eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Candidates need to read the questions carefully to ensure that their responses only include relevant information. They should carefully note the particular focus of any given question and focus their answers accordingly. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to ensure that their responses only include knowledge within the time span of the question.

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in continuous prose. In more extensive responses they should be encouraged to organise their ideas into distinct paragraphs, otherwise points can become blurred together or, alternatively, candidates can lose focus on the question set.

General comments

Strong responses reflected sound understanding and good knowledge in both the Core Content and Depth Study questions. These responses included a 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. These included conclusions that were more than purely summative and in which they came to a judgement and justified this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their essay.

Weaker responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts and no explanation. Some of the weaker responses were very brief and generalised, with few supporting factual details.

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. Background information is not needed. Explanation is not required. Most candidates realised that responses to **(a)** questions could be short and concise. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and always 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 to provide a description of what happened. Strong responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative answers or long introductions which 'set the scene' were 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', depending on the question set. Less successful responses often focused only on one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

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 frequently answered questions in the Core Content Section.

Question 5

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated understanding of how the Corfu incident of 1923 was resolved. The best answers typically featured four details such as, 'Greece appealed to the League of Nations', 'the League condemned Mussolini's invasion', 'Mussolini insisted the League refer the case to the Conference of Ambassadors' and 'Greece was made to pay reparations to Italy'. Credit was also gained for stating that, 'Greece was made to apologise to Italy' and 'the Italians left Corfu.' The focus of the question was on how the incident was resolved and lengthy descriptions of the build up to the incident were not needed. A number of candidates lacked knowledge of the Corfu Crisis and either left the response blank or confused it with another incident.

(b) Successful responses included two well explained reasons why the Vilna dispute was a challenge to the League of Nations. They explained that the dispute was between Poland and Lithuania. Vilna was the capital of Lithuania and included many Poles, so Poland invaded Vilna. The League found this a challenge because they asked the Poles to leave Vilna and they refused. This made the League seem weak. A second explained reason was that one of the League's major countries, France, did not want to offend Poland as they wanted Poland as a future ally against Germany. Britain was unwilling to act alone therefore no sanctions were given to Poland and it retained Vilna. Less successful responses included general details about the failure of the League of Nations, with no specific reference to the Vilna dispute. There were also some blank responses to this question.

(c) Most responses demonstrated some understanding of the weaknesses of the League of Nations. The strongest responses were well organised and produced a balanced answer by explaining why the absence of the USA was the main reason for the weakness of the League. They were able to explain that the USA's military and economic power, which had not been weakened by the First World War, would have given strength to the League when enforcing decisions. They were also able to explain that without the USA it would be difficult to effectively enforce economic sanctions because the USA would continue to trade with the offending nations, resulting in the limited impact of any sanctions. Responses usually included examples from the Corfu, Manchurian, or Abyssinian crises to emphasise these points. They balanced the absence of the USA with other factors that increased the weakness of the League, such as, the absence of Germany and Russia, the effects of the Great Depression, the self-interest of Britain and France and the weaknesses in the structure of the League. Most commonly explained was the self-interest of Britain and France, especially during the Abyssinian Crisis when they did not close the Suez Canal or impose sanctions on oil because they wanted to keep Mussolini as an ally against the rise of Hitler's Germany. Other responses were able to identify weaknesses in the structure of the League, such as the Assembly and the Council not meeting often, that votes had to be unanimous, a veto could be used in the Council and there was no standing army. These responses would have benefited from emphasising that these weaknesses resulted in slow decision making and meant a lack of decisive action by the League because it was difficult to enforce decisions. Examples that could have been used included the crises of Vilna, Corfu, Manchuria and Abyssinia. Some responses included details of why the USA did not join the League and the successes of the League both of which lacked relevance to the question.

Question 6

(a) This question worked well for most candidates, who were able to describe Hitler's preparations for war before 1936. Successful responses were confined to the time scale in the question, matching dates and events between these dates. Examples included Germany leaving the League of Nations in 1933, secret rearmament followed by a major rearmament in 1935, the introduction of

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

conscription and the naval agreement with Britain. However, some candidates focused on Hitler's aims (for example, tearing up the Treaty of Versailles) and used as evidence events outside the scope of the question, particularly the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, Germany's participation in the Spanish Civil War and the Anschluss with Austria 1938.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. The majority were aware that 'lebensraum' meant 'living space' but few were able to explain that this would involve taking over land to the east of Germany at the expense of Poland and Russia, with a view to resettlement and exploitation of resources in these areas. Some strong responses also alluded to the racial entitlement (belief in Aryan superiority) implicit in this policy. More responses could have considered what lebensraum would mean for the populations of the lands to the east of Germany. Some responses conflated 'lebensraum' with the union of Germany and Austria or the annexation of the Sudetenland or saw it as part of Hitler's aim to overthrow the Treaty of Versailles. Other candidates appeared to be unfamiliar with this term, for example regarding it as part of Hitler's domestic policies. A small number of responses were left blank.

(c) Though most candidates were familiar with and understood these two agreements, responses tended to be rather general in nature, and could have been improved by the inclusion of specific detail which could have turned an identification into an explanation. For example, most were able to say that after the Nazi-Soviet Pact was agreed, Hitler had cleared the way to invade Poland. Stronger responses developed these points by referring to the secret nature of the Polish clause and the subsequent enhanced Anglo-French commitment in Poland. They also linked the invasion of Poland to the collapse of the Munich Agreement caused by Hitler's takeover of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. To balance the argument strong responses could explain the impact of the Munich Agreement - the boost given to Hitler's confidence that Britain and France presented no threat and, often less exactly, the impact of Hitler's breach of the agreement in March 1939. Strong responses were also able to explain how the Munich Agreement brought war closer because it led to Stalin being receptive to making the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Weaker responses often muddled the chronology of events around the Munich Agreement. Some candidates found it difficult to give two explanations of the significance of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, the most common explanation being the avoidance of war on two fronts, providing Hitler with a green light to attack Poland. Some confused the Munich Agreement with the Munich Putsch of 1923.

Question 7

(a) Responses to this question were mixed. Stronger responses gained credit for identifying the agreements made at Potsdam. Examples included 'Germany was divided into four parts', 'the Nazi Party was banned', 'Nazi leaders were to be tried as war criminals' and 'Germany had to pay reparations'. Less successful responses confused the agreements made at Potsdam with those made at Yalta a few months earlier, although credit was given for responses which stated that 'some of the agreements made at Yalta were confirmed'. There were some responses that discussed why there were disagreements at Potsdam, which was not the focus of the question.

(b) Strong responses to this question tended to explain two reasons why Stalin imposed a blockade on Berlin in 1948. They demonstrated a good understanding of the division of Berlin, after World War II, between the Soviet Union, the USA, France, and Britain, and how the Western Allies had joined their zones together and introduced a new currency. The western powers were trying to make West Berlin strong, and Stalin felt threatened by this. They went on to explain that he blockaded Berlin because he wanted to remove the western powers from West Berlin and control all of Berlin, as it was deep inside Eastern Germany. Weaker responses often included details of why the blockade failed, which lacked relevance to the question, and/or confused the geography of Berlin and which side had East and West Berlin. Some responses detailed reasons why the Berlin Wall was built.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, 'Which did more to damage relations between the USA and USSR: disagreements over Poland or Marshall Aid?' Candidates were more confident explaining the impact of Marshall Aid on relationships than they were on the explaining the damage inflicted on relationships as a result of disagreements over Poland. Responses identified that Marshall Aid was part of the USA's policy of containment and was designed to prevent countries falling to communism. The strongest responses were then able to develop paragraphs explaining the impact of USA's action. For example: 'The USA had interpreted the Soviet take-over of Eastern Europe as the start of the spread of communism around the world. Marshal Aid was a package of financial support which was to help strengthen vulnerable European economies suffering from the effects of war. Stalin felt threatened by this policy and forbade any of the eastern European states

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

to apply for Marshall Aid.' On the other side of the argument, strong responses explained that Stalin had not done what was agreed at Yalta and allowed free elections to be held in Poland to choose the government that they wanted. He had fixed elections in order to achieve a provisional government of pro- Soviet Lublin Poles and exiled London Poles. His failure to do what was agreed had angered the USA. Weaker responses often included general comments on the differences in ideology and would have benefited from showing more understanding, especially of the disagreements over Poland.

Question 8

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

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 among candidates.

(a) This question was well answered and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the demands of the question. They were able to identify four aims of the Spartacists, most commonly the overthrow of the Weimar Republic, the establishment of a communist state, using the Bolshevik Revolution as an example, the establishment of a more equal society and the common ownership of property. Some candidates, whilst often making one or two relevant points, drifted into a description of the Spartacist rising, describing the role of the Freikorps and the fate of the Spartacist leaders, which lacked relevance to the question set.

(b) Some candidates struggled to focus on the importance of the Kapp Putsch for the Weimar government. Candidates were often knowledgeable about the events surrounding the putsch but could not relate these into implications for the Weimar government. Strong responses were able to point to the strength of the anti-democratic and pro-monarchical feeling, the fragility of the Weimar Republic when it could not rely on the loyalty of the army and the general support for the Weimar government amongst the workers and population of Berlin. Some less successful responses confused the putsch with other insurgencies.

(c) There were some strong responses to this question in which candidates had a good understanding of why proportional representation was a serious weakness of the Weimar constitution. These responses explained how proportional representation worked and how it led to a string of unstable governments in the 1920s. They also referred to the foothold that the system gave to extremist parties. Some also included the lack of a threshold which allowed such extremist parties to gain seats. On the other side of the argument, responses included details of the problems caused by Article 48 of the constitution. In most cases explanations here were less certain than for proportional representation and usually only one explanation on this side (most commonly that the president alone could decide what constituted an emergency) was included. Strong responses included a second explanation, showing how Hindenburg used these powers during the critical period of 1930 – 1933, and how this facilitated Hitler's grip on power in 1933. It was evident from weaker responses that the word 'constitution' was not clearly understood and these responses drifted from the question to write about the weaknesses and failures (mainly economic) of the Weimar government.

Question 12

(a) This question was well answered and most responses identified four features of the Hitler Youth such as, it had separate sections for boys and girls, it was used to indoctrinate the youth with Nazi ideas, the activities it offered were to turn boys into good soldiers and it was made compulsory in 1936. Others gained credit for saying that the members wore uniform and that it was established in the 1920s.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Most candidates could identify that the Nazi regime provided jobs and better working conditions for the workers. Stronger responses to this question identified and explained two reasons why many workers were happy with life under the Nazi regime. They explained that under the Weimar Republic, as a result of the Great Depression, there had been massive unemployment. One of Hitler's aims was to provide employment for workers which he did by providing jobs in the armed forces, in public work schemes, in building the Olympic Stadium and numerous autobahns. A second valid explanation was an explanation of the benefits brought to the workers through 'The Beauty of Labour' and Strength through Joy' programmes. A misconception among some candidates was that Hitler gave them higher wages.

(c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. Candidates needed to produce a balanced answer by explaining how far Nazi policies towards women were successful. The strongest responses stated clearly what the policy was, Hitler's view on the role of Nazi women and the impact of his policies. Most candidates had a good understanding of the Nazi policy towards women, including encouraging women to give up their jobs, stay at home, get married and have lots of children. Weaker responses were limited in that they understood the role of women but there was no assessment of the success of the policy. Stronger responses were able to explain that, as a result, the population would rise, which the Nazis believed in the long term would provide more soldiers for the armed forces. Some linked the increase in population to the domination of the Aryan race, which Hitler so desired. Strong responses explained that this worked until about 1937 when, with men joining the army, there was a shortage of labour and therefore women were increasingly required to return to work, and Nazi policies now had become contradictory.

Questions 13, 14, 15, 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

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 12

Key messages

Candidates should ensure that answers for **part (a)** questions are succinct and focused on the question. Very lengthy descriptions are not required. Candidates should ensure that their answers for **parts (b)** and **(c)** are focused on explaining the particular question set, rather than on narrating events. For **part (c),** analysis, balanced explanations, and substantiated conclusions are required. The conclusion should go beyond repeating points made earlier in an answer, and instead should address the command words such as 'How far do you agree'.

Candidates should pay particular attention to any dates included in a question and restrict their answer to the dates provided. This should help to ensure that their answer is fully relevant.

General comments

Candidates demonstrated sound knowledge and understanding in both the Core Content and Depth Study topics. Many answers contained good supporting evidence which was accurate and detailed, and used in well-developed explanations and arguments in response to their chosen question.

Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the particular question set. These responses identified numerous factors/reasons, but they needed to go on and develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced responses. Candidates need to ensure that they then use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make. Candidates do need to focus carefully upon the question set; in some instances they wrote in considerable depth about the main topic of the question, but would have improved their responses with a clear focus on the actual question.

There were some rubric errors seen. The most common was candidates who answered more than the required number of questions, particularly in the Depth Study. Time allocation was generally good, and very few instances were seen of candidates who failed to finish or had to shorten their final answers.

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) Some good answers were seen, with candidates secure in their knowledge of what happened in Vilna in 1920. Candidates recognised that the dispute was between Poland and Lithuania after Poland invaded Vilna. These answers also recognised that the League failed to solve the problem, since the Poles refused to leave. Weaker answers often confused this dispute with other disputes that faced the League in the 1920s, such as Corfu.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) There were some effective answers that were able to identify a reason why the League was slow to react to aggression, and to support this by providing an example. These answers were able to explain, for example, that since the League was based in Europe, when Japan invaded Manchuria the Lytton Commission was slow to respond. Other reasons explained were linked to the economic situation facing Britain and France which delayed the imposition of sanctions in the Abyssinian crisis. Other answers were able to identify reasons such as the lack of an army but were unable to explain how this resulted in the League's slow reaction.

(c) Some very good responses to this question were seen. Many candidates were able to produce balanced responses that considered both the role of Italy in the failure of the League, and also the role played by Britain and France. When considering the role of Italy, responses often discussed the impact of the Abyssinian invasion in undermining the League since it showed that the League was reluctant to impose sanctions or protect smaller powers. Some candidates also considered the invasion of Corfu or looked at Italian aggression as a whole. In order to provide a balanced response, candidates often argued that Britain and France were responsible due to the Hoare-Laval Pact, or their reluctance to impose sanctions on coal in order to protect their own economies. Weaker responses were often able to provide a description of the events such as the invasion of Abyssinia but neglected to explain how these events led to the failure of the League. Few inaccuracies were seen.

Question 6

This was the most popular question in the Core Content.

(a) This question was answered well by many candidates who were able to describe Hitler's policy of 'lebensraum'. These answers were able to identify that it was Hitler's aim of living space, and that this would mean expanding into Eastern Europe through the invasion of countries such as Poland and Russia. Most candidates were able to provide reasonable responses. In some responses there was a confusion between lebensraum and Grossdeutschland, with some candidates stating that it was to unite German speakers, or that claims made on Czechoslovakia were part of the policy.

(b) There were some good answers to this question, with candidates confident in their ability to explain why Stalin agreed to the Nazi-Soviet Pact. The most common explanation given was that Hitler had made it clear that his foreign policy aims included the eventual invasion of the Soviet Union and that by signing this Pact, Stalin had achieved the necessary time to strengthen his armed forces, which had been weakened by the Purges. Other responses explained that it allowed Stalin to regain land lost to Poland, and some strong responses were seen that were able to explain Stalin's disillusionment with the Allies after the signing of the Munich Agreement, which led him to seeking an alliance with Hitler instead. Few inaccuracies were seen, although some responses attempted to answer it as a **part (c)** question, also giving reasons for Hitler signing the Pact.

(c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates able to assess whether Chamberlain's attempts to appease Hitler were justified. Arguments agreeing with the question often considered the impact of the previous war on Britain and the British people, explaining that Chamberlain was fulfilling the wishes of the people, determined to prevent another costly and deadly war. Consideration was also often given to the nature of the early instances of appeasement, such as the Rhineland, which could be justified as Hitler only marching into 'his own backyard.' Arguments that appeasement was not justified were often centred around the idea that it gave Hitler the confidence to continue with his foreign policy aims, with this line of argument supported by the reoccupation of the Rhineland and the order to retreat if they met resistance. Whilst this is a valid argument, some weaker responses did not provide support in their answers, instead making general claims that it gave Hitler confidence. Some strong responses were also seen that argued that appeasement was not morally justified since Czechoslovakia was not consulted during the Munich Conference, resulting in the Sudetenland being handed over to Germany without Czechoslovakia's agreement. Some responses erroneously stated that the Rhineland was an invasion, and that the Sudetenland had previously belonged to Germany and was taken away by the Treaty of Versailles.

Question 7

(a) This was generally well answered, with a majority of candidates able to achieve good marks through their knowledge of what the Vietcong was. The most common points used to attain such marks were an awareness of the Vietcong's use of guerrilla tactics, that they were Communist and

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

that they fought against the US. Few errors were seen, although some responses contained lengthy descriptions of the guerrilla tactics that the Vietcong used, which was not the focus of the question.

(b) Many candidates were able to achieve at least one explanation of why President Johnson increased American involvement in Vietnam. The most common reason given explained why the US policy of containment and the fear of the spread of Communism increased American involvement in Vietnam. Some were also aware of the Gulf of Tonkin incident, though responses did not always explain why this factor led to increased involvement by the USA. Less successful responses described American involvement without providing the reasons why it happened.

(c) This was answered well by many candidates who were able to provide at least one-sided answers as to whether American popular opinion was more important than the tactics of the North Vietnamese forces as a reason for American withdrawal. The majority displayed good knowledge of the various protests within America against the Vietnam War. Many were then able to develop their explanation as to why public criticism led to the US government's withdrawal. There was also good, detailed knowledge of North Vietnamese tactics, though some answers were largely descriptive in nature and less successful in their attempts to explain how these tactics influenced the US government's decision to withdraw from the war.

Question 8

(a) Some good answers were seen which were able to state what the Brezhnev Doctrine was. Many candidates showed an awareness of Brezhnev as leader of the USSR being its author, and that the intent was to tighten Soviet control over the Eastern European states. Few candidates were able to link the doctrine to the Czechoslovak context and the Soviet response to Dubcek's reforms. Weaker responses confused the Doctrine with the building of the Wall, and some did not attempt the question.

(b) Whilst some weaker responses confused the building of the Berlin Wall with the events of the Berlin Blockade and Airlift, there were many good responses which were able to explain why the East German government's concern for the economy meant that it was keen to stop its skilled workers defecting to the West. Stronger responses were then able to explain a second factor for the building of the Berlin Wall, explaining that it was seen as a way to prevent the spread of Western ideas and the belief that standards of living were better in the West.

(c) Mixed responses were seen to this question, with weaker responses struggling to show both agreement and disagreement as to whether resistance to Soviet domination broke out in Hungary and Czechoslovakia for the same reasons. Many candidates were able to explain one side, either by explaining the different stance taken on membership of the Warsaw Pact or the similarities behind the long-term resentment of Soviet control. A small number of candidates produced balanced answers, explaining both similarities and differences. Some weaker responses focused on how the USSR reacted to the resistance in both countries or what happened during the uprisings, rather than the causes of it. There was also some confusion as to what happened in each country.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a) Most candidates were able to provide some valid descriptions of 'going over the top', with candidates aware that it was an attack across no man's land, and that it was very dangerous, with heavy casualties. Stronger answers were also able to show that the soldiers faced machine guns, and that the soldiers walked across in formation.

(b) Some good responses to this question were seen, with candidates able to provide at least one explanation of why the allied bombardment at the start of the Battle of the Somme failed to destroy the German defences. The most common reason provided was that the Germans had built strong underground bunkers, and this meant that they were not destroyed, and that once the bombardment stopped the German soldiers were able to return to their trenches prior to the Allied attack. Some candidates were also able to explain that the bombardment tangled rather than destroyed the barbed wire, but candidates often only attempted to provide one explanation.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) This question was sometimes answered well, with responses able to show how both tanks and aircraft were used in the First World War, although in weaker responses the comparison of effectiveness was missing. Stronger responses often considered the psychological effect of tanks, whilst recognising that they often broke down, particularly in the early years. On the other side, candidates often argued that aircraft were used effectively for reconnaissance, but that their use in fighting was limited. Some responses would have benefited from evaluating their effectiveness, rather than describing their use.

Question 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

(a) This question was answered well, with candidates able to identify groups that supported the Nazis in the 1920s. Responses were able to identify groups such as farmers, anti-Communists, the unemployed and people who hated the Treaty of Versailles or the Weimar Government. Few errors were seen, but less successful responses described how the Nazis gained the support of these groups, which was not the focus of the question.

(b) This question was generally answered well, with candidates confident in their knowledge of the topic, and able to provide at least one explanation of how the Reichstag Fire was important for Hitler. The most common approach was to explain how Lubbe provided Hitler with the opportunity to blame the fire on the Communists, leading to the arrest of many and their removal as an important opposition group to Hitler. Stronger responses were also able to explain that the Fire led to the Emergency Fire Decree passed by Hindenburg using Article 48, which allowed Hitler to remove many civil liberties such as freedom of the press, and privacy of communications such as the telephone. Weaker responses showed confusion over the details or chronology of the event, arguing that it gave Hitler the power to use Article 48, or pass the Enabling Act.

(c) Some good responses to this question were seen, with most candidates able to attempt a balanced answer explaining how far the Munich Putsch benefited Hitler. Agreeing with the statement, responses often explained that the national publicity provided by the trial as a result of the newspaper coverage enabled the Nazis to become more well-known, or that it encouraged Hitler to rethink his strategies, concentrating on increasing the electoral popularity of the party through the establishment of local organisations. Balance was most often provided through a consideration of the aims and defeat of the Munich Putsch, although this point was more often described rather than explained. Whilst weaker responses had a good knowledge of the Putsch itself, they were less confident in the details of the consequences, meaning that such answers sometimes did not achieve an explanation. Such responses stated, for example, that the Munich Putsch benefited Hitler as he decided to change tactics but did not support these statements with details of what these changes were.

Question 12

(a) This question was answered well, with many candidates demonstrating their knowledge of Nazi policies towards young people. Responses often focused on the changes to the education system, and the Youth Groups such as the League of German Maidens. Candidates were also able to show what was taught in these groups, such as loyalty to Hitler. Some responses ignored the question on young people and wrote more generally about policies such as propaganda and Strength Through Joy. Other responses answered accurately but wrote extensively on the topic of young people, which was not necessary.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Some good responses were seen to this question, with candidates able to explain at least one reason why some women were unhappy with changes made by the Nazis. Candidates were confident in their knowledge of the impact on women, often concentrating on the restrictions on women working, or the emphasis placed on the role of the women in the home and as mothers. Stronger answers were able to explain these as two separate reasons. A few responses were also seen that provided convincing explanations for the changes made during the war, and that these were unpopular with women who had experienced years of propaganda telling them not to work, or the struggles they faced working with children and a husband away with the army. Weaker answers either only provided one explanation, or described Nazi policies – often very detailed, but without explaining why these policies were disliked by women.

(c) This question was often answered well, with candidates able to produce balanced answers on whether the Nazis succeeded in winning support from young people. Opposition to the Nazi policies was often strongly argued, and good knowledge was displayed about the opposition groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the White Rose. Responses were therefore able to correctly identify their reasons for opposition, and the nature of their actions. To provide balance candidates used the indoctrination in schools and the youth groups to explain how successfully the Nazis gained their support. Weaker responses often were able to demonstrate sound understanding of both the support and opposition but provided descriptions, rather than showing what and how they were opposing.

Question 13

(a) Candidates displayed a good general level of knowledge and understanding on this question, with most able to identify at least some of the impacts of the Russo-Japanese War on the Tsar's regime. Most commonly candidates were able to identify that the defeat was humiliating, and also that it contributed to Bloody Sunday. More responses could have shown that it caused the mutiny on the Potemkin.

(b) This question was answered well, with many candidates providing at least one explanation why the Tsarist regime was able to survive the October Revolution. Most commonly candidates provided good explanations as to how the October Manifesto divided the opposition, enabling the Tsar to regain control. Other candidates were able to explain that the Tsar retained the support of the army and was able to use this to crush the opposition.

(c) Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer explaining ways in which the Tsar taking personal control of the army caused his fall from power. Responses were most confident in agreeing with the question, arguing that it meant that he left the Tsarina in charge assisted by Rasputin, both of whom were unpopular, or that it meant the Tsar was blamed for military failures. Often, however, these points were not linked to the Tsar's fall from power, instead describing rather than explaining. Attempts at a balanced answer were rare, and a number of responses would have benefited from attempting to explain other reasons, such as the lack of political reform.

Question 14

(a) Candidates secure in their knowledge of GOSPLAN understood that it was responsible for the administration of the Five-Year Plans, and that it was the organisation that set the targets for industry. A number of candidates either did not attempt the question or provided inaccurate answers.

(b) Most candidates were able to provide at least one explanation for why there was a famine in the Soviet Union in 1932 – 33. Most commonly candidates explained the impact of collectivisation, with farmers destroying their crops, or that grain was still being exported despite the shortage. Weaker answers described the famine without focussing on the causes of it.

(c) Some **c**andidates struggled to provide balanced answers to this question, with explanations agreeing and disagreeing on whether industrial workers benefited from Stalin's rule. Responses often understood the policies, providing details of the Plans, but did not explain the impact they had on workers. Better responses did recognise that workers received some benefits, such as free medicine and that childcare was available, and also that these benefits came at the cost of harsh discipline and tough working conditions. Some responses concentrated on collectivisation, rather than industrial workers.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 15

(a) Most candidates had a good knowledge of what the developments in cinema in the 1920s and many achieved high marks. Such responses recognised the number of films being made increased, and that the first talkie was introduced in 1927. Other valid identifications were the rise of movie stars such as Charlie Chaplin, and that this helped to popularise the cinema so that 100 million tickets were being sold each week.

(b) This question was generally answered well, with candidates able to explain at least one reason why there was religious intolerance in the 1920s. Responses often considered the impact of the Ku Klux Klan and their intolerance of Catholics and Jews. Another common approach was for responses to consider the Monkey Trial, explaining how this showed intolerance of anything other than fundamentalist beliefs. Few errors in content were evident, but some responses would have been improved by the inclusion of two explanations, rather than one.

(c) Many very good responses were seen to this question, with candidates able to provide balanced answers considering whether women's lives improved in the 1920s. In support of the question, responses often considered the impact of the greater freedoms experienced by women such as the ability to work, or the lives of flappers, with explicit consideration of how this was an improvement to previous times. To provide balance, this was often contrasted with the lives of women in rural areas who experienced little change, or the inequalities women still experienced, such as their rate of pay compared to that of men. Less successful responses described the lives of women without explicitly considering whether this was an improvement or not.

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

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Paper 13

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to help them 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 actual question set.

General comments

A significant majority of answers reflected sound understanding and good knowledge supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and had acquired a great deal of information and they were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions, which reward recall and description. Many answered these questions appropriately, in the form of a short paragraph. The best answers to **part (b) and (c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or including information which lacked relevance. These responses developed each identified factor fully. A significant number of responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the hypothesis) but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. These responses avoided repeating points already made in the essay and instead explained and analysed how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Less successful conclusions were limited to assertions on 'how far'.

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. Many candidates gained credit for stating that Nansen, working with the Red Cross, returned 425 000 to their homes between 1920 and 1922. Typically, credit was also given for naming the Commission, its work in setting up camps for shelter and for attempts to stamp out diseases such as cholera and smallpox.

Part (b) responses were characterised by general points about France's aim of maintaining military strength against Germany and/or Britain's reluctance to disarm as imperial outposts and trade had to be protected. Better responses made specific references to the League's Disarmament Conference, where Germany withdrew from the League and began to re-arm, complaining that other European countries had not

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

disarmed to their level following the Versailles Settlement. Additionally, answers tended to include that as France was afraid of Germany, it was unlikely to disarm its own forces when Germany was getting stronger.

Most candidates showed good knowledge in **part (c)** of the League's efforts in the 1920s to settle disputes. For example, solutions found in Upper Silesia, the Aaland Islands and Bulgaria's quarrel with Greece exemplified one side of the argument through explanations that when the League had reached a judgement, its resolutions were accepted. Better responses added the other side - a balanced argument drew on the League's failures to deal with the crises relating to Vilna and Corfu. The best responses were able to substantiate a judgement on the hypothesis given in the question.

Question 6

In **part (a)** there were some sound points about what the Soviet Union gained from the Nazi-Soviet Pact. These answers often related to the fact that the Pact gave Stalin time to rebuild the armed forces after the Purges, that he gained half of Poland and was able to maintain trade with Germany.

Candidates knew a great deal about Japanese militarisation in the 1930s, particularly the Manchurian Crisis and relations with Germany and Italy. Identifying relevant points such as these gained credit. Good answers went on to focus on the word 'threat' in the question and explained why Japan was regarded as a danger. For example, candidates argued that Japan had signed the Anti-Comintern Pact in 1936 with Germany. The Pact was directed against the USSR and was joined by Italy in 1937. Japan had already threatened Russia's railway interests in Manchuria and the Pact made the threat against Russia even stronger. The best answers tended to include a second explanation about Japan's departure from the League.

Candidates answering **part (c)** were not always able to explain why the Anschluss and the takeover of the Sudetenland achieved Hitler's aims. General points about the Treaty of Versailles or attempts to create a large and powerful Germany were often seen. The best answers made specific references to both events stated in the question and linked them to precise aims. For instance, on the one hand it was argued that the Anschluss was important to Hitler because he wanted to create a Greater Germany and to overthrow the Treaty of Versailles. An explanation would be added that Anschluss had been forbidden by the Treaty and so a union would help him achieve both these aims. Austria's soldiers, weapons and its rich deposits of gold, iron ore and salt would be added to Germany's increasingly strong army and industry to make it more powerful. Then, on the other side of the question, the Sudetenland was regarded as important to Hitler as he wanted to unite all German speaking people and there were 3.5 million living there. This land had been given to Czechoslovakia under the Treaty of St Germain, part of the Paris Settlement. It was also rich in resources, which would be valuable to Hitler. When the Munich Agreement was made Hitler realised the Allies would not fight over Czechoslovakia and invaded the rest of the country. Candidates expressing this balanced view of the issue wrote strong responses, while the very best answers made a valid judgement about which was the more important.

Question 7

Candidates knew many detailed points about the policy of containment in **part (a)**. These included its aim to stop the spread of Communism or halt the spread of Soviet influence in Europe, and that it was designed by Truman.

The best responses to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question which focused on why Khrushchev placed missiles in Cuba. Identified factors often referred to his wish to show the Soviet leadership he was strong; candidates mentioned Khrushchev's efforts to protect Cuba from attack, and the threat he could pose to the US from Cuba which was only 90 miles away. Better answers then developed and explained each factor fully. For instance, 'Khrushchev placed missiles in Cuba for political reasons. He was aware that some members of the Soviet government thought he was not aggressive enough in his policy towards the US. He wanted them to see that he could take strong action and so placed missiles in Cuba to show America (and the politburo) that he was a strong leader.'

The aim in **part (c)** was to write a balanced answer and assess how much of a surprise the US failure in the Vietnam War was. Responses tended to express lack of surprise at the expense of the other side of the argument. The former focused on explaining why the US were ill-equipped to deal with guerrilla warfare. Candidates wrote how the US failed to win the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people and lost the support of the American people as the war went on. The Vietnamese forces in the north were supplied by China and the USSR and were determined to fight to unite their country, while US civilians and soldiers became disillusioned with the war. Some stronger responses were also able to explain 'surprise', given the power (giving examples of size and available technology), as well as wealth of the US military, which had

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

overcome its enemies in World War Two and might have been expected to win the conflict in Vietnam. This side of the argument tended to be characterised by generalised statements which would have benefited from fully addressing the requirements of the question.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

The best answers to **part (a)** referred to the shelling of enemy lines for a week before the attack to clear the barbed wire, and to the planting of mines to destroy the enemy trenches prior to the start of the Battle of the Somme on 1 July 1916.

There were detailed narratives of 'going over the top' in **part (b)**, although the best answers met the specific demands of the question, focusing precisely on why it was so dangerous. Explanations included that 'the troops were visible to the enemy once they left the safety of their own trenches. It was difficult for them to move quickly, and enemy snipers or machine gun crews had plenty of time to get into position to shoot their attackers.' The best responses featured two explained points.

When answering **part (c)**, candidates knew a great deal about tanks and other new technologies used in the First World War, gaining marks for description. Better responses analysed 'impact'. For instance, there were good explanations of the problems encountered by tanks which reduced their effectiveness when compared with the reasons why defenders relied on machine guns, which accounted for ninety per cent of deaths. Some candidates developed other examples to make alternative comparisons about the impact of new technologies on the Western Front, such as gas which was difficult to use and probably led to only four per cent of losses. Balanced answers which explained both sides of the argument - tanks on the one hand and other technologies on the other, achieved high marks.

Question 10

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

Question 11

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**; there were detailed references to propaganda, Hitler's speeches, promises of work and SA violence.

In contrast, there was weaker knowledge about why Hitler attempted the Munich Putsch in **part (b)**. Strong responses developed and explained two identified factors, for example why the weakness and unpopularity of the Weimar Government provided the opportunity for an attempted Putsch, and why Hitler thought that the army and some members of the Bavarian government would support him.

There was often good knowledge of the Night of the Long Knives and the reasons behind it in **part (c)**. Balance was achieved in many answers which, on the one hand, explained that Rohm was a rival and a threat because he was the leader of the SA which numbered up to four million supporters, which could be used to challenge Hitler's authority and carry out Rohm's idea of a 'second revolution'. On the other hand, it was argued by some candidates that Hitler was keen to get the army on his side and knew that they would not tolerate Rohm and the undisciplined behaviour of the SA. Hitler acted against Rohm to show the generals that he was in charge. Hence, the extent of the threat to Hitler could be set against what he might see as the benefits of moving against his opponents.

Question 12

Candidates in **part (a)** were able to describe the changes made to education by the Nazis, including a heavy emphasis on race theory, sport and PE, military training for boys, domestic skills for girls and loyalty to Hitler.

The opposition of churchmen to the Nazis was less well known in **part (b)**. Good answers explained and developed identified points such as their opposition to changes made in education, the Nazi policy of euthanasia, the German Faith Movement and Nazi policy towards the Jews.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

A number of candidates found it difficult to apply relevant knowledge to both sides of the **part (c)** question about living standards under the Nazis. Supporting evidence included huge improvements in employment, benefits gained through the Strength through Joy organisation and the fact that farmers enjoyed price guarantees. On the other hand, counter arguments referred to wages which did not rise significantly, the outlawing of trade unions, food rationing from 1939 onwards and the privations suffered by Jews and other oppressed groups.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

In part (a), candidates knew many of the benefits the boom brought to people's lives in the 1920s. Better answers focused on employment (including for women), cars, household appliances, cheaper consumer goods and higher wages.

Responses to **part (b)** tended to be descriptive and would have been improved by reference to specific supporting factors. There was a great deal of information about overproduction, the use of machinery and tariff policies. In better responses, each point was applied to the demands of the question by explaining why each factor led to a farming crisis. For instance, 'Overproduction meant that farmers' incomes fell in the 1920s and many lost their farms as a result. From 1900 to 1920, while farming was doing well, more and more land was being farmed. Improved machinery, especially the combine harvester, and improved fertilisers made US agriculture very efficient. The result was that by 1920 it was producing surpluses of wheat which nobody wanted, and prices fell. Farmers could not pay their mortgages or rent and so many had to leave the land.' Two explained reasons were seen in the best responses.

For **part (c)** it was important to balance alternative reasons for the boom with mass production. When narratives were linked to the demands of the question, some reasonable answers were produced. Good responses recognised that mass production helped to create the boom because large quantities of products could be produced using assembly line techniques. Because of these techniques the price of products fell, which encouraged more people to buy. For instance, fifteen million Model T Fords had been produced by 1927 and the price had fallen to $290, which was a third of what it had been twenty years earlier. The best responses typically identified other factors too such as mass marketing, hire purchase and Republican policies and explained why each contributed to the boom.

Question 16

There was a small number of responses to this question. In relation to the 1935 Social Security Act in **part (a)**, credit was given for the provision of old age and widows pensions, unemployment benefit, help for the sick and the disabled.

In **part (b)** identified points about the Liberty League's opposition to the New Deal ranged from its Republican membership which resented interference in business, its dislike of unions which Roosevelt encouraged and attacks on the New Deal for being un-American and too 'socialist'. In the best responses these factors were explained and developed.

Answers to **part (c)** assessed the effectiveness of the New Deal in tackling unemployment. The success of some New Deal agencies was acknowledged, such as the CCC which provided voluntary employment for young men between the ages of 18 and 25, and the Public Works Administration which provided work on construction projects, such as building schools and bridges. As a result, it was argued, unemployment fell from almost 13 million to below 8 million in 1937. On the other side of the argument the view was expressed that unemployment remained stubbornly high despite Roosevelt's efforts. Jobs which were provided by the CCC and CWA were only temporary. Although unemployment had dropped by 1937, in 1938 it had increased again. Unemployment only dropped when war started. The best responses were balanced, offered both sides of the question and were fully explained.

Questions 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

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

It is important to answer the questions on either the nineteenth century or the twentieth century option. Candidates should not answer some questions from both options.

It is important to remember that all the questions are about the sources. All answers should therefore be based on interpretation and evaluation of the sources. All answers should be supported by using the content of the sources. This is important for all the questions. On **Question 6**, a number of candidates did not make use of the sources and wrote general essays.

Sometimes it can be useful to use a quote from a source to support a point being made in an answer. It is important to give the quotation in full. Ellipses should not be used as they often lead to crucial parts of the quotation being missed out.

When examining cartoons, especially for 'message' questions, candidates should be asking themselves, 'What is the point of view of the cartoonist?'

Candidates are advised to think about the questions and carefully plan their answers before writing their answers. This will help them understand exactly what the questions are asking and help them to directly address the questions in their answers. It will also help them avoid repeating or paraphrasing sources at the beginning of their answers.

It is important to answer the question which is set. For example, in **Question 2** in the twentieth century option, it is not enough to explain the message of the cartoon. Candidates need to explain that the message is the reason for publication. Similarly, in **Question 4** in the nineteenth century option, it is not enough to compare or evaluate the sources. Candidates need to use their analysis of the sources to explain whether they think Source E makes Source F surprising.

General comments

Most candidates answered the questions on the twentieth century option, although a good number attempted the nineteenth century option. A good standard of answers was seen but a number of candidates wrote generally about the sources or the topic and did not directly address the questions. Many candidates had the required contextual knowledge and were able to interpret and compare sources, but some were less ready to evaluate sources. Candidates need to decide when a question is asking them to evaluate and then decide the best method of evaluation for that particular question and those particular sources. Sources can be evaluated by using contextual knowledge or other sources to check the claims made by a source or by considering the purpose of the author of the source. A number of candidates on the nineteenth century option did not use the sources in their answers to **Question 6** and struggled to evaluate when tackling **Questions 3** and **4**.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well, with many candidates finding agreements such as Germany promising independence/sovereignty and demanding a conference. In terms of disagreements, a reasonable

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

number of candidates explained that Source A states that the Entente was under threat, while Source B disagrees with this. The best answers compared the two sources point by point. Some less successful responses summarised each source and then asserted that they agree or disagree.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to use parts of the cartoon (including the caption) to explain valid sub-messages, for example Germany was hostile towards Britain and France, and that Britain and France were allies. To explain the big message it is necessary to consider all the main parts of the cartoon. The title, 'The match-maker despite herself', is a big help. A small number of candidates put these elements together and were able to explain that the cartoon is suggesting that Germany's hostility towards Britain and France (aimed at testing and even breaking the entente) has been counter-productive and had brought the two closer together. It is important to note that the question is about the cartoonist's message. This suggests that the point of view of the cartoonist is required – he is showing approval of the fact that Germany's move has been counter-productive.

Question 3

A number of candidates struggled with their responses to this question. When evaluating a source it is often useful to consider the possible purpose of the author. In the case of Source D, the context (Germany's desire to destroy the entente), can be used to suggest the purpose of the German diplomat in writing the kind of account he has written. However, many candidates did not consider purpose. Instead, they attempted to evaluate Source D by checking details against other sources or their contextual knowledge. This was often a struggle, with candidates simply asserting that various details in Source D are not true. This was surprising as several sources, as well as the Background information, provide material that could be used, for example Source B states that the Kaiser stated his support for the Sultan's sovereignty, supporting Source D which tells us that the Kaiser described the Sultan as 'the free ruler of an independent country'. A number of candidates did reject the account in Source D because it was written by a German diplomat, but they needed to go on and develop their answers.

Question 4

A reasonable number of candidates found disagreements or agreements between the two sources and used them to explain surprise or lack of surprise. In Source E Fisher is keen on war and Grey in Source F does not rule it out. However, Fisher is keen on an alliance with France and on war with Germany, while Grey is much more cautious and does not want to act too early or go beyond the terms of the entente. A number of candidates wrote about the sources without addressing the question in a meaningful way. The best answers used the provenance and the content of the sources to argue that it is not surprising that Fisher was more keen on war because he was a military man, while Grey was a diplomat.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to provide a valid sub-message for Source G, for example the Kaiser is threatening Morocco, France and Britain are worried about the Kaiser's actions. For Source H, a reasonable number explained how the Kaiser appears to be a threatening figure. A number of candidates interpreted both cartoons but would have improved their answers by producing a comparison. Many of those that did manage a comparison were able to explain how the Kaiser appears to be up to no good or to be causing trouble in both sources. A small number of stronger responses got to the cartoonists' points of view – they both appear to disapprove of the Kaiser and what he is doing. A few candidates struggled to move beyond surface descriptions.

Question 6

This question is based on use of the sources. It is primarily about the sources, as well as the motivation of Germany in its actions over Morocco. However, a good number of candidates missed the sources and just wrote about the Moroccan Crisis or the details in the sources, without identifying any particular sources. Candidates need to test the hypothesis given in the question (Germany's aim in interfering in Morocco was to break the Anglo-French Entente) against the evidence in the sources and explain which sources support the hypothesis, and which do not. In doing this they need to clearly identify which sources they are using, clearly state whether each one supports or disagrees with the hypothesis, and make specific use of the content of sources to support their answers, for example 'Source C supports the statement because Germany is looking disapprovingly at the close relations between France and Britain. The caption says about Germany that it has been the match-maker, despite itself, meaning that it meant to break the relationship between

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

France and Britain but has achieved the opposite.' To ensure that proper use is made of individual sources, candidates should be encouraged not to group the sources. This often led to very general statements being made about the group as a whole, with no use of particular sources in that group.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to find agreements between the two sources and a good number also found disagreements. For example, both sources state that Lloyd George kept changing his mind, that Clemenceau was not interested in the League of Nations and that there were difficulties in the negotiations. There are also disagreements over whether or not Wilson and Clemenceau were able to work together and how far Wilson engaged with the other leaders. A small number of candidates summarised both sources without making any point-by-point comparisons. The best answers were those that went beyond the details of the sources and looked at them in the round. They explained that, on the whole, Source A suggests the Big Three got on fairly well, while Source B suggests the opposite.

Question 2

This question produced a wide range of answers. It required candidates to use their contextual knowledge to interpret the intended message of the cartoon and to infer the purpose of the artist. Not using their contextual knowledge led some candidates to claim that the cartoon is about the Treaty of Versailles when it is about the negotiations. (The date of the cartoon is March 1919, while the Treaty was signed 28 June 1919.) Some answers were less clear, suggesting in places that it is about the negotiations, but also stating it is about the Treaty. This question asks about the reason for the publication of the cartoon in March 1919. It is therefore important to give and explain a reason for publication. Some candidates suggested it was published in March because that is when the negotiations were taking place. Better answers focused more on the messages of the cartoon. Some just explained that, for example in the negotiations France was demanding heavy punishments for Germany, but others went further and explained the big message – disapproval of France's harsh attitude towards Germany. It is important to note that these messages must be presented by candidates as the reasons for why the cartoon was being published. It is not enough to simply interpret the cartoon. The following is an example of what is required, 'This cartoon was published to tell people that France wanted harsh punishments for Germany in the peace negotiations and that such harsh punishments would be a big mistake.' The best answers explain a possible purpose for the publication, for example to persuade MPs or the British public to oppose harsh punishments for Germany.

Question 3

This question also produced an interesting range of answers. The best answers rested on an understanding that the authorship of the source matters as much as what the source says. Candidates are told that Lansing was replaced by House as his chief advisor. A small number of candidates used this information to explain that they were not surprised by Source D because of his criticism of House. Other candidates focused on House and his position as Wilson's chief advisor. They explained their surprise at House's actions in Source D because of Wilson's belief in the League of Nations. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to select an aspect of Source D and explain why they were, or were not, surprised by it. For example, it comes as no surprise that the French preferred an alliance with the United States and Britain to a League of Nations. Weaker answers often selected something that was, or was not, surprising, but neglected to produce a satisfactory explanation, while others produced perfectly good reasons for being surprised or not surprised, but did not state whether they were actually surprised or not. In questions like this it is crucial that candidates clearly state whether they are surprised or not.

Question 4

Some candidates struggled with this question because they focused on particular instances of Wilson's behaviour, for example he resented the accusations or he got angry, rather than making an inference about the kind of man Wilson was from the evidence in Source E. Some candidates struggled with 'impressions' and copied the source or produced a paraphrase, and a few wrote about Wilson using their contextual knowledge, with no use of the source. However, there were many candidates who suggested and supported valid impressions, for example 'idealistic', 'rational', 'short tempered', 'passionate', 'confident' and 'thin skinned'. In better responses, candidates supported one or two valid impressions by reference to the content of Source E.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 5

Most candidates were able to interpret at least the sub-messages of the cartoons, although some did not compare them. Both cartoons contain two elements: Wilson and the nations. Many candidates were able to use one of these to produce a sub-message, for example the nations were interested in their own interests, or Wilson wanted a just peace. Fewer candidates went on to use all the elements in the cartoons to reach and compare the big messages – in Source F Wilson is unaware of the problems facing him in his pursuit of a just peace, while in Source G he is aware. Two important points come out of candidates' answers: candidates should not interpret the cartoons separately, but should make a direct comparison of their messages, and try and use all the elements in the cartoon to reach an interpretation. Interpretations should not be based on just one part of the cartoon.

Question 6

Many candidates did well with this question. They used details of the sources to produce clear explanations of how some sources support the hypothesis and how some do not. The explanations must use the content of the sources, for example 'Source B does not support the idea that Wilson's difficulties were caused by Clemenceau because it says that Lloyd George caused difficulties because he changed his mind so much and so was difficult for Wilson to work with.' This answer contains the following crucial elements: it makes clear whether or not the source supports the hypothesis, it makes reference to specific content in Source B, and it explains how this content shows that Source B disagrees with the statement. Weaknesses in other answers included: not using the sources, not explicitly stating whether the source supports or does not support the hypothesis, and not referring to a specific statement in the source. Candidates should avoid grouping the sources and making a general assertion that is meant to apply to all of the sources in the group. Each source needs to be dealt with individually.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Starting the examination by carefully reading through the Background Information, the sources and questions is a good approach. There will be an overarching theme to the paper which is given in the title, and having a grasp of how all the sources relate to this theme will assist in answering the questions, not just by providing appropriate opportunities for cross-reference, but also in answering **Question 6**, which addresses the theme.

Time management is important. Some candidates lose time by writing without a proper focus on the question. There is no need to summarise a source or describe a cartoon. A direct answer to the question is required. Candidates should leave enough time to answer the last question, **Question 6**, which invites them to study all of the sources, fully.

All the questions require the use of a source or sources, and where written sources are concerned, this will mean quoting relevant parts of the content. It is important that these quotes are given in full, and that ellipses are not used. The reason for this is that an ellipsis might take the place material which might be relevant to answering the question.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option. In fact, there were insufficient answers on the nineteenth century for a meaningful report to be written. Candidates' answers demonstrated that the sources were generally well understood, and that the level of knowledge of the historical context was good. Candidates were strongest in skills that utilised comprehension and manipulation of source content, such as comparison. They struggled more with source evaluation. One of the characteristics of the best candidates' scripts was the ability to evaluate sources through the authors' purposes in representing events as they did. On at least three of the questions, analysing the author's purpose was a more effective method of source evaluation than cross-reference, as it looked at the source as a whole, rather than just checking the accuracy of details, which was the technique adopted by many candidates.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well. On agreements, there were a good number of points to match, and most candidates could see that both regarded the Treaty as harsh, ignoring Wilson's principles, and likely to do Germany economic damage. A good proportion of candidates found at least one disagreement, generally that Germany was prepared to cooperate in Source A but would remain a menace in Source B. The best answers were able to provide examples of both agreements and disagreements. Only a few candidates summarised first Source A, then Source B, and then asserted agreements or disagreements. Almost all of the candidates understood that direct comparisons of content from the two sources were essential.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

This saw candidates generally being able to compare the two sources effectively but not going further and providing the evaluation the question invited. Most candidates regarded agreements between the sources as 'proof'. Detecting agreements does involve comparing 'like with like', and some answers compared the issue of war guilt from Source C with what was depicted in the cartoon. However, the cartoon did not address war guilt. Successful comparisons could be made between the claims in Source C that the demands of the Treaty were beyond the powers of the German nation, that the Treaty could not work, or even that the Germans would have to pay. At this stage, better responses went on to address the issue of proof. The purposes of the authors of the sources were important here. Both Sources C and D had the purpose of putting the German point of view on the Treaty into the public domain, perhaps even hoping to have the terms of the Treaty modified. At the very least, this raises the issue of whether Source D could constitute proof of the claims in Source C, and the best answers made this point. Finally, it is worth mentioning that a small number of answers successfully compared the two sources but would have been improved by going on to deal with the issue of proof. A number of these answers would have benefited from directly answering the question; starting the answer with a sentence that does this would help, for example, 'Source D proves the claims made in Source C because'.

Question 3

This question was generally answered well, though there was a clear difference between those that used the publication date of the cartoon (1933) and those that did not. Given that the question asked why the cartoon was published, the answer needed to include a reason. Some answers did not include one and so did not really answer the question set. These answers often provided some effective interpretation of the cartoon which could have been turned into a message that the cartoonist wished to transmit to the audience. Most valid answers were, in fact, based on the cartoonist's messages, which were clearly protesting against the military restrictions imposed by the Treaty of Versailles. Better answers dealt also with why the cartoonist would want to send these messages, including the idea of purpose – the intended impact of the cartoon on the audience of arousing opposition to the Treaty. What characterised the best responses was to add contextual awareness to the answer. In 1933 the Nazis had just come to power, and high on Hitler's agenda were German rearmament and repudiation of the Treaty. Understanding the specific purpose that the cartoonist would have had of winning support for Hitler's plans was therefore the basis of the most successful answers.

Question 4

Candidates struggled with this question, problems arising from comprehension of what exactly William II was claiming. In the first few lines of Source F, William was putting forward reasons why Germany should not have been blamed for the outbreak of the war. In many answers candidates thought he was arguing that Germany should not have been treated so harshly at Versailles. This made a big difference when candidates tried to test the accuracy of the claims, as they attempted to use the attitudes of the Allies in the peace process to cross-refer against the Allies' behaviour in 1914 and before. Only the second half of the source moved on to the post-war period, and here candidates were able to do some effective cross-reference, usually on contrasting William's assertion that Germany would have treated defeated nations more leniently with Germany's treatment of Russia at Brest-Litovsk. Although some answers tried to assess William's trustworthiness by using the provenance, this was usually through generalised comments about memoirs or on his status as Emperor. A small number of stronger responses were able to go as far as providing plausible arguments on what William's purposes in 1922 might have been. By then he had been in exile for over three years, so arguments that he would have been trying to get the terms of the Treaty softened did not seem very realistic. Much the best approach was seen in responses which viewed the source as an exercise in self-justification, and an attempt to restore some of his reputation.

Question 5

For most candidates, the utility of Source G was determined by the information it provided. This could be about the Treaty; for example, that it was a Diktat which dealt a blow to the new German Republic. Or it could be about the Republic itself; for example, that it faced problems from the start. The information could be what the source said, or it could be something inferred from what the source said. The limitation of this approach was to assume that what the source said was reliable, and that the information could therefore be believed. Better responses included a check on this. This check could simply be on the factual accuracy of what Source G claimed, by using cross-reference to other sources or background knowledge. If the information could be believed, then it was useful. The best answers were prepared to explore the source's provenance, analysing Preuss's possible purposes in writing the source, to reach a conclusion about its

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

utility. As one of the authors of the Weimar Constitution, it could be assumed that Preuss might want to defend the Republic, especially in 1923, a year in which it faced so many threats. Source G could therefore be seen as justification for what the creators of the Republic had done, in the light of the difficulties the Treaty had made for them. In some responses this made the source unreliable, and therefore not useful, and in others reliable, and therefore useful, because of the insights it provided into the mindset of people like Preuss. However, the most important thing was the ability to evaluate the purpose behind the source to reach a conclusion.

Question 6

In **Question 6** candidates are given a hypothesis to test against the evidence provided by all the sources. They should be aware that the sources will offer evidence both for and against the hypothesis, and should be ready in their answers to show how the sources can be used. This means identifying relevant pieces of content in the sources and explaining how they constitute evidence. Responses were of mixed quality. There were many thorough and relevant answers, using a range of sources on both sides of the hypothesis. There were also many less successful responses. A number of them seemed unclear about the meaning of the War Guilt Clause, and attempted to argue that every source provided convincing evidence to support the hypothesis. These answers would have been improved by considering both sides of the hypothesis. Answers sometimes lost sight of the hypothesis, and began to focus on another issue, such as whether the Treaty was harsh or not. Some answers retained a focus on war guilt, but lost focus on what it was that Germans hated about the Treaty. These responses tended to become lists of what each source was about – reparations, military terms, war guilt and so on. Some answers identified the issue in the source that the Germans disliked, for example military restrictions, but then missed the opportunity to use the source content to explain and illustrate this.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

- Candidates should read through the background information and all the sources before attempting to answer the questions. This should give them an understanding of the main focus of the paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding should then inform all their answers and help them to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. A helpful strategy is for candidates to directly address the question in the very first sentence of the answer, for example, 'Source C does/does not mean that Lloyd George was wrong in source B' or 'Source F is useful because'.
- On **Question 6**, candidates must ensure that the sources are used as the basis of the answer. They should avoid a general commentary using only their own knowledge in response to the question asked. Candidates should engage with the content of the sources and make it clear whether they are using it 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, 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

The majority of the scripts were on the twentieth-century option. There were too few responses on the nineteenth-century option for meaningful comments to be made. Most candidates completed all six questions. There were a few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both the nineteenth and twentieth century options. A good number of candidates were able to produce responses that demonstrated the necessary source handling skills and the ability to apply contextual knowledge relevantly.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates to explain the impression Source A gives of the Treaty of Versailles using details of the source and knowledge. The most commonly identified impression was the neutral one that the Treaty was forced on Germany, and the majority of candidates then went on to support this with reference to details from the cartoon. Some of the stronger responses were based on a critical impression of the Treaty. These responses often concluded that the impression of the Treaty was that it was harsh and there were various ways that this could be successfully supported by source detail. In the best answers candidates recognised that the overall impression of the Treaty is positive; the cartoonist's view was clear and support from the source was relevant. To perform well on this question, it was crucial that candidates made a clear reference to the source and that this served to support the inferred impression. Some candidates supported their inference with contextual knowledge without reference to the source. In other less successful responses, candidates focused their answers on an impression of Germany or the allies, rather than the Treaty.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Question 2

There were many good but few excellent answers to this question. In **Question 2**, candidates were asked to consider two sources from Lloyd George and conclude whether the content of one means that he was wrong in the other. Many candidates were able to pick out disagreements between the two sources and use these to conclude that Lloyd George was wrong in Source B. For example, in Source B Lloyd George clearly believes the Treaty is fit for purpose and will succeed, whereas in Source C, he makes it clear that the Treaty has not succeeded and is ultimately a failure. Some better answers focused on Lloyd George not being wrong as, in both sources, he is supporting the Treaty and maintains that it could have succeeded; in Source C the problem lies with those who were charged with enforcing the Treaty, rather than the Treaty itself. The best responses were achieved by 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 one or both of the sources. However, little genuine evaluation was attempted on this question. When it was seen, it was more often based on a contextual awareness of the fact that by 1938 the Treaty was pretty much undone and that many were critical of the Treaty at this time. Lloyd George's purpose to defend himself in Source C would also have been a valid evaluation, but few responses featured this approach. Nearly all of the responses managed to address the specific question being asked and, where valid comparisons were not made, credit was gained for identifying what Lloyd George was wrong or not wrong about or for use of the provenance at a basic level.

Question 3

This question proved a challenge for some candidates. On **Question 3**, candidates were asked to consider two cartoons and make a judgement about how far the two cartoonists would have agreed. When candidates are asked to use two sources, inevitably a comparison of what they say or show is required. Candidates must identify similarities and/or differences, but remember that valid comparisons can only be made on the basis of a criterion that is common to the two sources – for example, do they agree or disagree about a common issue? Direct comparisons of the content of the two sources are what is required, rather than a summary of first one source and then the other. The best answers identified the point that both cartoonists were saying something about and used this as the basis of their response. In this case, the cartoonists agree that Congress rejected the Versailles Treaty or failed to ratify or sign it. In the best answers, candidates could recognise, not only this agreement, but also that both cartoonists are critical of Congress for this. While a very small number of responses recognised this overall comparison, reasonable responses were provided by many candidates who could interpret sub-messages of one, or both, cartoons. In comparisons of sub-messages Source E proved problematic for many candidates but some were able to explain that in Source D, Congress does not like Wilson's proposal for the Treaty or that Congress has damaged the Treaty.

Question 4

This question asked candidates whether they were surprised by Source F. One crucial thing in a question of this nature is for candidates to make it clear whether or not they are surprised. Some candidates base a response on being surprised 'to a certain extent' or 'barely surprised' or 'a little surprised'. This approach often results in an unclear argument, and it is difficult to gauge whether a candidate is arguing that they were surprised or unsurprised. Candidates should state clearly whether or not they are surprised, by what, and then explain the reason for this based on the content of the source/s and their own knowledge. It is similarly crucial that candidates make it clear what they are surprised or not surprised about. There were a significant number of candidates who made it clear whether they were surprised or not and gave a contextual explanation of the reasons for this without referring to the detail, or even better, the overall message of the source, that had led them to this. In stronger responses candidates used their contextual knowledge to explain reasons for being both surprised and not surprised by the content of Source F. For example, it is not surprising that a British diplomat would report events in this way as his purpose could be to persuade the British to support the Treaty. However, it is surprising that the French would be so happy as many believed the Treaty was not harsh enough. Indeed, Clemenceau was criticised for not securing a harsher treaty.

Question 5

This question, which focused on the usefulness of Source G, proved mixed responses. The most common strategy was for candidates to use the source in an uncritical way as useful evidence. Such responses typically focused on a simple paraphrasing of the information in the source, identifying, for example, that the source tells us that it is wrong that Germany was totally to blame for the war, that the Treaty was unfair or that the British population had believed the lies spread by propaganda about German guilt. There were also a number of responses in which the assessment of usefulness was based on an undeveloped use of the

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

source's provenance; such responses tended to dismiss the source as either useful or not useful due to bias as it was written by a British anti-war organisation. In stronger responses, candidates were able to explain that the source is useful because of what can be learnt from it. They could then use their contextual knowledge, or cross reference to other sources on the paper, in order to arrive at a judgement about usefulness. The best responses were those which could explain how the source is useful and reasons why it can be seen as limited. It was seen as useful because it provides evidence that there were British people who held the view that the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh and that Germany should not be held totally responsible for the war. It was seen as limited because it is unrepresentative of popular opinion at the time and has a clear purpose, which was to persuade the British that the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh and unfair.

Question 6

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates provided strong responses by explaining how the sources can be used as evidence that the victorious powers were happy with the Treaty of Versailles. They then selected from Sources C, D, E and G and used the content of these to argue that the victorious powers were unhappy with the Treaty's terms. The most successful answers used the sources to present both sides of the argument. They examined several sources and explained how the content of each one supports or disagrees with the given hypothesis. Some less successful responses neglected to make it clear whether or not the source under discussion was being used to support or challenge the given statement. Some candidates addressed only one side of the hypothesis. 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. It is not enough to simply summarise each source. Many candidates used direct quotes from the sources as the basis of their explanations and this is a strategy that works well, as long as a full quote that makes sense, is used. Most candidates did not attempt evaluation, but those that did were successful when they examined the purpose of the writer or cartoonist; attempts at evaluation based on source type, undeveloped provenance or where it was unrelated to the hypothesis were less successful.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

Candidates should be prepared to use a range of criteria to assess significance. They should be aware that a person, development or event can be significant in some ways but not in others, and that failures can be as significant as successes. Coursework assignment titles must be appropriate and clearly allow candidates to assess significance. Lengthy description is not required, while assessment and the use of argument and counter-argument are needed. Candidates should aim to produce developed and supported conclusions about the most important way in which their subject was significant.

General comments

The overall standard of the candidates' work was high, with a good number producing impressive assessments of significance. Most of the titles used were valid and suitable, although some could have focused more a broad assessment of significance. The marking of candidates' work was generally accurate and annotated with useful comments by teachers.

Comments on specific questions

Most of the coursework assignment titles worked well. They need to encourage candidates to assess significance in the broadest possible way. A title such as 'Assess the significance of the New Deal for the USA' does this because it allows candidates to consider different ways in which the New Deal may have been significant, for example political, economic, social, for different groups, and so on. A title such as 'How significant was the Depression in Hitler becoming Chancellor?' does not do this. It restricts candidates to the role of the Depression in Hitler becoming Chancellor and does not allow other ways in which the Depression was significant to be investigated. It also places the focus on Hitler becoming Chancellor, rather than on the significance of the Depression. In responding to this title candidates are likely to compare the importance of the Depression with the importance of other causes of Hitler becoming Chancellor. This is not what is required. The key thing to remember is to **not** name an outcome in the title, and to keep it open.

Examples of the types of title that worked well included:

Assess the significance of political extremism for Germany from 1918 to 1934.

How significant was the Depression for Germany?

To what extent was the Wall Street Crash significant for the USA?

How significant was Dunkirk in the Second World War?

It is important to remember that titles should be taken from syllabus or centre-devised Depth Studies and not the Core Content of the syllabus. Most centres set the same title for all of their candidates, which works well.

There were a number of well organised and well-argued answers that addressed the assessment of significance. In other responses, candidates spent considerable time on explaining the background to the event or the individual they were assessing but this is not required. However, the best answers do consider the situation before the time of the event or individual. They do this as part of their assessment of significance. For example, when considering the significance of the New Deal, it is useful to examine government attitudes and policies in the decade before. This will enable the candidate to judge how much of a change/turning point the New Deal was, and this will contribute to the assessment of significance. It is also important to be aware that responses should go beyond just explaining significance. Some candidates just

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

explained what somebody achieved or what an event led to. They need to go one step further and assess how far this mattered – at the time and later. Candidates should also try to use a range of criteria such as political, economic, social, impact on different groups, turning point, long and short-term, to assess how far an event or an individual was significant in different ways and for different reasons. A good number of candidates managed to explain various ways in which their event or individual was significant but many could have gone further and used their conclusions to explain which was the most important way their event or individual was important and why.

Nearly all of the marking was well done, with close attention to the mark scheme evident. It is important that a 'best-fit' approach is used when applying the mark scheme. If an answer displays performance at different levels, the important question to ask is which level does the candidate's coursework, taken as a whole, match the best? Judgements about whether or not an answer has reached a certain level can only be made by considering the whole answer. Many centres provided helpful summative comments explaining why their final judgement placed the answer in a particular level.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This component 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 were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 45 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 41. A number of candidates attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 –41. There were too few responses to Depth Study E: China, c.1930-c.1990, Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940-c.1994 and Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945, to make any meaningful comments. Good answers had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses, with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were some rubric infringements 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 often wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focussing 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 importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 – 18

Both **Question 1** and **Question 2** were answered by a large number of candidates.

Question 1 saw a number of struggling responses. A small number of good answers were able to correctly define the term ‘race to the sea’ and explain how this led to a prolonged war. These candidates examined how, after the first Battle of the Marne in 1914, both sides dug in defensive lines of trenches and attempted to outflank each other as they raced for control of the Channel ports, which led to the end of mobile warfare on the Western Front. This was then balanced against other factors such as the new weapons and technology like the machine gun, the lack of effective military tactics to launch offensives and the failure of the Schlieffen Plan. The best responses were able to provide a good level of detail and chronological accuracy. Weaker responses often confused the chronology or examined events much later in the war, at which point a stalemate was already in existence. A number of candidates confused the term ‘race to the sea’ with the war at sea.

Question 2 responses tended to be more focused and accurate than **Question 1** responses. Good answers were able to give detailed descriptions and explanations of the significance of the German Revolution, both from above and below, often including material on the Kiel Mutiny. This was then balanced against other factors, such as the war weariness and shortages in Germany by 1916 caused by the British naval blockade of German ports, US entry into the war and the failure of the Spring Offensive in 1918. Some less successful responses tended to confuse the chronology of events in 1918 and a few answers also examined many events throughout the war in one long narrative, rather than focussing on the demands of the question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 45

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

Question 3 was generally well answered. The best responses tended to focus on the crises in 1923 that were linked to Germany's failure to pay its second instalment of the war reparations. Descriptions on the Ruhr occupation and the hyperinflation were often detailed, and some attempts were made to explain why this was an important cause of disorder in Germany. This was then balanced against other important factors such as the military and territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the War Guilt Clause, as well as the various uprisings in Germany by far-left and far-right groups. Weaker responses tended to give a generalised narrative of the period 1919 – 23 and would have benefited from explaining how these events caused disorder in Germany. A small number of answers made very universal statements about 'all Germans' hating the Weimar government or turning against Ebert. Candidates need to be more specific and focused with their comments, using in-depth supporting evidence to substantiate explanations.

Question 4 responses tended to be equally good as **Question 3** responses. Good answers were able to examine the effects the Depression had on Germany, such as high unemployment, and explain why this was a significant factor in increasing Nazi support up to 1933. Many candidates looked at how middle-class voters and industrialists turned their support to the Nazis in fear of a communist revolution and how the Nazis used negative cohesion to drive anti-Weimar feeling in the population. This was balanced against other factors such as the Nazi propaganda campaign, Hitler's leadership and the actions of the SA. The best answers were able to explain how significant each factor was in securing Nazi support in the elections of 1932 – 33. Other responses focused too much on events after the March 1933 elections such as the Night of the Long Knives or the death of Hindenburg, which happened in 1934, and therefore lacked relevance to this question. Other weaker answers also looked back too far to events in the early years of the Weimar Republic and suggested this increased Nazi support, often not producing a convincing argument.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 41

A good number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. **Question 5** and **Question 6** were both popular choices.

Question 5 produced some good responses but a number were hampered by a lack of precision in the answer. These responses focused too much on events between March and November 1917 before the Bolsheviks had seized power from the Provisional Government, examining events such as Lenin's reveal of his April Theses, the July Days and the Kornilov Affair. These events were factors that explained why the Provisional Government failed and was overthrown by the Bolsheviks, rather than the Bolsheviks' consolidation of power. The stronger answers examined Lenin's actions once in power such as his decrees, the introduction of War Communism and later the New Economic Policy. This was then balanced against other important factors such as Trotsky's leadership of the Red Army during the Civil War, the Red Terror and the use of the Cheka. These answers demonstrated depth and breadth of contextual knowledge and were able to assess relative importance.

Question 6 also saw fewer stronger responses. Many candidates examined the Five-Year Plans in some detail and gave detailed descriptions of their achievements and consequences for the Soviet people. However, the question required candidates to compare the significance of the different factors that led Stalin to introduce the plans, rather than the impact they had on the Soviet Union. Some good responses were able to compare the economic factors, such as the need to modernise the Soviet economy and compete against the Western capitalist powers, versus other factors, such as the need to modernise the Soviet defensive capabilities or ideological reasons, which included Stalin's desire to scrap the New Economic Policy and create a centralised, command economy in line with Marxism-Leninism.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 41

This was the second most widely answered Depth Study, with **Question 7** proving slightly more popular than **Question 8**.

Question 7 produced some strong responses in which candidates were able to accurately explain how US tariffs in the 1920s led to retaliatory tariffs from foreign nations which, in turn, meant that US foodstuffs became too expensive, causing prices to drop. Less successful responses did not grasp this fact and suggested that it was the US tariffs that made agricultural produce more expensive. Balance was provided by examining other important factors that meant farmers did not share in the prosperity in the 1920s such as mechanisation during the First World War, which led to overproduction and foreign competition from Canada

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

and Argentina. A small number of responses provided too much material on the boom in the 1920s in general and examined the growth of new industries in urban areas, which lacked relevance to the question.

Question 8 was generally better answered than **Question 7**. The strongest responses had a good knowledge and understanding of the impact Hoover's reaction to the Bonus Marchers had on his presidency and cited MacArthur's use of tear gas to clear the peaceful protestors. This was then balanced against other significant factors such as Roosevelt's election campaign, Hoover's perceived lack of effective action to tackle the effects of the Depression and many people's alienation with Republican policies. Other responses were often overly generalised and provided limited narratives of events during the Depression. A few answers also examined the New Deal era in too much detail which lacked relevance to this question.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This component 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 were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 45 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 41. A number of candidates attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 –41. There were too few responses to Depth Study E: China, c.1930-c.1990, Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940-c.1994 and Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945, to make any meaningful comments. Good answers had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses, with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were some rubric infringements 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 often wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focussing 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 importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 – 18

Both **Question 1** and **Question 2** were attempted by candidates, but **Question 1** was the more popular choice.

Question 1 was generally well answered. The strongest responses were able to examine the importance of the Battle of the Somme as a reason for the development of military tactics in the First World War. Many candidates gave detailed descriptions and explanations of the development of strategies involving tanks, combined arms tactics and underground warfare, which were then used more effectively later in the war. This was then balanced against other factors, including the development of new technology such as aircraft, naval innovations and battlefield tactics, which led to the breaking of the stalemate. Weaker responses tended to give a generalised narrative of the Battle of the Somme or an overview of the whole of the war. These responses would have been improved by a much greater focus on the demands of the question.

Question 2 was generally less well answered than **Question 1**. A small number of strong responses were able to give some detail of how Q-ships were used to counter unrestricted submarine warfare. This was then balanced against the significance of other factors such as the use of the convoy system, mines, the Battle of Jutland and the British Blockade of Germany's ports. Other responses tended to lack a detailed knowledge of what Q-ships were and how they operated during the war at sea. These responses were often very limited in terms of the descriptions they provided and rarely attempted to address significance.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 45

Question 3 and **Question 4** were answered by large numbers of candidates.

Question 3 produced a number of weaker responses. Some of the stronger responses were able to explain Ebert's importance to the survival of the Weimar Republic up to 1925 and examined his deal with the Freikorps in suppressing the Spartacist Uprising and future left-wing putsches, as well as his use of a general strike to quash the Kapp Putsch of 1920. This was then frequently balanced by considering how Ebert's actions led to a lack of stability in the Weimar Republic. His call for passive resistance during the Ruhr occupation and the printing of the Papiermark to pay the workers, leading to hyperinflation, were commonly cited. These responses were analytical and assessed relative importance using some good examples. Weaker responses would have benefited from a good knowledge of Ebert and his actions as President and some answers confused him with both Hindenburg and Stresemann.

Question 4 responses were generally well answered. The best responses had a good, detailed knowledge of the events surrounding Hitler's appointment as Chancellor and were able to explain how the actions of von Papen and Hindenburg in particular, were very significant. This was then balanced against other factors such as Nazi electoral support in the Reichstag, the fear of communism and Goebbels' propaganda campaign during the Depression. The strongest answers were well balanced and used detailed contextual knowledge to explain arguments. Weaker responses tended to lack contextual knowledge and focused too much on events either in the early 1920s, such as the Munich Putsch, or events after Hitler was appointed Chancellor, such as the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives, which lacked relevance to this question.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 41

Question 6 was the more frequently answered question in this Depth Study.

Question 5 saw some good responses but many were hampered by a lack of knowledge of the peasant land issue. The best responses were able to explain the importance of the land issue in Russia and give details of how it led to land seizures in the countryside when the Provisional Government refused to deal with the issue after the March Revolution, leading to greater support for radical socialist parties. This was then balanced against other important factors that weakened the Provisional Government such as the continuation of the war, including the Summer Offensive, the issue of Dual Power with the Petrograd Soviet and the Kornilov Affair, which drove support towards the Bolsheviks. Weaker responses lacked a detailed understanding of the land issue in Russia, and this led to limited descriptions and narratives of the whole period. A small number of candidates focused their material on events before March 1917, which lacked relevance to the question.

Question 6 was generally well answered. Some of the best responses were able to give detailed descriptions and explanations of Stalin's Cult of Personality in the Soviet Union and examined the nature of censorship, propaganda and Stalin's tight control over the media and aspects of Soviet culture. This was then balanced by examining other factors that were significant to Stalin's dictatorship, such as the purges of the 1930s, the use of the NKVD and the gulag system, as well as his control over the economy through the Five-Year Plans and collectivisation. Strong answers were well balanced and focused on significance and used well selected examples to substantiate arguments. Less successful responses focused too much on how Stalin rose to power before 1928 which lacked relevance to this question. It is vital that candidates read the question carefully and take note of the chronological parameters set out.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 41

Question 7 proved a slightly more popular choice than Question 8 among candidates.

Question 7 produced some very strong responses which demonstrated a breadth and depth of knowledge on the topic. Many of these answers were able to give detailed descriptions and explanations on the importance of racism as a factor which shaped US society in the 1920s. Commonly cited were the impact of the Ku Klux Klan in the early 1920s, the importance of segregation and Jim Crow laws in the South and the increasing demonisation of southern and eastern European immigrants. This was then balanced by examining other forms of intolerance such as the Red Scare and religious fundamentalism, as well as the societal impact of Prohibition and the entertainment industry. These answers were very analytical and assessed relative importance convincingly through well-substantiated arguments.

Question 8 saw some of the good responses which were able to focus on the problems faced by farmers in the 1930s during the Depression and compare these against other problems such as the failures of US

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

banks, unemployment and homelessness in the cities and the political consequences of the Depression, including the introduction of the New Deal reforms. However, many answers tended to examine the events of the 1920s more than the 1930s. Whilst there was some continuation of the problems faced by farmers from the 1920s into the 1930s, this was not the focus of the question.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This component 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 limited range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 45 and Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 41 were the most popular choices among candidates. Some candidates attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 –41. There were too few responses to Depth Study E: China, c.1930-c.1990, Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940-c.1994 and Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945, to make any meaningful comments. Good answers had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses, with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were a number of rubric infringements where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. This led to some very short answers which struggled to address the attempted question adequately. Other less successful answers contained too much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates often wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focussing 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 importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 – 18

Question 1 focused on the reasons for the failure of the Schlieffen Plan. The factor given was the decisions made by military leaders. Many candidates had a very good knowledge of what the Schlieffen Plan was and provided long and detailed outlines of this. This was valid to a certain extent but meant that often reasons for failure were not outlined. Successful responses were able to balance the actions of military leaders with other reasons for the failure of the plan, for example Belgian resistance, the arrival of the BEF and rapid Russian mobilisation.

Question 2 focused on the development of military tactics during World War I and the factor provided was the use of aircraft. Successful responses were able to write about other military tactics such as tanks, machine guns and naval warfare developments in order to provide balance. There was a good level of knowledge about aircraft although sometimes the capability of these was overstated. There was some confusion with World War II, with descriptions of the more advanced use of aircraft.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 45

Question 3 produced mixed responses. This question focused on the reasons for the survival of the Weimar Republic up to 1933 with the use of Article 48 as the given factor. As such it allowed for a variety of knowledge over a relatively long period of time to be used. Successful responses were able to show how, through the use of Article 48, presidents were able to pass laws quickly in an emergency. A counter argument was sometimes provided by arguing that the use of Article 48 allowed democracy to be discarded,

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

as in the events following the Reichstag Fire. Other factors used to provide balance included the use of the Freikorps to put down early left wing revolts, the calling of a general strike in response to the Kapp Putsch and passive resistance following the French invasion of the Ruhr. Many candidates were also able to outline Stresemann's policies after the period of hyperinflation and show how these led to a strengthening of the Republic. Less successful responses showed a lack of understanding of the roles of the President and Chancellor and therefore were confused about the use of Article 48.

Question 4 was the most popular among candidates, focusing on the reasons for the development of the Nazi Party during a specific time period, the 1920s, with Hitler's leadership as the given factor. Successful responses tended to note this time period and did not stray beyond 1929. These responses also focused on the development of the party, rather than simply showing how they gained support. Relevant information included Hitler becoming leader of the party and developing the message, for example through the 25 Point Programme and the creation of the SA. Other material included the change of aims following the Munich Putsch and the reorganisation of the party as a result of this. Balance was provided by looking at other factors in developing the party, such as the fear of Communism and resulting focus on groups such as farmers and industrialists. The events of the Munich Putsch were very well known but often descriptions were not deployed to answer the question. There was some confusion about the event, with some placing the Putsch in Berlin. Others confused the Munich Putsch with the Kapp Putsch. There was a tendency also to miss the parameters of the question and go into the 1930s mainly because of a focus on gaining support rather than development of the party. Some candidates provided much unfocused background material describing the end of World War I.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 41

Question 5 focused on the causes of opposition to the Tsar up to 1914, with the given factor being Bloody Sunday. Relevant material included the immediate impact of Bloody Sunday on the Tsar's popularity, as well as the ensuing strikes and establishment of the St. Petersburg Soviet and the Potemkin mutiny. Balance was achieved through discussion of the failure of the October Manifesto and the reforms introduced by the Tsar following Bloody Sunday. Also of relevance were the reforms brought in by Stolypin which failed to reform industry and created problems in agriculture. Many candidates however, went beyond 1914 and discussed the events of the 1917 Revolution, some confusing the Provisional Government and Bolsheviks. Others wrote about the problems created as a result of World War I as reasons for the weakness of the Tsar.

Question 6

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

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 41

Question 7 focused on the US economy during the 1920s, with the given factor being World War I. There were many assertions by candidates that the US was not involved in the war, demonstrating a basic misunderstanding of the period. More successful responses pointed out the support that the US provided to Europe through the supply of ammunition and foodstuffs. They were then able to show that this enabled US industry to develop and overtake European markets, aiding the boom of the 1920s. Overall, the best knowledge was on the 'other side' of the answer, with some good descriptions of mass production and the impact of the motor car. The impact of Republican policies such as low taxation was well known but there was some confusion about the use of tariffs to help growth. Some candidates lost focus on the question and wrote at length about social factors, such as the cinema and jazz age.

Question 8 focused on the reasons why the lives of women changed during the 1920s, with the given factor being the gaining of the vote. There were some good descriptions of how gaining the vote allowed women to influence government policy, for example changes in the divorce law and the implementation of Prohibition. Some took this aspect back further and wrote in depth about the earlier organisations which aimed to introduce Prohibition or wrote long accounts of the impact of the introduction. Much of this material would have benefited from a much greater focus on the question. Balance was provided through descriptions of changes of the role of women in society, such as increased employment, changes in clothing and morals. Some candidates lost focus on the question and wrote about the economic changes during the period.

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

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022