

HISTORY

Paper 0977/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Successful answers are dependent upon candidates reading the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are focused and relevant.

When a question asks 'why' a particular event happened it is important that candidates direct their response to address and explain the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened.

General comments

Candidates continue to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions. Many candidates communicate their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. There were few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

Part (a) answers should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. It was pleasing to see that 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, usually using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative or long introductions are not required. .

In **Part (c)** candidates need to argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful', depending on the question set. Less successful responses often focused on one side of the argument only and these responses could have been improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced and stronger answer.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2 and 3

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

Question 4

- (a)** There were mixed responses to this question. Good answers showed understanding of the events that took place in July 1914 after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife. Most were able to describe the ultimatum that Austria sent to Serbia with the 48-hour deadline and identified that although Serbia accepted most of Austria's demands, relations were broken off by Austria and on 28 July Austria declared war on Serbia. Weaker responses were characterised by lengthy descriptions of the events of the assassination.

- (b) This question was well answered and most candidates understood the term 'Dreadnoughts' and were able to explain why they were important to relations between Britain and Germany. Most identified that the launch of the super-battleship 'Dreadnought' by Britain in 1906 marked the start of the naval race between Britain and Germany. They then used supporting evidence to explain the impact of these Dreadnoughts.
- (c) This question produced many one-sided answers. Although candidates could describe the Moroccan Crises of 1905 and 1911, they were less confident about making clear links to the threat to peace in Europe and could not provide convincing arguments to prove that the Moroccan Crises were a threat to peace in Europe. Most candidates could identify at least one other threat to peace at this time, usually the Alliance System, the arms race or the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Supporting evidence was then included to explain these other factors. Less successful responses tended to be very generalised and to be improved these answers needed to include secure contextual knowledge.

Questions 5 and 6

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

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates had a good understanding of the dispute over the Aaland islands and provided brief and relevant details, such as 'The Aaland Island dispute was between Sweden and Finland', 'The League of Nations investigated the matter' and the 'League ruled in favour of Finland'. Candidates could have stated that most islanders wanted to be ruled by Sweden but Sweden accepted the judgement. A small number of candidates stated the wrong countries being involved.
- (b) Two well explained reasons were needed in response to this question. Successful responses identified an agency and then explained the work done by it to show why it was important. A popular example quoted by the candidates was the Health Committee, explaining how it worked hard to defeat leprosy and reduce the cases of malaria and yellow fever, the latter two by starting an international campaign against mosquitoes. It was also successful in dealing with cholera, smallpox and dysentery in Turkish refugee camps. Other well explained agencies included the work of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Slavery Commission and Mandates Commission. Other responses included less relevant, generalised information about the League of Nations, often including lengthy details on the role of the Assembly, Council and Secretariat which were not relevant to this question.
- (c) Candidates needed to produce a well- balanced answer explaining how the structure of the League and the Great Depression caused the weakness of the League and then assess which out of the two reasons was the most important. Many candidates were able to identify weaknesses in the structure of the League, including the Assembly and Council not meeting often, that the votes had to be unanimous, a veto could be used in Council and not all nations were members. Successful responses then included contextual examples, such as Vilna, Manchuria or Abyssinia to explain the problems caused by the structure. For example, many stronger responses identified that the USA not joining the League was a serious blow as the League needed the USA's military might and ability to make economic sanctions effective. Supporting evidence usually included a contextual example to emphasise the point, that if the 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 the USA would continue to trade with Japan. The importance of the Great Depression to the weakness of the League was less convincing, as a good number of candidates gave lengthy descriptions of the Depression and its effects, especially in Europe, but they drifted from the focus of the question and neglected to link their points to the weakness of the League. Some candidates did not mention the League at all. Successful responses explained how the Great Depression had political consequences with the growth of extremist parties who did not believe in democracy or international cooperation and acted in their own interests, which put great strains on the League.

Question 6

- (a) This question worked well for most candidates who understood the changing relationship between Italy and Germany in the 1930s, particularly with reference to Austria. Italy's frustration of Hitler's ambitions in 1934 and inaction in 1938 featured in successful responses, some of which also

included references to the dictators' common ideology, their fighting a common cause in the Spanish Civil War and the forging of the Rome-Berlin Axis and the Anti-Comintern Pact. Weaker responses were characterised by general comments on Hitler and Mussolini's actions; these answers would have been improved by making links to how these affected their relationship in the 1930s.

- (b) Good understanding was often shown of one reason for the increase of militarism in Japan in the 1930s. Most candidates were able to explain the impact of the Great Depression on Japan and its consequent search for markets and a more dominant position in the Far East, an explanation which would allow them to achieve high marks on this question. These answers concentrated on the invasion of Manchuria as a cause of growing militarism. Fewer candidates were able to develop a second argument but the strongest responses did refer to Japan's anxieties over the intentions of and the potential threat from Soviet Russia and the USA in the Far East and the Pacific. Stronger responses also commented on the domestic situation in Japan in which the military came to political prominence. Weaker responses, whilst giving an initially good explanation linking the Great Depression to the search for raw materials and the subsequent growth of militarism through the invasion of Manchuria, concentrated exclusively on a description of the events Manchurian crisis, which made it difficult for them to achieve higher marks.
- (c) Most candidates were able to explain the other factors leading to the outbreak of war in 1939, notably the counter-productive effects of appeasement and Hitler's exploitation of Germany's deep-seated hostility towards the Versailles settlement at the end of the First World War. Explanations on the other side of the argument (Hitler's desire to defeat communism) were less convincing and weaker responses concentrated solely on Hitler's actions against communist opponents inside Germany with no link to the outbreak of war in 1939. Others included information on why the Nazi Soviet Pact was beneficial to both Germany and the Soviet Union, which lacked relevance. The strongest answers were able to make valid points (supported by good explanations) about the importance of Hitler's anti-communism, firstly by illustrating its strength and intensity with reference to the views expressed in *Mein Kampf*, and secondly, linking these views to the anti-communist aspects of his foreign policy before 1939, including his involvement in the Spanish Civil War and participation in the Anti-Comintern Pact.

Question 7

- (a) This question was well answered by many candidates who had a good understanding of MacArthur's role in the Korean War. Four accurate factual details were provided by many, including details such as his being commander of the UN forces and that he advanced into North Korea in October 1950. Candidates could also describe how he was forced to retreat after attack by the Chinese forces and how he was removed from power by President Truman for his refusal to follow orders. Some candidates confused North and South Korea and a few weaker responses included descriptions of the events of the war without mentioning MacArthur.
- (b) Good understanding was shown of at least one reason why Chinese support for North Korea was important. The most common reason explained was that China was communist like North Korea and they did not want them to fall to the capitalists, therefore they provided armies and weapons to help the North Koreans push the UN army out of North Korea. Some candidates encountered challenges explaining a second reason, although some good answers were seen which discussed the impact of the UN forces, underestimating the strength of the Chinese forces, allowing the Chinese troops to launch devastating attacks against the UN and South Korean forces, thus driving UN forces out of North Korea.
- (c) There were a number of well developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates assessing the success of the USA in the Korean War. Most candidates agreed that the Korean War had been a success for the USA because their reason for entering the war had been containment and their actions had shown that they had the will and means to contain communism. They had provided half of the ground forces and most of the air and naval forces. As a result of their efforts South Korea had remained capitalist, thus their policy of containment looked strong as they had managed to stop the spread of communism. Weaker responses were one-sided and did not provide convincing arguments regarding the limitations of the US policy in Korea. These responses were often characterised by lengthy descriptions of the events of the Korean War, with no assessment as to the success of the USA.

Question 8

- (a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of Imre Nagy's role in the Hungarian uprising. Many candidates provided four accurate features of his role, including that he was Prime Minister at the time of the rising, he wanted a Hungarian form of Socialism and, on 1 November 1956, announced that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact.
- (b) Good understanding was shown of at least one reason why Gorbachev's reforms were important for Eastern Europe. The most common reason explained was that Gorbachev's own beliefs were much more open than those of his predecessors and he believed in more open social and democratic policies based around his policies of 'Glasnost' and 'Perestroika'. This meant that communist governments in Eastern Europe would no longer be dominated by the Soviet Union and the Red Army would no longer support communist governments, therefore the people of Eastern Europe could decide on their own system of government. Other responses wrote about Gorbachev's aims but needed to go on and make reference to their importance for Eastern Europe, which was the focus of the question.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates explaining the ways in which the Soviets kept control of Europe between 1960 and 1980, notably the way in which they put down the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and how they built the Berlin Wall in 1961 to stop people defecting to the west. The strongest responses then explained that although the Soviets were in control of Eastern Europe in this period, their position was not secure as many people did not like communist policies and saw that there were better opportunities for people in the west. It is important that candidates read the dates in the question as a number of candidates wrote about events outside the time band, for example the Hungarian uprising and the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies

- (a) The majority of candidates performed well on this question as they understood the term 'November Criminals' and were able to make references to the perceived betrayal of Germany, the 'stab in the back' and the year to which the term applies. Links to Ebert and his socialist government also gained credit, as did reference to Hitler's use and exploitation of the phrase. A few candidates were not familiar with the term, often identifying the Allied powers or communists.
- (b) Many very good responses contained two detailed explanations of why there was left-wing opposition to the Weimar Republic. Most candidates were aware of the Spartacists and of the influence of the Bolsheviks' success in Russia in late 1917, as well as the chaotic situation in Germany 1918–1919. Many cited German unhappiness with the armistice of November and with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, which fed support for both left and right wing groups. The urge for strong and decisive government rather than the uncertainties of a new democratic system was often cited and explained. Some stronger responses also explained left wing activity beyond the Spartacist failure of 1919, usually referring to Bavaria in 1919 and again in 1923. Weaker responses, although often referring accurately to the causes of discontent in post war Germany, were characterised by confusion between the left and right opponents of the government. They assumed that its left-wing opponents were nationalists who wished to restore the Kaiser. Others included details on the events of the Spartacist rebellion, which lacked relevance.
- (c) The strongest responses to this question came from candidates who had a good understanding of the weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution. Such responses explained the problems caused by a multi-party system operating under proportional representation, notably the turnover in coalition governments and of the effect of the use of Article 48, especially in the period 1930–1933. These responses also included details on other reasons as to why the Weimar Republic failed, often including the impact of the Great Depression on the economy, especially the growth in

unemployment which led to the increase in support of the Nazis. A few explained the damaging impact of the rivalry between Von Papen and Von Schleicher. Candidates could also gain credit for good explanations explaining why the Weimar Republic was not necessarily doomed to failure and wrote clearly about economic recovery in the 1920s as a result of the impact of the Dawes Plan and the cultural achievements of Weimar. A common misconception in weaker responses was the confusion between the Weimar Constitution and the Weimar Government; in most of these cases the word 'constitution' was used to mean 'government'. Nearly all of these answers did not consider proportional representation and Article 48, and instead wrote about the successes and failures of the Weimar Government, including (and often concentrating on) the troubled period of 1919–1924 which was more difficult to link to the fate of the Republic.

Question 12

- (a) Many candidates struggled with their knowledge of the Four-Year Plan. The most common misconception was that it was a plan to rebuild Germany after World War I. Successful responses noted that the plan was introduced in 1936, to ensure that the German forces were ready for war, Goering was in charge and priority was given to rearmament.
- (b) This question was well answered and successful responses showed good understanding of two reasons why some people were unhappy with the changes the Nazis made to the economy, with most identifying and then explaining the effect of the changes on women and Jewish business owners. Others wrote effectively on the impact on workers of the removal of trade unions resulting in workers being unable to express their discontent over pay and conditions.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question, with many responses being one-sided. Candidates wrote confidently about German economic preparations for war in the mid/late 1930s, explaining policies such as autarky, conscription and massive rearmament. Many candidates encountered challenges explaining the other side of the hypothesis, although some good answers were seen linking the Allied air raids to damage caused to German factories and production, resulting in German civilians facing greater hardship from 1941 onwards.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates were familiar with the state of the Russian economy by 1914 and performed well on this question. Most candidates were able to identify four features of the economy including that around 80 per cent of Russians were peasants who had small farms which were not very productive and that there was some industry in Russia at this time, as oil and coal were being produced.
- (b) Good understanding was shown by the candidates of the limited impact of the October Manifesto on the way Russia was ruled. 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. Weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons, for example, 'the Tsar dismissed the Dumas', but with no supporting evidence.
- (c) There were many good, well-balanced responses which explained why Nicholas II was responsible for his own downfall, most notably because he put himself in control of the army in August 1915 which made him responsible for the military defeats and deaths of millions of Russians. Strong responses then explained other reasons for his downfall, including the poor state of the Russian economy, which by 1917 had led to food shortages resulting in violent protests. Less successful responses were characterised by description of Rasputin's character and his relationship with the Tsarina, and would have benefited from making links to the downfall of Nicholas II

Question 14

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

Question 15

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. The majority of candidates knew that there was a 'quota system' and that 'immigration was limited'. Some responses could have been improved by giving details of the immigration acts in the 1920s, such as their titles, dates, quota figures and origins of immigrants. Other responses focused on giving reasons why people immigrated to America in the 1920s, which was not the focus of the question.
- (b) This question was well-answered and the responses showed that many candidates had a good understanding of why prohibition led to an increase in crime. Most candidates were able to explain two reasons, including that there were not enough law enforcing agents and that often the police 'turned a blind eye' to the illegal activities of the gangsters because they had accepted bribes. Weaker responses included generalised details about prohibition, such as why prohibition was introduced, which was not relevant to this question.
- (c) Successful responses were characterised by at least two well explained arguments on both sides of the debate. Most candidates found much evidence to explain how women's lives changed in the 1920s. The strongest responses explained what life was like for women before the 1920s and then showed the changes such as 'women getting the vote in all states in 1920' and 'more women employed in offices and manufacturing'. The most popular changes explained were to their dress and habits when they went out to socialise. Stronger responses were able to counter the argument by explaining that not all women were affected by the changes, especially those in rural areas who saw little change or improvement in their lives. Weaker responses tended to be one sided and a list of things that women could now do, including 'go the cinema'. These responses could have been improved by the inclusion of more supporting detail.

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 0977/21
Paper 21

Key messages

Candidates should answer each question directly, ideally stating their conclusion in the opening sentence, for example, 'Bush made this speech in 1990 because...' or 'Source G does make Source F surprising because...'. In adopting this approach, candidates will already have planned their answers and thought carefully about the conclusion, only writing down the answer once they know what it is going to be.

The most important decisions to be made about many questions are **(i)** does the source need to be evaluated, and **(ii)** should contextual knowledge be used in the answer, and if it should, then how should it be used? When evaluating sources it is often useful to consider the purpose of the author or artist. Contextual knowledge should only be used if it helps to answer the question better. For example, contextual knowledge might help candidates work out the message of a source or its purpose or how reliable it is. Candidate should also remember that sources that are biased can still be very useful for historians. Candidates need to think about how they can be useful. .

When using sources - cartoons in particular, candidates need to try to work out what the big message is. In other words, what is the main point that the author or artist wants to make?

The whole paper leads up to **Question 6**, which asks for a consideration of all the sources in the option. Candidates must ensure that they leave enough time to answer it fully.

General comments

Although the overwhelming majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option, a good number of candidates answered on the nineteenth option. Some candidates did not answer **Question 6**, or answered it without using the sources. Comparison questions were answered well and the candidates' contextual knowledge was impressive. Some used this to carry out effective evaluation, while others were not sure about how to use it appropriately.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Question 1

This question was answered reasonably well. The two sources agree in many ways and candidates usually explained some of these agreements, for example Mazzini established Young Italy, he was born in Genoa and he wanted to end the power of the Pope. A small number of candidates were also able to explain disagreements. Disagreements included Mazzini's aims were clear in Source A but in B his thinking was vague. However, a good number of candidates were able to go further, by comparing the overall views of the sources about Mazzini. Source A claims he was significant to Italian unification, while Source B argues he was not significant or successful. It was good to see only a small number of candidates summarising each source and failing to compare them

Question 2

Most candidates used Source C to help them answer this question and some understood the relationship between the two sources. In Source D Mazzini is keen to declare his support for republican principles and to dismiss any claims that he had deserted these convictions. Source C begins to explain why he did this. He

was worried that Source C could be seen as evidence of his support for the idea of Charles Albert becoming king of a united Italy. This is why in Source D he claims that he was actually pointing out why Charles Albert lacked the qualities to become such a king. Better responses understood the importance of the context. 1861 was the year the Kingdom of Italy was created. Mazzini (as the Background Information explains) opposed the new kingdom. This fits in with the sentiments he expresses in Source D which could have been published to underline his opposition to the new creation. Some candidates struggled to see the link between the two sources or the relevance of the context and tended to paraphrase Source D as an explanation for why it was published, while others only used the context of 1861 as the reason for publication and did not engage with the content of Source D.

Question 3

Weaker answers either identified parts of Source E which they asserted they did or did not trust, or simply stated that the source could not be trusted because it was written by Garibaldi and he would defend himself and criticise others. Better answers used contextual knowledge of either Garibaldi or Mazzini, or cross-reference to other sources, for example Mazzini's impracticable dreaming and Garibaldi's success as a military leader, to evaluate Garibaldi's account. There was a tendency in some answers to focus on the reasons why Garibaldi could, or could not be trusted, without actually stating what it was in Source E that was being checked.

Question 4

In a question such as this one the first important move is to compare what the two sources say. There is one clear disagreement – F contains much criticism of Mazzini, while Source G praises and defends him. This might suggest that G does make F surprising. However, there are also agreements, for example both sources show affection for Mazzini, which means that G does not make F surprising. A good number of candidates explained the disagreement and based their answer on it. A smaller number of candidates realised that it was also necessary to evaluate the sources, for example given Mazzini's record since 1852, Source F is not at all surprising. Less successful answers identified what they found surprising or not surprising in Source F but gave no valid reasons.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates just described the stamp, while others rejected it because of what it does not tell us about Mazzini (they had to identify what this was). Stronger responses realised that sources nearly always have some use and argued that the source shows us Mazzini was important by the very fact that he is on a stamp. However, the best answers focused on what we can learn from the fact that he is being honoured many years after his death on the Republic's twenty-fifth anniversary.

Question 6

A number of candidates did not attempt this question. Many of those that did answer this question did it very well, with explanations based on details in the sources, while others chose appropriate sources but struggled to explain how they supported or disagreed with the hypothesis. Some analysed the sources but did not make clear which supported the hypothesis and which did not. Below are parts of two responses. The first is an example of an adequate explanation, while the second is not because it lacks reference to specific details in the sources:

'Source G supports the idea that Mazzini helped Italian unification. It says that he gave the Italians the idea and hope that Italy could become a "single, strong nation". He also helped Italians get rid of "the seven or eight tyrants" who were standing in the way of unification.'

'Sources E and F shows that Mazzini did not help Italian unification. They show that he was of little use and that unification did not happen because of him.'

There is for more guidance on **Question 6** in the section on the twentieth century option.

Option B: 20th century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well by most candidates. They found both agreements and disagreements. Agreements included: Kuwait refused to help Iraq over the issue of oil, Iraq had a claim to Kuwait and Iraq wanted access to the sea. Disagreements included: in A Iraq was justified, in B it was not, A blames Kuwait, while B does not. Candidates need to explain agreements and disagreements clearly and precisely. For example, the following type of answer, provided by a number of candidates, does not achieve this: 'The sources agree over Iraq's problems.' However, other candidates made more adequate attempts, such as, 'Both sources say that Iraq had a claim over Kuwait.' A small number of candidates just summarised both sources and asserted that they agreed or disagreed, without carrying out any matching. Others compared the provenance of the sources but did not compare what they said, while others identified information that was in one source but not in the other. A small number of stronger responses managed to compare the overall big messages of the two sources – they both think that Iraq had a good case but Source B has less sympathy for Iraq's actions.

Question 2

In answering questions such as this it is important that candidates understand that there are two important steps. Firstly the sources need to be compared, and secondly one or both of the sources needs to be evaluated. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that in Source C Saddam is claiming that there was an American conspiracy, aided by some Arabs, against Iraq. They explained that Source D appears to support this claim because it mentions Kuwaiti officials secretly visiting the CIA and making plans against the USA. However, they also understood this does not necessarily mean that Source D proves Saddam's claims to be true. They went on to evaluate either Source C or D. Some explained that Saddam's speech in Source C was made as the crisis was developing and he needed to whip up support for his policies, while others argued that Source D can be trusted because it was a private report that the Kuwaitis did not make public in which they admitted plotting against Iraq. Both approaches led the candidates to reaching a conclusion about how far Source D proves Saddam's claims in C to be true. Less successful answers were based on finding agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources without any evaluation. Some candidates explored whether the claims made in Source C could be trusted but they did not use Source C.

Question 3

Source E is open to many different reactions and interpretations and this question produced a wide range of answers. April Glaspie's statement was a surprising one at the time. In it she stated a desire for better relations with Iraq and good wishes for Iraq's attempts at rebuilding. Even more controversially, she stated that the USA had no interest in the border dispute between Iraq and Kuwait. She later added that the Iraqi version of her statement had left out her insistence that disputes between Iraq and Kuwait should be settled without the use of violence. The best answers argued that whatever the concerns about the reliability of Source E, it is clearly of immense value to the historian. This introduced an idea that candidates can struggle with – that an unreliable source can still be useful. Some of these candidates argued that the fact that the Iraqi transcripts may intentionally be less than an accurate account of what she actually said makes it useful because it raises questions about Iraqi motives and intentions. Other good answers suggested that Source E is useful because it shows that the USA was partly responsible for Iraq deciding to invade Kuwait or it helps us understand why Saddam may have understood American intentions. Less good answers argued that Source E is not useful. This was either because Source E is factually wrong about the USA not being interested in Kuwait or because it was an Iraqi transcript.

Question 4

This is a question about Bush's purpose – why did he make this speech at that particular time? The best answers, and there were many of them, were produced by candidates who realised this. They set the speech into its context and suggested a valid purpose for Bush, such as persuading countries to join the multi-national force or Americans to support his policy in the Gulf. It is important to note that purpose must involve changing the behaviour of the intended audience.

Weaker, but reasonable, answers either suggested that the context was the reason for Bush's speech – that he made the speech because of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, or that he made the speech to justify his sending of troops.

There were a number of candidates who struggled with the question and got no further than paraphrasing the sources. Some struggled because, although they explained the context or the message of the speech, these were not given as the reason for making the speech. It is important that somewhere in their answer candidates make a clear and explicit statement about why Bush made the speech.

Question 5

A number of candidates struggled with these cartoons and gave simple surface readings of them. Some took them literally and thought that Saddam was running away with barrels of oil or that the USA was not in the Gulf for oil. A number did produce valid interpretations of one or both of the cartoons based on sub-messages, for example Source H is saying that American soldiers were dying for the sake of oil. Fewer compared the sub-messages. The most common valid comparison was that they agree that the crisis was over oil. The best answers compared the big messages of the cartoons. Source G blames Saddam for wanting oil, while Source H blames Bush for wanting oil.

Question 6

This question should be answered last because the understanding of the sources developed by candidates while answering the earlier questions can be relevant to **Question 6**. Candidates need to leave enough time to allow themselves to produce a developed answer containing careful explanations. The best answers demonstrate the following characteristics: **(i)** all, or nearly all, of the sources are used; **(ii)** sources both supporting the hypothesis and disagreeing with the hypothesis are used; **(iii)** care is taken in making clear which sources are being used to support the hypothesis and which are being used to disagree with it; **(iv)** the content of the sources is used as the basis for careful explanations of whether sources support or disagree with the hypothesis; **(v)** sources are explained individually. Although it can be helpful to group the sources into those supporting the hypothesis and those disagreeing with it, this should not replace each source being individually explained. Some candidates struggled because they grouped the sources and then made general comments about all the sources in that group. The best responses grouped the sources but then wrote about each one in turn. This involved using the evidence in the sources. Below are parts of two responses, the first of which demonstrates a satisfactory use of the sources, while the second does not. The first response refers to, and uses, specific details in the source. The second response only makes a general assertion

‘Source F does show that Iraq was to blame for the crisis. This is because it tells us that Iraq used unjustified and brutal aggression against Kuwait. It says that Iraq invaded a peaceful country without “provocation or warning”.’

‘Sources C and D do not prove that Iraq was responsible for the crisis over Kuwait. Instead, they show that the USA was the country causing trouble and was to blame for the crisis.’

Some candidates, although demonstrating an understanding of the sources, did not make clear which sources supported the hypothesis and which disagreed with the hypothesis. Finally, there were some candidates who neglected to make any use of the sources. These candidates would have benefited from an understanding that **Question 6** is asking them whether *the sources* provide convincing evidence in support of the hypothesis, not whether they themselves agree with the hypothesis.

HISTORY

Paper 0977/03
Coursework

Key messages

Coursework assignment titles must assess significance.

In their answers, candidates should directly address the title. They should focus on assessment of significance, rather than on description or narrative. To do this, they should use a range of criteria.

The mark scheme should be used holistically by teachers. Candidates are not expected to cover every aspect of a level descriptor. Teachers should use a 'best fit' approach to the levels when marking.

General comments

A wide-range of work was seen. Some of the assignments were of a very high standard, and some were less strong.

Most centres despatched their candidates' work in good time and with the necessary documentation, which was usually completed carefully and accurately. Most of the candidates completed work on the Germany or USA Depth Studies, although there were some interesting titles based on local history.

Comments specific questions

The vast majority of centres set appropriate titles which allowed their candidates to focus on assessing significance. It is important that the title of the coursework assignment does not encourage candidates to focus on causation, rather than on significance. For example, a title such as 'Assess the importance of the Depression as a reason for Hitler's rise to power' restricts answers to Hitler's rise to power and may lead candidates to compare the relative importance of a number of reasons. It puts the focus on explaining an outcome, rather than on the broad significance of a factor. On the other hand, a title such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany' places the focus clearly on the Depression and is much more open. It allows candidates to use a range of criteria such as political, social and economic to carry out a broad assessment of the different ways in which the Depression was significant. When constructing a title, it is important to consider whether the subject to be assessed for significance has the potential to be assessed in different ways. For example, if it can only be assessed for its political short term significance, then it would be better to devise another question. Making sure that titles do not name an outcome helps to ensure that they are suitable. It is also important that titles are not set on content from the core content studied by the centre. They should be set on one of the Depth Studies or on a Depth Study devised by a centre.

It is strongly recommended that centres use the following wording in their titles: 'Assess the significance of....' An exception to this is when the focus is on the idea of 'turning point' when a title such as, "How far was the Munich Putsch a turning point in Germany?" would be acceptable.

The titles used in this examination session varied a great deal but examples of the types of title which worked well are:

'How far was the New Deal a turning point for the USA?'

'Assess the significance of the Reichstag Fire for Germany.'

'Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch for Germany.'

'Assess the significance of the Cold War for apartheid in South Africa.'

There were some excellent and interesting answers. One characteristic of the best answers was that they focused on assessment of significance. They did not spend time on description, narrative or on explaining the background. They used a range of criteria to assess significance. These varied according to the subject being assessed. For some subjects, criteria such as political, economic, social and religious worked well. For others, depth and breadth of impact and long and short term were effective. The concept of turning point is a useful one to introduce to candidates and can work well with certain subjects. Using a range of criteria helped candidates to attempt broad assessments of significance. They did not focus on just one way in which their subject may have been significant.

Another characteristic was that they focused on assessment. They did not just explain ways in which their subject was significant, they assessed how far it was significant. This was often achieved through the use of argument and counter-argument.

Finally, the best answers reached and supported an overall conclusion about significance. Sometimes they concluded that in some ways their subject was significant, but in other ways it was not, while other answers reached conclusions about the most important way in which their subject was significant.

Some less successful answers identified some criteria at the beginning but then drifted into description and narrative. These answers tended to, for example, describe what somebody did and then assert that this made them significant. Others confused failure with lack of significance. It is important to realise that failures can be very significant.

It was clear that much of the marking had been carried out with care. There were many helpful annotations identifying strengths and weaknesses of answers. Summative comments were very useful for the Moderators, especially when they summed up the key characteristics of an answer and matched these with statements in the mark scheme.

HISTORY

Paper 0977/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates need 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 was undertaken. 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. A number of candidates attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–1918 but there were too few attempts at Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) and G (Israelis and Palestinians) 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 few managed to provide 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 candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focusing on the parameters set by the question. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was much more widely-answered, with only a very small number of candidates attempting **Question 2** this session.

Question 1 proved challenging for a good number of candidates, with some struggling with the term ‘nature of war on the Western Front’. Stronger answers focused on the trench system and the conditions in the trenches for soldiers on the Western Front and explained how this led to a static, defensive war. This was balanced by examining other factors such as the use of new weapons like the machine gun, the impact of artillery and gas weapons, and the tactics used by the military leaders of both sides. Less successful responses tended to be descriptive, rather than analytical, and often struggled to focus on the question, instead giving a narrative of the war on the Western Front from 1914.

Question 2 produced too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–1945

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

Question 3 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to have a solid knowledge and understanding of the territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles and the responses were often given balance by examining the importance of other terms of the Treaty. This sometimes limited the scope and range of the answers, as there were other factors beyond the Treaty that led to problems in early Weimar Germany. The strongest responses examined a range of the territorial terms, such as the loss of Germany's overseas colonies, Alsace-Lorraine and the Polish Corridor and explained how this had a negative impact on Germany's pride, economy and population. This was often balanced by examining the importance of the military restrictions, the reparations and the War Guilt Clause. The best answers also considered the importance of political extremism from the left and right, the nature of the Weimar Constitution and its inherent weaknesses, as well as the immediate impact of the First World War. Weaker responses tended to focus in on the Treaty alone, without examining other aspects that caused problems in early Weimar Germany. There were also factual errors made about the Treaty in some circumstances. A few candidates also went beyond the chronological parameters of the question and began examining Hitler's rise to power in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Question 4 was, in general, answered less competently than **Question 3**, although there were some strong responses. The best answers were able to examine in some detail how the SA and SS were used by the Nazis to secure power by 1934 and focused on the use of the SA after the Reichstag Fire and during the March 1933 elections and the successive passing of the Enabling Act. Candidates then examined the role played by the SS in running the concentration camps, though some confused these with the later extermination camps during the Second World War. Some also analysed the significance of the SS in the Night of the Long Knives in removing Rohm and the power of the SA, thus securing the loyalty of the German Army and the support of the President. This was then balanced by looking at the powers given to Hitler by the Reichstag Fire Decree and the Enabling Act, the banning of trade unions and other political parties, the role of the Gestapo and propaganda. Weaker responses tended to be vague on the significance played by the SA and SS, with some candidates confusing the two organisations. Many candidates also focused on the role of the Hitler Youth and the control of the school curriculum which mainly comes after 1934. One or two responses also saw this question as focusing on Hitler's rise to power and how the Nazis increased their electoral success in 1930–32. While there is some relevance in this material, the question is focused on the period after Hitler became Chancellor.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–1941

A number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. Responses were very evenly split between **Question 5** and **Question 6**.

Question 5 was the better answered of the two questions. The strongest responses examined the economic problems before 1917 in Russia and explained how this led to disturbances such as the 1905 Bloody Sunday incident, the riots in the countryside and strikes in the urban areas during the 1905 Revolution, as well as the impact of fuel and food shortages during the First World War which helped cause the March 1917 Revolution. This was then balanced by examining other factors such as the role played by wars (Russo-Japanese War and the First World War), the actions of the Tsar and the maintenance of the autocracy and opposition political groups. The best answers addressed importance well and explained their arguments with good factual support. Weaker responses tended to be vague and descriptive. Some candidates neglected to cover the whole period set in the question and did not examine the years 1914–17.

Question 6 was answered less well than **Question 5**, though there were some good responses. The strongest answers examined the significance defence had on Stalin's economic policies, namely the fear of a future invasion from the West and the threat of Nazi Germany after 1933. Answers focused on the Five-Year Plans and how they increased industrial production in heavy industry and later armaments. Some answers also examined collectivisation and correctly explained how this policy was crucial to feed the workforce and soldiers, as well as provide capital for technology needed for a future invasion. This was then balanced by examining other causes for Stalin's economic policies. Most cited were Stalinist ideology (Socialism in One Country), competition from the capitalist West, the need to make the USSR a global superpower and Stalin's own prestige. Many of the less successful responses would have been improved by more precise detail and a greater factual knowledge of the era. Many also focused their response on the impact of Stalin's economic policies, as opposed to the causes.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–1941

This was the second most popular topic among candidates, with **Question 7** generating many more responses than **Question 8**.

Question 7 was generally well answered. The strongest responses had a sound knowledge of the importance of the motor industry in causing the economic boom in the 1920s. Many candidates were able to provide excellent factual details on the Ford motor company and the role played by Henry Ford and his assembly line form of production. This was then developed by explaining the knock-on effect the motor industry had on other sectors of the economy such as glass, rubber, road building and urban development. This was then balanced with a wide variety of alternative factors. Commonly cited were the importance of Republican policies, the nature of the consumer society and confidence, advertising, the First World War and the USA's natural resources. The best answers gave focused explanations that addressed importance and used in-depth examples to support their arguments, and often reached valid conclusions. A small number of weaker responses tended to be descriptive, as some candidates lost focus in providing mainly detail at the expense of explaining how these factors actually helped cause the economic boom.

Question 8 was less well answered in general, although there were some candidates that fully understood the question and its demands. The strongest answers examined the loss of overseas markets due to high tariffs and foreign competition and explained how this led to a declining export market, as well as falling prices domestically. They also explained how this caused overproduction and the subsequent fall in profit, leading to wage cuts and unemployment. This was then balanced by examining the significance of over speculation and overconfidence that helped lead to the Wall Street Crash and the blame that could be apportioned to the Republican governments during the 1920s. Many of the weaker responses tended to be light on detail or only gave one-sided answers. A few candidates confused the Wall Street Crash and the Depression- while there is a clear link between the two events, they are not the same, thing though they share many of the same causes.

Depth Study E: China, c. 1930–c. 1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

A small number of candidates opted for this Depth Study, but only examples of **Question 13** were seen in any significant number. .

Question 13 was well answered by some candidates, who focused clearly on the chronology set out in the question. Candidates examined the role played by Israeli aggression in the 1956 war, the Six-Day War and the Yom Kippur War, and explained how Israel, sometimes with the help of other global powers, was a major cause of conflict. This was then balanced by examining the importance of the Arab states, such as Egypt and Syria, Arab nationalism, the role of the USA and USSR, and the long-term impact caused by the refugee crisis after 1948 and the forming of extremist groups such as al-Fatah and later the PLO. The best responses were focused and explained the relative importance of the different factors using good supporting evidence. Other responses were often descriptive would have benefited from more contextual knowledge. A few candidates focused too much on the causes of 1948–49 war, which was outside of the chronology of this question.

Question 14 produced too few responses for meaningful comments to be made.