

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions very carefully to make sure responses are focused and relevant.

Checking the dates given in a question so that only relevant material is included in responses is also vital.

General comments

Good answers were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. These candidates were able to use their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Less successful responses, whilst demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to use knowledge effectively to answer the actual question set. **Parts (b) and (c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced responses. Candidates need to ensure that they use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make; some candidates set out a clear argument but would have improved their answers by supporting this argument with relevant factual knowledge.

A small number of candidates wrote very lengthy responses to **part (a)** questions, which resulted in them having insufficient time to fully develop their responses to **part (c)** questions.

There were a small number of rubric errors; some candidates chose **parts (a), (b) and (c)** from different questions, some answered just three **part (c)** questions, and some answered more than three questions. On the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with many completing the paper.

It is important to indicate clearly the question number and part of the question being answered. Some candidates wrote one long paragraph in response to a question, and, in some cases, one long paragraph containing their responses to all the questions they had answered; it was sometimes difficult to distinguish where one part question finished and another part question began.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: Core Content

Question 1

- (a) Candidates needed to show knowledge of Mazzini's vision for Italy, and some candidates stated that Mazzini's vision for Italy included Italy being independent and unified. Other answers were generalised and made largely superficial comments, stating that Mazzini's vision for Italy was a positive one.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify general points, stating that Pope Pius IX issued his Allocution because he thought it was the right course to take. A small number of candidates identified that Pope Pius IX did not want to be dominated by Piedmont; this point was developed into an explanation in more successful answers.

- (c) Answers showed an awareness that the Austrian army had large numbers of reserves; this point was identified rather than explained. Weaker answers were generalised in nature, and needed to demonstrate a more detailed knowledge of Austria's military supremacy and other factors inherent in the failure of revolutions in Italy 1848–49.

Question 2

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

Question 3

- (a) Effective responses to this question gave focused descriptions of Harriet Tubman and the underground railroad, the influence of Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel and the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Candidates should ensure they are writing about the actual timescale given in the question. Some answers were focused on the American civil rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s; this is clearly not relevant to this question.
- (b) Good answers constructed clear explanations of why views about slavery differed between Northern and Southern states. These explanations usually focused upon the Southern economy's dependence on slaves, and the North's opposition to slavery on moral grounds. Some less good responses focused on any differences between the North and the South, rather than the differences between their views about slavery; such responses lacked relevance to a question focusing upon differences between views about slavery. Some less successful answers were able to explain differences in views about slavery, but attributed particular views erroneously to the North when they were actually explaining the views of the South, and vice versa.
- (c) Some candidates identified that the Compromise of 1850 could be seen as a success because it delayed the outbreak of civil war. Such identification needed to be developed into explanation. Other candidates wrote generalised responses to this question. Candidates are expected to have knowledge of the details of the Compromise of 1850.

Question 4

- (a) Some candidates stated that Germany had plans for war such as the Schlieffen Plan, and that Germany was determined to develop a powerful navy. Other responses were generalised in nature, with little reference to specific details concerning the part played by Germany. Some candidates wrote in detail about the part played by countries such as Britain and Russia in the arms race but made no reference to Germany; these answers were not relevant as the question asks specifically about Germany's part in the arms race.
- (b) Identifications in responses to this question focused mainly upon Serbia's objection to the Austrian annexation of Bosnia, Germany's support for Austria and the development of Russian support for Serbia. Good answers developed these identifications into clearly constructed explanations. Some less successful candidates wrote lengthy descriptions about the Moroccan Crisis and the assassination at Sarajevo; such responses lacked focus on the actual question.
- (c) Good answers were able to develop an explanation focused upon the relative strength of the armed forces of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. Other responses were generalised, stating that both alliances were powerful, but without giving detailed knowledge in support of this statement. Candidates are expected to know the countries within the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente; a substantial number of candidates appeared unaware of who was in each alliance.

Question 5

- (a) Successful answers demonstrated detailed factual knowledge of the effects of the Treaty of Trianon on Hungary, with the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, limitations on armed forces and armaments and the details of which land was lost and to whom all being mentioned. A number of candidates erroneously gave details of the Treaty of Versailles in response to this question. Candidates are expected to know the details of all the peace treaties of 1919–1923, not just the details relating to Versailles.

- (b) Effective answers to this question made clear reference to the Fourteen Points and explained exactly why Wilson believed that the Fourteen Points should form the basis of the Treaty of Versailles. Points explained included the belief that the Fourteen Points would ensure a fair and lasting peace and that the Fourteen Points, through identification of the causes of the war, were focused on providing solutions so war would not reoccur. Some candidates demonstrated that they had the knowledge to answer this question well, but this knowledge could have been used more appropriately, as lists were given of the Fourteen Points and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles without any explanation as to why Wilson believed the Fourteen Points should form the basis of the Treaty of Versailles.
- (c) There were some well-developed responses to this question, with candidates demonstrating a clear and detailed understanding of Clemenceau's aims and how far these were reflected in the peace settlement of 1919–1920. Responses focused primarily upon Clemenceau's desire to achieve security for France and the return of Alsace-Lorraine on one side of the argument, and, on the other side, Clemenceau being unable to achieve his desire to split Germany into many states, with an independent Rhineland state being of great importance. Again many candidates demonstrated that they had the factual knowledge to answer this question, but the knowledge was not always used effectively. Some responses simply gave two lists, one of Clemenceau's aims, and the other of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, without any explanation of connections between them. Some candidates answered the question as if it asked 'Was the Treaty of Versailles fair?', while others wrote three paragraphs detailing the aims of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson. To do well, candidates need to answer the actual question given on the paper.

Question 6

- (a) Some candidates gained maximum marks here, with clearly focused answers describing Hitler's takeover of Austria. Most candidates were able to achieve at least one mark, as they were aware that German troops marched into Austria in 1938. There were a number of responses with inaccurate chronology; candidates needed to be aware of the actual order in which events took place during Hitler's takeover of Austria.
- (b) There were many highly effective responses to this question. Candidates explained the underlying distrust between Stalin and Britain and France, with reference to Stalin not being invited to the Munich Conference, Stalin's belief that Britain and France were weak as they had allowed Hitler to break terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and the underlying ideological differences between them. Explanations relating to Stalin's interest in parts of eastern Poland and his desire to gain time to build up his armed forces were also given. Some less successful responses explained why Hitler wanted to make the deal; the question specifically asks why Stalin wanted the deal, so responses focusing solely upon Hitler lacked relevance.
- (c) Some candidates explained that the remilitarisation of the Rhineland was important to enhance Hitler's reputation and consolidate the support of the army generals for his plans. Explanations of the importance of the Spanish Civil War focused primarily on the opportunity given to Hitler to test his new military equipment and Blitzkrieg tactics in an actual war situation. Some candidates described the events of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland rather than explaining why it was important for Hitler's plans. A number of weaker responses focused in general terms only on the Spanish Civil War.

Question 7

- (a) Successful answers demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the main agreements reached at the Yalta Conference. Answers usually included reference to the division of Germany and Berlin into four occupation zones, and a statement of the four countries controlling the occupation zones. Reference was also made to Germany being required to pay reparations, Stalin's agreement to intervene in the war with Japan after Germany's defeat and the agreement that liberated countries would be allowed to hold free elections.

- (b) Good answers included effective explanations, focused upon the change in leaders, Truman informing Stalin that the USA had successfully tested an atomic bomb and that Stalin had not adhered to the idea of free elections. The question clearly asks about changes taking place between the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, but weaker responses strayed well beyond the remit of the question, with details relating to the Berlin Wall, Korea, the Cuban Missile Crisis and Vietnam.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained how Stalin's failure to abide by Yalta and Potsdam caused the Cold War on the one hand, and then explained other reasons such as Churchill's Iron Curtain speech, the Berlin Blockade, the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid. Less good answers described these points in considerable detail, without actually explaining how they helped to cause the Cold War. This question asks specifically about the causes of the Cold War; some candidates wrote about events such as Korea, Vietnam and the Cuban Missile Crisis which all occurred during the Cold War, but did not cause it initially.

Question 8

- (a) There were many detailed and clear answers to this question. Responses focused on the lack of freedom of speech, fear of the secret police, the banning of religion, Soviet control over education in schools, the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary and the country being run by the Communist Party even though they had only achieved a small percentage of the vote.
- (b) Effective responses to this question explained how the strong support for Solidarity, both within Poland and in media support from the west, and the fear of a general strike meant that the Polish government agreed to meet Solidarity's demands. Some less successful responses were descriptions of Solidarity's work which did not address the question. A small number of candidates did not seem to know what Solidarity was, writing as if Solidarity was a country.
- (c) Good answers were able to explain that the Berlin Wall was built to prevent East Germany losing its well educated young people and its skilled workforce. Most candidates were able to describe the building of the wall, and to identify why it was built; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations. Some candidates wrote in some detail about the Berlin Blockade rather than the Berlin Wall. Candidates should know the difference between the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Good answers explained that the Schlieffen Plan changed, as the German advance was now to go through Belgium alone. Less successful answers described the Schlieffen Plan in some detail, but their answers lacked any indication of the changes Germany made to the plan; the plan was described as it was originally conceived.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify that it was important for the Schlieffen Plan to succeed for Germany to avoid fighting a war on two fronts, and for Germany to be able to win the war. Good answers developed these identifications into explanations. Less successful responses featured lengthy descriptions of the Schlieffen Plan, rather than explaining its importance for Germany.
- (c) Good answers explained the role of the BEF in slowing down the progress of the Schlieffen Plan. Other answers described what the BEF was, but did not refer to whether the BEF was successful or not. There were a number of generalised responses to this question, stating mainly that the BEF took part in some of the battles of the First World War. Candidates are expected to know the contribution of the BEF in the First World War, and whether it was successful or not.

Question 10

- (a) Responses to this question included points such as the Zimmermann telegram being a message in the form of a coded telegram, the telegram being sent to the German ambassador in Mexico from the German Foreign Office and it being issued in January 1917.
- (b) Some candidates demonstrated that they had the contextual knowledge to answer this question effectively, identifying points such as the March 1918 offensive being Germany's last chance to win the war, that all German reserves had now been recruited, the failure of the submarine campaign to knock out Britain and the anticipated arrival of American troops and equipment on the Western Front. Effective answers developed these points to explain why Germany launched the March 1918 offensive. Weaker answers did not move beyond identifying points.
- (c) As in responses to 10(b), good answers were able to identify a variety of relevant points in response to this question. Points usually focused on the lack of discipline and low morale amongst the German troops, the effect of American troops and equipment and the larger numbers of Allied troops. Less successful responses stopped at identification of points; these points must be developed into explanation if answers are to look at both sides of the argument and address the aspect of 'how far.'

Question 11

- (a) Candidates demonstrated that they had detailed knowledge about proportional representation in Weimar Germany, and some gave clear details of its disadvantages for Weimar, focusing on the Germans being used to autocratic government, extremist parties now having a public voice, coalition governments creating instability and the difficulties of decision making. Some less successful answers described proportional representation in Germany without actually detailing the disadvantages of the system for Weimar Germany.
- (b) There were some effective responses to this question, with candidates giving two clear explanations focused on the Spartacists wishing to establish a communist-style government and the vulnerability of the Republic at this time. Some candidates attributed an incorrect political affiliation to the Spartacists, claiming that they wanted to establish a right wing government.
- (c) There were some very well-developed and clearly focused answers to this question, with focus on Stresemann's achievements on one side of the argument and the underlying weaknesses of the German economy and the perceived moral decline on the other. Some less successful responses identified points on both sides of the argument but were unable to develop these identifications into explanations. Better candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to clearly support the arguments they were giving.

Question 12

- (a) Good answers were able to give several clear examples of Nazi actions taken to reduce unemployment. Examples given included jobs on public works projects, the reintroduction of conscription, jobs being created in factories to produce weapons and other military equipment, Jews being deprived of their jobs and not being counted as unemployed and women being persuaded to relinquish their jobs. Some less successful responses were generalised answers and others described working conditions in Nazi Germany without stating the action taken to reduce unemployment.
- (b) Effective answers to this question explained clearly that the Nazis encouraged the 'perfect Aryan family' because they believed the Aryans were the master race, to use the Aryan family as role models for all Germans and because they wanted to rid Germany of those they believed to be inferior. Some answers were focused on the family generally rather than the 'perfect Aryan family' as stated in the question.

- (c) A number of candidates wrote well-developed responses to this question, demonstrating clearly how attractive the Nazi regime was to some young people and not to others. On one side of the argument, candidates stressed the appeal of activities within the Nazi Youth and also explained that the Nazi regime was seen as attractive by young people as they were conditioned by propaganda within their education and lives more generally to see it this way. On the other side of the argument, explanations focused upon young peoples' dislike of the regimentation and restrictions of the Nazi regime, with this being linked closely to the activities of the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates. Some less successful answers displayed detailed knowledge of young people during the Nazi regime and wrote long descriptions of their activities; such answers would have benefited from a focus on the actual question of how attractive the regime was for young people.

Question 13

- (a) Good responses to this question focused upon the autocratic nature of Tsarist rule, the Tsar's belief that God had appointed him as Tsar, the Tsar's secret police, the Okhrana and the Church's support for the Tsar. Some less successful candidates framed their answers in generalised terms only.
- (b) There were some focused explanations in response to this question, with reference being made to the October Manifesto, the loyalty of the army and peace being made with Japan. A number of candidates wrote explanations focused on Russian involvement in World War I; this lacked relevance to a question asking why the revolution of 1905 was unsuccessful.
- (c) Answers were focused on the events of 'Bloody Sunday' and how these events destroyed confidence in the Tsar on one side, and the defeat in the war against Japan and problems in agriculture on the other hand. A number of less successful responses consisted of detailed explanations focused on reasons for revolution in 1917.

Question 14

- (a) Good answers were able to state the exact dates relevant to the 'July Days', and also knew that workers, soldiers and sailors had come out on to the streets in protest. There was also awareness that there had been unrest over food shortages and the continuation of war throughout July. Some candidates wrote generalised answers only, with no specific points relevant to the 'July Days'.
- (b) Relevant identifications such as the Provisional Government's decision to continue with the war, the prospect of another winter of shortages and desertion and mutiny in the armed forces were given. Better answers developed one identification into an explanation; this usually focused on the decision of the Provisional Government to continue with the war.
- (c) Lack of unity amongst the Whites was explained clearly by some good candidates, with reference to the variety of groups within the Whites, all with differing ideas and aims. Explanations relating to Trotsky's role as commander of the Red Army were comprehensive in nature and demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of Trotsky in the Whites losing the Civil War. A number of candidates answered this question in general terms only, making points about disorganisation without any specific reference to the events of the Civil War in Russia.

Question 15

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates attempting it, with very clear focus on the impact of the Wall Street Crash on the American economy. Impacts stated included businesses and banks going bust, workers losing their jobs or having their wages cut, the collapse of business confidence, less money meaning people could not afford to spend money on buying goods and business expansion being abandoned. A minority of candidates described the Wall Street Crash events rather than focusing upon the impact of the Crash on the American economy.

- (b) Effective responses to this question explained the contribution of stock market speculation to the Wall Street Crash, focusing primarily on confidence in the stock market being of paramount importance and how this confidence was eroded when speculators realised their shares had lost value and therefore rushed to sell them, thus causing more general panic selling. Some candidates wrote about causes of the Wall Street Crash generally, rather than focusing on stock market speculation as demanded by the question.
- (c) Good, balanced answers explained the contribution of Republican policies to Hoover's defeat in 1932 on one side and the personality, policies and election campaign of Roosevelt on the other. Some candidates demonstrated that they had a wide and detailed knowledge of why Hoover lost the Presidential election of 1932, but this knowledge was not always used appropriately. Often candidates gave lengthy descriptions of Republican policies and Roosevelt's personality without explaining why this meant defeat for Hoover. Some candidates also wrote at length about the work of the alphabet agencies in the New Deal once Roosevelt was president, which is not relevant to this question.

Question 16

- (a) Good answers showed specific contextual knowledge of the ways in which Roosevelt helped farmers. Points made included loans being given to small farmers to help them buy land, the reduction of livestock numbers forcing up prices, payments to farmers to take land out of production, and the identification of the Agricultural Administration Agency being set up by Roosevelt.
- (b) There were a number of effective explanations given in response to this question. These included explanation focused on the need to identify and close unsafe banks and the restoration of confidence. Most candidates were able to give several identifications of reasons why Roosevelt needed to deal with the banks in 1933; to score high marks, these needed to be developed into explanations.
- (c) This question asked specifically about the threat to the New Deal from the Supreme Court and from radical critics. Some candidates explained the threat posed by the Supreme Court by focusing explanation on the Supreme Court declaring parts of the New Deal unconstitutional. Explanations focused on the radical critics were relatively unusual; candidates tended to describe the actions and policies of radical critics without explaining how they posed a threat to the New Deal. Less successful responses wrote about opposition to the New Deal in its widest sense, rather than focusing on the opposition from the Supreme Court and radical critics as demanded by the question.

Questions 17 and 18

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

Question 19

- (a) Responses to this question included details relating to the pass system, segregated housing for black people and black workers not being allowed to join trade unions. Some weaker responses were generalised in nature, stating only that black people had few civil rights and giving no specific examples.
- (b) Some candidates identified that the migrant labour system gave white people a guaranteed workforce and that it created wealth for the white population. Good answers developed these identifications into substantiated explanations. C
- (c) Some candidates were able to give one explanation of the contribution of gold mining to the success of South Africa's economic development by 1945, usually focusing on the value of exports. Less successful answers identified that gold mining created jobs, but without developing an explanation. Most candidates made no mention of other areas contributing to South Africa's economic development such as manufacturing and the role of major public corporations.

Question 20

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

Question 21

- (a) Some candidates stated that Nasser announced the nationalisation of the Suez Canal in 1956. Some weak answers focused solely on the actions of Great Britain, France, Russia and the USA, rather than focusing on the actions of Nasser as demanded by the question.
- (b) Explanations in response to this question were focused on it being the role of the United Nations to be involved in any crisis situation like the Suez Crisis of 1956. Some candidates were also able to identify that Britain and France had defied the United Nations' Charter. Less successful responses to this question were generalised, with little focus on the actual question.
- (c) Explanations were focused primarily on Nasser gaining control of the Suez Canal. Some candidates also identified that Israel had shown itself to be a strong military power. Less successful were generalised in nature, with a lack of specific contextual knowledge.

Question 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

Key messages

To score high marks requires answers to focus on the set question. **Part (a)** answers should focus on specific detail or information. Explanation is not required. To score full marks in **part (b)** answers requires two relevant explanations. Answers to **part (c)** questions need to contain more explained reasons supported by relevant examples.

General comments

On occasions candidates needed to focus more on the question as set. This would have benefited responses to **Question 7(a)**, where answers concentrated on the outcomes rather than the issues discussed, **8(a)**, where answers were about US involvement rather than the UN and **8(c)**, where the question asked about Korea but some wrote about Vietnam.

The more demanding **(b)** and **(c)** parts of a question require explanation if the higher marks are to be accessed. The better responses seen illustrated the ability to do this by developing identification into explanation. This requires showing understanding within the context of the issue covered by the question. This was often set out with one explanation per paragraph.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

In answering **(a)** there were many candidates who were fully aware of events in Sicily-Naples in 1848. Most described that the uprising in Sicily was against Ferdinand and that the Sicilians were demanding a constitution. The setting up of a provisional government was mentioned by most. Important, but not often mentioned was Ferdinand's military assault or the mass demonstrations in Naples which occurred towards the end of January 1848. In some instances, answers were unnecessarily lengthy for the marks available. Answers to **(b)** concentrated more on description of the March Laws rather than on an explanation of the part they played. Overall there was a lack of explanation, with many not even mentioning Kossuth. In answering **(c)**, better answers were well balanced, with explanation of the effects of the Hungarian Revolution and also the effects of the end of Louis Philippe in France. The best answers explained both short and longer term effects for each state. Good answers showed that although the Hungarian Revolution was crushed, in the long term, Hungary kept many of its revolutionary gains such as their own language and Diet. Most explained that in France the King was forced to abdicate, leading to the Second Republic. Here the best answers questioned whether having an Emperor compared to a monarchy was progress.

Question 2

The better answers to **(a)** showed knowledge in relation to Schleswig-Holstein and the actions taken by the new Danish King. Better responses were stronger in relation to the impact on the German Bund and the actions of Bismarck. A number of candidates demonstrated limited knowledge of Schleswig – Holstein and the Treaty of Vienna. Candidate answers to **(b)** concentrated more on explaining the disagreement over Schleswig-Holstein, with few able to provide a second explanation. Knowledge in relation to Bismarck's actions to gain French neutrality, or his agreement with Italy, featured in very few answers. Answers to **(c)** relied heavily on explanation of the Spanish throne issue and the Ems Telegram but could have been stronger on the Luxembourg Crisis; as a result, answers tended to be unbalanced.

Question 3

Many answers showed that candidates realised that **part (a)** asked for the 'impact' of the novel, resulting in responses appropriate to this demand. More thoughtful answers emphasised that the impact of the novel was different between the northern and southern states. Less strong answers concentrated on more generalised statements along the lines of 'it made people aware of how badly slaves were treated'. Overall, the answers to **(b)** were unconvincing. Most knew the admission was something to do with slavery but would have benefited from a greater understanding of the fundamental issue of the balance in the Union of slave and non-slave states. Where this understanding was not present, answers remained in Level 2. Most answers to **(c)** provided some information about the leadership but often needed to go on and show why this resulted in defeat. Some did touch on Lincoln's determination but often this did not make comparison with, for example, Davis and Lee. In challenging the question hypothesis, there was mention of how northern industrialisation helped the North produce weapons of war. Occasionally seen was comment on the attitude of non-slave holders in the south and the relative strength of civilian morale.

Question 4

There were many clear, concise answers to **(a)**. Most mentioned the French taking control of parts of Morocco and the Germans intervening by sending a gun boat. Many were aware the British navy was put on war alert. Less strong answers often concentrated on the sending of the gun boat. The motives of the Kaiser were rarely mentioned. Weaker answers featured confusion over the two crises, with the mention of the Algeciras Conference despite the date of this conference being mentioned in the next part of the question. Most answers to **(b)** contained reference to the humiliation of the Kaiser at the Conference. Some of these answers would have been improved by better explanation. Where the failure to break the Entente Cordiale was explained, good marks were achieved. The Kaiser's lack of support was often mentioned but not explained, whilst his aim of Moroccan independence was rarely seen. In answering **(c)**, those candidates who concentrated on the summer of 1914 had little problem with this question. In their answers they explained the respective roles of the major powers and the issues facing them. Less successful answers concentrated on the roles of Austria-Hungary and Serbia, not always making links to Russia clear. Weaker answers concentrated on much wider issues, in some cases going back to 1906, the arms race and the Anglo-German naval race.

Question 5

Many detailed answers to **(a)** were seen. Candidates were aware that Lytton was appointed to report on events in Manchuria and although the amount of time the Commission spent was not known precisely by many, most were aware the length of time was unacceptable. In some instances, Lytton was erroneously associated with other aspects of the League's work such as improving working conditions or slavery. A small number of candidates made no attempt to provide an answer to what was an important aspect contributing to the ultimate failure of the League. Answers to **(b)** were often strong on the impact of the Depression on Japan and were clear in explaining why it was necessary to attempt to negate the impact of loss of trade. Details of the Mukden Railway incident were also well known, although not always presented in the form of an explanation. Part **(c)** encouraged candidates to demonstrate their understanding as to why the League failed. Explanation was much better in relation to the actions of members where events relating to Manchuria and Abyssinia were explained, often in great detail. Information relating to Hoare-Laval was often strong but some candidates thought it was a formal agreement supported and signed by Mussolini. Defects in the organisation of the League were known but in some instances were not explained.

Question 6

Many answers to **(a)** showed good knowledge of the topic, giving detail relating to Mussolini's aggression, involvement in the Spanish Civil War and relations with Italy and Germany. Where answers were less strong, information about Italy's international relations was missing. Most answers to **(b)** contained explanation relating to the fact that Chamberlain was convinced that by his actions he had avoided war and was desperate to reassure the nation. Less strong answers often contained incorrect history where candidates thought that the Sudetenland was taken from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. The better answers to **(c)** made the explanations relevant to the start of the Second World War. In these answers, careful consideration was given to each of the issues within the context of the period. Less successful answers explained the issues themselves, such as the motives of Stalin in relation to a probable attack by Germany, or failed to mention Hitler invaded Poland which triggered the guarantee. Much was made of 'war on two fronts' by many candidates. In trying to explain this phrase, it was evident that some did not know to which countries it referred, or indeed which fronts.

Question 7

Many answers to **(a)** indicated that candidates needed to read the question more carefully, as some answered a question along the lines of 'What decisions were taken at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences?' This resulted in some over long answers which lacked relevance. Those candidates who did answer the question as set generally produced concise answers which gave points such as 'how to deal with a defeated Germany', 'the future of Poland' and 'how to maintain peace'. Most responses to **(b)** indicated an understanding of the US strategy of containment. The weaker answers neglected to develop this general answer into an explanation of why it was developed. The better answers produced explanation which showed understanding of the reasons for development within the context of the start of the Cold War by using examples such as Greece, the vulnerability of France and the economic state of western European countries. Responses to **(c)** showed good knowledge of the Berlin Blockade, including what happened. Less convincing were the arguments explaining if it was, or was not, a threat to world peace. Some of these explanations were limited to whether or not Stalin would commit an act of war in shooting down planes. The full context of time and place being used to make an argument would have improved some responses, although there were candidates who made an attempt to understand the thinking of both sides. Weaker answers confused the Blockade with the building of the Wall, whilst other had difficulty in the difference between Berlin and Germany, often seeing them as interchangeable.

Question 8

Again in **(a)**, some candidates needed to read the question more carefully, writing about 'why the US became involved'. Others showed good knowledge of the period in making relevant points, including the absence of the USSR from the Security Council meeting and thus not able to veto the decision. In **(b)**, many answers included an explanation about the Communists of the North invading the South and the implications of this. A second explanation was often missing. Less successful answers were limited to stating that the US had a policy of containment, describing what this meant. In answering **(c)**, some candidates missed the fact that the question was about the success of containment in Korea, writing in great detail about Vietnam and occasionally Cuba. The better answers showed awareness of the success of containment in Korea. This involved the US commitment to the UN, driving the Communists out of South Korea and that a unified independent Korea was not achieved, despite the will of some US military commanders.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Most answers to **(a)** contained reference to the value of observation and reconnaissance and the limited dropping of bombs. A number enhanced their answer by specifying that observation might relate to troop movement which later in the war could be relayed back to the generals and also the photographing of enemy trenches. There were few references to 'dog-fights'. In **(b)**, most candidates identified a number of points but in many instances these were not developed into explanation. Individual points mentioned included 'soldiers walking across no man's land', 'that shelling had tangled up the wire' and 'that most German soldiers survived the bombardment'. The best answers developed two of these or other relevant points into explanation. Only a very small number produced weak answers in which the general approach was 'Haig had got it wrong'. In **(c)**, the range of battles that candidates drew on was impressive: Mons, the Marne, the Somme, Ypres and Jutland. Many candidates were more assured in explaining the relevance of one or more of these battles than in dealing with Verdun. The most authoritative were aware of German intentions and the consequences. Some candidates limited Verdun to a brief statement that it was important because it led to the battle of the Somme, but did not explain why. The better answers in relation to Verdun explained the significance in terms of military pride and the fear of collapse, and the subsequent surrender, leading to British withdrawal.

Question 10

In **(a)** candidates showed good knowledge of the difficulties that Allied troops faced such as terrain, the climate and shortage of water, as well as the advantages of the Turkish forces in preventing progress. The weaker responses were more generalised such as 'the Allies were stuck on the beaches'. Answers to **(b)** were variable in quality. Weaker answers relied on phrases such as 'to attack Turkey' or 'to defeat Germany'. Sometimes it was evident that these candidates did not know that Germany and Turkey were allies. Other did not know the campaign was launched to help Russia. Better answers had greater awareness of these issues and were able to explain the need to help Russia and how this might also relieve the stalemate on the Western Front. Often the strategic thinking of the British formed a sound base for the development of explanation. The better responses to **(c)** explained the shortage of food in terms of the impact rationing had

and how health and morale were affected, whilst on the other side the impact of censorship, propaganda and the new roles for women, provided a balanced argument. Some answers were less strong as they neglected to explain the impact of the shortage of food, although a number of candidates took advantage of the wide scope of the question and explained the impact on Germany.

Question 11

Most answers to **(a)** contained reference to Article 48 and the emergency powers. In addition, the appointment of the Chancellor and being Commander of the Army formed the basis of many good answers. Given that the President's role was an important aspect of this period of German history, a surprising number of answers contained vague generalities or confused with the position of President that of Chancellor. In **(b)** most candidates attempting this question were aware of the cultural achievements of the time, particularly in relation to the cinema and Berlin's night life. However, some answers remained purely descriptive. Those who had a greater understanding and wider awareness of the period had little problem in explaining two reasons for change. Some very good answers to **(c)** were seen. In writing these answers, the candidates were clear as to the problems created by the Treaty of Versailles. Taking each problem in turn, the degree to which it had been resolved, and how, was then explained. Most contained explanations relating to the economic crisis of the Ruhr and the input of the USA in providing financial assistance. Gaining membership of the League of Nations was highlighted as a success but, in some instances, remained as a straightforward statement. The idea that the Treaty had caused hyperinflation was seen in many answers despite the fact that it was caused by the actions of the Weimar government.

Question 12

There were many detailed responses to **(a)**, describing what happened at the Nuremberg Rallies. The idea of encouraging support and loyalty for the Nazis was an important aspect of many answers. Less strong answers tended not to indicate more than one or two aspects of the Rallies, despite there being four marks available. A small number of candidates thought they were linked in some way to the control of Jews, as part of Hitler's policies. Most answers to **(b)** showed good awareness of the Aryan race as desired by Hitler, and this added to the idea that it gave the opportunity for the persecution of other groups. The explanation as to why the 'master race' theory was important was not always evident, thus preventing higher levels from being achieved. Most candidates in answering **(c)** demonstrated good awareness of the methods used by the Nazis to control the German people. Particularly strong under this heading was the effectiveness of the Gestapo. The use of propaganda and control of mass media also featured in many answers. Where these aspects appeared, they were generally well explained. The use of education was mentioned by some but often was more descriptive in nature. On the other side of the argument, the strong views of prominent churchmen and the Hitler Youth were given as evidence that control was not effective. The Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates were used to good effect in demonstrating opposition. Some answers concentrated more on how Hitler and the Nazis had secured power, which was not an appropriate approach to the question.

Question 13

The best answers to **(a)** showed knowledge of not only there being unrest in Russia over land, a lack of democracy and food shortages, but specifically identified the Socialist Revolutionaries and Social Democrats, with the latter being split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Most responses to **(b)** explained at least one reason for the success of the March 1917 revolution and, in many instances, gave two. These explanations included the losses in war, the role of the Tsarina and that of Rasputin, and the shortages of food. The weakest answers relied too heavily on statements such as 'the Tsar lost support' and 'people were short of food'. For **(c)**, many answers showed there was a strong knowledge base of what happened between 1905 and 1914, but in many instances this remained descriptive. If Stolypin was mentioned, there was often no link made between him and the Tsar to explain effectiveness. Explanation at a basic level was more evident if the answer contained information about the Duma.

Question 14

Most answers to **(a)** showed detailed awareness of life in labour camps. In some instances the answer was extended unnecessarily by the candidate writing detail as to why Russians were sent to the camps. Answers to **(b)** demonstrated both knowledge and understanding about the leadership contest, approaching the answer from the point of view of Stalin's success against the defects of Trotsky's campaign. Particularly good was the explanation of 'permanent Revolution' and 'Socialism in one Country'. Weaker answers often placed too much credence on Trotsky missing Lenin's funeral at the expense of other reasons. In **(c)**, most answers showed good knowledge of the different aspects of official art and culture; in some instances this could have

been stronger in explaining how this helped to secure Stalin's position as dictator. Much stronger explanation appeared on the side challenging the hypothesis, where the roles of the Purges and of the NKVD were well explained.

Question 15

The violence of the Ku Klux Klan featured in the majority of answers to **(a)**. Many answers included at least one other difficulty faced by Black Americans, although the Jim Crow Laws could have been more widely mentioned. Many answers to **(b)** contained explanation which centred on over production. Why this was a problem was generally understood fully. The influence of Canadian wheat was also explained in many answers. In some instances, the increased use of machinery, falling prices and restrictions on trade required explanation. The phenomenon of 'dust bowls' appeared in many responses despite this being a feature of the 1930s. In **(c)**, there were many good answers which, under mass-marketing, explained how advertising, mail order and the use of brand names increased sales significantly. This quality was matched on the other side of the argument by explanation of the value of chemicals and synthetic materials, electric power and hire purchase credit. Mass production also featured in great detail with the best answers explaining its value in much wider terms than just car production. Some responses were one sided as a number of candidates took mass-marketing to mean mass production. Weaker answers often lacked explanation, particularly of mass-marketing, and mass production was the only other reason offered.

Question 16

In response to **(a)**, most answers included Father Coughlin's work on the radio and his belief that Roosevelt was not doing enough to solve the problems of the poor. The better answers to **(b)** explained the concern about Roosevelt becoming too powerful and the New Deal undermining American core values. Weaker answers concentrated more on the identification and description of issues such as the creation of unnecessary jobs and increased government intervention. Many answers to **(c)** did not address the idea of success, which was a crucial part of the question. In these instances, answers contained unexplained detail identifying what the New Deal had introduced. If anything was explained it was the impact on morale and improvements in the banking system. Much stronger was the detail relating to what was considered less successful. Here answers explained the failure to target black Americans and racial discrimination. Much was also made about the failure to reduce unemployment to a more acceptable figure.

Question 17

Most answers showed good knowledge in **(a)** of the savage campaigns by the Nationalists against the Communists, the location of the offensives and, in the best answers, the importance of the fifth campaign. The emphasis of most responses to **(b)** was that the Jiangxi Soviet was an area where Communists could hold out against the Nationalists. Only the best responses picked up on the significance of the term 'soviet'. In **(c)**, most answers explained the acquisition of support from the peasants as being important, together with the survival of the Communists. The other benefits highlighted in answers, Mao's position, propaganda, restructuring and rebuilding, would have had greater impact if they had been developed into explanation.

Question 18

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

Questions 19 and 20

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

Question 21

Many responses to **(a)** emphasised the territorial gains achieved by Israel in the Six-Day War, rather than the benefits of Dayan's military plans. The decisive factor of the pre-emptive air strikes in the Israeli victory featured mostly in the better responses. Many responses to **(b)** showed good understanding in explaining the relevance of large scale troop movements on the Syrian border, as well as the actions of Nasser. Less strong answers concentrated more on the support given to the PLO raids given by Syria and the minor border clashes in the summer of 1966. In many instances these responses were descriptive rather than explanatory. In **(c)**, candidates' knowledge and understanding of the topic was often impressive in that they wrote relevantly about the respective benefits the superpowers gave to Israel and Egypt. The strength of many of these answers lay in the use of relevant examples to support their arguments, for example when writing about the build-up of Israeli forces on the Syrian border in 1967, many questioned the value of the

information given to Egypt by the USSR. Less strong answers were more prone to be descriptive of the help each of the superpowers gave.

Question 22

In **(a)**, candidates showed their knowledge to identify the actions of Black September at the 1972 Olympic Games. Additionally, enough was known about plane hijackings for one such event to enable the completion of an answer. This knowledge of hijackings often described events in Jordan in September 1970. Answers to **(b)** showed good understanding of the relevance of the takeover of the West Bank, Gaza and Sinai by the Israelis, causing the Palestinian refugees to flee from their homes. A limited number of answers were less strong, often lacking detail of the areas affected, resulting in generalised responses. In **(c)**, candidates wrote confidently about the negative reaction caused by Palestinian terrorism and the lack of support from the Arab states. On the other side, explanation centred on the massive world publicity received, and the significance of Arafat addressing the United Nations. Other answers were more descriptive in nature, often describing terror attacks, rather than considering effectiveness.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Paper 13

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates paying careful attention to the wording of questions and noting key words.

Avoiding lengthy narratives and having a focus on explanation, evaluation and analysis is also vital.

General comments

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

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

However, **parts (b) and (c)** demand explanation. Few marks are awarded for narrative or long introductions which do no more than 'set the scene'. Candidates who score highly are able to keep to the point, by applying their knowledge to the precise requirements of the question, and developing fully each identified factor. In **part (c)**, candidates need to argue both for and against the focus of the question to reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated, by addressing 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Less successful responses tended to rely on re-iterating the narrative and often included information lacking in relevance.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1, 2 and 3

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

Question 4

The dates in **part (a)** were designed to invite candidates to focus their attention on the Kaiser's plans for an enlarged Navy to challenge Britain's sea power and on his interference in the Boer War, following the sending of the Kruger telegram. Less successful answers focused on just the former and could have gone further by including the latter. **Part (b)** tended to attract general answers about Germany's aim to create an overseas Empire; developed points about 'Weltpolitik', the advantages of more raw materials, and rivalry with Britain and France featured in responses. Weaker responses to **part (c)** revealed more description than analysis of the two Moroccan crises; better answers discussed not only what happened, but also why the events were so important in the context of increasing tension prior to 1914.

Question 5

In **part (a)** candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the specific part of the Treaty of Versailles which related to the Saar. The challenge in **part (b)** was to make the link between the harsh terms of the Treaty of Sevres (which many candidates recognised) and the imperative to renegotiate the terms following Kemal

Ataturk's nationalist uprising and subsequent Turkish actions to revise the peace settlement. Many knew some of the details of Sevres but did not quite link these to why it was renegotiated.

There were some good answers to **part (c)** because candidates were able to explain both sides of the argument; i.e. did Germany have grounds for complaint about their treatment at Versailles? To reach the highest level, candidates needed to justify 'how genuine' by explaining why they had chosen one side of the argument and then why they had rejected the alternative view. Credit was given to responses which compared Germany's treatment at Versailles with the terms imposed on Russia at Brest-Litovsk, thereby drawing conclusions about how reasonable the terms actually were. Weaker answers focused on events in 1920s Weimar Germany which proved to be largely lacking in relevance.

Question 6

The focus of **part (a)** was on the humanitarian work of the League, and candidates clearly knew a great deal about this topic. **Part (b)** attracted sound answers which explained why the League was weakened by its failure to deal with the Manchurian crisis. Developed points explained the importance of failing to impose sanctions, the self-interest of Britain and France in their dealings with Japan and the inadequacy of Lytton's response to the invasion. Balance was achieved in **part (c)** by arguing, on the one hand, why sanctions (including the failure to ban oil and coal exports and to close the Suez Canal) proved inadequate in restraining Mussolini's campaign in Abyssinia. Good answers then posed counter arguments about alternative factors such as the Hoare-Laval Pact and efforts to preserve the Stresa Front as a response to the threat from Hitler.

Question 7

A significant majority of candidates scored well on **part (a)**. They were capable of identifying arguments over the government of Poland and the extent of reparations payments demanded from Germany. Some answers showed confusion between the terms of Yalta and Potsdam. Care was needed when answering **part (b)** which took 1945 to 1949 as the focus of the explanation 'Why was there tension over Berlin?' There were some good responses which developed the themes of Stalin's suspicions over the perceived threat posed by the Western Allies inside the Soviet zone as well as economic policies which provoked the Berlin Blockade and Airlift. Candidates did well when they went beyond description by explaining how these events caused tension. **Part (c)** answers were less successful because some candidates tried to repeat some of the points raised in **part (b)**, thereby not recognising that their answers should stop with events in 1948. The best responses balanced reasons for Soviet domination of Eastern Europe (such as use of the Red Army, rigging elections and use of Cominform) with examples where Soviet attempts to gain control failed, such as in Greece and Yugoslavia. It is worth noting that the Marshall Plan only had limited relevance to this question.

Question 8

Part (a) was a popular question about which candidates again clearly knew a great deal. Sometimes there was too much detail and time was wasted writing an explanation; marks were allocated for what the Czechs hated rather than why they did so. There were some good answers to **part (b)**, with sound knowledge about why people were leaving East Berlin before 1960. Developed responses were grouped around points about poor living standards in the East and lack of political and cultural freedom. Answers to **part (c)** were often less successful; while many candidates wrote at length about such factors as Gorbachev and his policies, the impact of Solidarity, the invasion of Afghanistan and the failing Soviet economy, weaker responses were descriptive. Better candidates appeared to ask themselves, 'Why then did this factor lead to the collapse of Soviet control in Eastern Europe?' Hence the explanation could meet the demands of the question.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

In **part (a)**, credit was given for examples of resistance from the Belgians, such as the defence of Liege and Antwerp or the opening of the flood defences to slow the German advance, which in turn gave time for the BEF to arrive. Candidates understood the details of the Schlieffen Plan but could not always apply their knowledge to explain why it was not as successful as the Germans had hoped (**part (b)**). Developed explanations made reference to rapid Russian mobilisation, the BEF's engagement of advancing German forces, the French success on the Marne and enforced changes made by von Kluck to the original plan. Answers to **part (c)** were often hampered by misunderstandings about the importance of the Battles of the Marne and Ypres; better candidates explained how the war was prolonged because the Marne saved Paris,

creating stalemate, while Ypres was important in halting the German's attempts to reach to the sea, which meant that the Channel ports were saved and the British could receive reinforcements and supplies.

Question 10

This question was infrequently answered. **Part (a)** attracted general comments (such as 'he wanted to win the war'), rather than specific details about Ludendorff's aims during the Spring Offensive of 1918. Better answers were seen on **part (b)**; they included the problems facing the Germans such as their own strategic and supply difficulties on one side of the coin, and the increasing strength of the Allies on the other. A balanced answer to **part (c)** required an appreciation of the state of German forces in the second half of 1918, with a range of other factors such as the dangers of political chaos as well as the dreadful conditions endured by civilians on the home front.

Question 11

Candidates knew the more obvious points about Hitler's role in the Nazi Party before 1929 to score well in **part (a)**. **Part (b)** gave an opportunity to explain the increase in popularity of the Nazi Party, 1929–32; many candidates occasionally lapsed into narrative. Better responses were able to use knowledge about the effects of the Depression, Weimar's failures and Nazi propaganda and apply it to the question set; it is these linking explanations which generate good marks, rather than information alone. There were many secure responses to **part (c)**, with good explanations of the Night of the Long Knives and alternative factors such as the effects of the burning of the Reichstag, Emergency Decrees and the Enabling Law. Candidates could link each feature to the concept of Nazi control, dealing effectively with the ways Hitler used each emergency to deal with opponents and extend his grip on local government, as well as create a one-party state. Answers which just repeated general points (sometimes made in **Part (b)**) about Nazi propaganda attracted little credit.

Question 12

Part (a) posed few problems and was well done. Similarly, **part (b)** attracted some excellent answers from those who realised that the question focused on why Hitler and his domestic policies remained so popular. The best answers explained his personal charisma, the success of his propaganda as well as attempts to lower unemployment, provide strong government and project German power abroad. Answers to **part (c)** were sometimes unbalanced because responses needed to convey an understanding of totalitarian power through terror, propaganda and the instruments of the one-party state. Better answers argued on the other side of the argument that control was less than complete in view of private enterprise in the economy and elements of non-compliance amongst Christians and the young.

Question 13

Answers to **part (a)** often included specific details of the Provisional Government's shortcomings such as the failure to end the war, guarantee bread supplies, introduce land reform or establish its power over the Petrograd Soviet. There were sound answers to **part (b)** which included explanations of the divisions amongst the Whites, the effectiveness of Trotsky's leadership and the advantages held by the Bolsheviks such as their central geographical position, use of propaganda and introduction of War Communism. It is perhaps worth reminding candidates, though, that references to Trotsky's leadership should be qualified and explained; i.e. what was it about his qualities and strategies which contributed to the Red Army's victory? Candidates used their knowledge of the New Economic Policy to argue strongly for its success in **part (c)**, but were less confident when balancing this with details of its perceived failures.

Question 14

This was a less popular question and candidates' knowledge about the benefits of economic changes in the USSR under Stalin in **part (a)** was less secure, as answers tended to be rather generalised. **Part (b)** responses tended to focus on the reaction of Kulaks to collectivisation. The peasants' dislike of new crops, local Communist leaders and their preference for the old, rather than new methods, were additional explanations and, if they were developed, gained full marks. **Part (c)** attracted some weak answers which sometimes lacked specific detailed knowledge about the impact of Stalin's policies on ethnic minorities. The focus should have been on 'Russification', the mandatory teaching of Russian in all Schools, the deporting of ethnic minorities back to Asia and the removal of non-Russians from positions of power. Candidates felt more secure when explaining the effect of Stalin's policies on women

Question 15

It was rare to see a poor answer to **part (a)** which required straightforward information about the Red Scare. Knowledge in **part (b)** of reasons why Sacco and Vanzetti were executed seemed entirely secure, with good explanations and detail about why they were considered to represent a threat to traditional American life and why their execution was based on flimsy evidence and prejudice. These two groups of factors, if explained well, enabled candidates to gain maximum marks. Answers to **part (c)** tended to be very detailed; candidates made valiant attempts to link their narratives of the Ku Klux Klan and the Monkey Trial to the idea of their 'importance'. These analyses very often dealt with the 'extent' and 'seriousness' of both aspects of intolerance.

Question 16

Part (a) responses tended to be generalised. **Part (b)** proved less challenging for many candidates who could explain Hoover's dealings with the Bonus Marchers and how they had a damaging impact on his reputation as a Presidential candidate. Paying real attention to the key word of the question helped candidates stick to the point. In contrast, candidates were less sure when balancing the factor of 'overproduction' against other causes of the end of the economic boom (**part (c)**). The focus should have been on structural economic weaknesses, such as the impact of tariffs on foreign markets, and the problems faced by farmers, banks, the poor and workers in older industries. Uneven distributions of wealth and the fact that many people had reached saturation point with consumer goods lay at the heart of the question.

Question 17

Part (a) was well answered with many details of what 'thought reform' meant. There were many high quality answers to **part (b)**, where candidates clearly knew why land reform was introduced. Better answers concentrated on Mao's punishment of landlords, the importance of giving peasants land and the desire to reform along 'true' communist principles. **Part (c)** was also dealt with effectively by many candidates who focused on how the lives of women were changed by the early years of Mao's rule. When answers concentrated on women at the expense of 'other factors' such as education, medicine and health, only limited credit could be awarded as such responses were unbalanced.

Question 18

Of the two China questions, this one produced some excellent responses. Better answers to **part (a)** included the aims and techniques of exploiting the mass media to spread important messages and cement Mao's status as a cult figure. It was important in **part (b)** to avoid general narratives about the Cultural Revolution. Good candidates were able to be quite specific about the reasons why it took place, including references to Mao's Communist ideology and his need to re-impose his authority over the Party and remove threats to his power. There were knowledgeable answers to **part (c)** which ranged over the impact of the Cultural Revolution. Some responses, however, did not cope well when keeping the two sides of the explanation clearly organised in the writing. Better answers separated the treatment of people i.e. 'intellectuals' (and foreigners), on the one hand, from the impact on, for example, schools (literacy rates), colleges, museums and historical sites on the other.

Questions 19 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Paper 21

Key messages

Candidates should spend time on reading and understanding the sources before attempting to answer the questions.

Candidates need to ensure they have an awareness of the totality of the evidence offered within the sources, so that answers to any the questions can, if appropriate, be informed by material taken from any of the sources (particularly relevant to questions involving source evaluation.)

Candidates need to ensure that they understand what the sources actually say and mean

Candidates should spend the first 10–15 minutes of the examination on reading, absorbing and thinking about the sources.

General comments

The general quality of answers was high, demonstrating a good level of ability in all the source-handling skills. Answers were stronger on source interpretation, i.e. where what the sources meant was at issue, rather than on source evaluation, where the analysis tended to be based on generalisations about source type rather than on a properly developed analysis of reliability/utility using cross-reference or use of sources' purpose and audience. **Question 6** remains an area where candidates could improve their performance. Some still try to answer on the hypothesis alone, rather than on how far the sources offer it support, or they attempt to use the sources but do not succeed in doing so effectively; that is, the way in which the source offers support or not is not explained.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Some less successful responses gave vigorous condemnations of British imperialism, particularly explicit in **Question 6**, focusing on how unjustified British actions were, rather than on whether or not the sources demonstrated this. Candidates found it hard to detect the attitudes of the cartoonists in Sources F, G and H, and tended to take these cartoons at face value. Nonetheless, none of the sources proved inaccessible to candidates, and many positive, developed responses were produced on all the questions.

Question 1

Almost always, **Question 1** asks candidates to compare two sources for agreements and disagreements, and this was no exception. There will always be points of detail from the two sources that can be matched: here, for example, that both sources state that there was an amnesty and it lasted until 1859, or the disagreement that total casualties were given at hundreds of thousands in Source A but as millions in Source B. Good answers noted both agreements and disagreements of this type. However, there is usually also an agreement or disagreement of a different, and better, nature to be spotted. Better responses took the sources as a whole and suggested, using the source content, that Source A indicated a degree of sympathy for the British that was entirely lacking in Source B, which was much more condemnatory in tone. This showed a higher level of understanding than the simple matching/mismatching of details.

Question 2

The question asked whether candidates were surprised by Queen Victoria's attitude, given what Canning had written to her. Less successful responses answered simply on Queen Victoria, with no reference to Canning, which ignored an important aspect of the question. The basic element on which arguments about surprise should have been constructed was the extent to which the two sources agreed with each other. If they agreed, why would you be surprised? If they disagreed, why would you not be surprised? Possibly the problem candidates faced was to tease out what the true attitudes of Canning and Victoria were, and this was not entirely straightforward as both sources contained aspects which were critical of the harsh punishment of Indians, and aspects which supported it. Ultimately, though, the sources made it clear that Canning disapproved and Victoria approved. The best answers could see this, and then explained whether or not they were surprised by the difference. This explanation could be any valid argument based on contextual awareness, e.g. of Canning's 'Clemency Proclamation', or on material from other sources.

Question 3

A surprising number of answers concluded that the source was not particularly useful as evidence about the Mutiny because it simply showed how Indians were brutally punished. This response seemed to be based on the idea that the Mutiny was something separate from the British reaction to it. Nonetheless, such answers were regarded as being of the same quality as those who agreed that the source was useful for showing the brutal punishment. The majority of answers, given a question on source utility, did not explore the issue of how far utility could be affected by reliability. True, some were prepared to reject the source on the basis that it was British, and so biased, ignoring the real point that the British would hardly have admitted such cruelties unless they were true – what would be the point of making up something that made one seem so brutal? The best approach, though, was to explore how the source could be used as evidence, given what one could infer from it. The best candidates, therefore, took the source as evidence about the British rather than the Indians, and concluded, for example, that it was useful as evidence of how cruel or how racist or how inhumane the British response was.

Question 4

On Source F, as on Source H, the best candidates detected that the cartoons were critical of Canning. Accordingly, most of the messages derived from Source F were to do with Canning protecting or patronising the Indians. Essentially these were sub-messages, valid as far as they went, but not engaging with the opinion of the cartoonist. Since the question asked for reasons for publication, most answers included some reference to the context, either general to the Mutiny, or more specifically on Canning's Proclamation. Very good answers showed a genuine understanding of the cartoon, first to give the genuinely critical message as a reason, and then to suggest a purpose for the cartoonist wishing to have such a message published. The best answers suggested that the reason was to persuade the audience that Canning's liberal attitude to the mutineers was wrong.

Question 5

Sound answers, using the word 'Justice', had little problem seeing that Source G approved of the harsh repression that was used to quell the Mutiny. Good answers could go beyond this to make a valid comparison with Source H. As mentioned above, many candidates could not come up with a proper interpretation of Source H, and assumed it approved of Canning – this was to miss 'Too civil by half' and the two dead children. The most common conclusion, then, was that the sources differed in their messages, though this did not prevent valid answers on comparison of sub-messages, such as both sources showing that the British were ruthless towards the Indians. Nonetheless, there was still a good number of answers that understood the attitudes of the cartoonists and concluded that both agreed with the ruthless repression.

Question 6

Despite the fact that some individual sources proved challenging for candidates to interpret fully in some questions, in **Question 6** they are permitted to use sources at face value, and thus do not suffer a double penalty. So, for example with Source H, candidates would be credited with valid source use for arguing that it showed British reaction was justified because it shows Canning's reaction was merciful in defending the sepoy (of course, they would also be credited for the opposite argument based on a proper interpretation of the cartoon). In fact, a number of the sources offered evidence both for and against the hypothesis, and what really counted was the way in which the candidates used the sources. This remains a tricky issue for many: the content of the source must be used to illustrate how it offers support or not, and it is not sufficient only to make assertions. However, candidates who based their answers on the sources were at least on the right lines. Candidates who wrote about the hypothesis, rather than the sources, which is not what the question required, were less successful in their answers. Here, successful answers needed to do more than to condemn British imperialism: they needed to explore whether or not this was the view of the sources.

Option B: 20th century topic

The sources on Iraq's occupation of Kuwait were all accessible to most candidates, with the possible exception of Source I, where, despite the White House in the background, many thought the President referred to in the cartoon was Saddam Hussein. Answers were notable for the amount of contextual knowledge they contained, though this could, in some responses, have been better focused on the demands of the question.

Question 1

Less successful answers tried to argue that the sources contained different reasons for the invasion of Kuwait (though the reasons were actually very similar), or that the attitude of the USA was different (it was similar). Another weakness was to try to compare the attitudes of the authors, but to get this wrong (overall both advanced justifications for Iraq's actions, but often candidates detected that one or other source blamed Iraq). More successful answers were able to spot at least some agreements, though few saw the disagreement on the amount of money owed to Kuwait. Detecting agreements and disagreements earned good credit, and the best answers looked at the sources as a whole, and saw them as both, on balance, sympathetic towards Saddam.

Question 2

Candidates readily spotted the contradiction between Sources C and D, which nicely opened up the discussion on whether or not this was surprising. In less successful responses, it was, simply because it was a contradiction, and no further explanation was attempted. Others neglected to use Source D and concentrated on explaining why they did or did not find Source C surprising. These explanations could be well argued and supported, but could never be a complete response to the question. They were at least explanations though, and as such were a better level of answer than mere comparison. The best approach was to detect the contradiction, and then to explain it using contextual knowledge or other sources. Many perceived Source D as a deliberate attempt to mislead Saddam. Others saw Source C as Saddam's attempt to mobilise his supporters in preparation for the invasion of Kuwait.

Question 3

This question required a similar approach to **Question 2**. Two sources had to be compared, and then a decision reached on whether what appeared to be a contradiction was evidence for Saddam lying (showing lack of sincerity). On the face of it Saddam offers some form of negotiation, and a desire for peace, in Source E, and then in Source F his Foreign Minister shows no interest in either of these. Clearly this could be evidence of insincerity in Source E. However, what better candidates detected was that Source E was perhaps not what it seemed – that Saddam's offers were in themselves bogus, which would then account for the behaviour of Tariq Aziz in Source F. This argument could be based on an explanation using contextual knowledge of what Source E was really saying, or on an analysis of Saddam's likely purpose in making this announcement – representing his actions in a positive way in order to win over domestic or world opinion.

Question 4

To an extent this question was well answered. Very few candidates indeed failed to recognise that the cartoon showed Saddam. Sound answers interpreted the cartoon as having a message hostile to Saddam – that he was a tyrant, responsible for many deaths, prepared to do anything for power, and so on. These sub-messages were all valid, but did not address the more problematic aspect of the cartoon, the reference to ‘Occupying the moral high ground’. For a few candidates that meant that the message of the cartoon was that Saddam’s actions were morally right, a clear misinterpretation. Others tried to include in their answers the idea that Saddam thought he was right, which was still missing the essential point, but did not undermine other valid sub-messages in their answers. The best answers saw that the cartoonist was making a point about Saddam’s hypocrisy – that he was claiming to be right only as a ruse to achieve his brutal aims, and that there was a gulf between what he claimed to be doing and what he was actually doing.

Question 5

The question asked how far the two cartoons agreed, but as mentioned above many candidates had difficulty in interpreting Source I, with each of the figures in the cartoon frequently being seen as Saddam Hussein. On the other hand, Source H was almost universally correctly taken as Saddam leading Iraq to destruction, so even weaker answers were able to do some interpretation. Despite this, valid comparisons of sub-messages could still be achieved if Source I was seen as anti-war: for example, a candidate might conclude that both cartoons showed that the war would lead to many deaths. Much rarer were comparisons on the overall messages of the two cartoons. In both the leaders (Saddam and Bush) are shown to be realising that they face disaster.

Question 6

Although the question referred to the outbreak of hostilities in 1991, it was clear from candidates’ answers that they were looking at the hypothesis much more broadly; in effect they were answering on ‘Who was to blame for the tension/conflict over Kuwait?’ It was decided that this approach was valid, and to reward answers accordingly. The real challenge in this question was to understand how a valid estimation of blame might be argued. Weaker answers mainly consisted simply of Saddam being to blame because he invaded Kuwait – but we know he invaded Kuwait; the issue is whether this was blameworthy. This problem affected many attempted source uses. For example, on Source A, the argument might be proposed that Saddam was to blame because he invaded Kuwait as Kuwait was drilling in the Rumaila oilfield. In fact, this works as an answer on why he was not to blame. Nonetheless, enough sources pointed unambiguously to blame or lack of it for most candidates to find it possible to use some on both sides of the hypothesis, thereby securing a good level of reward. The weakest answers failed to use the sources at all, writing simply on whether or not the hypothesis was true.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 22

Key messages

Candidates should read the sources very carefully and plan their answers before starting to write.

Responses should be closely focused on the sources, considering the point of view of the author. They should also answer the actual question set.

General comments

The overall standard was high, with many candidates demonstrating a good level of ability in source-handling skills. Candidates were stronger on source interpretation than on source evaluation. The contextual knowledge and understanding of candidates was generally very good. When interpreting sources, candidates should focus on the point of view of the author or artist. They should ask themselves ‘what point is the author/artist making and who or what are they criticising or supporting?’ For example, in Source E (20th century option), the cartoonist’s main point is not about the fact that both the UN and the USA are after Saddam Hussein or that he is making faces at that them, it is about criticising Bush and his policy.

The contextual knowledge of many candidates was detailed and accurate but care needs to be taken to use this knowledge so that it directly contributes to answering the question. Marks are not given for knowledge for its own sake. In responding to interpretation questions, candidates should try to use their contextual knowledge to help them explain the message or purpose of a source. The knowledge should always be related to explaining the source. In evaluation questions the candidates’ knowledge can be used in a number of ways, for example to test the claims being made in the source or, by using knowledge of the author and the historical context, to consider the intended purpose and audience of the source.

It is also important that candidates recognise when questions require, and do not require, evaluation of the sources. Questions that ask about similarities and differences between sources or about message or purpose, do not require evaluation. Questions that use words such as ‘reliable’, ‘believe’, ‘trust’, ‘prove’ and ‘surprise’, do require the evaluation of sources.

Question 6 carries a lot of marks. Some responses omitted the sources altogether and wrote essays on who was to blame for the Gulf War (20th century option), while others grouped the sources and made vague assertions about these groups of sources either supporting or not supporting the hypothesis. These types of answers are very limited in the credit they can achieve. See later comments on **Question 6** for more guidance.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

A good number of candidates were able to identify and explain valid agreements and disagreements, for example, both sources say that the cartridges were a cause of the mutiny and that taxes were a factor, while they disagree over where the mutiny started and what was the most important cause. Successful responses explained that the sources disagree over where the mutiny began, and gave the details of the disagreement, for example Barrackpore in A and Meerut in B. For top marks candidates needed to detect an overall difference in the points of view of the two sources. Source A says the cartridges were simply the trigger on

top of underlying causes, while B says that the cartridges were the key cause. Identifying information that is in one source but not in the other does not count as a disagreement and could only achieve limited credit.

Question 2

The first step to answering this question well consisted of identifying either an agreement or a disagreement between the two sources as a reason for D making, or not making, C surprising, for example Source C claims that the cartridges did upset the sepoys, while in D an Indian officer says he had no objection to their use. On the other hand, both sources recognise the cartridges had caused trouble. Identifying and using both agreement and disagreement resulted in a reasonable mark. To achieve higher marks, candidates needed to dig deeper. This could be done by investigating the provenance of the sources or by using contextual knowledge. For example, Source D cannot really make Source C surprising because there is plenty of other evidence that the cartridges upset the sepoys, or because the account in D is said by an Indian officer to a British officer and so may not reflect his true feelings. Whatever approach candidates took, it was crucial that in their answers they made clear whether or not they thought that D makes C surprising. Some candidates compared and evaluated the sources well but neglected to say if D made C surprising. Most candidates used the disagreement between D and C to state that C was surprising, but those who investigated the issue more deeply reached a higher level.

Question 3

This question operated in a similar way to **Question 2**. Most candidates compared Canning's claims in E that the Government did not interfere with the religion of Indians with the account in Source D and found reasons for suggesting that Canning was lying. However, the best answers went further by using contextual knowledge or the provenance of the sources. Some used their knowledge effectively to show that Canning was lying, while others focused on the fact that Canning had a purpose in issuing this message to the 19th Regiment of Bengal at this time.

Question 4

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to write about a valid sub-message and many recognised and explained the imagery in the illustration: the 'heroic' British woman, the 'cowardly and uncivilised' Indians and the bible on the floor. The illustration was published in Britain in June 1857 and the best answers went on to explain both its purpose and its context. Only a handful of candidates produced a surface description.

Question 5

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates misinterpreted the cartoon and thought it supported the British. However, most candidates at least recognised that it criticises British rule. The better candidates were aware of the fact that the East India Company had been governing India up until this date, realised that the cartoon was criticising its rule and suggesting what should be done about it. A few candidates even explained about the British government's introduction of direct rule in 1858 and the cartoonist's reference to the British practice of firing mutineers from cannons.

Question 6

This question asks candidates whether the sources provide convincing evidence that the Indian Mutiny was caused by the greased cartridges. It is crucial that candidates realise that they are being asked about the sources and that they base their answer on the sources. There were two, equally valid, ways of organising an answer to this question. One was to go through the sources in the order in which they appear and explain whether each supports or disagrees with the hypothesis that the mutiny was caused by greased cartridges. The second approach was to write first about the sources that support the hypothesis and then move on to the sources that disagree with it-while still writing about each source separately. Successful answers included proper explanations. Assertions that a source supports the hypothesis could not gain marks. A well-chosen quotation can do enough by itself, for example 'Source A does not support the idea that the mutiny was caused by greased cartridges because it says "The most important cause of popular discontent was the British policy of economically exploiting India"', but sometimes an explanation is needed, for example 'Source H disagrees with the statement because it shows the misgovernment and blundering of the East India Company and suggests that these, and not the greased cartridges, were the reasons why the mutiny took place.'

There were two different ways of showing how the sources disagree with the view that greased cartridges were the cause of the mutiny. First, to use sources that suggest it was not the cartridges such as Source D, and second, to use sources that suggest that other factors were responsible, for example Source F suggests it was the spread of Christianity.

A good number of candidates did score well on this question but a number who had done well on the previous five questions missed marks here because they either did not use the sources or did not use the sources carefully enough.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

Many candidates were able to identify and explain several ways in which these sources are both similar and different. Answers often started by pointing out that Source A is more recent than Source B. Although such answers were placed in a low level of the mark scheme, it is not necessary for candidates to make such obvious points if they can explain agreements and disagreements in terms of what the sources say. For example, the two sources agree that Iraq wanted the price of oil to go up and that it emerged from the war with economic problems, while they disagree over why Iraq attacked Kuwait and why the West/USA were concerned by this. Explaining a disagreement demands rather more than explaining an agreement. For the latter, it is enough to write, for example that the sources agree that Kuwait increased its production of oil. While for the former, it is necessary to do rather more, for example while Source A tells us that Kuwait asked OPEC to increase production, Source B claims that it went alone and increased production. For higher marks candidates needed to detect an overall difference in the points of view of the two sources. Both sources criticise nearly everyone involved. However, the overall tone of the sources does differ, with Source A being critical of Iraq and Source B being more critical of the USA and the West.

Question 2

This question was answered very well. Many candidates understood that Bush made the speech to win support for his plans. Some argued that he was trying to persuade the US Congress to support him, while others suggested a wider audience for the speech. Most of these candidates were also able to support their claims by using relevant parts of the speech. Weaker answers were limited to Bush's main message – either that Iraq was in the wrong or that the US needed to do something about Iraq. A few candidates largely ignored the content of the source and focused more on describing the context in which the speech was made. All of these approaches gained reasonable marks and few candidates low marks.

Question 3

There were many different responses to this question. Less successful answers spent a long time describing the details of the cartoons but more successful responses went beyond these details to get at the cartoonists' points of view – they are both criticising Bush. In both Bush is shown as not dealing with the situation well. Source D suggests that he was prevaricating and allowing Saddam to dig himself securely into Kuwait while Source E claims that he was hot-headedly and unnecessarily trying to charge in when the UN had got the situation under control. Some candidates gave these readings of the two sources without being explicit about the fact that he is being criticised. If candidates think that a source reflects a point of view, they should try and be explicit about it. There are many other sub-messages to be taken from these sources but none of them are as to the point as those explained above. Generally, candidates found it easier to interpret Source D. Source E was sometimes seen as approving of a determined Bush, in contrast with the less decisive Bush in D. However, this misses the fact that E is criticising him. The question asked candidates to compare the cartoons and so candidates who explained each source separately without directly comparing them were placed in a lower level.

Question 4

This question produced a wide range of responses. A few candidates missed the date of the source and claimed that it was about the Gulf War. Better answers explained that the cartoonist is suggesting the war was likely, or even inevitable, but understood that the cartoonist had a clear point of view about Saddam Hussein and Bush. Both of them are being blamed for the likely war. The more explicit candidates were about the criticism of Saddam and Bush, the better the response. There were some excellent explanations of the different ways in which the two men were contributing to the start of war – Saddam by invading Kuwait and Bush by his build up of military forces in late 1990. The best answers went on to suggest that although they are both being blamed, the cartoonist is placing most of the blame on Saddam.

Question 5

The first step to a good answer to this question was to find agreements or disagreements between the two sources. The most obvious disagreement is that in Source G Saddam does not pull his forces out of Kuwait, while in H he offers to do so. This could suggest that G makes H surprising. However, for a higher mark candidates had to dig deeper. A good number of candidates did this and saw the importance of the dates of the two sources. Source G is from August 1990, shortly after the invasion of Kuwait, while Source H is from January 1991, shortly before the UN ultimatum expired. These dates make the shift in Saddam's position very unsurprising. There are other agreements and disagreements between the two sources that can be analysed in similar ways, for example the consistent hard line taken by Bush. Good answers made it clear whether or not they thought G makes H surprising. Some candidates followed the type of reasoning outlined above and then neglected to reach a conclusion about surprise.

Question 6

This question asks candidates whether the sources provide convincing evidence that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the outbreak of hostilities in January 1991. Successful answers based their answer on the sources. There were two, equally valid, ways of organising an answer to this question. One was to go through the sources in the order in which they appear and explain whether or not each supports or disagrees with the hypothesis that Saddam Hussein was to blame for the outbreak of war in January 1991. The second approach was to first write about the sources that support the hypothesis and then move on to the sources that disagree with it- still writing about each source separately.

Good answers included proper explanations. Assertions that a source supports the hypothesis, without support or explanation, did not gain marks. A well chosen quotation can do enough by itself, for example 'Source A supports the view that Saddam was responsible for the war because it says that "Iraq caused military action to be brought against it" ', but sometimes an explanation is needed, for example 'Source D suggests that Bush was responsible because it shows that he at first prevaricated and allowed Saddam to dig himself into Kuwait, thus making a war necessary to get him out'.

There were two different ways of showing how the sources disagree with the view that Saddam was not responsible. First, to use sources that suggest he was willing to reach an agreement, for example Source H where he was offering to withdraw his troops, and second, to use sources that suggest that others were to blame, for example Source E, which shows that Bush was ready for a fight.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Paper 23

Key messages

Candidates should read the sources very carefully and plan their answers before starting to write.

Responses should be closely focused on the sources, considering the point of view of the author. They should also answer the actual question set.

General comments

Concerning the candidates' overall performance and handling of both options, there was a sound knowledge and understanding of the topics. Indeed, as a general rule it would be worth pointing out to candidates the importance of constructing answers which respond to the specific wording of the question set. This year it was noticeable that often answers contained detailed but not very relevant knowledge in light of the question posed. Overall, answers were of a comparable standard to those of recent years.

With regard to **Question 6**, which has the highest mark tariff on the question paper, it is important to emphasise that candidates should construct their responses around the sources. Better responses did make good use of the sources, rather than just providing answers based solely on contextual knowledge, which was seen in less successful attempts at this question.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

Weaker responses tended to summarise content from the sources without making successful moves to compare relevant details from the sources. Similarities of detail between the sources were plentiful, while the disagreement as to when the East India Company monopoly of trade with China ended proved more elusive. Many candidates analysed the two sources for agreements and disagreements then went on to explain the overarching 'big messages' of the sources, namely that the author of Source A believed Britain was to blame for causing the Opium War, while Source B argued that China's actions were the cause.

Question 2

The content, message and purpose of Lin Zexu's 'Letter of Advice' written to Queen Victoria in March 1839 was widely understood by candidates. Less successful responses often paraphrased the letter and often the question of utility was missed and replaced with a discussion about reliability. China's anger about the harmful effects of the opium trade and the desire for it to be stopped was cited as useful evidence and the higher level responses placed the purpose of the source into the context of the start of the First Opium War.

Question 3

The French and German cartoons were both drawn in 1840 and the cartoonists shared a common disapproval of the British trade in opium with China. There were some differences between the cartoons, with Source D suggesting the Chinese were happy to take the opium from the British, while in Source E the British were forcing opium on the Chinese. Weaker answers often showed an understanding of the cartoons but described, rather than compared them.

Question 4

Some candidates struggled to construct an answer that could meaningfully explore reasons why the views of the British Superintendent of Trade to China expressed in a letter to the British Foreign Secretary might or might not prove a contemporary criticism of Britain's aggressive Opium War to be wrong. Better responses included a consideration of issues of disagreement through comparison and evaluation of the two sources.

Question 5

Some candidates found the source, an extract from a speech in favour of the opium trade by past USA President John Quincy Adams, difficult to understand. A number of answers relied upon assertions based upon everyday empathy, candidates stating that they were surprised 'because the trade in opium was harmful and wrong'. Higher level answers were able to use contextual knowledge of the US desire to more fully participate in the opening up of Pacific trade markets, common understandings with Britain and other factors.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A small number of candidates struggled to use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source links to the question, instead repeating lines from the text before moving on to deal with another source. Grouping of sources (without then going through the listed sources individually), for example 'Sources A, B, D and F do not provide convincing evidence that China was to blame for the First Opium War' rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another characteristic of weaker answers. The successful evaluation of sources was rare and candidates might consider picking out a small number of particularly worthwhile sources to say something meaningful about regarding purpose and audience.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify and explain agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources. A few candidates struggled to make comparisons and just paraphrased or wrote out sections of the sources, citing them as agreements/disagreements. Some candidates identified agreements and/or disagreements without being specific, for example 'A says this, B does not.' However, many candidates performed well on this question; the overarching 'big messages' that Source A was clearly critical of the USA in its dealings with Iraq, while Source B justified the policies of the USA and was critical of Iraq, were explained in strong answers.

Question 2

This question proved challenging for some candidates. Some misunderstood the sequence of events from 25 July 1990 reported in Source C and the US newspaper report later on 22 August 1990. Not understanding that the first report was of the situation as reported by the US Ambassador before Iraq invaded Kuwait in August and that Source D summarised events as reported three weeks after the invasion, created confusion in some responses. Better responses were provided by those who appeared to have taken more time to make sure of their understanding of the sequence of events and who the principal characters involved were, was secure.

Question 3

Although good responses were seen, the sequence of six pictures which linked the United States' decision to go to war in the Gulf, the subsequent loss of lives and criticism of President Bush's policies, proved difficult for some candidates to interpret correctly. Some did not recognise the initial picture of a petrol pump, or that the cartoon featured a coffin. This led to confusion in these responses and meant candidates struggled to be able to explain the point of view of the cartoonist.

Question 4

Answers to this question often demonstrated impressive knowledge of Hitler's foreign policy and the failure of appeasement in the 1930s which was used in support of analysis of Saddam Hussein's aims in Source F. Whilst candidates were often able to make valid comparisons of the cartoons' sub messages, a number of

answers would have been improved with an explanation of the cartoonists' points of view that Saddam Hussein was to blame in Source F but that both Iraq and the USA were blamed in Source G.

Question 5

Less successful responses summarised the source content and appeared to regard this as a demonstration of its usefulness. Contextual knowledge could be used to explain what the source did not tell us about events in the Gulf at the time. Higher level answers placed the source in context and were able to offer interpretation and evaluation, including suggestions of the sources' purpose in the context of the eve of the war and the United Nations' resolution for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

Question 6

Many candidates were able to analyse the demands of the question, then select appropriate sources to support their judgements. A small number of candidates struggled to use evidence in a valid manner by showing how the selected source links to the question, instead repeating lines from the text before moving on to deal with another source. Grouping of sources (without then going through them individually), for example 'Sources A, B, D and F do not provide convincing evidence that the USA was responsible for the outbreak of military hostilities in January 1991' rather than splitting the sources and dealing with them individually, was another characteristic of weaker answers. The successful evaluation of sources was not seen very often and candidates might consider picking out a small number of particularly worthwhile sources to say something meaningful about regarding purpose and audience.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Key messages

Generally, candidates achieved success in the coursework component when they:

- were given titles that give them full opportunity to assess significance;
- were encouraged to **assess** significance and not just describe or explain it;
- had been introduced to ideas such as turning point, false dawn, and short and long term, equipping them with useful conceptual tools;
- made assessments and argued all the way through their answers;
- used a clear and sustained conclusion to deliver, argue and support the overall judgement about significance.

General comments

This was the second year in which the new coursework regulations have been used and the overall quality of work was impressive. Candidates kept to the word limit and, as a result, they generally produced concise and focused answers that reached judgements about significance. Nearly all Centres set appropriate titles and the marking criteria were used accurately. There were few adjustments to Centres' marks. These were usually reductions, especially to the top part of the mark range. It should be remembered that for work to be awarded marks at or near the top of the mark range, it must be outstanding rather than very good. This means a focus on argument and assessment throughout and a sophisticated understanding of the nature of historical significance, as well as of the historical context. Most of the work was marked with great care and with detailed annotations.

Comments on specific questions

Setting an appropriate title is crucial. The titles that worked best this year shared four characteristics:

- (i) they contained the word 'significant';
- (ii) they made clear that an assessment or evaluation of significance was required. This was achieved by using terms such as 'assess' or 'how significant' and by avoiding asking candidates to simply explain how a factor was significant;
- (iii) they did not name an outcome in the title. Titles such as 'Explain how significant the Depression was in Hitler's rise to power' are best avoided because they can become studies of causation rather than significance, with candidates simply writing about the relative importance of a series of causes. A title such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany' would be more appropriate;
- (iv) the subject chosen should be one that is not too vast but at the same time gives candidates possibilities for approaching an assessment of its significance in several different ways. It would not be a good idea, for example, to set a title such as 'Assess the significance of Hitler.'

The above does not mean that every question has to follow the formula of 'Assess the significance of X for Y'. However titles are worded, they should give candidates a range of opportunities for assessing significance. Sometimes, asking how far an event was a turning point can work very well, but the right subject has to be chosen. It is recommended that titles are sent to Cambridge for approval. Titles that worked well this year included:

Assess the significance of the Reichstag Fire for Germany.

To what extent was Prohibition significant for the USA in the 1920s and 1930s?

Assess the significance of the Tet Offensive.

To what extent was the Dawes Plan a turning point for Germany?

Assess the significance of Lenin in the period 1917–1930.

Assess the significance of Stalin's purges for the USSR.

There were many excellent answers from candidates. These answers often shared three main characteristics. Firstly, they were focused and relevant. They did not drift into description or narrative or lose time on introductory background and they engaged with the assessment of significance from the beginning until the end. Secondly, they were not simply surveys or descriptions of ways in which the subject was significant. Instead, they assessed significance, rather than describing it. This involved developing and supporting arguments. They had an overall point of view about the significance of the subject and supported this with argument and counter argument. They argued that the subject was significant in some ways but perhaps not so significant in others, and on the basis of this they reached an overall judgement. Finally, they used a range of criteria to assess significance. In other words, they asked a range of questions about significance and assessed it from different perspectives. These should be the candidate's own criteria and questions and should vary from candidate to candidate. While it is important that candidates are introduced to the concept of significance and to the use of criteria earlier in the course, they should not be provided with a list to use with the coursework exercise.

Weaker answers included much description and narrative and were often based on the assumption that an individual was important because of what they did or that an event was important because of what it was. It is important that candidates understand that, when assessing significance, there is a second vital step to take. It is not enough to argue that somebody was significant because of what they did or what they achieved. What matters is the impact (in various ways) of what they did or what they achieved. Some candidates equated significance with success. This led them to assume that failure always meant lack of significance. It is important that candidates understand that a failure can be as significant as success. It also helps if candidates understand that assessing significance should involve considering what happened/what the situation was before the named subject, as well as after it. If what somebody did led to an important change, this can only be understood by considering what was happening before. Some candidates appeared to believe that it was only necessary to look at the consequences of actions and events.

Some candidates approached the exercise as if it were about causation. For example, in response to a title about the significance of the war at sea in the First World War, they compared its importance in the final Allied victory with that of other possible causes. This often led to answers that were surveys of a range of causal factors, and where most time was devoted to factors other than the one that should have been assessed. An alternative, and more satisfactory approach, is to focus on the named subject and assess its significance through the use of a range of criteria (detailed guidance is given about this in the *Coursework Handbook*). Better assignments adopted this approach.

The generic markscheme was generally used accurately. It is important to remember that it should be used in a 'best fit' way. In other words, a response does not have to meet all the criteria in a level before being placed in that level. The crucial question to ask is – which level descriptors does the response match overall? It is also important to note that the skills listed in the markscheme need to be used by candidates to help them respond to the title and to make assessments about significance. Candidates are not being asked to display these skills for their own sake. Credit should only be given when there is evidence of a skill being used to develop arguments, assessments and statements about significance. The markscheme also contains clear reference to the ability to develop and support arguments and judgements. This reinforces what has been stressed earlier in this report – that it is important candidates are encouraged to develop, argue and support their own points of view rather than just produce descriptive surveys.

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0470 History June 2016
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

Most Centres annotated responses in detail. This was most helpful. Marginal annotations can be used to identify key points in the answer, while summative comments should identify the key overall characteristics of a response with clear reference to the terminology in the markscheme.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41

Alternative to Coursework

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany was the most widely answered, followed by the USA and Russia options. Depth Study A on the First World War was also attempted by some candidates but few answered on the China, South Africa and Israeli and Palestinians options.

Good responses showed some planning in their work to help the candidate select a wide range of material that was relevant to the answer. This enabled them to produce a balanced, well supported answer. In less successful responses candidates struggled to provide well-balanced explanations which directly addressed the question set. The very best answers displayed well-supported and sustained arguments, with supported judgements and conclusions. Some weaker answers either were of a narrative style or they did not address the question set, and lacked relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that they can deduce the key focus that drives the question and then address that focus in the answer. This is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a depth and range of detailed knowledge, rather than an outline, to support arguments.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was the more popular of the two questions and some candidates gave reasoned responses that showed the effects of technology in causing stalemate on the Western Front, and some also looked at other possible causes of the stalemate. Other responses included material post 1915 which lacked relevance, or material about other theatres of war. Somme appeared to have difficulty in understanding the concept of stalemate.

There were too few answers to **Question 2**, on the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive, to make any valid comment.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Question 3

A number of candidates wrote about Germany up to 1933 without linking to the specific question asked. A few went onto events after Hitler's appointment as Chancellor, which was not required. Those candidates who did link more closely to the question set mainly mentioned Hindenburg but would have improved their responses by including other relevant Weimar politicians. Stronger responses saw Hitler's own actions as relevant and some showed the rivalry and weakness of von Papen and von Schleicher.

Question 4

This was the more popular question in this Depth Study and in general, it was better answered than **Question 3**. Good responses were able to argue the effectiveness or not of the SS and control. Others could identify and at least narrate the other measures taken by the Nazis to control Germany post-1933. Most candidates kept to the correct time period and very few went back to the 1920s. Stronger answers related their points to the question set but others tended to describe events of the period without sustaining a valid or developed argument. Had they achieved this, the knowledge that they undoubtedly possessed would have helped them to achieve better marks.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

More candidates answered **Question 5** than **Question 6**.

Question 5

This was a popular question and it produced some good responses. Good responses showed a sound understanding of the actions of the Tsar during the war and the implications of leaving his capital. The better answers were also able to highlight events prior to World War I which led to his popularity declining. Less successful answers narrated the events and did not link them directly to the question.

Question 6

Candidates often found it difficult to give Lenin any credit for victory in the Civil War but rather passed it all onto Trotsky. Some, however, mentioned War Communism, the use of the Cheka and Terror. For the other side of the argument, Trotsky was given most credit but more could have mentioned the weaknesses of the Whites or geographical advantages.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

Question 7

Some candidates struggled with part of this question, finding it difficult to differentiate between hire purchase and credit. Those that did manage to do this, however, were able to show how demand was stimulated by both methods, and that this helped economic growth in the USA. For other aspects of growth in the period, the production line came into focus in many answers. In others, farming was seen as a relevant aspect of growth in this period but this was not the case.

Question 8

Many candidates were able to relate how overproduction caused problems for the USA, and better answers were able to link one area to another and show how confidence fell. The best responses linked overproduction to over speculation, and went on to show how this played its part in the Wall Street Crash.

Depth Study E: China, 1930–1990 and Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940– c.1994

There were too few responses to these Depth Studies to make any meaningful comments.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians Since 1945

A number of candidates answered the questions from this Depth Study.

Question 13

Some candidates who attempted this question focused their answers on Palestinian terror activities which were not relevant here. A number of responses would have been improved by a greater focus on reasons for Britain leaving in 1948, as required by the question.

Question 14

This question was slightly better answered than **Question 13**. Candidates had some reasonable knowledge of the events of 1967. Some answers struggled to go beyond the basic dislike of Israel by Arab states and peoples. Specific details of groups and individuals would have benefited a number of responses.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 and Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41 were the most popular choices with candidates this year. There were also a good number of attempts at Depth Studies A (The First World War) and C (Russia), though very few candidates chose Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians).

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide-range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported and sustained arguments but supported judgements and conclusions would have improved some responses. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. Many candidates wrote at length on various aspects of a particular topic or Depth Study instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates performed well when they read the question carefully before answering and ensured that their response focused on importance or significance. The other key consideration is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

There were a number of rubric errors made by candidates with the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in a number of Depth Studies. It is imperative that candidates read the instructions carefully before attempting the examination.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 required candidates to focus on the significance of new weapons as a cause of high casualties during the First World War. The strongest responses were provided by candidates who were able to compare the significance of new weapons such as the machine gun, artillery, rifles etc. and explain how they caused huge casualties on the various fronts of the war. Many good answers were able to cite decent examples to support their arguments and a few of the best responses acknowledged not just weapons that were used on land but also naval and air based weaponry as well. To balance these responses, candidates examined the significance of other factors that led to casualties such as the development of the trenches and the poor conditions they created, and the lack of tactics and strategies that led to military losses, and some critically assessed the significance of some of the weapons such as gas weapons and tanks, and explained their limited impact. Less successful responses tended to be one-sided answers that were overly descriptive and lacked specific examples to add the necessary detail required for higher level responses.

Question 2 showed that many candidates had a very good knowledge of the Gallipoli campaign and were able to examine a wide-range of factors linking to poor military planning and to compare these to other factors that led to the campaign's failure, such as Turkey's defensive strength, the effectiveness of the German trench systems used by Turkey and the strategic advantages they held when the Allies invaded. Strong responses were well explained and contained a wide-range of in-depth examples to support arguments made. Weaker answers tended to only have a summative overview of the Gallipoli campaign and lacked the necessary depth to attain higher marks.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Question 3 demonstrated that many candidates were able to give relevant material relating to the military terms of the Treaty of Versailles and assess the impact this had on the Weimar government. Popular examples given included how the terms led to high unemployment in Germany as the army was reduced to

100 000 soldiers, the establishment of Freikorps and the subsequent Kapp Putsch in 1920, caused by the nationalist backlash from ex-soldiers (many also included references to the creation of the Nazi Party as well) and the growing fear and resentment caused by the lack of an effective defence against foreign invasion. Strong answers compared the significance of the military terms against other terms of the Treaty such as the reparations and the War Guilt Clause and a good number of candidates also examined factors such as the inherent weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution or the social and economic consequences of the war and the armistice on Germany. Some candidates achieved top level responses by giving sustained arguments about the relative significance of the military terms compared to other factors. Less successful responses tended to lack the depth of knowledge about the military terms of the Treaty, sometimes citing incorrect figures and examples. A few wandered from the chronological parameters and examined material after 1923 such as the Dawes Plan which was not relevant to the question.

Question 4 was, in general, not well answered compared to **Question 3**. Many candidates answered this question by citing material that would have better answered a question about electoral success rather than the development of the Nazi Party. While there is some crossover, many candidates focused on how the Nazis got into power which led them to include material from after 1930. Stronger responses examined appropriate examples of how the Munich Putsch helped develop the Nazi Party, such as the change in tactics initiated by Hitler to turn the party away from violent revolution and more towards winning by the ballot box. Good responses also examined other important factors that developed the Nazi Party such as the greater use of speeches, propaganda, the adapting of Nazi policies towards all classes in German society and the impact of the Wall Street Crash and the use of negative cohesion. The best responses also examined the importance of the role of Hitler and other important Nazis such as Goebbels, and the parts played by organisations such as the SA and the Hitler Youth.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Question 5 saw good responses which were able to examine a wide range of material linking to social and economic problems faced by Russians by March 1917. Most commonly cited were the food shortages, particularly bread rationing, fuel shortages, inflation, unemployment, living and working conditions and the failure by the Tsarist regime to solve the peasants' land issue. Good responses often examined the significance of political and military problems, including the huge casualties, the mutinies, the personal command by the Tsar on the front and the poor governmental decisions taken by the Tsarina under the influence of Rasputin back in Petrograd. The best responses also compared the relative significance of all of these factors and gave sustained arguments to substantiate their judgements and conclusions. Weaker responses often confused social, economic and political factors or lacked precision in the material cited. A few candidates made the error of examining the November Revolution instead of the March Revolution.

Question 6 responses generally had a good knowledge of collectivisation and the reasons why Stalin initiated it. The strongest answers examined the importance of dekulakisation and compared it with other reasons for collectivisation, such as the need to modernise the backwards economy, preparation for future invasion, funding the Five-Year Plans and the wish of Stalin to control the countryside in Russia. Many of the stronger responses saw candidates cleverly link together various factors to come to well-supported conclusions. The best responses were able to sustain this argument throughout their essay.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was a popular topic, with a similar number of candidates attempting both **Question 7** and **Question 8**.

Question 7 responses struggled to attain higher marks. The focus of the question was to compare the significance of the different reasons why President Hoover responded to the Depression in the way that he did. Most reasonable responses were able to examine the significance of Hoover's lack of government involvement by citing his adherence to Republican policies such as laissez-faire, rugged individualism and his promotion of voluntary and charitable arrangements to tackle the effects of the Depression. A number of candidates struggled to offer a well-balanced response. The better responses that were seen effectively examined the fact that Hoover did use the government in his response to the Depression by citing examples such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Farm Board and infrastructure investment such as the Hoover Dam to create jobs. Weaker responses often refocused their answer on either causes of the Depression or its consequences, which was not the question.

Question 8 generated some strong responses that were able to go into detail about the importance of agricultural reforms in the success of the New Deal. The agrarian based alphabet agencies such as the AAA, TVA, RA and FSA were examined in detail by the strongest candidates. This was then effectively compared to the importance of other agencies and reforms of the New Deal such as the FERA, the PWA and the CCC,

as well as the Social Security Act, Wagner Act and the Emergency Banking Act. The strongest responses reached well-substantiated conclusions about the relative importance of the different aspects of the New Deal and its success. Less successful responses tended to lack factual depth about the various agencies or confused which agencies constituted agrarian reforms.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

There were too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

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

There were too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A few Centres chose this Depth Study, but only **Question 13** produced enough responses to make any comments meaningful.

Question 13 was, on the whole, well answered. Strong responses examined the significance of a wide range of factors that determined how the PLO developed. Most commonly, candidates went into detail about the impact of the Six-Day War by citing references to the refugee crisis and the strengthening of Arab nationalism after the Israeli expansion. To balance this, candidates examined the importance of other factors that led to the development of the PLO such as the role of Arafat, the emergence of more radical and extremist groups within the PLO, the expulsion of the PLO from Jordan and many others. Factual knowledge and detail was often exemplary and the strongest responses were able to evaluate the relative significance of these various factors and reach substantiated judgements. Weaker responses relied too much on factual detail which caused the answers to drift into narrative with very little effective comment or explanation given to assess the importance of the various factors.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 and Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41 proved the most popular choices among candidates this year. There were also a good number of attempts at Depth Studies A (The First World War) and C (Russia), though very few candidates chose to attempt Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians).

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide-range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave well supported and sustained arguments but more could have given supported judgements and conclusions. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description, or failed to properly address the question that was set. Many candidates provided a lot of knowledge about a particular topic or Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their responses focus on importance or significance. The other key point is that this is a Depth Study paper and this means that it requires a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

There were a number of rubric errors from candidates, with the most common being an attempt to answer both questions within the Depth Study or multiple questions in a number of Depth Studies. It is imperative that candidates read the instructions carefully before attempting the examination.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of responses for Depth Study A, but only **Question 1** was attempted.

Question 1 was generally answered. Good responses were able to examine various elements of Haig's leadership at the Battle of the Somme and explain their importance in determining the outcome of the battle. Many candidates explained how Haig's leadership resulted in both positive and negative outcomes such as the relief of the French forces at Verdun, as well as the huge casualty list. These factors were then compared with other reasons for the outcome such as the poor quality of military equipment and the German forces' preparations. The strongest answers used in-depth factual examples and statistics to support explanations. The weaker answers lacked relevant material or were mainly narrative in style.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates though **Question 3** proved the more popular choice.

Question 3 was generally well answered by candidates. Good responses contained plenty of examples of how significant the Great Depression was as a reason for Nazi success in the elections. Most commonly cited were the impact of high unemployment and how this was exploited by the Nazis and the use of anti-communist rhetoric in Nazi propaganda to increase middle-class support. A number of solid and good responses provided adequate balance by examining the significance of other factors for Nazi electoral success such as the use of the SA, Hitler's leadership skills and the impact of the Reichstag Fire on the March 1933 election results. The best responses drew substantiated judgements about the most significant factor and often made relevant links between them. Weaker answers focused on Hitler's appointment as Chancellor rather than on electoral success, which was not the focus of the question.

Question 4 was less well answered than **Question 3** in general. Many candidates were unable to cite a wide range of material about how the economic recovery led to lack of effective opposition which resulted in mainly one-sided responses. Stronger responses were able to examine how the Nazis used public works programmes, the National Labour Service and conscription to reduce unemployment and bring many German citizens on-side with the regime. This was then balanced effectively by examining the importance of other methods used by the Nazis to reduce opposition such as propaganda, the SS and the Gestapo, and concentration camps.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study but **Question 6** was the more popular choice, with only a small number of candidates attempting **Question 5**.

Question 5 was the least popular question in this Depth Study. Less successful responses would have benefited from greater knowledge of the October Manifesto. The stronger responses seen were able to examine the importance of the political concessions given in the Manifesto to appease the liberals in Russia and maintain the Tsarist regime. This was then balanced against other factors such as the return of the Russian army, political oppression via the use of the Okhrana and the issuing of the Fundamental Laws in 1906. A few of the weaker responses missed the focus of the question and examined the regime during the First World War, therefore beyond the 1914 limit of the question's parameters.

Question 6 was more popular and, in general, answered more competently. Good responses were able to examine the significance of different elements of Lenin's April Theses and explain how they helped lead to Bolshevik success by November 1917. This was then effectively balanced by examining the significance of other factors such as the Provisional Government's continuation of the war, particularly Kerensky's failed Summer Offensive, the Kornilov Affair and Trotsky's role in arming the Red Guard and planning the seizure of power. The best responses were able to evaluate the relative significance of the different factors using in-depth examples and a wide-range of precise material to explain arguments convincingly. Weaker responses lacked the depth of knowledge required or used narrative and descriptive styles that failed to directly address the question.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was a popular topic, with more candidates choosing **Question 7** than **Question 8**.

Question 7 required candidates to consider the significance of the motor car as a cause of changes in US society in the 1920s. Some less successful answers focused more on economic development in the 1920s, essentially arguing about how the car and other factors caused the boom. Stronger responses did note the difference and examined how the motor car helped increase the freedom to travel, the use of the radio, the growth in the use of the cinema and visiting of sporting events, as well as increasing women's freedom and breaking down social norms. This was then balanced by examining other factors that caused changes in US society such as prohibition, new forms of entertainment and music, and new household products, with the best answers also examining aspects of intolerance such as the Red Scare and the KKK.

Question 8 was the less popular choice in this Depth Study and responses varied in quality. Weaker responses would have been improved by better knowledge of Hoover's responses to the Depression and were not able to provide a wide enough range of material to answer the question effectively. Some candidates examined Roosevelt's promises more effectively but other responses discussed aspects of his New Deal and alphabet agencies which are not relevant to the time parameters of the question.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

There were too few responses to make general comment appropriate.

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

There were too few responses to make general comment appropriate.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were too few responses to make general comment appropriate.