

HISTORY

Paper 0977/12
Paper 12

Key messages

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

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

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

General comments

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

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Questions 5 and 6

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

Question 5

- (a) This question required simple recall and description and, therefore, only a short answer was needed. There were mixed responses to this question. Many candidates gained high marks with brief relevant answers including points such as, 'It wanted to abolish slavery worldwide', 'It tried to stop slave trading', 'It worked to abolish the trafficking of women and children', 'It fought against forced prostitution'. The most successful responses tended to provide examples of places where the Slavery Commission had been successful, such as in Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ethiopia, Burma, Iraq and Nepal. Weaker responses included irrelevant information on the reasons for the formation of the League of Nations and its general aims. Many candidates lacked understanding of the work of the Slavery Commission, apart from that it tried to abolish slavery. Some candidates shifted the focus of the question, which was the work of the Slavery Commission, and wrote at length on various aspects of the League, including the role of the Refugee Commission, the Health Organisation or the International Labour Organisation.
- (b) This question was well answered. Two explained reasons are needed. The focus of the response must be why Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935. Most candidates were able to identify two reasons for Mussolini's actions, such as wanting to build up an empire, to distract from economic problems at home, to test the League of Nations, to gain fertile land or to gain revenge for Adowa in 1896. These answers achieved good marks. To achieve the strongest responses, candidates needed to explain the reasons, for example: 'the Great Depression had caused Italy economic problems and Mussolini was losing popularity; in order to distract the peoples' attention at home, he needed a successful foreign policy, therefore he chose to invade Abyssinia for its fertile land and mineral resources.' Weaker responses included information about events after the invasion, including the actions of Britain and France and the League of Nations, which lacked relevance.
- (c) Successful responses to this question included contextual examples to produce a well-balanced answer, by arguing for and against the focus of the question. Most candidates were able to explain at least one reason for Britain and France contributing to the failure of the League of Nations. The most common factor concerned their self-interest, revealed through their actions over Abyssinia. These candidates correctly explained that they didn't want to alienate Mussolini as they needed him as an ally against Nazi Germany, so they didn't close the Suez Canal and only half-heartedly imposed sanctions. They correctly explained that Britain was concerned over British coalminers' jobs so did not make coal one of the sanctions against Italy, whilst many explained the Hoare-Laval Plan, which was revealed to the press and was a fatal blow for the League. As a result of explanations such as this, candidates achieved answers explaining one side of the argument. The other side of the argument was less convincing, and weaker responses tended to include a 'list' of other factors that led to the failure of the League, including the structural weaknesses of the League, the lack of the USA membership and the effects of the Great Depression. Many candidates lost time in explaining the reasons why the USA did not join the League, which was lacking in relevance to this question. Some responses could have been improved by identifying that the USA's lack of membership was a serious blow to the League, as they needed USA's military might and ability to make economic sanctions effective, and then by using a contextual example to emphasise the point, that if USA had been a member, it could have used its Pacific forces to make Japan comply with the League of Nations in the Manchurian Crisis or economic sanctions would have been no use, as USA would continue to trade with Japan.

Question 6

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

- (b) Good understanding was often shown of at least one reason for Germany's involvement in the Spanish Civil War. The most common reason identified was to test his new armed forces, especially the Luftwaffe. Successful responses were able to support this with examples, including the development of Blitzkrieg and dive bombing at Guernica. Some candidates encountered challenges explaining a supported second reason, although some good answers were seen linking the desire to have closer relations with Mussolini in order to achieve Anschluss. However, in some responses the reasons were identified with no supporting evidence.
- (c) This question achieved good differentiation across the answers seen. Successful responses were characterised by an explanation of how the Nazi-Soviet Pact was responsible for war breaking out in 1939 and then explaining other reasons why war broke out such as, the failure of appeasement, the effects of the Great Depression, Hitler's foreign policy aims and the failure of the League of Nations. These responses did not just describe the factors, but clearly linked them to the outbreak of war, i.e. they clearly showed the effect of that particular factor. Good examples seen, for example, linked the invasion of Czechoslovakia to the acquirement of the Skoda armament factories or to the British and French guarantee to Poland in March 1939. Less successful responses described the factors accurately, without connecting them to the outbreak of war, or finished with generic statements such as: 'and this made war more likely'. Weaker responses were characterised by the inclusion of irrelevant details, such as the reasons why the Soviet Union signed the Nazi Soviet pact or why Britain and France followed a policy of appeasement, rather than linking the pact to the invasion of Poland and the outbreak of war. A common misconception in weaker responses was that at the Munich Conference Chamberlain allowed Hitler to take Czechoslovakia. Weaker responses, whilst including the key events, often confused the chronology of events, for example the war started after the invasion of Czechoslovakia, or that the guarantee to Poland happened after the Nazi-Soviet Pact. It is important for candidates to have a good understanding of the chronology of events in order to write a successful answer.

Question 7

- (a) This question was well answered by many candidates who had a good understanding of the achievements of Lech Walesa in Poland. They were able to describe the successes of Lech Walesa, both in respect to his involvement with the Solidarity trade union movement, and in his later role as President of Poland. Four accurate factual statements were often provided by strong candidates, such as: he founded the Solidarity movement; he led the strike in the Lenin Shipyard; he secured reforms from the Polish government through his 21 demands; he became President of Poland.
- (b) Responses to this question varied significantly in quality, with the strongest answers identifying and explaining why Gorbachev decided not to intervene when countries in Eastern Europe moved towards democracy in 1989. The most common reason explained was Gorbachev's own beliefs, which were much more open than those of his predecessors, and he believed in more open democratic, social and political systems based around his policies of 'Glasnost' and 'Perestroika'. A second reason explained was his improving relationship with the West, particularly with Reagan and the USA, which was making the need for a protective sphere less vital.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates explaining both how the Soviet Union was successful in maintaining control of its satellite states between 1956 and 1968, but also how it was not so successful. However, a significant number of responses did not keep to the date band in the question and focussed on events post-1968, especially Poland and Solidarity in the 1980s, and the pulling down of the Berlin Wall. The three main incidents that candidates successfully referred to were Hungary 1956, Berlin in 1961 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Credit was also given for the demonstrations in Poland in the summer of 1956. The best responses were able to explain how each of these events could be regarded as being successful and unsuccessful examples of the Soviet Union keeping control. For example, the success of Soviet troops in putting down the Hungarian Revolt and the Prague Spring were explained alongside the counter argument that communist regimes only managed to exist because of the strength of Soviet military intervention and that despite being successful in in defending communist control in these countries, they had not solved the problem of the unpopularity and failure of communist regimes in Eastern Europe.

Question 8

- (a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of the rule of the Shah of Iran. Maximum credit was achieved for identifying four accurate features of his rule. Examples included: the westernisation of Iran; corruption issues surrounding himself and the ruling elite; the Communist Party was banned; use of the SAVAK to put down political dissent.
- (b) Good understanding was shown of at least one reason why the West got involved in the Iran-Iraq War. The most common reason explained was the importance of oil in the region and the urgency of keeping the supply of oil going as there was fear in the West that if the war was prolonged the price of oil would increase, which would have a knock-on effect on western economies. Some candidates encountered challenges explaining a second supported reason, although some good answers were seen linking the concern over the balance of power in the region to Iranian ambitions in the Gulf, their close relations with the Soviet Union and their hostility to Israel.
- (c) This question produced mainly one-sided answers. Most candidates agreed that the actions of Iraq caused the outbreak of war in 1991 because of their invasion of Kuwait. They supported their argument by explaining why Saddam invaded Kuwait, including details such as the economic problems inside Iraq, the increase in unemployment and the importance of victory to increase Saddam's popularity at home. Weaker responses did not provide convincing arguments as to how far the USA was to blame for the outbreak of war, which could have included: 'that in April 1990 April Glaspie the US ambassador to Iraq gave Saddam the impression that the USA was not particularly interested in Kuwait. This made him think that if he invaded there would be no reaction from the USA. If they had made it clear from the beginning that they would not allow Kuwait to be invaded, then Saddam may not have attacked Kuwait.'

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

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

- (a) The majority of candidates performed well on this question and showed a good understanding of how the SA contributed to the Nazi Party. Successful responses included accurate contributions of the SA. They included: they disrupted opposition meetings; they were Hitler's private army; in elections they intimidated other parties. Less successful responses confused the role of the SA with that of the SS or the Gestapo, and some wrote at length about Rohm and The Night of Long Knives.
- (b) Many very good responses contained two detailed explanations of why the Munich Putsch was important to Hitler. Most identified the same two reasons, firstly that the trial gave Hitler publicity and secondly that he realised that if he wanted to gain power, he would have to change political tactics. Successful responses were able to support these reasons with accurate details such as the trial gave Hitler a national platform where he could put forward his views about the weaknesses of the Weimar Republic which were reported in the newspapers and he became well known throughout Germany; his lenient sentence showed that he had impressed the judges. Weaker responses could have been improved by ensuring that they were focussed on the question, rather than including details on the events of the Putsch and reasons for failure which were usually accurate but lacking in relevance to this question.

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

Question 12

- (a) The focus of this question was how the Nazi Regime used informers. Successful responses showed a good understanding of the role of informers, candidates noting that: the Nazis created a network of informers across the country; they contributed to a climate of fear or suspicion; people were used to spy on their neighbours; and to report anti-Nazi behaviour. Some common misconceptions were that informers were the Gestapo and weaker responses wrote at length about the role of the Gestapo in clamping down on opposition and their punishments. Others assumed that the informers were people who spread the Nazi message through propaganda or simply to inform the public about the Nazi Regime.
- (b) This question was well answered, with the majority of candidates being able to explain two reasons. Successful responses focussed on how easy it was to manipulate and indoctrinate young minds to produce future generations of loyal Nazis, and then used contextual examples to explain their point. They referenced specific changes in the school curriculum to support their responses. An example being in Biology, they were taught that they were one of the Aryan race, they were special and superior in intelligence and strength to other races, especially the Jews. These lessons instilled anti-semitism into the minds of German children. In History, they were taught how Germany had been ‘stabbed in the back’ by the weak politicians who had made the Treaty of Versailles. Other well-developed explanations were built around the fact that the Nazis wanted to ensure that the boys would be strong enough to fight in the army and that the girls would understand their future domestic role.
- (c) There were many very good responses that contained detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Others needed to develop thoroughly more detailed arguments in order to explain the opposition and lack of opposition to the Nazi regime to enable them to achieve high marks. Most candidates were able to explain the opposition from the youth, including the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement. Another form of opposition explained was that from the Church. Candidates named religious leaders such as Bishop Galen and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the latter who was well known for his opposition to Hitler’s euthanasia programme and persecution of the Jews. He was sent to a concentration camp and later executed. Successful responses then included details on why there wasn’t much opposition and two of the most common factors explained were the ‘fear factor’ and the reasons why people actually supported the regime. Candidates explained that the Nazis kept control using the SS and the Gestapo and how the Gestapo tapped telephones and intercepted mail to catch and arrest people who were showing disloyalty towards the Nazis. This resulted in people being intimidated into obedience because they were afraid of being sent to a concentration camp. Numerous reasons were identified as to why people supported the regime, including the popular Nazi policies, for example their solution to the unemployment problem, improved conditions in the workplace through the Beauty of Labour and the return to traditional values. Candidates then gained more credit for explaining these points with supporting relevant details.

Question 13

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

- (b) Good understanding was shown by the candidates of the continuing opposition to the Tsar between 1906 and 1914. The most common reason identified and explained was that the Tsar did not allow the Dumas to operate properly. In the 1905 October Manifesto the Tsar had offered the people of Russia a Duma, the right to free speech and the right to form political parties. However, the Tsar continued to rule without taking any serious notice of them and dismissed the first two very quickly. He had issued the Fundamental Laws in 1906 which agreed to the existence of the Duma but put so many limitations on its powers that it could do virtually nothing. The people of Russia were disappointed that the Tsar had not kept to his promises. Weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons, for example people were living in dreadful conditions, but with no supporting evidence.
- (c) There were a number of one-sided answers to this question because although most candidates were able to describe the social and economic distress, as cited in the question, they found it a challenge to explain the impact of the social and economic distress and its link to the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution. Candidates found it easier to offer explanations on the other side of the argument, for example, the events of Bloody Sunday or the impact of Russia's defeat in the Russo - Japanese war. Successful candidates were able to use supporting evidence to explain why these two events caused the 1905 Revolution.

Question 14

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

Question 15

- (a) Successful responses identified the beliefs of the Ku Klux Klan and gained maximum credit for including four relevant facts. For example, they believed in white supremacy; they were anti Catholic; they believed that black Americans were inferior; and that communism was threatening the country. Weaker responses included the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, especially their violence towards black Americans, rather than focussing on their beliefs, thus gaining no credit.
- (b) The responses to this question revealed that the question had been clearly understood. Successful responses explained about the American fear of the influx of immigrants, especially in the context of growing American isolationism after the First World War. They highlighted the fear of communism as a result of the Russian Revolution and the potential threat to American values. Weaker responses were able to identify reasons for the 'Red Scare', for example the bomb attack on Attorney-General Palmer or the Sacco-Vanzetti Case, but these responses lacked clear explanation. Supporting evidence was needed to convert the identification to an explanation such as, it was the Americans themselves who fuelled the 'Red Scare' by their actions against immigrants, as in the Sacco-Vanzetti case, emphasising that the focus was not on their crime but on their political beliefs.
- (c) Successful responses were characterised by at least two well explained arguments on both sides of the debate. They stated that it was surprising that Prohibition failed as it had been strongly supported by temperance groups, leading political and business figures, and it was an actual law. They used supporting evidence to substantiate their case. Candidates were more familiar with reasons why it wasn't surprising that Prohibition failed, including the influence of gangster culture, enforcement difficulties and widespread corruption. Weaker responses were often one-sided and focussed entirely on why it was unsurprising that Prohibition failed, thus gaining no credit for the other side of the argument. A small number of candidates wrote descriptive accounts of the St. Valentine's Day Massacre, gang rivalries and Al Capone's career, without linking these to the question.

Question 16

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

- (b) This question was well answered, many offering two well-explained reasons. The focus of the question was why Hoover was accused of not doing enough to deal with the consequences of the Depression. The most common reason used was that he was doing nothing to relieve the suffering of the poor. Successful responses were able to explain that unemployment was rising and homelessness was increasing as people could not pay their mortgages. He believed in laissez-faire and that businesses should be left alone to bring back prosperity. He also thought that the Depression would not last and that 'Prosperity was just around the corner'. He believed that too much help would make the people less self-reliant, so despite trying to restart the economy in 1930 and 1931 by tax cuts, he was accused of not doing very much. Other reasons identified were Hoover's dispersing of the Bonus Marchers or the limits of the Hoover Dam Project and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Weaker responses included irrelevant information on what Roosevelt did to improve the situation, which was not relevant to this question
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, with many answers being one-sided. Weaker responses, although showing an understanding of how the Stock Market worked and of terms such as 'buying on the margin', encountered challenges when trying to link this information to the cause of the Wall Street Crash. Strong responses explained how the Depression was caused by the greed of speculators in buying and selling shares as the stock market seemed a quick and easy way to get rich. Buying on the margin made things worse. Confidence is important and if people are confident that prices are rising there will be more buyers than sellers; when prices stop rising there will be more sellers and that caused the crash in 1929. Other reasons for the Wall Street Crash were more clearly understood, such as underlying weaknesses in the economy, overproduction and the 1920s depression in agriculture. Weaker responses also tended to be disorganised and included a mixture of causes and results of the Wall Street Crash. This question was purely focussed on the causes, and not on the results of, the Wall Street Crash.

Questions 17–22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0977/22
Paper 22

Key messages

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

General comments

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

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Option A: nineteenth century topic

Question 1

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

Question 2

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

Question 3

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

Question 4

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

Question 5

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

Question 6

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

Option B: twentieth century topic

Question 1

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

Question 2

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

Question 3

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

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

Question 4

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

Question 5

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

Question 6

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 0977/03
Coursework

Key messages

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

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

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

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

General comments

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

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

Comments specific questions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



HISTORY

Paper 0977/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

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

General comments

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

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

Comments on specific questions

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

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

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

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

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

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

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

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

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

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

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

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

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

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

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

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

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

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c. 1990

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

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

Question 10

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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

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