HISTORY

> **Paper 0470/03**
> **Coursework**

Key Messages

IGCSE History coursework is about assessment of the historical significance of an individual, event, development or place. It is crucial that the title used makes clear to candidates that they should focus on assessing significance. This involves considering the different ways in which, for example, an event may be seen as being significant. It may have been significant immediately or in the longer-term, it may have been significant for some people but not for others, it may have been significant economically but less significant politically. It also involves reaching and supporting judgements about whether the event was more significant in some ways than in others. Assessment of significance should involve argument and counter-argument, with the candidate reaching an overall assessment of significance at the end. It is important that significance is not confused with success. Something can be significant because it was a failure. It is also important that candidates try to use ideas such as 'turning point', 'false dawn' and 'long and short term' where appropriate, and in deed, such ideas were seen in a good number of strong answers. It is also key that titles address significance, rather than tend towards causation. Some titles might use the word 'significant' but this does not mean that they are appropriate, for example, 'How significant were the policies of the Tsar in leading to the February Revolution?' Much better would be 'Assess the significance of the policies of Tsar Nicholas II.' The latter gives candidates much more scope and the chance to assess historical significance properly.

General Comments

Much of the candidates' coursework that was moderated was of a high standard. The majority of centres set appropriate titles and nearly all candidates kept their answers within the word limit of 2000 words (although a few used significantly less than 2000 and thus did not give themselves a chance to produce answers of the necessary depth of analysis and assessment). Most answers were well organised and managed to avoid too much description or narrative. The best assessed significance from a variety of perspectives. Centres' administration of the coursework was generally excellent, with the correct number of samples sent to the moderator and the correct forms completed. It is important to remember that coursework should be set on a Depth Study. It should not be set on events covered in the international core content.

Comments on Specific Questions

Titles that were appropriate and worked well this year included:

Assess the significance of the Night of the Long Knives.

Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch.

How far was the New Deal a turning point in US history to 1941?

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

How significant was the Warner Brothers studio in 1920s USA?

Assess the significance of Martin Luther King.

The appropriate titles seen in this examination session were those which encouraged candidates to focus on causal explanations. A title such as 'How significant was the Enabling Act in the Nazi consolidation of power?' will lead candidates to writing an analysis of the different ways the Nazis managed to consolidate their power. They may well assess and compare the importance of different factors, including the one named in the title, but the answer will not engage with historical significance. A title such as 'Assess the significance

of the Enabling Act' will encourage candidates to ask themselves about the different ways it might be significant and whether it was more significant in some ways than in others. The crucial difference between these two titles is that the second does not mention an outcome. This gives candidates more scope to consider significance in its widest and truest sense.

Some candidates used some of their 2000 words in describing the background or in description and narrative. However, the best answers briefly explained how they were going to address the title and then got straight into assessment of significance. Other answers would have benefited from using a range of criteria in this assessment. In other words, they needed to ask themselves questions such as 'how was this event/individual/development significant in different ways?', 'how significant was it for different people or groups?', 'was it more significant for some people than others?', 'was it more significant immediately or in the longer-term?' and so on.

The best answers assessed significance rather than just described or explained it. This involved argument and counter-argument. They also showed some understanding that judgements about significance are provisional and vary as the perspective changes. In addition, these answers tended to make use of ideas such as 'turning point' and considered issues such as how the event or individual merely hastened developments already underway or how far it changed the direction of events. This involves considering the situation and the direction of events both before and after the event or individual being assessed. Above all, candidates should be encouraged to ask themselves challenging questions about the event or individual and to develop and support their own ideas, views and judgements. Candidates need to support and justify their own personal judgements. Another crucial quality of the best answers seen was relevance. Such answers avoided wandering away from judging and assessing significance with argument and counter-argument. Weaker answers constantly drifted away from assessment into description or narrative or into assessment of other factors.

Coursework was mostly carefully and accurately marked. When there were reductions in the marks, this was usually because answers contained much description and narrative and insufficient use of a range of criteria to assess significance in its widest sense. It is helpful if summative comments can be provided for each piece of coursework. These should sum up the main strengths and weaknesses of the answer and should relate directly to statements in the generic mark scheme. Marginal comments can also be made alongside important parts of the answer. Comments that identify, for example, where significance is being assessed well or where an answer is lacking relevance, can be very useful, and many Centres provided detailed annotations which were most helpful.

HISTORY

Key messages

- The answer to a question should have a clear focus on the question as set.
- Answers to parts **(b)** and **(c)** should be developed into explanation.
- Evaluations to **(c)** part answers should not be a repetition of what has been written previously.
- The development of an overview chronology of the period of study would benefit candidates when they are constructing longer answers.

General comments

Many candidates coped well with the demands of the examination. These candidates applied their knowledge and understanding to answering the set question. Other candidates focused more generally on the topic, and would have improved their responses by addressing the question set more closely. In better responses, candidates showed an awareness that historical events are interlinked, demonstrating an overview of a period, and showing an understanding of how events linked together to bring about an outcome.

Some candidates would have benefited from an awareness of the difference between narrative and explanation. Stronger responses demonstrated the skill of turning a relevant point into an explained response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A - Core Content

Question 1

Most answers to **(a)** showed some awareness of the part played by Kossuth prior to the March Laws and full descriptions were given. Some answers needed to focus more on personal qualities and beliefs. There were many responses which showed good understanding in relation to **(b)**. The relationship and perceived powers of the Frankfort Parliament were well explained, as was the significance of the German princes. Other responses lacked a full understanding of events.   The best answers to **(c)** integrated knowledge and understanding within the context of the period to give well balanced explanations which gained high marks. Sometimes the question needed to be more closely addressed, with answers being more descriptive and generalised in relation the revolutions.

Question 2

Some responses to this question were rather general in nature. In **(a)** answers often struggled address the reasons for the setting up of the Parliament and were descriptive. Although many responses to **(b)** were over lengthy, most included at least one explained reason as to why the terms of the Agreement of Olmütz were important. An understanding of the continuing dominance of Austria was often well understood. For part **(c)** an understanding of the diplomatic and intellectual qualities of Bismarck was used to good effect in producing answers of high quality. Some candidates needed to develop identification into explanation to achieve better responses.

Question 3

There were too few answers to this question to make meaningful comments.

Question 4

In response to **(a)** many answers showed good knowledge about the activities of the Kaiser. This included the development of the German navy and events relating to Morocco in 1905-06. Where responses were less strong, the answers were more general, referring to points such as 'building his military' and 'disputes over Morocco'. Some answers made more of events after 1908 which was not the question. Some responses to **(b)** were of a high quality, explaining a number of reasons as to why the Balkans were unstable. These responses were built on a sound understanding of the region and the influence of Austria, Serbia, Russia and Turkey. Other answers needed to develop a sound chronological basis for the explained points being made. The weakest answers showed awareness of some reasons but these identifications needed to be developed into explanation. Many answers to **(c)** were stronger in explanation of other reasons as to why war broke out in 1914 than they were in explaining the contribution of the Alliance System, and often dealt with these other reasons first. Where the contribution of the Alliance System was understood, it was that it acted as stimulation to Serbia – Austria – Russia relations in the middle months of 1914, providing a sound basis of an argument. In many instances responses would have been improved if the awareness of the Alliance System, as well as different reasons for war, had been linked more closely to the demands of the question, rather than being a narrative.

Question 5

Some of the responses to **(a)** were excellent, with specific detail of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in relation to German land forces being identified. Other answers would have benefited from a more careful reading of the question, as they contained references to naval restrictions. On occasions general reference was made to the 'disarmament' of the German army. Specificity is important in terms of Treaty detail. Some answers struggled to assess the demands of the question. In these answers, a number of references were made to land lost by Germany. In **(b)** many responses showed good understanding of the defects of the Treaty of Sèvres, leading to its replacement. In relation to **(c)**, those answers which started with the terms of the Treaty in relation to France were generally excellent, as this approach provided the opportunity to offer detailed arguments both for and against the question of 'how satisfied'. Other answers were characterised by a concentration on the needs of France, and in some instances of Wilson and Lloyd George, rather than the acceptability of what was achieved. The terms of the Treaty were not always understood with reference being erroneously made to 'the Saar being given to France', Germany 'losing the Rhineland' and 'Germany being broken up into smaller states'.

Question 6

Many responses to **(a)** would have benefited from taking account of the date in the question. Most contained information regarding Hitler's wish to take over Austria but then related the rest of the answer to events in 1938. Some candidates showed misunderstanding by stating that Hitler wished to reunite Germany with Austria, having lost Austria under the terms of the Treaty. Most candidates, in response to **(b)**, were able to explain one reason why the re-militarisation of the Rhineland was possible. Often other reasons were identified but remained unexplained. Some responses showed misunderstanding in stating that Germany had lost the Rhineland, rather than it being demilitarised. The best answers to **(c)** integrated convincing discussion of the context into their explanation. This enhanced appreciation of the policy and its impact. Some answers were more descriptive of what happened when the policy was applied and would have benefited from a demonstration of greater understanding of impact. Sometimes the quality of the answer was affected by a lack of understanding of what appeasement was – for example, that the League of Nations was often credited with the policy, and that it was applied by formal agreement between countries.

Question 7

Whilst most candidates were aware of the coming to power of Castro, some struggled to appreciate when this was. The result of this in the responses to **(a)** was characterised by either information about Batista or events relating to the missile crisis. Those candidates who had a good knowledge of the chronology had little difficulty in achieving good marks. In **(b)** most candidates were able to explain the humiliation of Kennedy through the failure to maintain secrecy or by the loss of face with his own people and the USSR. Less strong answers often contained many identified reasons which could have been developed into explanation. The best answers to **(c)** considered, in an organised manner, the successes and failures of the containment policy in relation to Cuba. This approach enabled strong explanatory answers on both sides of the argument

to be developed. Some answers contained many of the reasons used in the best answers but would have benefited from greater coherence and organisation which would have made the arguments easier to sustain.

Question 8

In **(a)** factual detail relating to the 'July Revolution' in Iraq was often well known, with reference being made to the role of Saddam Hussein, Ahmad Hasan al-Bakr and the Baath Party. The fact that Saddam Hussein used force on his own people after he became President was generally well known for **(b)**, with many answers containing the required explanation for higher marks. Some other responses needed to develop the detailed identification into explanation. Part **(c)** saw the best answers providing well-argued explanations that were logically organised. Some responses were stronger on the explanation about the domination of the region but were less strong on the explanation of other reasons. Both sides of the argument need to be developed.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Successful responses depended on candidates having knowledge of the activities of the main combatants in the early stages of the war. Parts **(a)** and **(b)** related to the actions of France and Britain in response to German force. In **(a)** most answers indicated that, in response to the German advance, the French military were moved towards the country's borders to protect Paris and, that with the help of the British at the Battle of the Marne, the Germans were forced back. Plan 17 was named by many candidates. Other responses were more generalised and lacking in specific detail. The better answers to **(b)** showed good knowledge and understanding of the activities of the British Expeditionary Force (BEF). The difficulties of Belgium and France were highlighted, as was the professionalism of the BEF. Reference to the Treaty of London and the Triple Entente was rarely made by candidates. Less successful answers concentrated more on impact on the BEF when in France, rather than the reasons for it being there. The better answers to **(c)** were well argued and logically organised, with a number of reasons, including the actions of the BEF, being explained as to why the Schlieffen Plan failed. Less strong answers had greater focus on reasons other than the BEF, and were sometimes unbalanced in terms of the argument.

Question 10

Many responses to **(a)** showed a sound knowledge of submarine warfare, which in some instances was described in great detail. The detail of 'unrestricted' submarine warfare was less strong, although many answers made reference to the sinking of the Lusitania. Some answers included the effect in terms of number of ships lost which, when this was correct, added to the quality of answer. The better answers to **(b)** included explanatory reference to the use and organisation of convoys, with the best answers mentioning Q ships and other methods of removing the danger of U-boats. In some instances answers would have been better if explanation of the reasons for improvement had been used, rather than just description. The best answers to **(c)** used explained examples from both sides to produce a convincing argument as to relative success. Other answers were characterised by a tendency to more generalised comment and could have been better supported by explanation and analysis.

Question 11

Detail of Hitler's role in the German Workers' Party was generally well known in **(a)**, from when he joined to when he became leader. Much emphasis was placed on his role in relation to propaganda, whilst his part in other activities was not always made clear. Sometimes the question needed to be more closely addressed; some answers contained material relating to German workers through programmes such as 'Strength through Joy'. In response to **(b)** many candidates were able to explain reasons for the importance to Hitler of the work of Goebbels. Here the points were well argued and logically organised. Some candidates went beyond Hitler's rise to power by writing about the Berlin Olympics, which was not required. The best responses to **(c)** explained the significance of the Enabling Act, followed by other reasons set out within a timeframe. This allowed a convincing argument to be produced. Some answers were less convincing as the date parameters were missed, suggesting a lack of understanding of the inter-relationship of events. Weaker answers were aware of a number of the events but were often confused over the role they played.

Question 12

In answer to **(a)** responses often showed sound knowledge of the network of informers used by the Nazis. Many responses to **(b)** demonstrated a good understanding of the value of the media to the Nazi regime.

The reasons were well explained, covering a wide range of knowledge. Other responses would have been improved by the inclusion of sound explanation based on the identification of reasons. Some answers to **(c)** were excellent, with detailed explanation on each side of the debate. Less strong answers were restricted mainly to the explanation of how the youth of Germany was dealt with. In these instances, the dealings with the churches were limited to the identification of methods or, in some answers, comment on the treatment of the churches was absent.

Question 13

Most candidates were able to identify three or four pieces of information to support their answer to **(a)**. In weaker answers, most candidates showed awareness that the Soviet was an alternative to the Provisional Government. In answering **(b)** many candidates were fully aware of the deficiencies of the Provisional Government, resulting in well-argued explanations, logically organised. Some candidates were able to identify the reasons but needed to go on and turn this identification into explanation. In answer to **(c)** there were responses that showed consistency of explanation. This, together with a clear and sometimes sophisticated style, accompanied an understanding and ability to judge alternative explanations. Weaker answers were characterised by a tendency to generalised comment, and were less well supported by explanation and analysis.

Question 14

Most responses to **(a)** showed good knowledge of the qualities possessed by Trotsky, particularly his role in relation to the Red Army. Some candidates neglected to answer the question as set, by writing about the virtues of Stalin. Most answers to **(b)** mentioned that the introduction of the New Economic Policy was a temporary one and explained why it was seen in this way. Better answers concentrated more on what was needed at the time as reasons for its demise. Some needed to move the identification of reasons into explanation to achieve higher marks. In **(c)** some candidates needed to address the question more closely. The responses of these candidates were much stronger in relation to the Purges and struggled to recall other methods of control used by Stalin. Those candidates who understood both sides of the argument produced a variety of reasons which were explained and analysed.

Question 15

There were many very good answers to **(a)**, particularly relating to the use of the car. Here, the services industries were well documented. Weaker answers concentrated on the specific industries associated with the building of cars, whereas the stronger responses included a greater impact range. The best answers to **(b)** produced two good explanations which showed excellent knowledge and understanding of the lives of black people. Less strong answers tended to offer general statements only, such as 'they were discriminated against'. There were responses to **(c)** that showed a consistent, clear and sometimes sophisticated style with an ability to judge alternative explanations. The best answers addressed the question directly, constructing their answer to compare new technology with other causes of the industrial boom. Less strong answers were characterised by explanation of the argument on one side and identification on the other.

Question 16

There were some answers to **(a)** which struggled to answer the set question, as they were characterised by a generalised description of the entertainment industry at the time. Better answers made clear the changes that took place. Many answers to **(b)** were descriptive in nature, containing information on the lifestyle of modern women. The better answers provided an explanation of the shock which arose from the changes that took place. Where this distinction was made, some answers were excellent. The best answers to **(c)** were extremely well argued and logically organised. Examples as to why Prohibition was not supported were carefully thought out and fully explained, the ensuing explanation dealing with other reasons for the failure. Less successful answers demonstrated a sound knowledge but explanation and evaluation was very limited.

Questions 17 – 22

There were too few answers to these questions to make meaningful comments.

HISTORY

| Paper 0470/12 |
| Paper 12 |

Key messages

- The answer to a question should have a clear focus on the question as set.
- Answers to parts **(b)** and **(c)** should be developed into explanation.
- Evaluations to **(c)** part answers should not be a repetition of what has been written previously.
- The development of an overview chronology of the period of study would benefit candidates when they are constructing longer answers.

General comments

A number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, while demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the actual question set. **Parts (b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors when answering their chosen questions, but were unable to develop these identified points into explanations. In better responses, candidates focused upon using their factual knowledge to explain events rather than deploying a narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers to these questions. These candidates were able to use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they made; other candidates set out a clear argument but would have improved their responses by supporting their arguments with relevant factual knowledge.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A - Core Content

Questions 1 to 3

There were too few answers to these questions to make meaningful comments.

Question 4

(a)   Some candidates detailed the part played by Germany in naval rivalry with the British, identifying Germany's building of dreadnought type battleships and their submarine building programme. A small number of candidates were able to give the details of the first and second Navy Bills. Other candidates focused solely upon Britain's role in naval rivalry, rather than Germany's role as demanded by the question.

(b)   There were some effective responses to this question, with candidates explaining how the Kaiser's desire to test the strength of the Entente Cordiale, the Kaiser sending a gunboat to Agadir and the humiliation of the Kaiser at the Algeciras Conference all contributed towards tension between Germany, Britain and France. A number of candidates were unable to differentiate between the First Moroccan Crisis of 1905–06 and the Second Moroccan Crisis of 1911, and others wrote about the Alliance System without any reference to events in Morocco.

(c)   Effective responses to this question explained clearly how the actions of Serbia brought war in 1914, detailing Serbia's policy to join all Serbs into one larger Serbia and the effects of the assassination of Franz Ferdinand by Serbian militants. On the other side of the argument, clear explanations were given of the role of the arms race and the alliance system in bringing war in 1914. A number of candidates wrote lengthy narratives of the events surrounding the assassination of Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo; these answers would have benefited from addressing more closely the issue of how these events brought war in 1914. In stronger responses, candidates structured their answers with explanations to address the question.

Question 5

(a)   Many candidates achieved full marks on this question, demonstrating a detailed and accurate factual knowledge of the territorial terms of the Treaty of St. Germain. A small number of candidates wrote about all the terms of the Treaty of St. Germain, although the question only required the territorial terms. Some candidates erroneously gave details of the Treaty of Versailles with Germany in response to this question.

(b)   Effective answers to this question explained the differing opinions of the peacemakers and how these opinions, together with public opinions in their individual countries, made their work at the Paris Peace Conference difficult. Explanations focused primarily on the difference in opinion between Clemenceau wanting a high level of reparations and Lloyd-George wanting to ensure Germany recovered sufficiently to ensure continued trade with Britain, and the differences in opinion between Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson, based on the varying experiences of war. Some candidates listed the individual aims of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson without developing these statements to explain why this made their work difficult. A number of candidates wrote about the difficulties in dealing with Germany after World War Two, which was clearly not relevant to this question.

(c)   Effective answers to this question identified a relevant point from the Treaty of Versailles that was hated by the Germans, and then explained clearly whether or not this hatred was justified. Explanations arguing that the hatred was justified focused mainly upon the limitations on Germany's armed forces and the effects of reparations. On the other side of the argument, answers focused mainly upon Germany's treatment of Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. A number of candidates missed the word 'justified' in the question and based their answers solely upon whether the Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles or not.

Question 6

(a)   Many candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of events relating to the Sudetenland during 1938 which raised tensions in Europe. Relevant points given included the Sudeten Germans complaining about discrimination by the Czech government, Hitler's demand that Germany was given the Sudetenland, and the details of the various meetings and the decisions made. A number of candidates wrote about events in relation to Czechoslovakia as a whole rather than the Sudetenland. Some candidates erroneously wrote about the Anschluss.

(b)   There were some clearly structured explanations given in response to this question. Explanations focused primarily on the invasion of Czechoslovakia not being part of self-determination and the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler's breaking of the promise he made at Munich and the failure of appeasement. A number of candidates confused events in Czechoslovakia with the Anschluss in Austria. Some candidates based their answers on events in the Sudetenland in 1938, rather than on the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1939.

(c)   Effective answers to this question explained how the outbreak of war in 1939 was Hitler's fault, given his desires to destroy the Treaty of Versailles and create a Greater Germany and his invasion of Poland despite warnings from Britain. They then went on to provide other explained reasons for the outbreak of war such as the ineffectiveness of the League of Nations and the policy of appeasement. Some candidates identified numerous factors; these factors needed to then be explained. Some candidates wrote at great length about German grievances about the Treaty of Versailles; this information needed to be explained to show how Hitler used these grievances and the link to the outbreak of war. A few candidates wrote about Germany's attack on Russia in 1941; this was not relevant to a question about the outbreak of war in 1939.

Question 7

(a)   Many candidates achieved full marks on this question, demonstrating detailed and relevant knowledge. Relevant points given included Soviet troops remaining in Eastern European countries after these countries had been liberated from the Nazis, with examples of the countries also detailed, the rigging of elections and the elimination of political opponents. Some candidates missed the statement 'by the end of 1945', and wrote about Cominform, Comecon, the Warsaw Pact and the Berlin Blockade. A small number of candidates wrote in generalised terms only, simply repeating the question by stating that Stalin extended his control across Eastern Europe.

(b)   There were a number of effective answers to this question, with clearly developed explanations focused on the differing motives of Stalin who wanted to cripple Germany, and Truman who did not want to repeat the mistakes made at Versailles. Further explanations detailed the differing perceptions based on experiences of war, with Russia having been invaded by Germany and thus fearing this could happen again in the future, and the USA being unlikely to face the threat of invasion by Germany in the future. Some candidates were able to identify a number of reasons; they needed to develop these identifications into explanations. A number of candidates based their answers on why it was difficult for the Big Three to reach agreement about Germany after World War One, which was not relevant to this question.

(c)   Effective answers to this question carefully considered both sides of the argument, explaining how on the one hand the USA's development of the atomic bomb, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan all contributed to starting the Cold War, and on the other side of the argument, Soviet actions such as the imposition of communist rule on Eastern Europe, the setting up of Cominform and Comecon and the Berlin Blockade could be seen as responsible. The question asked about responsibility for starting the Cold War; some candidates wrote detailed narratives of events in Korea, Vietnam and the Cuban Missile Crisis. These events, whilst clearly part of the Cold War, are not evidence of the initial responsibility for the Cold War, but its later development.

Question 8

(a)   There were some clearly focused and detailed responses to this question, with relevant points including the timescale of Operation Desert Shield, the fear of the Saudis that Saddam Hussein would invade their country, the desire of the US to protect oil supplies and the UN's economic sanctions against Iraq. Some candidates wrote answers that had no detail specific to Operation Desert Shield.

(b)   Some candidates were able to explain that much of Iraq's economic infrastructure was destroyed in the First Gulf War, and the effects of this upon the Iraqi people. A significant number of candidates were able to identify that there were many Iraqi civilian deaths and many combat fatalities, but these points needed to be developed into explanations.

(c)   Some candidates were able to formulate clear explanations focused on the ejection of Saddam Hussein's forces from Kuwait and the desire of the Western powers to guarantee their supplies of oil as reasons for Operation Desert Storm. Most candidates gave a number of identifications in response to this question, and would have benefited from developing these identifications into explanations.

Section B - Depth Studies

Question 9

(a)   Some candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the actions of the British and the French at the Battle of the Marne, citing relevant points such as the halting of the Schlieffen Plan, the diversion of French troops to Paris and then their transport by taxis to the front, and the role of the BEF. Some candidates wrote about the actions of the Germans, although the question asked about the actions of the British and the French.

(b)   Answers to this question focused mainly on the ending of mobile warfare, the demise of the BEF and the huge number of casualties on both sides. The majority of candidates who answered this

question identified relevant points; these needed to be developed into explanations demonstrating why fighting around Ypres in October–November 1914 was important.

(c) Some candidates were able to explain the importance of the Battle of Verdun with reference to the importance of Verdun to French morale, and then proceeded to explain the importance of the Battle of the Somme by referring to the Somme being a diversion to help French troops and also how the first day of the Battle of the Somme was a disaster for the British army. A number of candidates described both battles in general terms only, without referring to why each was important.

Question 10

(a) Candidates who answered this question displayed a detailed knowledge of the events bringing the USA into the war. The events most commonly referenced were the use of submarine warfare by the Germans, the sinking of the Lusitania and the loss of American lives, the publication of the Zimmermann Telegram and the offer of US territory to Mexico if Mexico agreed to join Germany in the war. A small number of candidates wrote about events once the USA was actually involved in the war, rather than the events bringing them into the war. Some candidates stated that the bombing of Pearl Harbour brought the USA into the war; this is not relevant to World War One.

(b) Many candidates were able to give at least one clear explanation as to why the German offensives of March to April 1918 were successful. Explanations usually focused on how far the Germans advanced initially, how close to Paris the Germans were and the deployment of German troops from the Eastern Front. Some candidates identified relevant points but needed to go on and develop these points into explanations.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained weaknesses within the Home Front by detailing mutinies at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven naval bases and the discontentment among Germans at home due to food shortages. On the other side of the argument, explanations of the total exhaustion of the German army and the help being given by the USA to the Allies were given. Some candidates appeared unaware of what was meant by the 'Home Front' and therefore were only able to give one side of the argument.

Question 11

(a) Candidates demonstrated a detailed and comprehensive knowledge of the Communist threat to the Weimar Republic in 1919-20, many achieving very high marks. Points made included the naming of the Spartacists, the names of the leaders of the Spartacists, details of the revolt in Berlin, the deaths of Communist agitators including Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht and the role of the Freikorps in supressing Communist agitation. A small number of candidates wrote about Hitler and the Munich Putsch, which lacked relevance to the question.

(b) There were many highly effective answers to this question. Explanations focused upon Stresemann's role in Germany's economic recovery and on Germany's foreign policy and its ultimate acceptance into the League of Nations. Some candidates also explained the contribution of the cultural revival to well-being in Germany and therefore the recovery of people's personal satisfaction with their lives.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained the weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution, referring to proportional representation and Article 48, and how these led to the collapse of the Weimar Republic. On the other side of the argument, clear explanations were given of the role of the Depression and of Hitler and the Nazi Party in the collapse of the Weimar Republic. A number of candidates explained the role of both the Depression and Hitler in the collapse and described the weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution, rather than explaining how these led to the collapse of the Republic. Many candidates wrote in some depth about events in the years immediately following the First World War; these answers focused on the early 1920s and ways in which the Weimar Republic was weak at this time. These answers missed the fact that the Weimar Republic survived the problems of the early 1920s. Material based on the early years of the Weimar Republic was usable as a long term factor if clearly linked to the question; in some cases candidates writing about the early 1920s simply gave a narrative of events.

Question 12

(a)   Relevant points given in response to this question included the development of propaganda under Josef Goebbels, the expansion of party membership and the decision of the Nazi Party to achieve power by legal constitutional means. A number of candidates wrote detailed narratives about the Munich Putsch and/or events in Germany once Hitler became Chancellor even though the question asked about the development of the Nazi Party during the rest of the 1920s, following the Munich Putsch.

(b)   A number of candidates gave two or more clear explanations in response to this question, focusing upon the Wall Street Crash, the inadequacies of the Weimar government, the USA recalling their loans, the promises made by the Nazis and Nazi propaganda. Some candidates missed the date '1930' in the question, and wrote in detail about later events such as the Reichstag Fire.

(c)   Some candidates explained that Röhm and the SA had become an embarrassment due to their violent and thuggish behaviour and, on the other side of the argument, explained that Röhm was increasingly being seen as a threat to Hitler, and that Hitler took the opportunity to remove a variety of rivals and potential enemies. Some candidates wrote lengthy narratives of the events of the Night of the Long Knives rather than explaining why it happened.

Question 13

(a)   Some candidates were able to identify several relevant points about the Kronstadt Mutiny of 1921; these focused mainly upon the concerns about War Communism, the demands for freedom of speech, Trotsky's Red Army storming the naval base and the number of casualties. Some candidates appeared not to know what the Kronstadt Mutiny was.

(b)   Some candidates explained that the New Economic Policy was introduced because War Communism had failed. Some were also able to identify other reasons, such as the increasing resistance to food requisitioning and the need to increase agricultural and industrial production. Some candidates described the New Economic policy rather than explaining why it was necessary to introduce the policy.

(c)   There were some effective answers to this question, with clear explanation of the role of the Red Army in ensuring Bolshevik victory in the Civil War on one side of the argument, and on the other side, explanation of the various failings of the White armies, such as their indiscipline and corruption and their lack of unity. A number of candidates produced one side of the argument only, focusing solely upon the strengths of the Red Army.

Question 14

(a)   A small number of candidates stated that Gosplan created annual economic plans and was responsible for the supervision of the Five-Year Plans. Other candidates were not aware of the details relating to Gosplan.

(b)   Some candidates produced detailed descriptions of the types of jobs undertaken by women; these descriptions needed to be developed into explanations of why women were important to Stalin's Russia. A small number of candidates identified relevant points such as Stalin wanting Russia to have a higher birth rate and that women were crucial to the success of the Five Year Plans; these points needed to be developed into explanations for higher marks.

(c)   Explanations were focused on the success of the economic changes as demonstrated by the statistics, showing great increases in the output of steel, coal and oil. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained that success came at a huge cost to human lives and well-being. Some candidates identified valid points such as Russia becoming stronger militarily and the successful achievement of some targets in the first Five Year Plan; better responses supported these points with specific contextual knowledge and developed them into explanations.

Question 15

(a) There were many effective answers to this question, with candidates stating four valid points about the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. Points made included the intimidation of Jews, Catholics and immigrants, the carrying out of beatings, mutilations and lynchings and the constant violence towards black Americans. Some candidates focused their answers on descriptions of the hierarchical order of the Ku Klux Klan and the type of people who were members, which lacked relevance; the question asked for description of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan.

(b) Many candidates were able to give at least one clear explanation why prohibition was introduced; explanations usually focused upon the claims that alcohol destroyed family life, the effects of alcohol on productivity in the workplace and strong anti-German feelings. Some candidates produced a list of who wanted prohibition to be introduced – they then needed to go on to explain why this was.

(c) There were some well-developed responses to this question, with answers giving clear explanations of the Sacco and Vanzetti case, demonstrating intolerance towards radical ideas, and on the other side of the argument, intolerance as shown in the Monkey Trial, the Red Scare, the activities of the Ku Klux Klan and the attitudes towards immigrants. A number of candidates described the Sacco and Vanzetti case in some considerable detail, but needed to go on and explain this as an example of intolerance. Some candidates wrote very detailed narratives of events; these candidates demonstrated that though they had the factual knowledge to answer this question, this knowledge needed to be used more effectively.

Question 16

(a) Some candidates gave at least three relevant points, usually stating that Hoover considered the economic crash to be a normal business downturn and therefore prosperity would return, that he increased tariffs and that he set up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Some candidates wrote about the economic crash rather than Hoover's reaction to the crash.

(b) Some responses featured one clear explanation focused on the army being used and why this damaged Hoover's personal reputation. Other candidates who answered this question gave a very detailed narrative of the events relating to the Bonus Marchers, and would have improved their answers by explaining why these events damaged Hoover's personal reputation.

(c) Effective answers to this question explained how the market was saturated due to over-production, and clearly linked this to the uneven distribution of wealth. Further explanations were given of the difficulties of exporting in the wake of the First World War and the effects of tariffs. Some candidates described production in industry and the variety of goods produced and would have benefited from a greater focus on the question set.

Questions 17 to 22

There were too few answers to these questions to make meaningful comments.

HISTORY

<div style="border:1px solid">

Paper 0470/13
Paper 13

</div>

Key messages

- The answer to a question should have a clear focus on the question as set.
- Answers to parts **(b)** and **(c)** should be developed into explanation.
- Evaluations to **(c)** part answers should not be a repetition of what has been written previously.
- The development of an overview chronology of the period of study would benefit candidates when they are constructing longer answers.

General comments

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

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

A significant number of the responses to part **(c)** questions not only tried to argue on both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given hypothesis), but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Although some conclusions simply asserted 'how far', other responses went on to explain which side of the argument was stronger than the other.

Comments on specific questions

Section A - Core Content

Questions 1–4

There were too few answers to these questions to make meaningful comments.

Question 5

This was a popular choice. There were many good answers to the **part (a)** questions, which was about features shared by the peace treaties which followed the First World War. Weaker responses only referred to losses imposed on Germany under the Treaty of Versailles. Better responses gained credit for relevant comparisons; for example, the defeated countries not only lost territory, but also were made to pay reparations and were disarmed. In **part (b)**, the reasons why Germany's people were unhappy with the Treaty of Versailles attracted some general answers about diktat, harsh reparations, losses of land and war guilt; better responses explained what it was about these features which fuelled people's disappointment. Less successful answers were dominated by descriptions of the terms of the Treaty, rather than an analysis of why Germans hated them. **Part (c)** produced some weaker answers which tended to describe Lloyd George and Clemenceau's aims. Better responses argued, for instance, that Clemenceau was pleased that Germany's economic power and military capacity had been reduced, although he failed to get the Saar Basin for France and he failed to establish the Rhineland as an independent state. Further credit was achieved for additional points about Lloyd George, such as his satisfaction that the reparations Germany had to pay were

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

© 2016

not as high as France wanted them to be, and this meant Germany was still in a position to trade with Britain. He was not happy, however, that German-speaking people were under the rule of other countries.

Question 6

In **part (a)** there were some sound descriptions of how the Spanish Civil War made Europe a more dangerous place. These answers often related to how Hitler tested his armed forces in conflict, the opportunity taken by the Luftwaffe to practise and perfect dive-bombing techniques, and the collaboration between Hitler and Mussolini, who then formed the Rome-Berlin Axis.

In **part (b)**, candidates were not always able to explain why Germany left the League of Nations. Statements such as, 'It was linked to the Treaty of Versailles which Hitler hated', 'Germany was the only country to have been forced to disarm', or 'Hitler was already gained some credit. For higher marks, each statement would need development to explain why Hitler felt it necessary to leave the League. In **part (c)** there was evidence of good knowledge of appeasement which was used to support the idea of British and French weakness. Candidates knew a great deal about the Nazi Soviet Pact and could explain why it contributed to the tensions which eventually led to war in 1939. Better responses avoided just writing a narrative of events and were able to link what happened to the reasons for war; for example, appeasement encouraged Hitler's aggression to the point where he no longer believed that Britain and France would intervene when Poland was invaded. In this style of question, candidates should keep their arguments to the two factors stated.

Question 7

Candidates knew many detailed points about the 'domino effect' in **part (a)**. A significant number of answers to **part (b)** contained much narrative about Nixon's military strategy in Vietnam rather than focusing on the issue of why he found it difficult to withdraw US forces. Stronger responses included two, or sometimes three, developed points about anti-war protests, US reluctance to admit defeat and the failure of Vietnamisation. **Part (c)** answers sometimes lacked balance; it was important that the focus was on Kennedy and Johnson's terms of office, and whereas candidates knew a great deal about Johnson's escalation of US involvement in Vietnam, they tended to gloss over Kennedy; the key, as seen in better answers, was to use both presidents and compare their policies and success.

Question 8

There were a small number of responses to this question. **Part (a)** required knowledge of methods used by the Soviets to maintain control of Hungary. Stronger responses were able to provide the four relevant points or two well-developed points for full marks. **Part (b)** attracted some general points about the success of Solidarity, but they lacked detail. Better candidates were able to explain that Solidarity had the support of the Catholic Church, whereas elsewhere in Eastern Europe, Communist governments had tried to crush the Christian churches. In Poland, however, the strength of the Catholic religion meant that the government dared not confront the Catholic Church. Answers to **part (c)** were unbalanced because there was sound knowledge of the advantages of the Berlin Wall to the USSR, but less explanation of its advantages to the Western allies.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

There were few answers to this question. Candidates were able to identify some general problems faced by early tanks such as mud, mechanical breakdowns, lack of manoeuvrability and slowness of pace in **part (a).** The same characteristic was apparent in responses **to part (b)**; candidates provided many general descriptive points such as the use of military aircraft for observation and reconnaissance, the detection of troop movements, and the fact that they could spot gaps in the enemy's lines. These responses would have benefited from developing more precise explanations about their importance. There were many balanced answers in **part (c)**, which debated whether or not Haig was the 'Butcher of the Somme'. The use of detailed knowledge of Haig's career was, on the whole, impressive.

Question 10

Of the limited number of responses to this question, **part (b)** was well answered because candidates had sound knowledge to explain why Russia left the First World War in 1918. **Parts (a) and (c)** revealed less secure understanding of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and why British civilians joined the army.

Question 11

It was rare to see a poor answer to **part (a)**; answers included detailed references to concentration camps and a significant number of candidates gained full marks. In contrast, there was weaker knowledge of why Kristallnacht occurred in **part (b)**. Answers which developed two or more of the following identified factors scored well: for example, it was caused by the murder of a German diplomat in Paris by a Jew; it was revenge for the murder; it was an anti-Jewish protest; it was a way of destroying Jewish businesses and synagogues. Less successful responses tended to be more generalised accounts of anti-Semitic movements. There was often good knowledge of Nazi methods of control as required by **part (c)**. There was balance in many answers which argued on the one hand that oppression was the key – supported by details of the police state such as use of the Gestapo, courts and concentration camps. On the other hand, responses offered a range of alternative factors including the genuine sense of patriotism shared by many Germans who were proud of the achievements of the Nazi state which had full employment and excellent public facilities and road networks.

Question 12

Part (a) posed few problems and there was good knowledge of the 'Final Solution'. Responses displayed an understanding of the term and of the manner in which it was carried out. There were also May good answers to **part (b)**; the reasons why some women were unhappy with Nazi policies were generally well known. References were made to why some women disliked traditional domestic roles and dress, and the policy which forced many professional women to leave their jobs. Many found it difficult to apply relevant knowledge to both sides of the **part (c)** question about living standards under the Nazis. Supporting evidence included huge improvements in employment, benefits gained through the Strength through Joy organisation, and the fact that farmers enjoyed price guarantees. The idea of a 'feel good factor' was allowed when supported with details. On the other hand, counter arguments referred to wages which did not rise significantly, the outlawing of trade unions, food rationing from 1939 onwards and the privations suffered by Jews and other oppressed groups.

Question 13

Candidates knew a great deal about the importance of religion to the Tsar's autocracy in **part (a)**, but answers to **part (b)** tended to be more descriptive. The question was looking for a precise explanation as to why discontent continued after the 1905 Revolution up to 1914. Some candidates included events of the 1905 Revolution, which lacked relevance. Answers to **part (c)** revealed sound arguments explaining the Tsar's shortcomings on the one hand, and alternative factors on the other, such as food shortages, high prices, industrial unrest and the impact of Rasputin.

Question 14

There were few answers to this question. There was some general knowledge of the 'cult of Stalin' (**part (a)**), while explanations of the disastrous impact of the Purges tended to be more descriptive than analytical (**part (b)**). The removal of experienced officers in the army, the loss of every one of the navy's admirals, the inexperience amongst the leadership of the forces when facing Hitler, and the loss of skilled engineers, were typical of the identified reasons given but sometimes they lacked detail. **Part (c)** answers could often have been more effectively argued because unbalanced answers either focused on Stalin or Trotsky, rather than both.

Question 15

Part (a) was well answered. Many candidates could correctly identify a range of Republican policies which encouraged industrial growth in the 1920s. Some responses to **part (b)** tended to be overly descriptive, without reference to specific supporting factors. There was a great deal of information about Henry Ford and how assembly line production was organized. However, each point needed to be applied to the demands of the question by explaining why this method of production helped the US economy to grow in the 1920s. For **part (c)** it was important to balance different groups of people, some of whom benefited from the boom and some of whom did not. Answers were particularly strong when explaining factors relating to immigrants, farmers and black Americans. Arguments about alternative groups who did prosper in the 1920s tended to be less developed. Typically, the latter might have included explanations of prospering upper and middle class people who were able, for instance, to own cars and purchase luxury goods

Question 16

There were few responses to this question. **Part (a)** was well answered but candidates tended to offer general explanations of the Second New Deal in **part (b).** Developed reasoning might have included concerns that progress was slow in overcoming unemployment and needed more immediate measures, such as the WPA. The Second New Deal was introduced, however, to produce a fairer and more caring society and these measures were more long term. This meant bringing in legislation such as the Social Security Act, which provided old age pensions and unemployment benefits based on an insurance scheme funded by taxes levied on workers and employers. Answers to **part (c)** were sometimes unbalanced by focusing much more on Republican opposition then on Supreme Court decisions.

Questions 17–20

There were too few answers to these questions to make meaningful comments.

Question 21

In **part (a),** many candidates possessed good knowledge of Nasser's takeover of the Suez Canal in 1956. **Part (b)** answers tended to contain general comments about Israel's dislike of Nasser. Typically, these included Nasser's desire for revenge following an earlier defeat by Israel, Nasser's receipt of arms from the USSR, the encouragement of Fedayeen attacks from Egyptian soil and Nasser's ambitions to take over the Suez Canal. In **part (c)**, some responses would have benefited from the inclusion of detailed knowledge about the extent of Israeli success during the Suez Crisis. Some responses approached the question well, firstly defining the nature of 'success' and then supporting arguments by explaining Israel's achievements on the one hand, and the continuing threat posed by Arab neighbours, on the other.

Question 22

It was rare to see a weak answer to part **(a)**. Those who attempted **part (b)** produced strong responses about why Israel did not allow Palestinian refugees to return to their homes in Israel. Typically, good answers explained how around $700,000$ Palestinian Arabs fled from their homes by 1949, which gave the new nation of Israel considerable areas of land and houses for its increasing population of Jews. The Jews wanted as few Palestinian Arabs as possible within Israel so that it was a Jewish state with its own language and culture. **Part (c)** produced many well-supported arguments to assess the importance of the first Intifada. Candidates were able to explain why it brought much sympathy for Palestinians, even in the USA; this was balanced by recognition that the Intifada did not bring any improvements in Palestinian living conditions. Many responses provided well-supported points on each side of the argument, some going on to analyse 'importance' and arrive at a judgement.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21 **Paper 21**

Key messages

While candidates need knowledge and understanding of the topic, the interpretation, evaluation and use historical sources by candidates is paramount. Sources can be interpreted and evaluated and used more effectively when the historical context is used, but all the questions are about the sources and require judgements to be made about them. Therefore, answers should always be primarily about the sources with knowledge of the context being used in supporting roles. Sources are interpreted, evaluated and used better when contextual knowledge is used in a relevant way, but it must be used to support whatever judgements are being made about the sources.

Candidates need to be especially careful when interpreting cartoons. Political cartoons are nearly always produced and published to put across a political point of view and to convince an audience of this view. When candidates are asked about the message of the cartoonist they should ask themselves 'What is the point of view of the cartoonist?' and 'Is he or she criticising or supporting the subject of the cartoon?'

An awareness of how to compare two sources is also important. Some candidates are unable to make proper comparisons and tend to summarise both sources and then assert that they agree or disagree. Comparisons of sources need to be about the same point, for example, if one source makes a claim about the invasion of Abyssinia being popular in Italy, candidates should try to see if the other source has anything to say about this particular point. Comparisons can also be achieved by seeing if the overall messages or points of view of the two sources agree.

Another key message concerns **Question 6**.   Some candidates answer **Question 6** without properly referring to the sources. This question contains a statement and candidates are asked to explain whether the sources support the statement. The key is to understand that the question is about the sources as evidence in relation to the statement, and not just about the statement itself. Candidates need to refer to the sources individually and explain how each one does or does not support the statement.

General comments

The entry for the twentieth century option was much larger than that for nineteenth century option. Candidates entered for the latter tended to summarise the sources in many of their answers and struggled with the events of 1848. The contextual knowledge of the twentieth century option candidates was, on the whole, good, and, importantly, was used in an appropriate way to help the candidates in their use of the sources.

There were many outstanding scripts that demonstrated the required range of skills at a high level and most candidates were able to demonstrate reasonable understanding of the sources and the issues involved. Nearly all candidates had time to complete all the questions and incomplete scripts were rare as was misinterpretation of sources. Some candidates attempted **Question 6** first. This is not a good idea because using and answering **Questions 1–5** first will help prepare candidates for **Question 6**.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well. Most candidates were able to at least explain agreements or disagreements between Sources A and B. For example, both sources state that the revolutionaries failed to win the support of the peasants, while the sources disagree over whether Charles Albert saw the struggle as

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

a dynastic one or one for an independent and united Italy. A number of less successful responses summarised each source without making any direct comparisons.

Question 2

This question is about Charles Albert's purpose in issuing the proclamation in Source C. To explain his purpose and to obtain good marks, some reasonable knowledge and understanding of the context is required. Generally, candidates struggled, with some repeating the information in the source. Others were able to go further by making valid inferences about possible messages of the source, for example, Austria can be defeated or Piedmont will provide leadership. Some candidates explained the context of Charles Albert's proclamation but did not infer a message or a purpose. The best answers put these different elements together and explained a valid message or purpose through the historical context of March 1848.

Question 3

Candidates found it difficult to find connections between the two sources. There are ways in which Source D supports Source E, for example Piedmontese support for Italian independence, as well as ways in which it disagrees with it, for example, Castagneto fears that the cause is lost while Charles Albert does not. A few candidates were able to go further and use their knowledge of the context to evaluate one or both sources. It is important that candidates state whether they think that D makes E surprising. Some candidates managed to compare the two sources but would have improved their answers by reaching a conclusion about surprise.

Question 4

This question produced better answers. Many candidates knew about Pope Pius IX' s apparent switch from liberalism to conservatism and this helped them interpret the cartoonist' s message that he was two-faced and could not be trusted. The best answers explained their reading of the cartoon with reference to this contextual knowledge and were clear about the critical nature of the cartoon. Weaker answers were based on the claim that the mask of Christ meant he was a saintly figure.

Question 5

This question produced a number of general and unsupported assertions about Source F. There were also some weak answers that dismissed Source G simply because it was written by Garibaldi. These could have developed into much better answers if candidates had explained the circumstances in which Garibaldi wrote his memoirs and what his purpose was. The other valid approach that gained candidates good marks was to check the claims being made by Garibaldi by cross-referencing to other sources or to contextual knowledge. Some candidates did this.

Question 6

Some candidates performed very well on this question through careful explanation of how some sources supported the statement that the revolutions failed because of Charles Albert, and of how other sources disagreed with the statement. These answers wrote about sources separately and made clear use of the content of the sources, for example 'Source F does not support this statement because it shows that Pope Pius IX was two-faced. This implies that he let the revolutionaries down by changing his policies. Perhaps if he had continued with his liberal policies the revolutions would have stood a better chance.' Weaker answers missed the sources altogether and wrote instead about the statement. Others summarised the sources with no reference to the statement, and then added a conclusion asserting that they agreed (or did not) with it. Some went through the sources stating whether or not they agreed with the statement, but not showing how. There were also responses which wrote about several sources together and neglected to refer to the content of any of them individually.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

This question required candidates to compare two sources for agreements and disagreements. There were two ways of doing this. First, candidates could make a point-by-point comparison. This type of comparison needs to be precise, for example, 'Both sources state that the idea of occupying Abyssinia was popular in Italy' or 'Source A claims that Mussolini had not thought of invading Abyssinia before Wal Wal, while Source B claims he was just waiting for an excuse to invade'. The second valid way of answering the question was

to compare the overall big messages of the two sources. They disagreed over who was to blame for the crisis over Abyssinia – A does not blame Italy while B does (along with the great powers).

Overall, this question was answered well, with many good answers making clear and valid comparisons. There were some answers in which candidates just summarised both sources and then wrote that they agreed or disagreed, and others in which comparisons were attempted but were either wrong or incomplete. For example, both sources state that Wal Wal provided an excuse for Italy to invade (wrong), or the two sources disagree over Hoare-Laval (incomplete and too vague). Some thought that by identifying information that was one source but not in the other, they were identifying disagreements. Some of the better responses approached this question by going through the two sources carefully and comparing the claims made by them one by one. When these candidates were confident that they had one or two agreements and disagreements, they wrote their answers explaining first the agreements and then the disagreements. If candidates think they have compared the big message of the sources they should also explain agreements and disagreements of detail just in case they have misunderstood the big messages.

Question 2

Firstly on this question, candidates needed compare the two sources. This could be done in terms of details, for example, both authors claim the British Empire was won by force, and in terms of the authors' points of view about whether there should be intervention over the Italian invasion of Abyssinia. The latter is the better approach and a number of candidates achieved good marks by explaining that D does prove C right because it agrees that there was no need for intervention. It is important that after finding agreements or disagreements between the sources, candidates use these to reach a conclusion about whether or not these mean that Source D proves Source C was right. A number of candidates analysed and compared the sources but needed to go on and say whether they thought D proved C to be right. There were also a number of candidates who summarised the sources and then asserted that Source C was right or wrong. A small number of candidates went further and, after comparing the sources, they evaluated at least one of them. They made good informed use of either the fact that the author of Source C was American or that the author of Source D was a supporter of appeasement.

Question 3

This question produced a wide range of answers. There were those that misunderstood the cartoon, and those that demonstrated a sophisticated understanding. The question asks candidates to explain the cartoonist's message. At the highest level this involves not just interpreting the cartoon but inferring from this the cartoonist's point of view about the Italian invasion. Some candidates just described the surface features of the cartoon while others misinterpreted it and thought it was supporting Italian actions. Many candidates managed to explain a valid sub-message of the cartoon, for example the Abyssinians were civilised or the Italians brought destruction to Abyssinia. Some of these answers were general and not explained in the context of Italian actions, while others managed to suggest the point of view of the cartoonist. A good number went further. They explained the big message of the cartoon - that the Italians were being hypocrites; they had claimed they were fighting barbarism but were in fact bringing it to Abyssinia. These answers explained how the cartoonist was criticising Italian action.

Question 4

Candidates understood Source G better than they understood Source F. Some thought that the large figure in the middle of Source F represented the League Nations or Britain. A reasonable number of candidates understood sub-messages of Source F, for example that the League was weak, but a much smaller number suggested that the cartoonist was criticising or blaming Italy. There were many good interpretations of Source G, with candidates understanding how it was criticising Britain. This was probably helped by the suggestion in Sources C and D that Britain was being hypocritical. Working out the messages of Sources F and G was only the first step in answering this question. The question required candidates to compare the messages of the cartoons and some were reluctant to do this. Such comparison needs to be direct and explicit and some candidates wrote about each cartoon separately without any direct comparison. Of those that did compare, some compared sub-messages, for example Italy is strong in F but weak in G, while some managed to compare big messages, for example, F criticises Italy while G criticises Britain. A misunderstanding in some answers was the idea that both sources are claiming the League was weak. This is valid for Source F but Source G has nothing to say about the League.

Question 5

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates produced some good analysis and explanation of Haile Selassie's speech without saying whether they were surprised by it. Those that answered the question well often used four elements together: what the speech said, who said it, the immediate audience and the wider context in which it was being made. Most candidates managed to produce reasonable answers by expressing no surprise that Haile Selassie was complaining about what Italy had done to his country. Better answers focused on the fact that the speech was being made to the League of Nations. Some candidates were surprised that he thought the League was capable of taking any meaningful action and gave examples of past failures. Others expressed a lack of surprise about the fact that he was appealing to the League because of its purpose and aims.

Question 6

Some candidates performed very well on this question. To achieve good marks, candidates explained how some of the sources supported the statement that the Italian takeover of Abyssinia was justified and how other sources disagreed with it. For example 'Source E does not support this statement because the cartoon is claiming that the Italians, through their invasion, brought destruction to Abyssinia. The picture on the left shows how they have destroyed Abyssinian civilisation and so their takeover was not justified', and 'Source C justifies the Italian takeover because it claims that Abyssinia was "savage and uncivilised" where people lived in "filth, poverty and degradation". This implies that the Abyssinians would be better off under Italian rule.' What is important about both of these two examples is that one source is being focused on at a time and there is clear explanation of how the source supports or disagrees with the statement given in **Question 6**. Weaker answers missed the sources altogether and wrote instead about the statement. Others summarised the sources with no reference to the statement, and then added a conclusion asserting that they agreed (or did not) with it. Some went through the sources stating whether or not they agreed with the statement, but not showing how. There were also responses which wrote about several sources together and neglected to refer to the content of any of them individually.

HISTORY

> **Paper 0470/22**
> **Paper 22**

Key messages

This paper tests candidates' ability to interpret and evaluate historical sources. The questions require candidates to demonstrate a range of source-handling skills and understanding of concepts relating to those skills, such as similarity/difference, proof and evidence. It is important, then, that candidates understand not just what the sources say or show, but exactly what the question is asking them to do with those sources.

For example, **Question 1** in **Option B** asked what you could learn from a source. Many candidates only looked at what the source said the wording of the question was asking about what you could tell from what it said. In other words, it was inviting inferences to be made from the source content. Crossing this threshold of answering on the basis of what the sources mean, rather than on what they say/show, is one of the keys to success on this paper.

Another key message was that a number of candidates appeared to be answering **Question 6** without proper reference to the sources. However, candidates are given a hypothesis and asked to use the sources to check the validity of the hypothesis. The key is to understand that the question is about the sources as evidence in relation to the hypothesis, and not just about the hypothesis itself.

General comments

There were many outstanding scripts that demonstrated the required range of skills at a high level. There were also many complete scripts with good, positive answers to all the questions. Incomplete scripts, or scripts showing significant miscomprehension of sources, were rare. The paper contained three cartoons, and most candidates were able to interpret these effectively. One area where some candidates struggled was on the skill of comparison, which featured in two questions. Here, candidates stated that they had identified similarities/differences, but without having made clear the basis of the comparison. There needs to be a common criterion which applies to both sources and against which the comparison is made. Thus if analysis of one source indicates, for example, that the League was weak, then a true comparison with the other source will have to be on whether it too shows weakness (similarity) or alternatively strength (difference). A conclusion that the sources are different because one shows the League was weak whilst the other, for example, shows the League tried its best to resolve conflicts, lacks a proper basis for comparison.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

There were too few answers on this option for meaningful comments to be made.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates what they could learn about the League from Source A. Less successful responses paraphrased the source, whilst others wrote about the League in general, and added points from the source to this narrative/description. Neither of these two approaches engaged effectively with what was being asked. Better answers made inferences from the source about the League, for example that it was weak. Some also showed how the source supported the inference: 'I can tell the League was weak because the source says the sovereign state was the only source of its power.' The best kind of inference was one

that looked at the message of the source as a whole about the League's prospects – that its chances of success were not too good.

Question 2

This question asked why something happened, and the basic requirement was to provide a reason; on this question, most candidates had no difficulty doing so. Wilson's campaign to try and persuade Americans to support his idea of a League of Nations was clearly well known to candidates. What distinguished good answers from excellent ones was the extent to which the reason ('to persuade Americans to approve joining the League') was explained in the specific context of late 1919, when Wilson was battling against the probable rejection of the League by Congress.

Question 3

This was the first of the questions based on a cartoon, and candidates were asked to identify the cartoonist's message. The cartoon leant itself to two diametrically opposed interpretations. It was possible to see it as optimistic about the League, flying off into a future where disarmament would occur and war would be abolished. Alternately, it could be viewed as a prediction of the League's imminent demise, doomed to plunge off the cliff if it attempted to take off. Many answers spotted both possibilities, and indeed either interpretation was accepted as valid. A few candidates concentrated too much on details in the cartoon, specifically on the role of Uncle Sam sitting in the plane, but most could see that the cartoon was addressing the issue of the League's prospects – would it succeed or fail? Some candidates found another aspect which was worth exploring, which was the cartoonist's own opinion about the League, because this could certainly be seen as an aspect of the message: regardless of whether it would succeed or not, was the idea of the League a good thing? Here the message was not ambiguous, as the cartoonist clearly approved of what the League wanted to do.

Question 4

This was the least effectively answered question. Although it required comparison of the content of the two sources as a basis for deciding whether Source D made Source E surprising, some candidates found it hard to get to grips with what each source was actually saying. Many of these answers summarised first one source, then the other, and concluded with an assertion about surprise, without establishing a basis of comparison between the two sources. Careful reading of the sources would have yielded points of comparison both for similarity and difference (was the League effective or not, did they support the League or not, did they support sanctions or not?), and thus purely on content alone valid conclusions both of surprised or not surprised (or both) were possible. There was another way of establishing surprise, which was to bring contextual knowledge into the analysis. Many candidates used knowledge to explain why the French and the British were saying what they did at that time, which key to resolving the contradictions in the sources, but it was essential to have identified the contradictions (or indeed agreements) first, otherwise the contextual evaluation of the source had no purpose.

Question 5

This was a comparison question, based on two cartoons. Unlike **Question 4**, the issue here was not on how effectively candidates comprehended the sources, because in general they interpreted the cartoons well, but rather on using a common criterion as a basis for comparison. Source F was almost always seen as depicting the League as a sign of hope for the future. This was reasonable, but a valid comparison on this basis would have to be judging Source G on whether it too saw the League as a hope for the future. This is where comparisons struggled, as Source G was seen as being about something different, on whether the League could cope with aggression. This did not prevent other, but ultimately less persuasive comparisons being made. For example, if one started with the idea that Source G showed the League to be weak, then Source F could be said to show the League was strong, or the cartoons could be said both to show the League as well-intentioned. But often possibilities of valid comparisons were missed in answers that offered effective interpretations of the cartoons individually, but needed to identify true common ground between them. Overall the two cartoonists were both commenting on the League's future prospects, and the best answers, however they expressed it, were based around the comparison that Source F thought the League would succeed, whilst Source G thought it would fail.

Question 6

Many candidates answered **Question 6** very well and achieved high marks. They understood that the task is to use the sources to show how they (i.e. the sources) agree or disagree with the given hypothesis. They

went through the sources in turn, saying whether or not they agreed, and used the source content to show how the source indicated its (dis)agreement. They made sure that they had used some sources in agreement and others in disagreement. Weaker answers missed the sources altogether and wrote instead about the statement. Others summarised the sources with no reference to the statement, and then added a conclusion asserting that they agreed (or did not) with it. Some went through the sources stating whether or not they agreed with the statement, but not showing how. There were also responses which wrote about several sources together and neglected to refer to the content of any of them individually.

HISTORY

Key messages

The understanding of the context of the sources was generally good and there was considerable evidence of background knowledge being used to help answer the questions being asked. Candidates were better at interpreting and comparing sources than they were at evaluating them. Many were able to work out the messages of the sources. However, some would benefit from reading the source as a whole and giving greater consideration to the point of view of the author or artist. Those who attempted to evaluate the sources with generalisations about source type were less successful in their responses. Candidates need to go beyond accepting or rejecting sources at face value, or at the level of undeveloped provenance. The best attempts at evaluation were nearly always those that focused on a source's purpose in its historical context. These answers considered the reservations one should have about a source because of its purpose and used this to inform their responses.

General comments

Most candidates responded well to the demands of the paper. An overwhelming majority of candidates answered on the twentieth-century topic; consequently there were too few responses on the nineteenth-century option for meaningful comments to be made.

Candidates responded well to the precise details in the questions. For example, on **Question 4 in Option B** the issue of surprise was addressed by many in their opening sentence; this is a strategy that works well.

While many candidates did very well in response to **Question 6**, there were some who did not use the sources as the basis of their answer. Similarly, those who grouped the sources together and made general comments about the statement usually struggled to engage with the content of each source. Candidates need to use the sources to both support and disagree with the given statement. The sources provided enabled them to do both and, consequently, to write a balanced answer.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

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

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

There was a wide range of answers to this question which asked candidates to assess the level of agreement between two sources. The best responses identified points of agreement and disagreement and illustrated these with content from both sources. Weaker answers summarised the sources without making specific comparisons. The agreements were more easily spotted by candidates than were the disagreements, and many candidates were able to explain the former well. For example, many responses explained that both sources agree that the League was successful in resolving the dispute between Sweden and Finland, or the dispute between Greece and Bulgaria. Many answers also recognised that both sources agreed that the League was successful when smaller states were involved and that it was just an addition to existing power politics. One point of disagreement centred on the League's effectiveness when great powers were involved. In A, the League was 'less effective' when great powers were involved. In B, the League's intervention in 'the clash between Britain and Turkey over oil-rich Mosul in 1924' is used as evidence of its ability to 'keep the peace in matters involving a great power.' Candidates need to explain points of

disagreement rather than just describing differences between the sources; in other words, disagreements must be about the same thing. Many candidates attempted to compare the reasons for the League's failure in Abyssinia, stating that Source B blames Britain and France. There was, however, no direct point of comparison to this in Source A.   The best responses compared the overall 'big messages' of the sources; that is that Source A was negative about the League, while Source B was positive.

Question 2

In this question, candidates were required to compare two cartoons. Less strong responses compared surface details or undeveloped provenance.   Most candidates, however, managed to address the question, and clear attempts at comparisons were made in all but a few responses. The very best answers focused on the disagreement between the cartoonists' overall opinions. They explained that Source C approves of the League and believes it will prove effective in the future, whereas Source D is mocking the League because it can only deal with small disputes, like the one between Bulgaria and Greece. The majority of candidates were able to interpret the cartoons and explain similarities between them, for instance, many recognised that both cartoons showed the League as powerful, or as stopping war. While valid, these answers would have been improved if they had then gone on to provide a comparison of the big messages; in Source C the cartoonist, whose work was produced in 1920, is predicting that the League will get stronger overtime. In Source D, the overall message is also positive - the League can effectively deal with small disputes.

Question 3

This question proved the most challenging for a number of candidates and there was some misinterpretation in answers. Many saw the cartoon as a sign of the League gaining peace or based their answer around the mistaken belief that the central figure in the image was either Mussolini or Hitler. While some candidates were able to recognise the context of Manchuria, this was not always used to explain the League's failure. Without the context of Manchuria, candidates were only able to explain sub-messages, of which there were many, for example: the League is weak, the League has no principles or the League turns a blind eye to problems. Those candidates who achieved higher marks made use of the words 'prophesies for 1932' and were able to explain how the cartoon is predicting that the League will cave into Japan and allow Japan to get away with its invasion of Manchuria. The best responses came from candidates who could also explain the cartoonist's viewpoint, i.e. that he is condemning the League for this.

Question 4

This question asked whether or not source F is surprising. The crucial thing in a question of this nature is for candidates to make it clear whether or not they are surprised, and by what – their explanations can then have a proper focus. Also, explanations should be consistent with the stance taken on surprise. Some candidates based their answers on Source F alone and used every day empathy or reasons internal to the source to explain their lack of surprise; for example, not surprised Chamberlain said the League had disappointing results as it could no longer be relied upon to secure the peace of the world. Those who achieved higher marks tended to consider the source as a whole, rather than focusing an answer on details within it. They also explained surprise, or, in the very best responses, a lack of surprise. Another good approach was to look to the other sources on the paper, or to relevant contextual knowledge, to support arguments.

Question 5

In **Question 5**, candidates were asked to consider two conflicting written sources and conclude whether the content of one proved the other wrong. Here, the evaluation of the sources could have been better. Some responses recognised that the provenance and/or purpose of the two sources was a crucial element in the answer, but then went no further than stating that one being written by a Soviet and the other by the Secretary General of the League meant that Source G proved Source H wrong. Another approach was to use the dates of the sources – here, some answers would have benefitted from greater development. Most candidates dealt with this question by mismatching the content of Source G with Source H and stating that this meant Source G does prove Source H wrong. Most highlighted the disagreement over the League's degree of success – Source G states it failed as its policy led to three wars and a fourth one threatened, while Source H says the League 'succeeded during a number of years' and its 'balance-sheet' was 'not altogether unfavourable'. Those candidates that were able to make a developed use of the provenance or purpose of either source achieved good marks.

Question 6

Overall this was answered very well, and many candidates achieved high marks on this question by carefully explaining how a number of the sources could be seen as providing convincing evidence that the League of Nations was a failure, while others said the League was not a failure and enjoyed at least some degree of success. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Some candidates would have improved their answers by making it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. Candidates should avoid grouping the sources together and making assertions about them as a group; this rarely worked well.   Good responses also avoided summaries of the sources and generalisations about source type. The best responses included genuine evaluation based on a source's purpose, rather than simple statements involving bias or undeveloped provenance.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Candidates need to be able to use a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

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

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 widely answered this year. There were also many of responses to Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41, though very few candidates chose to answer on Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians).

Good responses were 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 did not address the question that was set. Some candidates wrote lengthy narratives on their chosen Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of responses for both **Question 1** and **Question 2** for Depth Study A, though **Question 1** was answered by a higher number of candidates.

Question 1 required candidates to focus on the significance of the Battle of the Marne as a reason why the war was not over by Christmas 1914. In the strongest responses candidates were able to compare the significance of the Battle of the Marne with other factors such as the new technology being used in warfare, the use of trenches and the development of a stalemate. Many good answers were able to cite decent examples to support their arguments and a few of the best responses acknowledged that the Battle of the Marne was a direct result of the failure of the Schlieffen Plan. Explanations tended to be partial or implicit in other responses and the range of material used could have been broader. Some candidates produced overly short responses or narratives of the first few months of the war in 1914.

Question 2 saw some reasonable responses in which candidates were able to explain the importance of the conditions in the trenches and the nature of trench warfare as a cause of the stalemate on the Western Front. This was then balanced with an examination of other factors, most notably the use of modern weapons such as the machine gun, gas weapons and artillery. A few candidates also gave material about tactical mistakes in 1914 and the use of conscripted soldiers on both sides that lacked experience in warfare. Other responses were primarily descriptive or one-sided answers and often the material lacked depth and range.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates. **Question 4** proved to be the more popular of the two.

Question 3 was reasonably well answered. There were some good responses in which candidates began to explain the relative significance of the different reasons for instability in the Weimar Republic up to 1923. The best answers gave a broad and in-depth range of material linked to economic reasons such as the war reparations, the near bankruptcy of the German economy after the First World War and the impact of the Ruhr invasion in 1923. This was well balanced with an examination of material on other reasons for instability. Most commonly cited were political uprisings from the far left and far right such as the Spartacists and the Kapp Putsch, with the strongest responses also commenting on the impact of the other terms of the Treaty of Versailles such as the War Guilt Clause and the loss of German territory. Less successful responses tended to be overly descriptive in nature and turned into narratives of Germany after the war. Some candidates also began to give details of the post-1923 era under Stresemann which was not relevant to the question.

Question 4 was, in general, well-answered, with the best responses gaining very high marks. Candidates tended to have a good knowledge of the Reichstag Fire in 1933 and of how it helped Hitler remove the threat of the Communists and gain emergency powers from Hindenburg. Many of the strongest answers also then linked this to the greater success the Nazis had in the March 1933 elections and the subsequent passing of the Enabling Act. This was then balanced against other reasons for Hitler's consolidation of power by 1934, such as the use of the Enabling Act to ban parties and trade unions, the violence of the SA and the SS, the Night of the Long Knives and the death of Hindenburg in 1934. These responses were well-balanced and developed, with focused and explicit explanations of how the different factors led to Hitler's consolidation of power. Other responses tended to be more descriptive or only partially explained. A few responses were purely narratives of the period and some went beyond the 1934 parameter of the question.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study. **Question 5** was the more popular choice among candidates.

Question 5 responses varied considerably in quality. Good responses were able to examine a wide range of material linking to the collapse of the Provisional Government in November 1917. The best responses explained how the continuation of the war brought with it a huge number of social and economic problems for the Russian people and many cited the failure of the July Offensive, the continuation of food and fuel shortages and the growing popularity of the Bolsheviks who promised an end to the war. This was well balanced with other material such as the Provisional Government's failure to solve the land issue with the peasants, the system of Dual Power in Petrograd and the influence of individuals such as Lenin and Trotsky. A few responses were balanced but under-developed as they contained primarily descriptive material. Some weaker responses also confused the November 1917 Revolution with the March 1917 Revolution and cited Rasputin, the Tsar and the Tsarina as reasons for the collapse of the Provisional Government.

Question 6 was generally less well answered by candidates. Some responses managed to give balanced answers by comparing the need to defend communism with other reasons for the introduction of the Five-Year Plans. Most commonly cited was material based on Stalin's wish to defend Russia from attack from the West and the need to industrialise and improve agricultural output. Other responses tended to be overly short - sometimes containing much irrelevant material, or short narratives of Stalin's methods of control.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-1941

This attracted many responses, with a similar number of candidates attempting both **Question 7** and **Question 8**.

Question 7 was generally not as well answered as it could have been. The best answers were able to look at multiple reasons for the restriction of immigration in the 1920s. The Red Scare was often well understood and candidates made note of providing examples on the Sacco and Vanzetti trial and the Palmer Raids in particular. These were then balanced with other factors such as the racism of the KKK, the competition for jobs, religious fundamentalism and the fear of growing organised crime. Less successful responses were often narratives of the period and some focused more on the Red Scare being an aspect of intolerance, rather than as a cause of restricting immigration. These are related issues, but often the responses were not focused on restricting immigration and examined material on the lives of black Americans and Native Americans.

Question 8 was answered more strongly than **Question 7** and many of these responses were able to go into detail about the importance of bank failures and other factors. Some explained in detail how the bank failures caused a loss in confidence in the USA, led to a mass withdrawal of savings and meant businesses were no longer able to borrow. This was balanced with other factors such as the impact of the Wall Street Crash, overproduction in agriculture and industry, the inequality of income in the USA and the impact of tariffs on American trade. The best answers attempted to draw convincing conclusions from the evidence they had cited and explain explicitly the relative importance of different causes of the Depression. Other answers would have benefited from greater depth or factual detail.

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

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

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

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

HISTORY

<div style="border:1px solid">

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

</div>

Key messages

Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Candidates need to be able to use a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

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

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 widely answered this year. There were also many of responses to Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41, though very few candidates chose to answer on Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians).

Good responses were 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 did not address the question that was set. Some candidates wrote lengthy narratives on their chosen Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were a number of responses for both **Question 1** and **Question 2** for Depth Study A, though **Question 1** was answered by a greater number of candidates.

Question 1 was well answered in some cases, though some responses would have been improved with greater knowledge in some areas. The best responses were able to explain the significance the BEF had on their entry into the war in 1914 and cited their impact in slowing the German advance in Belgium and the battle of Ypres and the Marne in particular. This was balanced with often a wide variety of other factors, including the significance of the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, the impact of new technology, as well as the significance of battles after 1914 such as Verdun and the Somme. This was a question which invited candidates to use material across the whole period of 1914-1918. The strongest responses explained significance and developed their material with good examples or statistics. Weaker responses tended to be narratives of 1914.

Question 2 was one on which candidates struggled in general. Some responses managed to compare the importance of the Zimmermann Telegram with other factors such as the sinking of the Lusitania, the fear of Germany dominating Europe and the growing Anglo-American alliance before 1917. Other responses lacked depth, some appearing to have no knowledge of the Zimmermann Telegram and giving a wide variety of incorrect definitions. A few candidates confused the First and Second World Wars.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-1945

Both questions were attempted by candidates. **Question 4** proved to be the more widely answered.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Some high quality responses were seen and many convincing solid answers were also seen. The strongest answers had a good knowledge of the Spartacist Uprising in 1919 and explained how the government had to rely on the Freikorps to maintain control. A few also linked the Spartacist Uprising with other left-wing uprisings. This was countered with some explanations of other factors that led to instability such as the Kapp Putsch, Munich Putsch and the impact of the various terms of the 1919 peace settlement. Some candidates also examined the Weimar Constitution and its inherent weaknesses and looked at the consequences of the Ruhr invasion and hyperinflation in 1923. Knowledge of these different factors was generally strong and helped candidates reach valid and logical conclusions in their answers. Some less successful responses tended to be more descriptive than analytical and a few drifted into narratives of post-war Germany.

Question 4 received a large number of responses. There were many good answers of high quality and also many solid responses where candidates had a good knowledge and understanding of the importance of the media and other factors that helped the Nazis to maintain control after 1934. The best answers gave detailed and developed examples about Goebbels' control of the media in Nazi Germany and balanced this with an analysis of other factors such as the use of terror- the SS, Gestapo and concentration camps; the use of the school curriculum and youth movements and the control of the churches. A small number of weaker answers found it difficult to stay within the chronological parameters of the question and cited examples from 1933 and 1934 such as the Enabling Act, the Reichstag Fire and the Night of the Long Knives.

Depth Study C: Russia 1905-1941

Candidates attempted both questions in this Depth Study but **Question 5** was the more popular choice out of the two.

Question 5 was more popular than **Question 6**, although it varied in the quality of responses given. Good responses were able to examine a wide range of material linked to the growth in opposition to Tsarist rule in Russia. Material on the role of Rasputin tended to be strong - the best answers were able to explain how Rasputin caused instability in the government and how this led to growing opposition from all classes due to his influence over the Tsarina. This was then countered with other causes such as the legacy of the 1905 Revolution, the decision made by the Tsar to take command of the Russian army and the general impact on social and economic conditions in Russia due to the war. High quality responses were well-balanced, explicit and developed in their explanations and knowledge. Other answers tended to be more descriptive in nature.

Question 6 produced some reasonable responses but candidates struggled overall. The strongest answers showed a good knowledge of the impact of the NEP and how many in the Communist Party saw the policy as a step backwards towards capitalism. They explained how Stalin wished to industrialise rapidly to catch up with the West, as well as his dislike for the counter-revolutionary Nepmen and kulaks that prospered from the NEP. This was countered with material on Stalin's wish to defend communism, defend Russia militarily and impose his rule over the whole of the USSR. A number of responses would have benefited from greater depth and a better focus on the question. Some were overly short or narrative in style and focused on Stalin's consolidation of power in Russia.

Depth Study D: USA 1919-1941

This was a popular topic. **Question 7** proved to be the choice for a majority of candidates.

Question 7 varied in the quality of response from candidates. Some high level answers showed an excellent knowledge of the impact immigration had in the USA and how it was a major cause of intolerance. Most commonly, candidates cited material on the growth in the Red Scare across the USA by giving examples such as strikes in 1919, the Palmer Raids and the Sacco and Vanzetti Trial. This was well balanced against other causes such as religious fundamentalism, racism (particularly the role of the KKK), and some relevant material on prohibition (though this needed to be linked to intolerance). Strong answers were able to give some explanation and draw conclusions on the relative importance of the different causes of intolerance. Weaker responses lacked depth and detail or were overly narrative in style. The question was generally well answered by many candidates.

Question 8 was also answered well. Some less successful responses tended lack depth or a knowledge and understanding of the New Deal and its policies on the unemployed but an overwhelming majority of

candidates were able to give good solid answers. There were also some very high quality responses; the best answers gave in-depth and detailed factual knowledge about the various New Deal agencies and legislation that helped remedy the huge unemployment in the 1930s, such as the TVA, the CWA, the CCC and the PWA. This was then balanced either by a critical evaluation of the success of these agencies or by examining the impact of the New Deal on other areas of society and the economy such as businesses, poverty and agriculture.

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

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

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

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

HISTORY

<div style="border:1px solid">

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

</div>

Key messages

Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Candidates need to be able to use a wide range of detailed knowledge to support arguments and explanations.

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

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45, Depth Study D: The USA, 1919-41 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41 were the most widely answered this year. There were very few responses to Depth Study A (The First World War), Depth Study E (China) and Depth Study F (South Africa). A number of candidates chose Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945.

Good responses were 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 did not address the question that was set. Some candidates wrote lengthy narratives on their chosen Depth Study, rather than focusing on the parameters set by the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

There were few responses to these questions. Answers to **Question 1** responses tended to describe weapons used and **Question 2** responses in general would have benefited from material being used with a greater focus on the blockade.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

This Depth Study was answered by many, with most candidates opting for **Question 4**.

Question 3 responses would have been improved by a greater understanding of the term 'Final Solution', with some candidates seeing this as a solution to end the war. Where the term was understood, candidates were able to write balanced answers, understanding the role of German expansion into the Soviet Union and providing balance by looking back at earlier Nazi policies towards the Jews.

Question 4 was a popular choice among candidates. The role of women was well understood and candidates were able to provide balance with material on youth, minorities, propaganda and terror. Less successful answers wrote generally about the experience of women in Nazi Germany, neglecting the term 'policies', and answers sometimes lacked focus on the creation of a Nazi 'society'. Better answers had knowledge of what type of society the Nazis were trying to achieve and were able to focus on the policies they implemented to achieve this.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

© 2016

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

This Depth Study was also popular, with both questions being attempted.

Question 5 answers demonstrated a sound knowledge of the Kronstadt Rebellion and other relevant factors like War Communism and the Red Terror. Some responses were well explained, although others described events in detail without explanation. The most successful answers linked the Rebellion with the effects of War Communism and the Civil War in general.

Question 6 was the more popular of the options in this Depth study. There was evidence of a good depth of knowledge, with a range of material used on propaganda balanced with other aspects of Stalin's regime such as the use of terror. Knowledge of the NKVD, the purges and the use of gulags was good. The link between the cult of personality and propaganda was not always explained or understood. Many candidates did attempt to explain their answers. Some stronger answers relevantly used material on Stalin's consolidation of power and the removal of his opponents in the Communist Party.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

Question 7 allowed candidates to look at a large range of factors that led to the boom. Candidates showed a good knowledge of Republican policies such as tariffs, low taxation and laissez-faire and made links to their importance to mass production, advertising, natural resources and hire-purchase schemes and so on. Many were only aware of Hoover as an example of a Republican President during the period. There were many descriptive answers but stronger responses were able to explain or partially explain the impact of policies on the boom.

Question 8 was attempted by many candidates but on the whole less confidently than **Question 7**. Many responses concentrated on the impact of intolerance, with long descriptions of the activities of the KKK rather than how racism led to their growth. There were responses which simply described the general growth of intolerance in the USA and lacked focus on the question.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

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

Question 13 was generally well answered, with candidates showing a good level of knowledge. Many included detailed knowledge of the role of the Israeli military and the external support to the new state of Israel. Knowledge of Arab involvement was less detailed, although stronger responses included specific details demonstrating lack of unity.

Question 14 saw many candidates struggling to find other causes for the Yom Kippur War beyond the focus of Sadat and the role of Syria. Some answers tied in elements of revenge and the role of the superpowers.