Relevant points in **part (a)** included the lack of action by Britain and France plus additional points of detail, such as Britain's view that Germany had a right to do what it wanted in 'its own backyard'. The opposition of French public opinion and the economic and political crises faced by its government were also cited. Candidates knew a great deal about the failures of the League of Nations in the 1930s in **part (b)** but needed to apply this knowledge to why these failures were important to Hitler. In this case, the League's failures were important to Hitler because they showed him that the League would not stand up to countries which had aggressive foreign policies. This was clear when Japan got away with invading Manchuria and the incapacity to deal with Italy's aggression in Abyssinia. When Hitler decided to destroy the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, he was more confident that the League would not stop him. Many valid factors were identified in answers to **part (c)** and candidates attempted arguments to both support and challenge the idea that they may be surprised by Germany's invasion of Poland in 1939. Some explanations dealt precisely with the Polish context. For example, some responses expressed surprise because both Britain and France realised that Hitler wanted to conquer the whole of eastern Europe and he was not going to stop at Czechoslovakia. This was explained by reference to Polish guarantees that if it was attacked they would come to its aid. Answers explained that appeasement had therefore ended and as Hitler did not want a war with Britain, the invasion of Poland was a significant risk. Candidates who went on to provide a balanced answer in which other arguments were explained provided the best responses. These answers included a 'lack of surprise' because of the well-publicised aims of Hitler's foreign policy (such as lebensraum), as they applied to Poland. The terms of the Nazi-Soviet Pact were also used as a signal of Hitler's intent. Some then progressed to an evaluative conclusion, rather than repeating points already made.

Question 7

There were some good answers to **part (a)**; many responses included the military nature of the alliance, its purpose to stand up to communism and how its members used it for mutual protection. The best answers to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question which focused on why the fate of Germany at the end of the Second World War led to disagreements, rather than general differences such as those based on ideology. Identified factors referenced the issue of reparations, the West's preference for a strong Germany to counter Soviet influence and Truman's hostile attitude to Stalin. Candidates who then explained each factor fully achieved the strongest responses. The aim in **part (c)** was to write a balanced answer which looked at the motives behind the Marshall Plan. Responses tended to emphasise and explain efforts by the United States to combat the advance of communism in poverty stricken and war-torn European states. Some responses offered more, explaining that the idea behind lending European countries enormous sums of money was that, as their economies recovered, they would buy goods from the USA. This would help US industry and create jobs in the USA because there would be a great demand for US exports.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

It was rare to read a poor answer to **part (a)**, as candidates gained marks by describing such features as disease, trench foot, mud, wet and damp conditions, rats, shell shock and boredom. There were detailed narratives of the use of tanks in **part (b)**, although the best answers met the specific demands of the question with explanations of importance. Weaker answers tended to make generalised observations about tanks and trench warfare. Two explained points about importance or impact were provided in the best responses, for instance, the impact of tanks at the Battle of Cambrai in 1917 and the co-ordinated

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

counterattacks of 1918. Answers to **part (c)** reflected many details about the battles of Verdun and the Somme but were less clear about their comparative importance. An analysis of their relative impacts might have included the argument that Verdun was crucial as the loss of the fortress would have been catastrophic, while the Somme played its part in taking pressure off Verdun and it also enabled valuable lessons to be learned about how to develop military strategies to fight attritional warfare.

Question 10

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

Question 11

Candidates in **part (a)** were able to describe numerous events in 1932 and 1933 which led to Hitler becoming Chancellor. The best responses focused on elections and the roles of Hindenburg, Papen and Schleicher. It is worth noting the importance of dates –some answers included events after January 1933. Answers to **part (b)** contained detailed knowledge about the reasons why the Nazis failed to win support during the so-called 'Golden Age' of the Weimar Republic, emphasising why economic 'recovery' lessened the appeal of extremist parties. **Part (c)** saw candidates writing at length about the Reichstag Fire and Night of the Long Knives and in better responses candidates were able to link their narratives to the demands of the question. In other responses, these links could have been made more explicitly; in this case, the quality of the answers relied on a discussion of 'importance'. Some candidates would have benefited from greater engagement with the idea of analysing impact, placing both events in the context of the development of a one-party state, the destruction of the opposition to the Nazis and Hitler's assumption of dictatorial powers.

Question 12

It was rare to see weak answers to this question. Candidates knew a great deal about the Nuremberg rallies in **part (a)**. **Part (b)** provided an opportunity to explain why some young people rebelled against the Hitler Youth. Weaker responses relied on general criticisms of Nazi indoctrination, discipline and activities aimed at preparation for either life in the military for boys or in the home for girls. Higher marks were achieved when candidates explained the specific objections of groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates or those who might consider themselves members of the Swing Movement. In **part (c)**, many candidates went beyond description to explanation and tried to create an argument; for example, they contrasted the fear engendered by the Gestapo with the effectiveness of Nazi propaganda in considering why the Nazis managed to stay in power. Developed attempts to interlink the two factors reflected a complex understanding of the topic.

Question 13

In **part (a)** some candidates took the opportunity to focus precisely on consequences of the Russo-Japanese War and achieved good answers; for example, responses focused on Bloody Sunday, criticism of the Tsar's authority and the loss of military prestige. Responses to **part (b)** saw candidates take a short and long term view of the significance of Bloody Sunday; there were explained references to the loss of trust in the Tsar, leading initially to the 1905 Revolution and subsequently to the October Manifesto. Many answers to **part (c)** reflected strong lines of argument expressing surprise that the Tsar survived as long as he did until 1917 on the one hand, with lack of surprise at his maintenance in power because of his use of both reform and repression after 1905. Explanations were supported by knowledge of the royal family's unpopularity following the failed Dumas, The Fundamental Laws and the disastrous entry into the First World War to support 'surprise'; alternative factors such as Stolypin's reforms and the Okhrana's brutality evidenced lack of surprise.

Question 14

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

Question 15

Candidates knew many of the products promoted by advertising in the USA in the 1920s in **part (a)**. Better answers focused on cars and examples of domestic appliances. **Part (b)** attracted many quality explanations of the failure of Prohibition which often focused on a lack of public support, the problems of enforcement, corruption and the widespread supply of illegal alcohol. **Part (c)** responses tended to be unbalanced and descriptive; the elements of 'similarity' and 'difference' were not always made clear. The best answers drew on knowledge of poverty and discrimination in both urban and rural areas (similarities), and evidence of the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

'boom' enjoyed by urban Americans, rather than those in rural parts of the country (differences). Developed arguments tended to be stronger when explaining the latter.

Questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

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

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

- Candidates should read the sources carefully. Often a phrase or sentence on its own will not be sufficient to reveal the true meaning. One source quoted President Wilson as saying of the Treaty of Versailles, 'the punishment is hard'. Some candidates focused on this and missed what followed: 'but the punishment is not unjust'. Using all of the sentence, and not just a part of it, could make all the difference to an answer.
- Using the time allowance well is important. The last question carries the most marks, so enough time must be kept in hand to answer it properly. Some scripts had very lengthy answers to **Question 1** but rushed responses to **Question 6**.
- Questions should be answered directly. If a question asks why something happened, then giving reasons why is required. If a question asks how useful a source is, then giving an answer that addresses its utility as evidence as the approach to take. Some answers struggle to clearly relate to the questions asked.

General comments

There were some shorter responses, as well as those in which the comparison of sources was not effectively done, and scripts in which individual questions were omitted. However, most scripts were complete, and included positive answers to the questions. Candidates could use the information that the sources provided, and whilst this was usually understood in context, it was only rarely evaluated. Sources were generally taken at face value in some responses, rather than being regarded as the product of the people who created them, with all the opinions, purposes, inclusions and omissions this inevitably involves.

The level of contextual knowledge demonstrated in candidates' answers was sound. Some questions invite the use of knowledge more than others, particularly those where checking the accuracy of a source is involved, and when appropriate many candidates were able to select relevant recalled information to use in their answers.

Although the majority of candidates answered the questions on the twentieth-century topic, there were a number who opted for the nineteenth century, and on both options a full range of quality of answers was seen.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

There were lots of opportunities to find both agreements and disagreements in the two sources. Many could spot the overall difference of tone between them, with Source A being more downbeat about united Italy and Source B more positive. There were also clear agreements, such as Venice and Rome joining Italy later, so the best candidates were able to explore 'How far' by giving examples both of agreement and disagreement.

Question 2

Few candidates accepted the invitation in the question to reject Source C as evidence because it was not produced until 1910. Almost all responded that it was still useful as it showed us what was going on in 1860. This was a reasonable approach, but a number of responses would have benefited from greater

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

engagement with the issue of the source's significance, given that it was produced fifty years after the events. The source is actually evidence of how the events of the Risorgimento were represented in 1910; that is, of the fact that 1860 was still perceived as a time of great achievement and joy.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to detect the contradictions in the two sources, and many concluded that this did, indeed, prove one or other to be wrong. Better candidates reached a different conclusion; that the difference did not mean that either was wrong because they were simply different opinions with different perspectives, one Neapolitan, the other Piedmontese. It was rare to see an answer that attempted to explain the difference either by using cross-reference to explore the accuracy of the claims, or by arguing that either of the authors might have had a particular purpose behind what they were writing.

Question 4

This question was answered well by candidates who had some sound contextual knowledge about Mazzini. They were totally unsurprised by what he wrote, generally on the grounds that his hostility towards the Italy of 1871 could be explained by his republicanism. Candidates without such knowledge were only able to check claims in Source F against their wider knowledge of Italian unification or use other sources as the basis for cross-reference, but this could not work quite as well, as it was neglecting the author.

Question 5

The cartoon was not well understood, and answers were almost always based, to a greater or lesser extent, on misinterpretation. The cartoon was only rarely seen as sympathetic towards Italian unification. Many answers were limited to face-value descriptions and would have been improved by being able to place the cartoon properly in its historical context.

Question 6

In answering **Question 6** candidates need to use the content of the sources to illustrate whether or not it confirms a given hypothesis. Central to this is the hypothesis itself. The answer must focus on this hypothesis; it must not be missed, nor can an alternative hypothesis be substituted. The idea to be tested in this question was whether or not Italian unification was a triumph. Better answers simply worked through the sources one by one, finding material that could be used either to confirm or to question the hypothesis. Other answers started with a proper focus on 'triumph' but quickly moved into testing whether unification was a 'success' or 'popular' or 'a good thing'; in other words, losing focus on the question. Other answers worked through the sources, commenting on them, but without stating whether or not they indicated a 'triumph'.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

There were many points of agreement and disagreement in Sources A and B, but candidates had to be careful that their comparisons were based on valid criteria that the sources had in common. For example, whilst the sources agreed that the British viewed the Treaty as too harsh, they did not agree overall that it was too harsh – on this criterion, Source A regarded the Treaty as 'not excessively harsh' whilst Source B saw it as 'simply vindictive….a serious blow'. Despite this issue, most candidates were able to spot agreements, for example on the plebiscite in Upper Silesia, and better candidates added disagreements too, so as to explore the 'How far' element in the question.

Question 2

Almost all responses saw the source as useful either for what it showed about the impact of the Treaty on the Germans, or for what it showed about German feelings of dislike towards the Treaty. The second of these was preferable, since the publication date made it clear that the cartoon was more a prediction of what the Treaty would bring, rather than a reflection of what had already occurred. Some candidates made the point that it was not that useful because there were all kinds of things about the Treaty that it did not tell you. All these answers were acceptable but limited by the fact that they took the cartoon at face value; they assumed that the cartoon provided information and that the information was accurate. A few answers went further by beginning to explain why it might be better to question the source's reliability. The usual way to do this was to see the cartoon as propaganda with the purpose of turning public opinion against the Treaty, or of

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

putting pressure on the Allies to moderate the terms. This kind of analysis would lead to a conclusion that the unreliability undermined the source's utility as evidence. Of course, it would have been possible to argue that its unreliability might in itself have indicated something useful about the Treaty – that it could serve as evidence of what German propagandists wanted people to think about the Treaty, but generally candidates did not perceive the source in this way.

Question 3

Whether or not candidates were surprised by what Wilson said in Source D almost always depended on the contextual knowledge they had about him. The more general kind of knowledge focused on Wilson's beliefs, his idealism and his support for the League. This would produce arguments of not being surprised that he says he wants a just peace because that's the kind of idea that you would find in the Fourteen Points. There was other contextual knowledge that was equally relevant, such as the attitudes of the various peacemakers at Versailles, so some candidates were surprised that Wilson says his colleagues in Paris wanted justice for Germany when they know that Clemenceau wanted a punitive peace. These arguments were all sound but could have been enhanced by reference to the specific circumstances in which Wilson was making his speech. The better kind of contextual knowledge was used to explain how you would not be surprised by what he said because of the specific purpose he had in saying it; that is, these candidates knew about Wilson's speaking tour of the United States, when he sought to persuade people to support the Treaty and, in particular, to ensure that Congress ratified the Treaty and agreed to join the League.

Question 4

This question was well answered. Almost all candidates were able to produce some valid comparison of the cartoons, ranging from answers that looked only at the reparations (both showed they were a large amount), to answers that looked at the impact on Germany (both showed that Germany was struggling under the burden of reparations). Better responses moved into the realm of cartoonists' opinions, usually saying that both cartoonists regarded the reparations as too heavy for Germany to bear, or seeing the Treaty as a whole as unjust. However, the very best candidates perceived differences and disagreements, rather than agreements. These answers would make something of the way in which Germany was portrayed in Source F, not really as a victim, but resistant to the demands of the Treaty. This could be contrasted with the helplessness of Germany in Source E.

Question 5

Almost all candidates gave reasons for Lloyd George writing his book at that particular time that were based either on his message – what he wanted to say about the Treaty – or on the context of what was happening in 1938. These were clearly acceptable reasons, but they missed the issue of why he would want to say these things at that time – in other words, they missed his purpose. In giving the message that the Treaty could have worked well enough had it not been betrayed by the failure of the victors to uphold it, he is clearly trying to justify his own actions in 1919, and shift the blame for failure onto those statesmen who succeeded him. This message was particularly pressing given that by 1938 war was looming again. The best answers were able to explore this line of argument.

Question 6

Some answers to this question were characterised by candidates not keeping a consistent focus on the idea of whether or not the Treaty could have been justified. Very often this was caused by focusing instead on an alternative hypothesis – whether or not the Treaty was 'harsh'. There are two fundamental requirements in **Question 6** – using content from the sources and illustrating agreement or disagreement with the hypothesis. This has to be the given hypothesis, and those candidates who methodically worked through the sources, maintaining a proper focus on the hypothesis, discovered material both in support and questioning the hypothesis, which is what the question requires. Some candidates attempted to evaluate the sources; these responses would have benefited from this being part of the process of assessing their utility in relation to testing the hypothesis. Instead, there tended to be conclusions on whether the source was reliable or not.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Candidates should ensure that they answer the question directly. If a question asks how useful a source is, candidates should clearly refer to 'usefulness' in the answer; if a question asks why a speech was given or a letter was written, then explaining a reason is vital. The best way to ensure that the question is being directly addressed is to refer to it in the opening sentence of the answer, for example 'This cartoon is very useful to a historian because'.

Avoiding descriptions of pictorial sources and paraphrasing written sources is important. Candidates should try to interpret sources. This means they need to work out the argument or point of view the artist/author was trying to put across and their purpose in doing this. It can be a useful starting point for candidates to ask themselves about each source, 'What is the point of view of the artist or author?'

Question 6 carries a high number of marks. When answering it, candidates need to directly check each source against the hypothesis given in the question and not against something that is similar to it. In the twentieth century option, a number of candidates focused on 'harsh' rather than on 'unfair'.

General comments

A large majority of candidates answered the questions on the twentieth-century option. There were many competent scripts and a small number of outstandingly good ones.

Nearly all candidates were able to comprehend the sources and showed at least reasonable skills in interpreting, comparing and evaluating. The better candidates made good use of their knowledge and understanding of the historical content to help them understand and use the sources relevantly. Weaker responses tended to focus on the historical context without relating it to the question or the sources.

Nearly all candidates completed all the questions, although there was a tendency to write very long answers to **Question 1**. These answers often contained lengthy paraphrases of both sources and did not address the question until right at the end. This sometimes appeared to lead to candidates not having enough time to complete **Question 6** properly.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

Most candidates managed to find several agreements such as the Papacy, Austria and local loyalties all being an obstacle to unification. Many also explained that the sources disagree over what was the biggest obstacle to unification, the Italians or Austria. Some candidates summarised both sources and then made assertions about agreements or disagreements. The best way to answer this question was a point-by-point comparison.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

The most common way of answering this question was to focus on the fact that Charles Albert promised his immediate support in Source C, but in Source D he claimed that he was not ready and was very slow to act. Candidates used this difference as proof that Charles Albert was lying in Source C. Some also compared his show of enthusiasm for 'Italian brotherhood' in C with his rejection of popular support in D, and the suggestion that he was more interested in expanding Piedmont's power. Better answers evaluated one of the sources to check whether these differences meant he was lying. The most popular way of doing this was to consider Charles Albert's purpose in making the proclamation in Source C. Relevant use of sound contextual knowledge made this approach work well and produced some very strong responses. Other answers tended not to compare the sources or identified lying by Charles Albert but did not explain the lying.

Question 3

The key to answering this question well was to consider Mazzini's message in the context of November 1848. By this time it is not surprising to see Mazzini feeling frustrated because of the defeat of Charles Albert and the change of mind by Pope Pius and King Ferdinand. Most candidates were able to explain Mazzini's message but tended to set this in the very general context of 1848, rather than specific events of that year. A small number of candidates paraphrased the source, rather than interpreted its message.

Question 4

Most candidates were able to find similarities in the messages of the two cartoons. Similarities most commonly explained were the fact that Italy is not free in either cartoon and the fact that Austria is portrayed as an oppressor in both. A few candidates managed to find a difference such as Source F suggesting some possible hope for Italy, but Source G suggesting no hope at all. The best answers were those that compared the points of view of the cartoonists – they are both in favour of a free independent Italy.

Question 5

There are two crucial steps on the way to writing a good answer to this question. The first is to infer from Source H the Pope's attitude towards a unified Italy. The second is to clearly and explicitly address the issue of 'surprise'. Some candidates wrote good answers that could have led to being surprised or not surprised but did not get as far as addressing the issue. Most candidates were surprised by what we are told about the Pope's attitude in Source H. This was based on Pius's actions as a reformer shortly after being elected as Pope in 1846. A few candidates were able to use their knowledge of the Pope's actions and pronouncements since 1848 to argue that there is no reason to be surprised by Pius's attitude.

Question 6

This question was generally answered well. The sources provided candidates with plenty of material to work with on both sides of the argument. They managed to focus on the hypothesis about Austria being the most important obstacle to Italian unification and used the sources clearly and convincingly. The following is a good example of how a source should be used in response to **Question 6**: 'Source D shows that the most important obstacle to Italian unification was the incompetence of Charles Albert. The source tells us that he was very slow in attacking the Austrians and his army was not ready. It also suggests that he was interested in increasing the power of Piedmont rather than helping Italian unification.' A few candidates neglected the sources and wrote general essays about the struggle for Italian unification.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

Most candidates had little difficulty identifying and explaining agreements between the two sources, for example they both state that the British thought the Treaty was too harsh, they both state that Germany did not like the Treaty, and they both claim that Germany was made stronger by the Treaty. Candidates found it harder to find disagreements but they are there, for example Source A claims Germany was made stronger by the splintering of the Austrian and Russian empires, while Source B says that this was caused by the creation of Poland. Candidates should avoid summarising each source and then asserting that they agree or disagree. What worked best was a point-by-point comparison.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

The majority of candidates were split into four groups by this question. Some thought that the cartoonist approved of the treatment of Germany, and this seems to be supported by the mocking way in which the Kaiser and Germany are presented. The date of the cartoon would also support this view. In June 1919, a large majority of people in Britain wanted Germany to be punished harshly. Those that were explicit about the cartoonist's approval provided the strongest responses. A second group of candidates understood that Germany was being punished harshly but did not get as far as suggesting approval. A third group inferred valid sub-messages from the cartoon, for example the Treaty was a diktat, Germany did not like the Treaty or the Allies were in total control. A final group of candidates, probably influenced by Sources A and B, understood the harsh treatment of Germany but argued that the cartoonist disapproved of what was happening. These answers were the weakest ones to this question. A small number of candidates either misinterpreted the cartoon (for example Germany was being punished lightly) or described the surface features of the cartoon.

Question 3

There were few poor answers to this question. Most candidates addressed the issue of surprise and did so by comparing the claims made by the two sources. This usually led them to conclude that Source D does make Source E surprising because of the disagreements about the Treaty. However, some then turned their answers around by pointing out that because D is British and E is German, the disagreements are not surprising. The best answers developed this approach further by using either contextual knowledge or cross-reference to other sources to explain why the views expressed in Sources D and E are to be expected. Less successful answers either claimed that D does not make E surprising because one is British and the other is German, without using the content of the sources, or did not address the issue of surprise.

Question 4

This question is about Lloyd George's purpose in making the speech in Source F when he did. The best answers therefore focused on what he said and how he wanted to affect the behaviour of others. This led them to explain that Lloyd George was trying to win the support of Parliament or of the British people. Many candidates put their answers in context by explaining, for example, that he may have been doing this because of the demands in Britain for a tough treaty. A careful reading of Source F shows that Lloyd George was trying to convince people that the Treaty was a good one because it was just, its punishment of Germany was appropriate, and that it would help maintain peace in the future. Many candidates just focused on the message of the speech and did not consider Lloyd George's purpose in making such a speech, while some explained the context as the reason for giving the speech but neglected to address what he was actually saying. The best answers brought message and context together, to explain Lloyd George's purpose. It is very important, when answering a question such as this one, that candidates make clear that what they are explaining about the message or the context, is a reason for the speech. A few candidates explained message or content but would have improved their answers by stating why they were doing this.

Question 5

This question produced many good answers**.** Most candidates argued that the cartoon is useful evidence. They did this on the basis of interpreting the messages of the cartoon, for example, Germany was punished harshly. Better answers added that Germany's allies were also going to be heavily punished. This is a central feature of the cartoon. The cartoon also reveals the cartoonist's glee that the punishment was going to be harsh. The cartoon has a gloating tone and some candidates were able to use this as evidence of British support for the treatment of Germany and its allies. Weaker answers dismissed the cartoon as not useful because it is just a cartoon, it is British and therefore biased, or because of what it does not tell us. When responding to questions about usefulness it is usually a good approach to try to find a way that the source is useful. This cartoon is undoubtedly biased, but this is not a good reason for rejecting it because it provides useful evidence about British attitudes. Some candidates argued that the cartoonist is criticising the peace treaties, whereas the portrayal of the various figures in the cartoon clearly suggest a mocking of the fear and discomfort of Germany and its allies.

Question 6

Many candidates answered this question well. They were able to explain how some sources support the hypothesis that Germany was treated unfairly, and how some sources disagree with such a claim. The best answers contained certain key features. First, it was made clear which source was being referred to and whether it supports or disagrees with the hypothesis. This can be achieved very simply, for example 'Source

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

E supports the idea that German was treated unfairly because…'. Second, the focus was on the hypothesis, rather than on a variant of it. For example, it is not acceptable to replace 'unfairly' with 'harshly'. They do not have the same meaning. Something can be harsh without being unfair. Thirdly, if sources were divided into two groups, each individual source was then used by itself. Attempts to make general claims about a group of sources do not generally result in strong answers. Finally, source detail was used as the basis of an explanation of how a source supports or disagrees with the hypothesis, for example 'Source E supports the idea that Germany was treated unfairly. It does this by calling the treaty 'disgraceful' and claiming that German honour was being 'dragged to the grave', and 'Source F does not support the claim that Germany was treated unfairly. This is because Lloyd George argues that the treaty was right and fair. He does this by arguing that Germany has to pay reparations because of the damage it caused in the war. It is being punished because it tried to trample on national rights and freedoms.'

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

- Candidates should read through the background information and the sources before answering any of the questions. This should give them an understanding of the main issue of the paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding will feed into all of their answers, as well as helping to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. For example, answers on the twentieth century topic that did not address a reason for publication in **Question 2**, the issue of surprise in **Question 3**, or usefulness in **Question 4** struggled to achieve high marks. A helpful strategy is for candidates to directly address the question in the very first sentence of the answer, for example, 'Source B was published at this time because' or Source C does/does not make Source D surprising because'.
- On **Question 6** candidates must ensure that the specific hypothesis stated in the question is being addressed and that sources are used as the basis of the answer. Candidates should engage with the content of the sources and make it clear whether they are using a source to agree or disagree with the given statement. It is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support and challenge the given hypothesis.
- If quotations from the sources are used, and this can be particularly useful when answering **Question 6**, candidates should not use an abbreviated form of quotation that misses out some of the words and replaces them with ellipsis points. The words that are used must make sense and support the point the candidate wants to make, so giving the quotation in full is crucial.

General comments

Most candidates responded well to the demands of the paper and the overall standard of answers was broadly in line with previous series. An overwhelming majority of the scripts were on the twentieth-century option, consequently there were too few responses on the nineteenth-century option for meaningful comments to be made. Most candidates completed all 6 questions, however there were a few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both the 19th and 20th century options, such scripts did not tend to score highly.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Option B

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates to explain the impression of Clemenceau presented in Source A. Many candidates were able to identify an impression, such as Clemenceau was misunderstood, open-minded, reasonable or rational, and then use information from the source to support this. In the vast majority of instances, if a valid impression was identified, support was then given, often in the form of a direct quote from the source. The strongest responses were from those who could support more than one valid impression. In less successful responses, some candidates paraphrased the source and made no

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

inferences. One issue with the use of Source A is that the author comments on the views of others. It is important that candidates distinguish between the presented opinions; for example, the source says that 'Clemenceau was personally responsible for the damage the Treaty did to the ideals of Wilson', however this is not the author's view, rather this was a popular idea that was, in the author's view, wrong. Neglecting to make this distinction hindered some attempts to present a valid impression.

Question 2

This question produced a wide range of responses, but most candidates were able to demonstrate at least some understanding of the cartoon 'The Reckoning'. The best answers focused on the purpose of publication in the context of the time. The context being that the Treaty of Versailles had yet to be signed, but negotiations were well underway and the purpose being to justify the reparations bill to the British or get the British to support it. What was crucial was that candidates recognised that the cartoon is about reparations specifically. Answers that referred in more general terms to the Treaty were rewarded as sub-messages. Many candidates produced reasonable answers by focusing on sub-messages, for example, that the Germans were unhappy about reparations or that they complained about the Treaty, but these fell short of explaining the cartoonist's overall message. Here there were a couple of routes that candidates could pursue, one being that the reparations were fair and the other that Germany was being unreasonable in complaining about the reparations. Less successful candidates wrote surface descriptions of the cartoon or offered valid interpretations of it without considering reasons for its publication in 1919. Some responses were based on a misinterpretation of the cartoon. These candidates had not made use of the provenance given and wrongly concluded that the cartoonist's message is that the reparations were too high or the Treaty's terms too harsh.

Question 3

In **Question 3**, candidates were asked to consider two written sources and conclude whether the content of one makes the other surprising. Specifically, they were asked whether Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau's response to the proposed terms of the Treaty of Versailles in Source C makes Source D, Clemenceau's reply to the objections he raised, surprising. Many candidates were able to pick out agreements, or more commonly, disagreements between the two sources and use these to explain their surprise or lack of surprise. Agreements between the sources include that Germany must pay reparations, while the disagreements focus on the nature of the Treaty and its impact on Germany. In Source C, the Treaty is not just or it is unfair, while in Source D, it is fair or just. In Source C, the terms are more than Germany can bear and economic life is made impossible, while in Source D, there is no intention to strangle Germany and it will be treated fairly economically. The best responses were from candidates that could make a valid comparison between the sources and then explain a reason for the agreement or disagreement based on an evaluation of the sources. The surprise, or lack of surprise, expressed had to make sense in the light of the specific explanation presented. The most commonly used contextual evaluation centred on Clemenceau's aims and the experiences of the French in the war. It is worth noting that there was a small but significant number of responses in which the issue of surprise was not referred to at all; such responses were not addressing the question. A helpful strategy with a question about surprise is for candidates to directly address the issue in their opening sentence.

Question 4

This question, which focused on the usefulness of Source E to a historian studying the Treaty of Versailles, produced a wide range of answers. In many responses, candidates dismissed this source as not useful simply because 'it is a British source and therefore biased'. Some candidates were able to identify a valid sub-message from the source, for example, that the Treaty was not harsh enough or that Germany did not receive the punishment it deserved, but then still concluded that the source has no use due to its bias. It is worth remembering that most sources can be useful in some way and that the bias of a source is often precisely what gives it its usefulness. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that the source tells us a lot about British attitudes towards the Treaty of Versailles and that the source is useful as evidence that British opinion wanted the Treaty to be harsher.

Question 5

This question produced many strong responses. When candidates are asked about the message of a source they should always try to consider the author's voice or opinion. Many recognised the need to address the cartoonist's view in this question and consequently produced strong responses by explaining that, in Source F, the cartoonist is disapproving of the harsh treatment of Germany in the Treaty of Versailles. The support from the source for this conclusion was wide ranging; many referred to sub-messages, such as the Treaty

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

was a diktat, the Treaty was harsh, the Germans will suffer as a result of the Treaty, or identified the overall message, that being that Clemenceau wanted to punish Germany harshly. There was little misinterpretation seen in responses to this question and, with very few exceptions, candidates were able to move beyond a surface description of the source and explain one or more of the cartoon's numerous sub-messages.

Question 6

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved high marks by carefully explaining how some of the sources (B, C, D and F) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that Germany was punished as much as the French wanted, while others (A, B and E) argue that Germany's punishment was not sufficient to satisfy the French. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supports or disagrees with the given hypothesis. Other candidates did not make it clear whether the source under discussion was being used to support or challenge the given statement or used a slightly different hypothesis - for example, simply referring to the Treaty of Versailles as being harsh or not harsh. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **Question 6** by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement; candidates should use the words from the question to do this. They should then continue by writing about the sources in order, or by addressing those that support the statement before moving on to deal with those that reject it. What is crucial is that clear explanations about how the content of a source provides evidence to either support or dispute the hypothesis are given. Many candidates used direct quotes from the sources to do this. For this to work well, however, as mentioned above, a full quote must be used. Few genuine examples of the evaluation of the sources were seen. Most candidates did not attempt evaluation, but those that did were successful when they examined the purpose of the writer or cartoonist, as opposed to evaluation based on source type, undeveloped provenance or evaluation unrelated to the hypothesis.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

An appropriate coursework title will point candidates in the right direction and give them a good chance of demonstrating the relevant skills and understanding.

Candidates should try to assess significance, rather than describing or explaining it. Long narratives and descriptions should be avoided. Use should be made of argument and counter argument.

Candidates should focus on the subject named in the title, rather than on other factors.

Candidates should use a range of criteria such as political, social and depth and breadth, to assess significance. They can also consider significance from the perspectives of different individual/groups at the time and consider immediate and longer-term significance.

General comments

There was much good work seen, with many candidates using appropriate titles and producing focused assessments of significance. Most candidates kept to the word limit, although a small number used significantly less than 2000 words and could have developed their arguments further. Nearly all centres sent well organised packages of coursework containing the correct sample of candidates' work and relevant supporting documentation. Useful summative comments on candidates' scripts explained why certain levels and marks had been awarded.

Comments on specific questions

Nearly all of the titles used for this session were appropriate. A wide range was seen but examples of the types of title that worked well include:

Assess the significance of propaganda in Germany between 1933 and 1945.

Assess the significance of the New Deal in the USA.

Assess the significance of Gustav Stresemann.

Assess the significance of black opposition to apartheid in South Africa.

How significant was the Battle of the Somme in the First World War?

Assess the significance of Goebbels for Germany and the German people.

Most of these titles include the words 'assess' and 'significance', making it clear to candidates how to approach the task. The titles are also open, allowing candidates to use a range of criteria of their own choosing. On the other hand, a title such as 'How important was the Depression in helping Hitler come to power?' is not appropriate. This is because it does not allow a broad assessment of significance because the impact of the Depression is limited to Hitler coming to power. Other ways in which the Depression was significant for Germany cannot be assessed. It also encourages candidates to spend much of their answers writing about other factors that contributed to Hitler's rise to power, instead of focusing on the significance of the Depression. This type of title, in practice, tends to produce multi-causal explanations (in this case of Hitler's rise to power). This is not what is required.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Most answers were focused on significance. The most successful made genuine attempts to produce an assessment of significance, while weaker answers only described or explained significance. Some candidates just explained the outcome of an event or of the actions of an individual. The best answers, however, assessed how far the impact of the individual or event mattered – in different ways, for different reasons and to different people. These responses often included argument and counter-argument and demonstrated an understanding that judgements about historical significance are provisional. Weaker answers were one-sided. They argued why a person or event was significant but made no use of counter-argument to suggest possible qualifications to their argument. The weakest answers tended to be narrative accounts and some focused on factors other than the one named in the title.

Another feature of the best answers was the use of a range of criteria such as political, economic, social, depth and breadth of impact, impact for different groups, and immediate and longer-term significance. These criteria do not have to be announced in the first paragraph of the answer; doing this can look rather mechanical and artificial. Answers were often better when the criteria emerged naturally. Candidates should think carefully about which criteria to use. They should choose those that work most effectively with the individual or event they are evaluating. A few of the best answers included supported judgements about the most important way in which the named factor was significance, for example was its political significance more important than its economic significance?

Most of the marking was accurate and demonstrated a good understanding of the markscheme. This should be used holistically, with judgements being reached about an answer as a whole. The key features are focus, relevance and assessment of significance, supported by good knowledge and understanding of the history. Although marginal comments can be useful in identifying the qualities of an answer, they should not be used to award levels, especially early on in a response. Moderators found centres' summative comments most useful, especially when they were used to sum up the key qualities of an answer and to explain why it had been placed in a particular level.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This paper 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 very limited range of Depth Studies was undertaken, namely Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 – 1918, Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 - 1945, and Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941. There were too few responses to the other Depth Studies for meaningful comments to be made.

Overall candidates showed a reasonable level of knowledge, with most attempting balance in their responses. Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balance with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but many would have benefited from providing a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question, which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on the issue in the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

This was a popular Depth Study among candidates, with responses to **Question 1** and **Question 2**.

Question 1

A focus on the reasons the war was not over by 1914 was required. Many candidates were able to outline the main points of the Schlieffen Plan, and some recognised the impact of its failure on continuing the war. Some were able to show how this was linked to the digging of trenches. The slowing down of German forces due to Belgian resistance was generally well known. More successful responses outlined the impact of other reasons for the war's continuation beyond 1914. These included new weapons such as machine guns and many candidates recognised that these made a war of movement impossible.

Question 2

This question focused on factors influencing Britain's ability to continue the war. Most candidates were able to outline the impact of submarines on food supplies, although a number of these would have benefited from providing greater detail. Successful responses included more detail on rationing and the introduction of the Women's Land Army. Balance was created through looking at measures taken such as the use of Q-ships and the introduction of DORA.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study B: Germany, 1919 – 1945

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

Question 3

This question required recognition of the problems Germany faced up to 1923 and the impact this had on the lives of the German people. Most candidates were able to outline the problems faced in Germany following the end of the war, including unemployment and a lack of food following on from the British Blockade. Some candidates were able to show how the terms of the Treaty of Versailles led to massive economic problems, which led to right wing uprisings and the Ruhr Crisis, which caused hyperinflation. Some responses were narrative in nature and outlined details without demonstrating how these related to the problems in Germany during the period. Successful responses outlined factors in addition to economic and social ones to provide balance, including the introduction of a democratic government and rebellions such as the Kapp Putsch and Munich Putsch. Some responses went beyond 1923 and focused more on the rise of Hitler.

Question 4

This question focused on how the Nazis were able to gain support before they came to power in 1933. Most candidates were able to identify the role of Joseph Goebbels in the use of propaganda but did not always make the distinction between his methods before and after the Nazis came to power. Successful candidates were able to outline his role in attacking the Weimar Government and whipping up anti-Communist feelings. Many candidates were also able to outline the role of Hitler through his speeches and promises, as well as consider the role of the Depression in increasing support for the party. Some candidates went beyond the parameters of the question and described how Hitler was able to keep control, once in power.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941

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

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919 - 1941

Question 7

Most on the responses to this Depth Study were to **Question 7.**

This question focused on why the USA became prosperous in the 1920s. The impact of the assembly line was very well known and successful candidates were able to show how the increased production of cars led to a boom in other industries. They also recognised that more jobs were created in other industries using the production line to produce goods such as radios and fridges. To provide balance successful responses were able to show other reasons for prosperity such as the availability of credit, and mass advertising on billboards and in the cinema. The impact of Republican policies such as laissez faire and tariffs was known but could have been explained in more detail.

Question 8

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

Depth Study E: China, c.1930 - c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This paper 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 range of Depth Studies was undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941. A good number also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E (China), Depth Study F (South Africa) or Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians) for meaningful comments to be made.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balance with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but many would have benefited from providing a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question, which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on the issue in the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 attracted a good number of answers, with too few candidates attempting **Question 2** for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 1

This was generally well answered. Candidates had an in-depth knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan and why Russia's mobilisation was an important cause of its failure in 1914. The strongest responses were able to examine the impact Russia's mobilisation in the early months of the war had on the Schlieffen Plan and provide detailed evidence to support their explanations, often citing precise examples in their answers. This was then balanced against other important factors such as the changes made to the original plan by von Moltke, Belgian resistance, the BEF's entry into the war and key battles such as the Battle of the Marne and the subsequent race to the sea. Some candidates demonstrated relative importance by comparing the different factors and assessing their overall impact on the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, often in a concluding paragraph. Weaker answers tended to be descriptive or a narrative of the early months of the war and would have benefited from providing more assessment of importance.

Question 2

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945

Question 3 and **Question 4** were both popular choices among candidates.

Question 3

This question was generally well answered, though there was confusion in weaker responses over the term 'Weimar Constitution'. This term, which refers to the set of rules governing the new German Republic signed in August 1919, was often confused with the 'Weimar Republic' or 'Weimar government', which refers to the institution itself. Good answers focused on the aspects of the Constitution which caused instability in Germany between 1919 and 1933, such as proportional representation and Article 48. This was then balanced against other factors such as the impact of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, uprisings by the extreme left and right, the Wall Street Crash and Depression amongst others. The best responses explained the relative importance of these factors and used specific examples to support their arguments; some candidates made valid and convincing judgements in their conclusions. Less successful responses misinterpreted or misread the question or provided answers which were very thin on detail or contained large numbers of errors; many of these were chronological.

Question 4

Candidates tended to lack specific contextual knowledge of how the churches in Germany opposed aspects of Nazi rule and this often led to very generalised answers. Many candidates also confused Catholic and Protestant churches or referred to them as the same entity. Some good responses did provide accurate and well deployed examples in their arguments, such as Bishop Galen's opposition to the T-4 euthanasia programme and Niemoller and Bonhoeffer's Confessing Church, which was set up to oppose the Reich Church. This was then balanced against other forms of opposition in Nazi Germany, such as youth opposition, army opposition and conservative opposition. Some candidates were able to provide assessments of the significance of each form of opposition to Nazi rule and support these with a broad range of examples. Other responses, however, would have been improved by greater depth, breadth and focus. Some answers refocused the question onto control in Nazi Germany, which led to material on the SS, concentration camps, the Gestapo and propaganda, which was not the focus of this question.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941

There were more responses to **Question 5** than there were to **Question 6**.

Question 5

This question produced some strong responses. The best answers demonstrated a solid grasp of the importance of agriculture as a cause of Russia's problems by March 1917. Candidates focused on the peasant land issue, food shortages and famines, as well as the lack of impact of Stolypin's reforms for poorer peasant families. This was then balanced by assessing the relative importance of other key factors such as the nature of the tsarist autocracy, the actions of Nicholas II, the impact of the Russo-Japanese War and the First World War, as well as the socio-economic consequences these had for many Russians. Weaker responses tended to lack a detailed knowledge of agricultural problems in Russia before 1917 and often only provided very generalised contextual knowledge in the arguments.

Question 6

This was generally answered convincingly. Many candidates had a strong knowledge and understanding of the how significant War Communism was in the consolidation of Bolshevik rule up to 1924 and commonly cited how the Bolsheviks used the policy to nationalise industry and the banks, coordinate grain requisitioning to feed the soldiers and workers and launch the Red Terror against the Russian population who opposed Bolshevik rule. This was then balanced with other significant factors, such as the role of Lenin and Trotsky, the victory for the Reds in the Russian Civil War, Lenin's decrees, and the NEP. The best responses provided judgements on the relative significance of various different factors and explained their arguments with strong supporting examples. Other responses were often descriptive or narrative in approach, with a significant number of candidates focusing on why the Reds won the Russian Civil War which, although a relevant factor, was not the actual question set.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941

This answered by many candidates, with **Question 7** proving slightly more popular than **Question 8**.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 7

There were some strong responses from candidates. Many were able to provide a detailed and comprehensive set of explanations that focused on how important electricity was as a reason for economic growth in the 1920s. Most stronger answers focused on how electricity was used to power assembly lines in factories to increase efficiency and decrease prices, as well as how it led to a boom in consumer appliances like the radio and washing machine. This was then balanced against other factors such as the impact of Republican policies, the legacy of the First World War, mass advertising and the availability of credit. Many candidates were able to explain the relative importance of the different causes of economic growth in this period and used specific examples to support their arguments, with some reaching substantiated conclusions and judgements. Weaker responses did not grasp how electricity helped industry boom and some were confused and referred to cars and agricultural machinery being electric during this period. Some candidates focused their answers on the social impact of electricity, such as its use in cinemas, and then provided explanations of how this improved people's lives, which was not the focus of this question.

Question 8

This question was generally well answered and most candidates were able to provide good depth and range to the material they incorporated in their arguments. The strongest answers were able to examine how the impact of Prohibition changed the lives of many Americans, especially in the cities during the period 1919 – 33. Commonly cited were the increase in sales and production of illegal alcohol, smuggling and the control of the trade by organised crime. This was then balanced by examining other significant factors that changed people's lives such as the movie industry, the increase in popularity of jazz music, new sports and leisure activities made possible by the widespread adoption of the car, religious intolerance, the Red Scare and issues linked to immigration and racial discrimination. Some candidates were able to assess significance well and linked factors together with convincing explanations. This helped some provide clinching arguments in their conclusions, supported by well-selected examples. Less successful responses focused too much on the causes of Prohibition in the USA which was not the focus of the question. Other candidates refocused their answers onto the causes of the economic boom in the 1920s, especially when examining alternative factors in their responses.

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 too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This paper 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 range of Depth Studies was undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941. A good number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 - 1918 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941. There were some responses to Depth Study E (China, c. 1930- c. 1990), but too few attempts at Depth Study F (South Africa) or Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians) for meaningful comments to be made.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balance with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but many would have benefited from providing a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question, which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on the issue in the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was answered by a reasonable number of candidates, with a small number attempting **Question 2**.

Question 1

This question was well answered in some cases, though some candidates reinterpreted the focus of the question and examined the changing nature of warfare across the whole time period of 1914 – 18. The question specifically asked candidates to focus on the causes of trench warfare (which occurred primarily in 1914 and early 1915). Candidates generally had a good knowledge of the different types of new weapons that were used at the start of the war, such as machine guns and artillery, and the strongest answers were able to explain how important these were as a cause of both the Allied and German sides digging in by late 1914. This was then balanced with alternative factors such as the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, Belgian resistance, the BEF entering the war, the Battle of the Marne and the race to the sea. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive rather than analytical and often did not address the idea of relative importance in their arguments.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

This was generally well answered by candidates. This question allowed candidates to draw upon factors from across 1914 – 18 and some stronger answers showed excellent depth and a broad range of contextual knowledge. Most candidates addressed the factor in the question by examining the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and explaining convincingly how it led to a two-front war for Germany by the end of 1914, with many candidates including references to battles on the Eastern Front and fact that Germany had weaker Allies in central Europe, which it had to often reinforce. The best answers then examined other factors to provide a clear balanced approach. Most scripts cited key battles in 1916 – 18 and how this sapped Germany of its military strength and examined the effects of the British Blockade of German ports and how this led to shortages. Many also demonstrated good detail of how significant US entry into the war was by 1918. Other responses sometimes appeared to misread the question and neglected to address how the two-front war led to defeat in 1918 and instead focused on the events of 1914 only. It is vital that candidates carefully read the question to identify what the focus is and what the chronological parameters are.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945

Question 3 and **Question 4** were both answered by a large number of candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to give accurate and detailed contextual knowledge about left-wing uprisings between 1919 and 1923, with most answers referring to at least the Spartacist Uprising in January 1919, though a few stronger responses did also give details of uprisings in Bavaria and the Ruhr as well, which added breadth to their arguments. Many candidates chose to balance their response by examining a variety of other factors that caused Germany problems between 1919 and 1923, such as right-wing rebellions, the impact of the restrictions placed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles and the weaknesses inherent in the Weimar Constitution. The best responses were focused and gave convincing explanations of how each of these factors caused Germany problems, with some candidates reaching supported conclusions. Weaker answers were mainly descriptive or confused left-wing with right-wing uprisings. A few responses went beyond the time period set by the question and included material on the Stresemann era which lacked relevance to this question.

Question 4

Some stronger answers were clear in their understanding of the term 'minorities' in the context of Nazi Germany after 1933 - this included the Jews, gypsies, black people and other non-white Germans; homosexuals, the handicapped and others that did not fit into the Nazi racial theory of Aryan superiority were also considered as minorities for this question. Candidates often provided good detail on how the Nazis treated minorities, particularly the Jews in Germany and Nazi occupied Europe, and some explained how this fitted in with the Nazi policy of trying to create a racially pure 'volkisch' state. This was then balanced by examining other Nazi policies such as those linked to the role of women and young people in Germany, the task of rebuilding Germany's military for future expansion and solving the unemployment crisis during the Depression in the 1930s. Some weaker responses included the communists and trade unionists as a 'minority' but these were political groups that were targeted by the Nazis in the first few years of Hitler's rule.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941

A good number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. **Question 5** was the more popular choice, with a small number of candidates attempting **Question 6**.

Question 5

This question produced some strong responses. The strongest of these demonstrated a solid grasp of the nature of tsarist autocracy in Russia before 1917 and were able to give some convincing examples of how important it was as a reason for the regime's collapse by March 1917. Many cited the Fundamental Laws, the role of the Orthodox Church and Nicholas II's actions in their answers, and then provided balance by examining socio-economic factors such as the peasant land issue, the shortages during the First World War and the role of other key individuals such as the Tsarina and Rasputin. Less successful responses often went beyond or only examined events after the March Revolution of 1917 which was not relevant for this question. Other responses would have been improved by the inclusion of detailed contextual knowledge and more specific examples in their descriptions.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 6

This question was generally well-answered by candidates. The best responses showed a good grasp of the Purges and explained how significant they were in allowing Stalin to create a totalitarian state after 1928. Many cited the purging of the military, the Communist Party as well as Soviet citizens in their answers, often providing in-depth and precise examples to support explanations. This was then balanced by examining other key factors such as the use of the NKVD, censorship, the creation of a Cult of Personality around Lenin and Stalin, the use of Five-Year Plans and the dekulakisation of the countryside. Some candidates were able to reach substantiated conclusions about relative significance, though this was often only in the final paragraph and not sustained throughout the response. Weaker responses were often descriptive or a narrative of the time period, with some candidates misunderstanding the 'totalitarian'. A few answers also only examined events prior to 1928 and examined the period when Stalin was manoeuvring himself into a position of power in the USSR, which lacked relevance to this question.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941

Question 7 generated more responses than **Question 8**.

Question 7

There were some strong responses from candidates. Many were able to provide a detailed and comprehensive set of explanations that focused on the how the movie industry changed life in the USA in the 1920s. Many responses examined the impact that Hollywood and its movie stars had on culture, fashion and behaviour, as well as the new forms of music and entertainment cinema influenced. This was then balanced by comparing it to other factors that changed life for the American people such as the impact of the motor car, new sports and leisure activities, Prohibition, the Red Scare and racism. In other responses candidates answered a question more linked to the causes of the economic boom, which was not the focus here. Whilst there is some crossover, such as the fact that hire purchase and advertisements helped lead to a consumer society, this question was not focused on why or how companies made more profit or why share prices increased.

Question 8

Many responses would have benefited from greater knowledge or understanding of how the Crash occurred. Some were confused over the term 'financial speculation'. Some answers also focused more on the consequences of the Crash, such as the Depression and its social impact, rather than the causes. Some stronger responses grasped the fundamentals of speculation and were able to explain why it was a significant cause of the Crash in 1929 - many pointed to the over-confidence in the stock market and the reckless borrowing on the margin that took place in the years preceding the Crash. This was then balanced against other key factors such as the inherent weaknesses in the US economy by 1929 due to overproduction, tariffs on exports and the inequality of wealth across the USA. This helped some candidates to reach convincing conclusions.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930 – c. 1990

Question 9

This was generally well-answered when chosen by candidates who demonstrated a strong knowledge and understanding of the importance of health reforms in China by 1960 and how it changed the lives of the peasants. Many responses gave a broad range of examples of improved healthcare such as the introduction of surgeries in 1958 in the communes and the focus on disease prevention by the Communist Party against the more traditional medicinal remedies still in use in rural China. Most responses balanced their arguments by examining other factors that changed the lives of the peasants such as the newly introduced social and educational reforms in the 1950s, the Agrarian Reform Law, as well as the impact of the Five-Year Plans and the Great Leap Forward. Explanations of importance tended to be convincing for the most part, though some answers did not develop their comments substantially or explicitly. Weaker responses tended to be short due to a lack of contextual knowledge or provided very few specific examples and relied on very generalised and sometimes inaccurate material for support.

Question 10

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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 too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021