

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11
Structured Questions

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully. This will help them to understand exactly what is being asked and will give them the opportunity to write focused and balanced responses. If candidates are asked to compare two given factors or individuals, answers should be focused on these specified factors or individuals. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help ensure that responses only include relevant details.

In more extensive responses, candidates should organise their points into distinct paragraphs. This should help to avoid separate points becoming blurred together and in maintaining focus on the original question.

In **part (c)** responses, candidates need to provide evaluative, rather than purely summative conclusions. They should attempt to make a judgement and justify this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their response.

General comments

Candidates displayed sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions. Many candidates communicated 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. Answers should be precise, as explanation is not required.

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 or was important, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than providing 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 valid concluding judgement. 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, 3 and 4.

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

Question 5

(a) There were mixed responses to this question, with most candidates able to recall at least some of the economic consequences of the Treaty of Versailles for Germany. The most common responses stated that the economy suffered, for example through the imposition of reparations, or the loss of important industry and areas such as the Saar. Better answers were able to consider the consequences up to 1923, for example through the issues with hyperinflation and the government printing money. Few errors were seen, but weaker answers did not focus on economic consequences, instead making reference to general terms of the Treaty, such as military restrictions or territorial loss. Whilst these could be made relevant, for example by causing unemployment or the loss of resources, these consequences needed to be stated in responses.

(b) Most candidates were able to identify reasons why the Germans were disappointed when they heard the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in June 1919. Most commonly, candidates recognised that the War Guilt Clause made the Germans feel humiliated, and that the reparations caused economic problems. Stronger responses were able to expand these identifications into explanations, for example by showing how the military restrictions would make Germany vulnerable, given that they shared a border with France and a history of previous aggression. When considering the War Guilt Clause, many responses stated that it was seen as unfair, but only the stronger responses were able to explain why this was, perhaps through an explanation of the role played by other countries at the start of the First World War. Few errors were seen, but some candidates moved outside of the timeframe of 1919, basing their responses in 1923.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, with the more successful answers able to explain whether the victorious powers achieved what they wanted in the Treaty of Versailles, and with some evaluation of whether the terms overall could be seen as an achievement. Some responses attempted to approach the question considering whether the overall aims of the victorious powers, such as peace, were obtained or not. Other responses considered the powers individually to explain whether their aims were achieved or not, for example by considering Wilson's aims for a league of nations, or Clemenceau's desire for revenge. Either approach was acceptable. Most candidates were confident in their knowledge and understanding but were less able to construct valid historical explanations; many responses showed an awareness of the aims of the powers, but would have been improved by including valid explanation of why these aims were necessary, and reference to the exact terms of the Treaty, to support an argument as to whether these were achieved or not. Less assured answers often focussed only on the aims, with little reference to the terms of the Treaty.

Question 6

(a) Some very good answers were seen in response to this question, with candidates able to identify several ways in which Germany was involved in the Spanish Civil War. Most responses were able to identify that they supported Franco or the Nationalists, and that this involved sending troops and the Luftwaffe to help his forces. Candidates were also aware that Hitler used the war to test his weapons, and stronger responses also stated the nature of the fighting, for example the use of carpet bombing and Blitzkrieg tactics. Very few errors were seen, although less successful responses were aware of the general German involvement without providing specifics.

(b) Most candidates were able to identify or describe at least two reasons why Britain and France did not intervene over the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, and there were some very good responses to this question. Candidates often placed the event in context, arguing that they were keen to avoid war after the deaths and devastation of the First World War, or explained that elections were happening in France, and military action would be unpopular. Another successful approach was to show that, by this point, the Treaty of Versailles was considered harsh by some, and that this meant they were reluctant to challenge German actions, which could be considered as 'marching into their own back garden'. Weaker responses showed some knowledge and understanding, but the responses would have benefited from greater detail and explanation. For example, these responses sometimes stated that France would not act without British support but did not explain why that was the case.

(c) Mixed responses were seen to this question, with the strongest responses able to explain both why the Munich Agreement could be considered a defeat for Hitler, and also to provide balance by assessing how it did not prevent him from achieving his foreign policy aims. The most common approach seen by candidates providing explanation on one side was the counterargument, through

an explanation of how Hitler's actions were not prevented after the agreement, most usually through understanding of the subsequent invasion of Czechoslovakia. The best responses were able to explicitly link this to the Munich Agreement, for example by explaining that the Sudetenland contained both border defences and the Skoda armaments factory. Other responses considered the impact that the agreement had on the Soviet Union, arguing that it led to the Nazi-Soviet Pact and explaining the benefits that this provided Hitler. There were many unbalanced responses, with candidates less confident in arguing why it was a defeat for Hitler, although the strongest responses were able to provide some arguments on this side. Weaker responses were able to describe the events leading up to the Munich Agreement, or the Agreement itself, but without linking these points to the consequences for Hitler. Some candidates wrote in error about the consequences of the Munich Putsch for Hitler.

Question 7

(a) This question was generally answered very well, with most candidates recognising that China supported North Korea/the communists during the Korean War, and that this meant that China provided troops. Stronger responses were also able to provide specific details of China's involvement, for example that they were able to take Seoul, or that they were able to push the UN forces back to the 38th parallel. Weaker answers lacked focus on China's involvement, instead writing generally about the Korean War, or the involvement of other countries such as the US or the Soviet Union. Few errors were seen, with most candidates having at least a generalised understanding.

(b) Some good answers to this question were seen, with many candidates able to provide at least one explanation as to why Kennedy imposed a naval blockade on Cuba in October 1962. The responses seen displayed a good level of knowledge and understanding of the situation, and the most common approach was to provide one explanation considering the events leading up to the naval blockade. These responses provided a narrative of the discovery of missile sites by the US spy plane, before explaining that this meant that Kennedy had to take action, and that the blockade was the option he chose. Stronger responses were able to provide a second explanation, sometimes through using the context of the Cold War and the need for Kennedy to resist Soviet aggression, or through the context of the failed Bay of Pigs invasion. Other responses considered the options facing Kennedy, before explaining that the blockade was chosen since it demonstrated determination to resist the Soviet Union without the dangers of direct action in Cuba. Weaker responses often provided lengthy description of the Cuban Missile Crisis without linking this to why Kennedy therefore imposed the blockade. Few errors were seen.

(c) Some good answers to this question were seen, but many candidates struggled to provide a balanced answer. Many answers were able to explain that it was an error for the United States to become involved in Vietnam, since it was a failure. Evidence to support this assertion was through consideration of the inability of the US army to combat the Vietcong's guerrilla warfare, and this was often linked to the subsequent escalation of US tactics, leading to widespread bombing or the killing of Vietnamese civilians. Other responses also focused on events such as the My Lai massacre to argue that this was an error, since it turned American public opinion against the war and led to the growth of the anti-war movement and resultant withdrawal of US troops. The unpopularity of the war was also considered through the nature of the draft and the number of American deaths, whilst achieving little. Whilst these responses were able to achieve good marks, when attempting balance fewer candidates were able to provide a supported counterargument. Stronger responses were able to place the Vietnam War within the context of the Cold War and the fear of the Domino theory and the spread of communism to other countries such as Laos and Cambodia, but in weaker responses this context was stated rather explained.

Question 8

(a) Good answers to this question were seen, with most candidates able to identify several impacts that the Berlin Wall had on the people of East Berlin. These responses were aware that the Wall divided families and prevented East Berliners from accessing their jobs in West Berlin. Candidates were also aware the Wall was guarded extremely tightly and that people trying to escape were shot and killed. Some candidates attempted to identify the economic consequences of the Wall, but these tended to be more relevant to life in Eastern Europe as a whole. The weakest responses wrote about the Berlin Blockade, which lacked relevance.

(b) Some good responses to this question were seen, but greater knowledge and understanding of the topic would have helped many to explain why Solidarity was important. Stronger answers explained the importance, since it showed that the power of the people could threaten the Soviet Union, although most responses were unable to provide a second explanation. Weaker responses were aware that Solidarity gained widespread support both within the country and from the international community, without considering why this was important. Other responses provided a narrative of the actions of Solidarity but needed to go on and explain the importance of these actions.

(c) Some good responses were seen to this question, with candidates able to assess both the similarities and the differences in how the Soviet Union responded to unrest in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. When considering similarities, the most common approach was to consider the violent nature of the Soviet responses in both cases. When considering differences, candidates referred to the differences in outcome for the two leaders, with the execution of Nagy compared to the removal of Dubcek from politics. Weaker responses often displayed knowledge and understanding, but this was not used to create an argument based on similarities and differences. Rather, such responses provided lengthy narratives describing the Soviet responses in each case, without drawing conclusions as to similarities or differences. Other responses described the reasons for the unrest, or the course of the uprisings, but neglected to make reference to the Soviet response.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

(a) Some very good responses were seen, with candidates confident in their knowledge of what happened in the Ruhr in 1923. Most candidates were able to identify that France and Belgium invaded, and that they seized resources. Stronger responses were also able to identify that the German government encouraged passive resistance from the workers in the Ruhr, and that this led to violence and the expulsion of some Germans. Very few errors were seen, although a few responses included details outside the remit of the question.

(b) Mixed responses to this question were seen. Most candidates recognised the overall unpopularity of the Weimar Government, but fewer responses were able to link this specifically to why Germans supported the Spartacists in 1919. Stronger responses were based around communism, and why this would be attractive to the Germans at that time. These answers were able to explain how the success of the revolution in Russia had made a communist revolution in Germany also seem possible. This was then often linked to the economic situation in Germany, such as high unemployment, to explain how workers were hoping to see an improvement in their lives if there was a communist government. Some reasonable responses were achieved through more generalised arguments about the unpopularity of the Weimar Government if they argued that this meant that Germans would support the Spartacists trying to overthrow the government. Weaker responses lacked clarity on who the Spartacists were or believed that they were a right-wing group.

(c) Some excellent responses were seen to this question, with candidates confidently arguing to what extent Stresemann's policies were of little benefit to Germany. Some very well explained and supported arguments were seen when disagreeing with the statement, with candidates considering the benefits that Stresemann brought to Germany politically, economically and socially. For example, many responses explained that through loans from the USA the economy was stabilised, and that Germany's international status was improved through the Locarno Treaty. Arguments agreeing with the statement were often less developed, but candidates were able to achieve balanced answers when considering the problems brought by the loans after the Wall Street Crash. Some evaluative judgements were also seen, for example arguing that Stresemann brought short-term benefits to Germany, but problems in the longer-term. Weaker responses often contained knowledge and understanding of the topic but took a narrative approach without direct reference to the question.

Question 12

(a) There were mixed responses to this question, with a number of candidates unsure who Franz von Papen was. Better responses recognised that he was a German Chancellor who resigned due to his lack of support in the Reichstag. These responses were also often aware that he had a role in the appointment of Hitler as Chancellor, and that he then became Vice-Chancellor. Weaker responses sometimes confused von Papen with Rohm, or other members of the Nazi government such as Goebbels.

(b) There were some very good answers seen to this question, with most candidates able to explain at least one reason why Ernst Rohm was a threat to Hitler. The most common answers explained how his role as head of the SA was a direct threat, since he was in charge of an armed force of four million men. Some candidates were also able to explain the problems caused by Rohm's demands for a 'second revolution', or the threat posed to Hitler's ability to gain the support of the army. Some candidates were also aware of the fabricated evidence produced by Himmler which indicated that Rohm was planning a coup. Very few errors were seen, but some responses were limited to identifying these issues, rather than explaining why they posed a threat to Hitler.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, with some candidates able to produce a balanced answer to explain how far Nazi ideas and methods changed over the period 1920 to 1932. On the one side, some responses were able to argue that change was shown through the move from attempting to take power by force, to concentrating on increasing votes in order to pursue a more democratic approach. These responses also sometimes considered the ways that this was achieved, for example through targeting specific groups such as farmers, or through the development of the Nazi propaganda machine. On the other side, candidates explained that certain policies remained consistent throughout the time period, the use of anti-Semitism and demanding the destruction of the Treaty of Versailles cited as examples. Weaker responses often adopted a narrative approach, describing what the Nazis were doing, rather than arguing whether this demonstrated change or continuity. The weakest answers missed the given timeframe and often wrote about changes that were made after the Nazis came to power.

Question 13

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

Question 14

(a) Many candidates struggled with this question since they were able to describe collectivisation but were less able to describe the reaction of the kulaks to the policy. The strongest responses identified that they were against collectivisation, and some were able to provide examples of their actions, such as killing their livestock or burning their crops. Weaker responses lacked focus on the kulaks.

(b) There were some good responses seen to this question, with many candidates able to explain at least one reason why the First Five-Year Plan was important to Stalin. The most common approach was to explain the need for industrialisation in order to make the Soviet Union a stronger country, and that therefore there was a concentration on increasing production of resources such as iron and steel. Another common approach was to consider the Five-Year Plan within the context of Stalin's consolidation of power, and his own political motives for carrying out the plan. Less successful responses tended to describe the plan.

(c) Some very good answers were seen to this question, with candidates using their clear knowledge and understanding of the topic to discuss how successful Stalin was in changing traditional ideas about the roles of women and the family in Soviet society. Most responses concentrated on the roles of women and were confident in assessing at least one side of the argument. The best answers argued that, in reality, there were elements of both change and continuity, with initial changes such as increased employment and a higher divorce rate being rescinded, resulting in a change to a more traditional role for women. Weaker responses were often still able to produce a supported argument on one side, although such answers could have been improved by making attempts to provide balance. Few errors were seen in response to this question.

Question 15

(a) The majority of candidates provided good answers. Candidates were confident in their knowledge that the Ku Klux Klan were an organisation in the American South who discriminated against certain groups such as black Americans and immigrants. Most candidates also knew some of the violent methods that were used, such as the burning of crosses and lynching.

(b) There were some good responses to this question, with most candidates able to explain at least one reason why there was a 'Red Scare' in the 1920s. Strong answers were confident in their knowledge and understanding of the fear of communism spreading to the USA, particularly after the success of the Russian Revolution. An alternative approach seen from candidates was to explain that the 'Red Scare' was also based on anti-immigrant feeling, in particular immigrants coming from poorer Eastern European countries. Some responses also referred to the context of the 1920s, by referencing the number of strikes that were occurring and also violence from some anarchist groups. Few errors were seen, and weaker answers generally accurately identified reasons, but did not go on to explain them.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question, with some achieving a balanced argument considering how far the 1920s were the 'Roaring Twenties', but others lacking focus on the specific question. On one side of the argument, candidates were able to use their knowledge and understanding of the positive elements of the time period, for example the increased freedom and employment of women, to argue that it was the 'Roaring Twenties'. Such responses often also considered the development of the jazz age and the increasing popularity of movies to support this side. When attempting balance, an awareness was shown that the benefits did not apply to the whole of the USA, for example that in rural America women remained in traditional roles, and that other cultural improvements were not available. Weaker responses displayed knowledge and understanding of the period as a whole, but these answers often lacked focus of this specific question.

Question 16

(a) Many candidates were able to display some knowledge about the 'Dust Bowl', although a greater depth of knowledge would have improved many responses. The most common approach was to identify that it was caused by drought and that it involved the soil blowing away. Stronger responses were also able to identify the consequences for farmers, including poverty and the need to leave their farms, in order to find employment elsewhere. Few errors were seen.

(b) Most candidates displayed some understanding of the nature of speculators and speculation, and stronger responses were able to show why they were important in the events of 1929. A common approach was to describe what speculation was, and then to explain that this drove the price of shares up beyond what they were worth, leading to the start of the mass selling on Wall Street. An alternative and equally valid explanation was provided by candidates who explained how speculators borrowed money from the banks to buy shares which they were unable to repay once the stock market crashed, thereby exacerbating the financial consequences of the Crash. Weaker answers were often descriptive and lacked the link to the events of 1929.

(c) This was a well answered question, with candidates often providing balanced explanations of why Roosevelt was able to win the 1932 election. When arguing the importance of the Depression, responses were able to show that the promise of a New Deal appealed to voters who were unemployed and living in poverty. In order to provide balance, Roosevelt's promises were usually contrasted with Hoover's weak response to the Depression, with candidates referencing Hoovervilles, his actions towards the Bonus Marchers, and the laissez-faire approach to the economy. Conclusions tended to be summative, rather than evaluative. Weaker responses could often provide supported explanation on one side but would have benefited from providing balance.

Questions 17 and 18

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Structured Questions

Key messages

Candidates need to read the question very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question and structure their response accordingly.

Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted, so that responses only include details within the time span of the question.

If candidates are asked to compare two given factors or individuals identified in the question, answers should be focused on these specific factors or individuals.

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in continuous prose.

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis.

In **Part (c)**, the strongest responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond stating what has already been written in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important' or 'how successful', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

There were many strong responses, which reflected sound understanding and good knowledge in both the Core and Depth Studies. These responses included a wealth of factual detail and a clear and accurate communication of ideas, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement.

Candidates were able to put their knowledge to good use when answering the **part (a)** questions, where there is no need for background information, explanation is not required and many answered in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

Most **part (b)** questions asked 'Why' something happened or was important. The strongest responses identified and explained the reasons using supporting contextual detail, rather than giving a description of what happened. These strong responses were well-organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Some weaker responses included narratives about the topic, without addressing the question.

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

There were many good quality responses to **part (c)** questions. The most effective responses applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or including information which was not relevant. These strong responses included explanations both for and against the focus of the question and reached a balanced judgement. A valid judgement should avoid repeating points already made in the essay and should try to explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Weaker responses to **part (c)** often provided well organised explanations but only on one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by

including relevant explanations, supported with contextual examples on both sides of the argument, in order to produce a balanced response. Other less successful responses included narratives about the topic, without addressing the question.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was the most popular of the Core Content questions and most candidates answered this question first in the examination.

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates misinterpreted the word 'colonies' and wrote about Germany's territorial losses in Europe, including details such as Alsace Lorraine went to France and West Prussia went to Poland. A number of candidates wrote generally about other terms of the Treaty of Versailles, including the reparations and military terms. The strongest responses demonstrated a good understanding of what happened to Germany's colonies in the Treaty of Versailles, differentiating between those in Africa and Asia, naming specific colonies and stating which country they were awarded to in the Treaty.

(b) The key to this question was clearly explaining what a 'diktat' was in relation to the Treaty of Versailles and why it was important to the Germans. A number of candidates either neglected to write about the 'diktat' or did not understand what it meant and wrote generally about why the terms of the Treaty were important. Others did understand that a 'diktat' was a 'dictated peace' but would have improved their responses by clearly explaining what this meant in the context of the Treaty of Versailles. Strong responses identified that a 'diktat' meant that the Germans had not been allowed to take part in the negotiations at Versailles and thus had no say in the decisions made. In the best responses, two explanations were provided. A variety of examples were used to explain the impact of the 'diktat', including the unfairness of the Treaty, as the Treaty was so harsh and they had agreed to an armistice in November 1918 and did not see themselves as a defeated power. Some included the fact that Wilson's 14 Points led them to believe that they would be treated fairly and this was not the case. Other strong responses stressed the sense of injustice and resentment of Germans towards their government for signing the Treaty ('the November Criminals'), which resulted in political unrest shown through the Kapp Putsch, Munich Putsch and political assassinations in the early 1920s.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. The strongest responses identified specific terms from the Treaty of Versailles and explained why Clemenceau and Lloyd George were satisfied or disappointed with them. For example, Clemenceau aimed for France to be secure against future threats from Germany and wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state. He was disappointed because this did not happen, as he had to compromise with Wilson and Lloyd George and the Rhineland was only demilitarised. Other examples explained were Clemenceau's disappointment with the military clauses and the size of the reparations. Candidates tended to be more confident in explaining why Clemenceau was disappointed with the Treaty and some candidates only gave explanations on his side of the argument. To produce a balanced argument, strong responses also explained Lloyd George's disappointment with the Treaty. Most referred to how Lloyd George wanted Germany to be able to continue to trade with Britain after the war as, previously, Germany had been Britain's second largest trading partner. As a result of the Treaty of Versailles, he was disappointed with the large reparations and the loss of German industrial areas, most citing the loss of control of the coal industry of the Saar region, which would lessen Germany's capacity to trade with Britain, and thus affect Britain's economy. In making a judgement, the majority came to the conclusion that Clemenceau was most disappointed with the Treaty because France had suffered great damage to the landscape and huge loss of life, therefore he wanted the terms to be much harsher on Germany, such as the complete destruction of its armed forces, so that it could

not invade France again, whereas Lloyd George did achieve the reduction of the German navy and was pleased with the additions to the British Empire. Weaker responses devoted much time to explaining the aims of the two men and why they had these aims, without specifying why they were disappointed with the Treaty. Some wrote out all the terms of the Treaty and then, at the end of the response, stated that Clemenceau found them too harsh, without specifically saying why. The best approach was to take a specific term of the Treaty and explain why each of the men were happy or disappointed with the term.

Question 6

This was the second most popular question of the Core Content questions.

(a) This question was well answered, with many candidates being very familiar with German rearmament in the 1930s. Many candidates were able to provide more than the four relevant points required, including the initial secrecy and later openly rearming, the introduction of conscription and the remilitarising of the Rhineland. Most were also secure on the chronology of events. Weaker responses identified fewer points.

(b) A small number of candidates omitted this part question entirely (while often answering the other two parts satisfactorily). Others struggled in their responses. Most were able to identify the anti-communist purpose of the Pact but could not always explain this fully enough. Hitler's hostility to communism was best known, but that of Japan was less understood, with some candidates asserting that Japan was under threat from communist China. The strongest responses explained the common ideological links between the three signatories of the Pact and also identified and explained the imperialistic ambitions of all three powers. These responses often displayed good contextual knowledge, such as the impact of the Spanish Civil War on relations between Germany and Italy, and the way in which Hitler's designs on Austria played into this developing partnership. Some candidates omitted one of the Pact members in their responses, concentrating on Germany's links with either Japan or Italy, but not both. Some described it as a formal military alliance. Where candidates struggled with their knowledge of the Pact, responses took different directions. Several wrote about an anti-communist pact involving Britain, Germany and France (and in some instances, the USA). A small number of responses asserted that Soviet Russia was expanding into Eastern Europe in the 1930s.

(c) This question produced some strong responses. The most successful responses to this question were well organised and identified and explained which was more important - the Nazi Soviet Pact or the Munich Agreement. Most candidates were able to identify two relevant points on either side of the argument, and many were able to support these with convincing explanations. While a few candidates wrote a narrative of the events of 1938-39, most concentrated on 'importance' as the key word in the question and provided a balanced response with sufficient detail and contextual knowledge to attain high marks. The strongest responses, regardless of which agreement they saw as the more important, were able to explain how the Munich Agreement led onto the Nazi-Soviet Pact, especially focusing on Munich's effect on Stalin's thinking. Some candidates were strong on explanations on one side of the question only, but most could provide explanations on both sides and come to a judgement. Some weaker responses still identified relevant points, but explanations would have benefited from the inclusion of firm contextual knowledge. Overall, candidates tended to be rather more secure in their understanding of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Where explanations faltered on the Munich Agreement, there were some common misunderstandings, for example about the extent of what was agreed, with a number of candidates thinking that Britain and France gave Hitler access to the whole of Czechoslovakia, or that, far from this being seen by many as a great success for the policy of appeasement, the western powers ended appeasement at this point because Hitler had demonstrated at Munich that he could not be trusted, rather than after he proved this by taking over the whole of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. A small number of candidates believed that discussions at Munich were being conducted by the League of Nations or that Hitler was testing the League, whereas the League was not involved. The most common misunderstanding on the Nazi-Soviet Pact was the belief that this was a mutual defence pact which would mean that Britain and France would find themselves at war with both Germany and Soviet Russia if they declared war on Germany over an invasion of Poland.

Question 7

(a) This question was well answered. The strongest responses identified four features of the Tet Offensive such as: it occurred during the Tet New Year celebrations; it was a surprise attack;

communist/Vietcong attacks took place across Vietnam; the Americans and the South Vietnamese won back the territory that they had lost; it was seen as a defeat by the US media. A common misconception was that the US embassy in Saigon was captured, while very few candidates mentioned the capture of Hue. Weaker responses did not recognise the Offensive and either saw it as a US attack or an event in Europe during the Cold War.

(b) This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding as to why the Cuban Missile Crisis was important. Strong responses identified and explained two reasons, most commonly, the threat of nuclear war and the respective fortunes of Kennedy and Khrushchev, with Kennedy's reputation enhanced and Khruschev's diminished. For example: 'The crisis did damage to Khrushchev's reputation because although he appeared to be a responsible peacemaker by removing the missiles from Cuba, he appeared to have backed down because, although Kennedy removed the missiles from Turkey, this was done in secret. There were many in the Soviet government who were unhappy with this and the damage it did to the reputation of the Soviet Union. It did lead to Khrushchev's removal from power in 1964'. Weaker responses readily identified the reasons for the importance of the crisis, such as the introduction of the 'Hotline' and the 1963 Test Ban Treaty, but they needed to include contextual details in order to develop their response into an explanation. A small number of candidates confused the Cuban Missile Crisis with the Bay of Pigs invasion and less successful responses contained much narrative and description of the crisis, rather than stressing its importance. It was rare to see responses which examined the impact of the crisis on Cuba.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question as to how far the United States failed to achieve its aims in the Korean War. The strongest responses were from candidates who explained that the original aim of the US was to implement its policy of containment and to remove the North Koreans from the South, but that it subsequently changed its aim to defeating the North. The former aim was achieved because North and South Korea remained separated at the 38th parallel but not the latter, because China's entry into the war forced the US to retreat. Candidates were more confident in explaining how the US contained communism, often including the support of the United Nations. The involvement of the UN was sometimes identified as an aim of the US, partly to show that the UN could succeed where the League had failed and partly because it provided legitimacy for the US cause. The role of General MacArthur featured prominently in many strong responses to good effect. The expansion of the Cold War to Asia was rarely recognised as an unintended consequence of the war in Korea, but many candidates were able to explain that it strengthened, rather than weakened China, and by extension made communism more secure in North Korea. Many responses referred to the human cost of the war, particularly the impact of the war on civilians which was relevant, but this point could have been enhanced by addressing the duration of the war, which was not expected to last for as long as it did, especially after the battle lines had stagnated into stalemate in 1951. A few weaker responses muddled events in Korea with those of Vietnam and some thought that North and South were divided as a result of the war.

Question 8

A small number of candidates answered this question.

(a) Knowledge and understanding were variable in response to this question. Strong responses identified four key elements of the role played by Jaruzelski in Poland in 1981, such as in February 1981 he was Prime Minister of Poland; he had negotiations with Walesa to form a government of understanding; these negotiations broke down; in December he introduced martial law; he arrested Walesa; he arrested thousands of other Solidarity supporters. Weaker responses often confused Jaruzelski with Walesa and wrote about the Solidarity Movement, which lacked relevance. Others often referred to events before or after 1981. It is important to read the question carefully, especially the dates, to ensure that only relevant information is included.

(b) This question was well answered, and most responses were credited with one valid explained reason as to why Soviet policy towards Eastern Europe changed after 1985. Most responses demonstrated a good understanding of the changes that occurred when Gorbachev became leader of the Soviet Union, including the introduction of new policies such as Glasnost and Perestroika. Another creditable explanation revolved around the economically weak state of the Soviet Union and highlighted the problems of the increased costs faced in respect of maintaining control of the satellite states of in Eastern Europe. As a result, they chose to stop propping up communist regimes because it was costing far too much money. The protests of Eastern European peoples due to poor economic conditions, the growth and actions of Solidarity and the tearing down of the

Berlin Wall in 1989 were other factors explained that led to a change in policy towards Eastern Europe after 1985. Some responses would have been improved by the inclusion of contextual detail.

(c) There were many strong responses to this question in which candidates demonstrated a good understanding of events in both Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Most were familiar with the reforms that Nagy wanted to make in Hungary and highlighted that the real threat to Soviet control was the idea that Hungary should leave the Warsaw Pact. They explained that this was a military alliance of communist countries, and it was important for keeping the communist bloc secure and putting down anti-Soviet risings. If one country like Hungary left, it would make all of the communist bloc less secure and could encourage other countries to follow. To produce a balanced response, the threat from Czechoslovakia was explained, including the reforms proposed by Dubcek and the Prague Spring ideas, such as allowing other political parties and free speech, were discussed. The implication of these ideas was a real threat to communism and to Soviet control. The best responses included a valid judgement, with many responses choosing events in Hungary to be the most serious threat because, although the ideas put forward in these two countries were similar, there was a crucial difference. In Hungary it was proposed to leave the Warsaw Pact, and this could seriously weaken Soviet control over Eastern Europe. Whether candidates chose events in Hungary or Czechoslovakia as the greater threat to Soviet control, it was important that responses were supported by contextual knowledge. Weaker responses were usually able to identify events in one or both of the countries, but their responses were limited to a description of events, rather than explaining why the events were a threat to Soviet control in Eastern Europe.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies

(a) This question was well answered and many candidates described what Stresemann did in 1923 to deal with hyperinflation, for example: he ended the passive resistance in the Ruhr; he restarted reparation payments; he burnt the worthless marks; he introduced a new currency, the Rentenmark. A key part of the question was 'in 1923'. A number of responses drifted into 1924 and discussed the Dawes Plan. Others spent time describing the effects of hyperinflation, both of which lacked relevance to the question.

(b) This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding of why the Kapp Putsch took place in 1920. Strong responses identified two reasons most commonly. Firstly, that they hated the Treaty of Versailles and secondly, they wanted to overthrow the Weimar Government and bring back the Kaiser. To develop the first reason into an explanation, strong responses referred to the military terms of the Treaty, especially the restrictions to the size of Germany's armed forces, which had resulted in out of work ex-soldiers joining the Freikorps. Their anger had increased when the government announced that the Freikorps would be disbanded. Details to support the second reason included that they blamed the Weimar Government for signing the Treaty, especially when they believed that the German army had not been defeated and the sense of injustice fuelled the Dolchstoss, as well as the label of the new government as 'November Criminals'. Weaker responses spent much time describing the events of the Kapp Putsch, which was not the focus of the question. Other weak responses confused the Freikorps with the Spartacists.

(c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question in which candidates were able to demonstrate whether the Weimar Republic was stable in the period 1924 to 1929. Arguments for the Weimar Republic being stable revolved around economic prosperity, international acceptance, cultural revival and lack of support for extremist parties. On the other side of the argument, candidates put forward reasons why the Weimar Republic could be considered unstable during this time including nationalists being against joining the League of Nations, traditional Germans seeing the advances in culture as 'moral decline', unemployment still being high and farmers facing problems due to overproduction. The most successful responses included explanations on both

sides of the argument and then came to a valid judgement, with many stating that the Weimar Republic was stable during these years and this 'Golden Age' was enjoyed by many Germans. However, this stability was not built on firm foundations; its economy was built on US loans and if these were withdrawn, which they were, in October 1929, Germany would be in trouble. A number of responses included information from before 1924, including the French occupation of the Ruhr, the economic results of hyperinflation and the Kapp and Munich Putsches, which were all outside the scope of the question. Others included details of how Hitler used the Depression from the Wall Street Crash to rise to power, which also lacked relevance. Weaker responses would have benefited from the inclusion of relevant information to support the statements made.

Question 12

(a) Candidates struggled to name any churchmen and to describe anything specific as to why they opposed the Nazi regime. However, some strong responses named two churchmen and gave reasons why they opposed the Nazi regime. For example, Bishop Galen led a popular protest against the Nazi policies of killing the mentally ill and physically disabled people; Dietrich Bonhoeffer preached against the Nazis and helped Jews escape. Some responses drifted away from the focus of the question and included details of the Concordat with the Catholic Church in 1933.

(b) This question was well answered, and most candidates were very familiar with the reasons why the Nazis persecuted the Roma. Strong responses identified and explained two reasons. Most commonly explained was Hitler's belief that the Aryan race was superior to all others and thus he saw the Roma as an inferior people, a threat to German racial purity. A second creditable reason put forward was that the Nazis regarded the Roma as criminals and vagabonds who were also lazy and did not contribute to German society. Less successful responses drifted from the focus of the question and often wrote much about how Hitler persecuted the Roma, with details of the concentration camps.

(c) There were many strong responses to this question which demonstrated a very good understanding of how far mass rallies were the most important reason why the Nazis were able to keep control of Germany. The best responses identified and explained how mass rallies were important for keeping control, including the huge Nuremberg rallies, the marches, bands, speeches, torchlight processions and flying displays. They emphasised that these were huge emotional events, with people caught up in the atmosphere, and this helped strengthen their loyalty to the Nazi state; these rallies gave them a sense of belonging and convinced them to support Hitler. Responses were more confident explaining other reasons why the Nazis kept control, most commonly citing the fear produced by the 'police state' ordered by Hitler and the role of the SS. The role of the SS was well known and the impact of their activities on the German population was clearly articulated, especially the fact that they dealt with anyone who opposed the Nazis, detained them without charge and often tortured and killed them. Evidence of the role of the different branches of the SS was also seen in responses, such as the Death Head Units and the Waffen. Most candidates were very familiar with other ways in which the Nazis kept control and considered the fear of the Gestapo, the control of the youth population through education and the Hitler Youth, the distribution of radios, control of the media and control of the courts as effective forms of control. Weaker responses, although showing some understanding of the ways in which the Nazis kept control, were characterised by long sections of description, and would have benefited from emphasising how the identified ways helped Hitler keep control.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) This question was very well answered, and most candidates were very familiar with the industries which did not benefit from the boom in the 1920s. Many included details such as the coal industry did not benefit because they suffered from competition from new industries like oil and electricity; the traditional textile industries of cotton and wool suffered from new materials such as rayon. Reference to other industries which suffered including farming, leather and shoemaking also gained credit.

(b) Knowledge and understanding of why the developments outside the United States affected American farming in the 1920s was varied; some wrote about problems inside the United States, rather than outside. Strong responses identified and explained two reasons. The two most common reasons identified were the competition from the highly efficient Canadian wheat producers and the lack of European markets, due to the ending of the First World War. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of supporting factual details.

(c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question, in which candidates were able to demonstrate whether credit was more important than Republican policies in causing the boom of the 1920s. The best responses explained that the widespread availability of credit fuelled a consumer boom, allowing Americans to purchase goods like cars, vacuum cleaners, radios and washing machines on hire purchase schemes which significantly boosted demand and economic growth. This 'buy now pay later' system made previously expensive items accessible to a wider population, helping businesses boost their sales and profits, thus creating new jobs and driving the growth of various industries. Weaker responses usually included details of the meaning of credit but were unable to make a link to increased production and profits for firms to reinvest into their industry. Most candidates were familiar with, and identified at least one of the Republican policies, including laissez-faire, low taxation, tariffs and trusts. The most successful responses explained how the policy caused the boom, rather than just listing the policies. For example, the government were keen to protect domestic industry by placing high tariffs on goods from abroad. As a result, foreign goods became more expensive. These tariffs protected businesses from foreign competition and allowed American companies to grow even more rapidly. The strongest responses gave at least one explanation on each side of the argument and came to a valid judgement. Most agreed that although the Republican policies were important, it was more important that the American people could afford to buy the new consumer goods which were being made, like cars and fridges. Credit enabled large number of Americans to buy these goods, which stimulated industry; it would have been pointless for industries to increase production of goods if Americans could not afford to buy them. A few candidates strayed away from the focus of the question and wrote about other factors prevalent in America which caused the boom, for example industrial strength, advertising and new methods of production.

Questions 16, 17 and 18

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13
Structured Questions

Key messages

- Candidates need to read the questions very carefully to ensure that their responses are relevant. They should note the particular focus of any given question, and structure their answer accordingly.
- Dates given in a question should be noted, so that only relevant material is included in responses.
- Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question. **Part (a)** questions require recall and description. **Part (b)** questions require recall and explanation, and **part (c)** questions require recall, explanation, and analysis.

In **part (c)** questions, the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond restating what has already been written in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important' or 'how successful', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

A significant majority of answers reflected sound understanding and good knowledge supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and were able to put the knowledge they had gathered to good use in the **part (a)** questions, which require recall and description. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach.

The best answers to **part (b)** and **(c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' or which included information which lacked relevance. Candidates were rewarded for the identification of relevant factors, but the best answers were those which went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the exact demands of the question.

A significant number of responses to **part (c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation) but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. However, some conclusions were limited to assertions on 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was stronger than the other. Some of the best answers were able to present two good explanations (one on each side) and a valid reasoned judgement. However, many candidates found that the best route to a valid judgement was one in which they had more than two valid explanations upon which to draw.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

This was a popular question among candidates. Candidates were able to achieve high marks by stating four separate facts related to what happened to the Saar in the Treaty of Versailles. Responses included that it was placed under a League of Nations mandate, and it was occupied by British and French troops for 15 years, after which there would be a plebiscite to decide its future. Some candidates mistakenly thought that

the Saar was ruled by France up to 1935, although there was an understanding that the coalfields were ceded to France up to the date of the plebiscite.

Part (b) was answered well. Consequences focused on the economic and social impact of the Treaty of Versailles up to 1923 such as reparations and inflation on the one hand, and social disorder, because Germans hated Weimar for signing the Treaty, on the other. High quality answers tended to identify two points and explain them, adding supporting evidence. For example, one explanation is that the Treaty had consequences because people strongly opposed it. Terms such as 'disarmament' led to people like ex-soldiers and right wingers being determined to overthrow it. Ex-soldiers formed private armies and in 1920 the Kapp Putsch took place, which aimed at overthrowing the government. A new government was set up headed by Kapp. It was defeated by a general strike, but it made the Weimar Republic very unstable. Less successful responses often just described factors but did not fully explain them.

Part (c) focused on the idea of a league of nations and whether or not it was the most important of Wilson's Fourteen Points. The best answers were characterised by balanced explanations. For instance, on the one hand, it could be argued that Wilson believed in a league of nations because he wanted an organisation that would ensure that, in the future, countries could resolve their differences through negotiation, instead of going to war. He thought this would provide peace for the future. Wilson was an idealist, and this was his most important aim in the negotiations. This can be seen by the fact that he insisted on a league being set up all the way through the negotiations. On the other hand, candidates could explain ways in which other aspects of Wilson's Fourteen Points were meant to prevent war and maintain peace. For instance, disarmament or self-determination. For example, while Britain and France wanted to carve up German colonies, Wilson believed that people in the colonies should have the right to decide their own futures. This is why he insisted that the colonies should be under mandates until they could govern themselves. His belief in self-determination can also be seen in the independence of Czechoslovakia and Poland. References to disarmament could explain its importance by including the impact of the arms race which preceded the First World War and how Wilson was at pains to avoid conflict on that scale again.

Question 6

In **part (a)** most candidates knew a great deal about 'lebensraum'. Many provided four points of detail, often including its aims, a definition and the areas of Europe which the policy targeted.

Candidates knew details of the League of Nations' peacekeeping efforts in the 1930s but did not always apply their knowledge to the question (**part (b)**). There were a number of descriptive responses, but the best answers focused on 'importance'. For instance, this example analyses the failure of the League over the Japanese invasion of Manchuria: 'It showed that while the League could deal with small nations, it was not going to stand up to powerful ones like Japan. Mussolini and Hitler were watching very closely and realised that if the League was going to be this weak, then they would be able to get away with similar actions.' An alternative explanation argued that the League lost credibility when handling the Abyssinian crisis and how this had a significant impact on events in 1936 and 1937, such as the formation of the Rome Berlin Axis, the reoccupation of the Rhineland and the Spanish Civil War.

In **part (c)**, candidates gained credit for explaining points for and against the proposition that Britain should not have appeased Germany. There were some strong answers which explained the stated factor; it simply persuaded Hitler that Britain would never stand up for France and that he could get away with anything. This is why he went ahead and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia. He knew Britain would not act. The policy showed Hitler how weak Britain was. It did not prevent war; it just postponed it for a number of months. On the other side of the argument responses explained, for example, that Britain's policy was the right one. Britain would have struggled to fight a war in 1938, as its army was not ready. Britain was still recovering from the Depression and could not afford a war and was struggling to rearm. The Munich Agreement meant that there was no war in 1938, and this gave Britain time to rearm. The best responses concluded with a valid judgement such as, 'Although most people in Britain were relieved when the Munich Agreement avoided war, it really achieved little. Britain's appeasement had been going on for years over the Rhineland and Anschluss, and all the time Hitler's view that Britain would do nothing was strengthened. Hitler only carried out his policy of aggression in the 1930s because of appeasement.'

Question 7

The best answers to **part (a)** mentioned that Germany would be divided into four zones – American, French, British and Soviet – this also applied to Berlin. Apart from the setting up of a UN, there was knowledge that Eastern Europe should be seen as a 'Soviet sphere of influence', Germany would be denazified, war criminals would be punished, and Poland's eastern border would be further west.

Quality responses to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question, which focused on the importance of the Berlin Blockade. Candidates identified several causal factors, such as Stalin's defeat, the setting up of two states in a divided Germany, and the confirmation that the Cold War had entered a more intense phase. The best answers identified two points and explained them, using supporting evidence. An interesting and creditworthy answer stated that the Blockade 'was important because it was a victory for the West and showed that western countries would stand up to Stalin. The Blockade was defeated by the West's airlift, which brought into Berlin enormous quantities of supplies. There was nothing Stalin could do about this unless he was ready to shoot down the planes. This would have led to war and Stalin did not want to go that far.'

The aim in **part (c)** was to write a balanced answer and explain how far the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan had similar aims. There were many answers which showed detailed knowledge, but this was not always applied to the precise demands of the question. Candidates would benefit from constructing responses which are carefully organised, separating similarities and differences with leading sentences which signal which aspect is the focus of the argument. For similarities, candidates identified factors such as that they were both aimed at stopping communism from spreading, they both were aimed at helping countries threatened by communism or that they were both aimed at containment. Identified differences included that the Truman Doctrine was aimed at stopping communism anywhere in the world, while the Marshall Plan was aimed at European countries. Or that the Marshall Plan was aimed at strengthening countries economically, while the Truman Doctrine also aimed at driving communists out by force if necessary. Additionally, the Marshall Plan aimed to improve the US economy, but the Truman Doctrine was about stopping communism. Better responses went beyond description to provide explanations of some of these stated factors, although many one-sided answers were seen. The very best responses provided both sides and also substantiated a judgment to the hypothesis given in the question, rather than just restating points already made in their answer. For example, 'Although there were some differences in their aims, there was a fundamental similarity that was more important than all the differences. This is that they were both aimed at the containment of communism, which the USA feared more than anything else at that time.'

Question 8

Candidates were secure in their knowledge of Vietnamisation in **part (a)**. References to Nixon's policy of withdrawing from the war by handing over the fighting to the South Vietnamese military, and that the policy was ultimately seen as a failure when communists took over South Vietnam, were among the valid answers seen.

Part (b) asked for an explanation of the opposition to the Vietnam War in the United States and attracted some knowledgeable and well-argued answers. Here is one example how an identified point about reactions to the My Lai massacre can form the basis of a good explanation: 'There was opposition because of the terrible things happening in Vietnam. Americans saw women and children being killed and having their homes destroyed. They saw prisoners being tortured and US soldiers suffering from terrible wounds. This was made worse when US troops killed hundreds of innocent civilians at My Lai. People in America began asking 'what are we fighting for?'

The **part (c)** question enabled candidates to construct valid arguments about the relative success of Kennedy and Khrushchev in handling the Cuban Missile Crisis; on one side there was an appreciation that Kennedy handled it much better. He rejected advice to attack Cuba as this could have led to a nuclear war between the US and the Soviet Union. He came up with the idea of a blockade, which allowed Khrushchev and the Soviet Union a way out without looking as if they had been defeated. He managed to get rid of the threat of the missiles without any fighting at all. This was major achievement. On the other hand, candidates presented the view that Khrushchev had some important successes which shows he handled the crisis very well. The US had to make some very important promises, such as taking their missiles out of Turkey, and promising not to invade Cuba. This meant that a communist Cuba remained off the coast of the USA, which was a major success. In the best answers, judgements included valid arguments in favour of both leaders, and typically they took the view Kennedy was more successful because he won the removal of Soviet missile bases from Cuba in exchange for the removal of some obsolete US missiles from Turkey, having forced Khrushchev to back down once the quarantine was in place. Kennedy had stood firm despite pressure from the US military to take stronger action, while Khrushchev's failure seemed complete when he was forced from office.

The best answers to both **(b)** and **(c)** questions were from candidates who organised their extended writing so that each argument included a point, an explanation, and some accurate evidence in support.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

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

Question 10

The best answers to **part (a)** provided included details that the Turkish machine gunners had a direct line of fire on the troops when they landed, that some of the Allied troops were dropped off in the wrong place, and that they were faced with steep cliffs preventing much progress, so could not move off the beach. Other points included the intense heat and lack of water.

Candidates provided largely generalised information about why the Home Fronts were important during the First World War in **part (b)**, although the best responses focused precisely on explaining two reasons. Among those reasons were the importance of producing food and munitions, of counteracting the effects of blockades and of maintaining civilian morale.

In answering **part (c)**, candidates needed to focus on the two named factors. Many answers referenced the impact of the Battle of Jutland, which allowed Britain to remain in control of the North Sea and continue the Blockade. These identified factors became explanations when placed in the wider context of the war and why the Blockade contributed to Germany's defeat. The best responses also showed an appreciation of the importance of convoys to the war at sea, because Britain imported 60 per cent of its food. Candidates recognised that thousands of tonnes of merchant shipping, which carried food imports, were sunk by German submarines. Food shortages could have easily led to Britain's defeat. The convoy system was started in 1916 and was designed to protect merchant ships. Merchant ships crossed the Atlantic in large numbers and were escorted by battleships and sometimes aircraft. This made it harder for U-boats to attack individual ships and sometimes depth charges were dropped to destroy the U-boats. This drastically reduced the number of ships lost and meant that civilians were fed. If this system had not been beaten, then Britain could have been forced out of the war.

Question 11

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**. Credit was given for the details of 'Strength Through Joy', which included a range of provision for leisure activities in Nazi Germany. Credit was given for references to propaganda, maintaining the fitness of the population and saving up for a Volkswagen car.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were unsure about the Four-Year Plan of 1936 which focused on the war economy, self-sufficiency and rearmament. An example of a good response argued that 'The Four-Year Plan was important to Hitler because he was planning for war. He wanted Germany to be great and to recover territory lost at Versailles, as well as to go on and make further conquests. He needed well-equipped armed forces for this, and the Plan was to help rearmament. Factories were built to manufacture weapons and munitions.' The best responses included another explanation, for example about autarky.

Part (c) was characterised by some unbalanced answers. There was often good knowledge of the police state and instruments of repression, and many candidates achieved good marks when they went beyond descriptive knowledge and attempted to explain 'impact'. Apart from the machinery of the police state, other factors such as the effectiveness of propaganda and employment policies (when related to the idea that popular support might enhance control) were also credited. Better answers explained both sides of the argument, and the best ones included a judgement which went beyond restating points already made. The question invited an analysis of the dangers posed by resistance to Nazi control; identified factors most often mentioned were opposition from youth groups, individuals such as Niemoller and other representatives of religious groups, and the members of the 1944 Bomb plot. Treatment of this side of the argument was often descriptive, and some responses would have been improved by giving more time to the assessment of the extent of the threat they presented in context. An example of a valid analysis in one of the strongest responses, which built on explanation of both sides of the question, argued that 'There was some opposition to Hitler like that from some leading churchmen and some youth groups, but while it was never completely wiped out, it never really threatened Hitler and the Nazis. The SS and the Gestapo dealt with most of the opposition and there was no danger of Hitler being overthrown.'

Question 12

Candidates in **part (a)** described the Edelweiss Pirates in some detail. Credit was given for their attitudes or views, actions and how they were dealt with by the Nazis.

Responses in **part (b)** often included a great deal of general description about Hitler Youth. Better answers explained 'importance' and included some context. The best answers contained two explained points and these typically dealt with boys and girls separately, their indoctrination and importance to the future of the Third Reich.

Some candidates struggled to provide a balanced response to the **part (c)** question about the changing role of women in Nazi Germany. Candidates wrote most confidently about how life changed significantly for women because of the war. Good answers argued how women had been encouraged to stay at home before the war but were subject to conscription from 1943 and made to work in factories and on farms. These answers also often included that the hours were long, the work was hard, and, coupled with this, that they still had to feed their families in the face of ever worsening food shortages. On the other side of the hypothesis, features of continuity were less well known. However, an example of a thoughtful answer on this side of the argument stated that 'I do not think that the attitudes of Hitler towards women ever really changed. He always believed that women's role was in the home. He believed women were gentler and more emotional than men and did not belong in workplaces. Even during the war, he banned them from combat roles in the armed forces. They were only allowed auxiliary roles.'

Question 13

Candidates struggled when answering **part (a)** and providing details of the 'Soviets'. Many responses included general references to workers councils. Better answers included information such as their activities in 1905 when they organised strikes, or in 1917 when they shared power with the Provisional Government. Credit was also given for the way they protected the interests of the workers in the cities and were elected by workers and soldiers.

The reasons why Lenin withdrew Russia from the First World War were explained well in **part (b)**; typically, candidates referenced domestic issues such as 'Land and Bread', as well as the need for peace. An example of a good response was that Lenin had no choice. There was war weariness across Russia, with most people against the war. On the battlefield, the Russian army was being badly defeated, and soldiers were deserting. In these conditions, it would have been impossible to carry on with the war.

It was rare to read a poor answer to **part (c)**; candidates knew a great deal about the Russian Civil War and were able to balance the divisions amongst the Whites with the strengths of the Red Army. The best answers provided an explanation of both sides and a valid judgement in conclusion which directly addressed the question. For example: 'The Whites were divided, and they had little in common with each other. But this only mattered because the Bolsheviks were the opposite of this. They were united, well-disciplined and under the clear leadership of Trotsky. He ensured that the soldiers were fed well, and he had a clear strategy. It was because of these factors that the divisions in the White mattered so much.'

Question 14

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

Question 15

In **part (a)**, candidates were sometimes unclear about the tariffs introduced in the 1920s, and responses, although including valid points on protecting US industries and taxing imports so Americans would buy domestic products, were often rather general in nature. Better answers adopted a more specific approach and also included information on how they were part of Republican policies to increase prosperity, referencing specific tariffs such as the 1922 Fordney-McCumber tariff, which made imported foods more expensive.

Part (b) asked about why Republican governments followed laissez-faire policies. The best responses explained two reasons. An example of the type of commonly seen explained reason was, 'Republican politicians like Hoover believed in 'rugged individualism'. This was a belief in being self-reliant and sorting your problems out yourself, rather than depending on the government or others to do it for you. It claimed that success in life was determined by the individual themselves and not by other factors.' Some candidates

included knowledge of the immediate context, referencing the 1920s boom, which Republicans used as evidence that laissez-faire policies worked successfully.

For **part (c)**, it was important to balance whether all American industries prospered during the boom of the 1920s. Candidates were most confident when writing about new industries which did well, such as the car industry, which grew enormously and employed half a million workers. It also helped other industries because it needed glass, rubber and leather. The building and construction industry did very well because roads were needed, as well as new factories and offices. People also demanded to be provided with electricity, and this provided lots of jobs. The treatment of the impact of the boom on old industries was, typically, less strong in candidates' responses. However, some responses did provide sound material on this, such as on the coal industry, which did not do well in this period. Responses stated that other sources of power such as oil and electricity were becoming more popular and the demand for coal went down. Soon wages were cut, and pits were closed. Farming also struggled. It was over-producing, and prices and profits fell. Many small farmers had to sell up. Strong answers could argue from both sides, although it was more common to read unbalanced answers to this question. A valid judgement might have drawn the conclusion that new industries were emerging and would prosper at the expense of older industries, which had little future in the longer term, such as coal or cotton textiles. Americans were moving on, and those manufacturers which adapted to the demands of people during the boom of the 1920s for products such as those made from synthetic materials, were bound to succeed.

Question 16

Candidates knew a great deal about the 'Roaring Twenties' in **part (a)** and were able to describe many social, economic and cultural features, including the perception of people who lived through it that there was a sense of newness and a break with the past.

There was good knowledge about the reasons why Prohibition was repealed in **part (b)**, with many detailed responses explaining not only the economic drawbacks, but also the rise in corruption and lawbreaking as gangsters produced and supplied alcohol.

Part (c) proved a challenging question for some candidates. They knew a great deal about both political and religious intolerance in the 1920s and were able to describe in detail the Monkey Trial, the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, the Red Scare and the Sacco and Vanzetti case. The key was to address importance in the context of the USA at that time. On the one hand, political intolerance mattered because there was a Red Scare, which was a fear of communism. This was caused by Russia becoming communist. Some people thought that immigrants coming from Eastern Europe and Russia would spread communism and un-American ideas. People thought that American values were under threat. This was important because it led to race riots and many immigrants being persecuted and treated unfairly. On the other hand, religious intolerance also mattered because many people in America, especially in rural areas, believed the bible literally. They believed that God had made the world in six days. However, schools were teaching the theory of evolution, which was completely rejected by the fundamentalists. In southern states, laws were passed banning the teaching of evolution and a teacher was found guilty of breaking the law. The best responses included both of these sides of the argument, and also a valid judgement which went beyond a repetition of previous points.

Questions 17 and 18

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21
Document Questions

Key messages

- Candidates should read all the sources before answering any of the questions and take time to familiarise themselves with what the sources say/show. This can be a help in answering each of the questions.
- Candidates should ensure that they answer the question. If the question asks whether they are surprised by something in a source, candidates should remember to say 'yes' or 'no' and explain why. If the question asks why someone said something, reasons why should be given. Some candidates did not provide direct answers.
- Questions about cartoons tend to be about what the cartoon means, and not just what it shows. Rather than just describing the cartoon, candidates should be trying to interpret it.
- When using source content in an answer, it should be given in full. Using ellipses could leave unclear the point the candidate is trying to make.

General comments

A large majority of the candidates responded to the twentieth century option but the characteristics of the answers on the two options were similar. Contextual knowledge is needed to understand the sources, and to help in explaining answers, and most candidates showed that they had the necessary grasp of the topic, though there were occasions where a determination to use some knowledge hindered the consideration of what the source actually said. It is worth remembering that all the questions are about the sources.

The strengths displayed in the answers were comprehension of written sources, and using source content in making comparisons. Although many candidates interpreted cartoons effectively, there were instances where some or all of a cartoon's features were missed or misunderstood. A number of candidates struggled with source evaluation. When the reliability/utility of a source was the focus of a question, some responses were based solely on the nature of the source provenance. Whilst better candidates used cross reference to contextual knowledge or other sources to check claims made in the given source, many responses would have been improved by analysing, in context, the possible purposes of the source's author as a means of testing reliability.

On the part (e) question, keeping the following points in mind should help candidates in their responses:

- The question is about how the sources can be used to test a hypothesis, rather than whether the hypothesis is accurate or not.
- The given hypothesis must be tested, rather than a different or modified version.
- Testing the hypothesis requires use of the sources. This means selecting specific points from the sources that show whether or not they support the hypothesis.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

(a) Sources A and B provided plenty of examples of agreements and disagreements, so whether or not candidates were able to recognise them depended on comprehension of what the sources were saying. Most answers managed at least one valid comparison. There were other examples where the answer just summarised Source A, then Source B, with a conclusion asserting

agreements or disagreements, without directly matching content from the sources. There was an overall summative disagreement on who was responsible for the move towards war between Austrian and Prussia, and the best answers included this.

(b) The key to interpreting the cartoon was secure contextual knowledge, recognising that it referred to the run-up to the Austro-Prussian War and depicted the Prussian alliance with Italy. A small number of candidates were able to explain all the features of the cartoon and thereby identify the main message – that Italy and Prussia were making a mistake by going to war with Austria as they would lose. In other responses, Italy was often left out, and sub-messages on Prussia alone were identified. A few candidates just described the surface features that the cartoon showed.

(c) There was a basic difference between Sources D and E on who was held responsible for bringing about war between Austria and Prussia, and for almost all candidates who identified this, the difference made either one source or the other surprising. More candidates could have taken the next step of considering the provenance of the sources and explaining why this would make the difference unsurprising. The weakest answers neglected to identify the essential difference and so struggled to explain whether or not they were surprised, though there were many unexplained assertions.

(d) Although most answers agreed that William's account could not be trusted, this was generally on the basis that it was intended to be seen by the British, so clearly would intend to mislead. A number of responses would have benefited from exploring this further. Attempts to use cross-reference to contextual knowledge to test William's claims would have improved many responses. Answers tended just to assert that these were known to be true or false.

(e) This question was answered well. Candidates found the hypothesis straightforward and were able to use the evidence in the sources to test it. As always, the quality of answers was determined by the effectiveness of source use; that is, the identification of specific references from the sources that indicated whether Austria was or was not to blame for the war.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 2

(a) Although the sources offered plenty of agreements and disagreements, candidates seemed to struggle to make valid comparisons. Many responses did manage to find examples of both agreements and disagreements, but even these answers tended also to include some attempted comparisons that did not work properly. Many responses would have been improved by the establishment of a proper basis for comparison and the presence of a common criterion between the sources. For example, answers might state that the sources disagreed about Lloyd George because Source A says he preferred private meetings of heads of governments, whilst Source B says he did not feel strongly about the League. Rather than a disagreement, this constitutes two different pieces of information about Lloyd George. There were also responses in which the misunderstanding of one source prevented valid comparisons from being made. Many candidates dealt with the sources separately, summarising one, then the other, and then asserting agreements and disagreements, without showing how content from each of the sources matched/mismatched with what was in the other.

(b) Successfully judging whether or not there were similarities between the two cartoons depended on being able to interpret them properly, and for some candidates this proved challenging. Most were able to understand Source C, but many struggled with Source D, seeing Wilson and concluding that there was a message about the importance of the USA joining/not joining the League. Some candidates managed a valid comparison, although some of these fell short of complete understanding of both sources – for example, that both cartoons showed that the League was interested in maintaining peace. Though true, this missed the more important point that Source C suggested the League would succeed in achieving this, whilst Source D indicated that it would fail. The best responses saw this difference but also detected that there was a basic difference in the opinions of the cartoonists about the League, with Source C favourable towards it and Source D sceptical.

(c) A relatively small number of better answers identified and explained the cartoonist's full message. Most responses showed some understanding of the cartoon and provided sub-messages from it, for example, that the League was not bringing peace. Stronger responses understood that 'Affairs

of the World' on the side of the cart, together with the title of the cartoon, indicated that the League was putting these affairs before the achievement of peace; this meant that other features of the cartoon – the horse, the signpost – would all fit properly into the interpretation. Not understanding this tended to limit other responses to dealing with sub-messages.

(d) Here the question was asking why the Italian delegate said what he did to the British ambassador. The response, therefore, had to provide a reason or reasons. A number of candidates neglected to provide this and wrote instead about events going on at the time, or summarised what Source F said, but without giving a reason. The most straightforward way to avoid this is to begin each answer with words taken from the question itself – here this would be 'The Italian delegate said this to the ambassador because...'. Most reasons were taken from the words of the source, with the idea that the Italian delegate wanted to tell the ambassador something – for example, that Italy was being prevented by the League from expanding. Better answers noted the context of October 1923 and suggested that the reason was that the Corfu crisis has just occurred. The best idea was to see the delegate's purpose, perhaps to put pressure on the British not to interfere with Italy's plans for expansion. A few candidates struggled with the context and thought that the source had something to do with the Abyssinian crisis.

(e) Some good responses were seen but a good number of candidates appeared to struggle with this question. The 'early critics' referred to in the hypothesis seemed to deflect some candidates away from focusing on whether or not the League was too weak. Sometimes this produced answers that moved on to what appeared to be a different hypothesis – whether or not the League was a failure. Also, source use was often too limited, or it was missing from responses. In testing the hypothesis, answers must show how the content of the sources either offers support or challenges it. Thus, if arguing, for example, that Source B shows that the League was too weak, the answer must select and use something from the source that actually shows the weakness – such as saying that the League could not make member states take action, or that it was weak because it faced the growing power of nationalism. Specific and relevant references to the sources such as these, which properly tested the hypothesis, were seen in better responses. Many candidates showed that they were capable of using the sources properly in finding material on both sides of the hypothesis.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Document Questions

Key messages

Candidates should plan their answers before writing them. This will help lead to focused, relevant and well-organised responses. When candidates start writing their answers, they should know what they want to say.

A direct response to the question in the first sentence of the answer should be made, for example 'He made this speech then because...', 'Source D does not prove that Mussolini was lying because...', 'These two sources disagree because...'. Responses can then move on to reasons, explanation and argument.

Candidates need to read the questions through carefully and decide which ones require an evaluation of the sources. Proper evaluation constitutes using relevant knowledge or cross reference to other sources to support arguments.

When quotations are used in answers, they must be given in full. When ellipses are used the quotation often loses its meaning and relevance.

When answering the final question, candidates must test the hypothesis given in the question and refer to key parts of the sources that support and clinch their arguments.

Candidates should use their knowledge of the topic to help them interpret and evaluate the sources.

General comments

A large majority of the candidates opted for the twentieth century option. Nearly all candidates understood the requirements of the paper and only a very small number struggled with the language of the sources. The majority of candidates demonstrated sound contextual knowledge and a good range of source skills. Many candidates interpreted and evaluated the sources well, although some struggled with comparing sources in **2(a)**, and with explaining why sources disagreed in **1(a)**. The final question in both options showed that some candidates were not sure how to use the sources to support their answers.

Very few candidates failed to complete all five questions and only a very small number attempted both options in error. One general weakness was the excessive length of many answers. Some candidates wrote at great length about many aspects of the sources, rather than producing focused answers that were direct and concise. Stronger answers tended to be provided by candidates who had clearly thought about the questions and planned their material before responding. This was clear from the opening sentences of their answers which directly addressed the questions. The rest of their answers provided relevant supporting analysis and argument.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

(a) The best answers were based on a careful reading of the question. It is about why the two sources disagree, rather than how they disagree. These answers used the background information and relevant knowledge to explain that both sources were announcements made on the day the Franco-Prussian War began. Having established this, they then explained the purpose of both the French government and William I. Slightly less successful answers just used the context as an explanation of why they disagree. A number of candidates neglected to read the question carefully and just explained what the disagreements between the sources were.

(b) A reasonable number of candidates showed understanding of the two cartoons and explained that the cartoonists would not have agreed. They understood that, in Source C, 'Death' is Napoleon's friend. The clear suggestion is that Napoleon was responsible for the carnage shown and for war, famine and ruin. In Source D, 'Death' is pleased with Bismarck, who is shown to be responsible for the war and the killing. A number of candidates suggested an alternative reading of Source D – that it is predicting a disaster for Prussia and Bismarck. This interpretation was credited. The remaining candidates often understood parts of the cartoons (sub-messages) but were unable to construct valid overall interpretations. This was sometimes due to not using the information provided. This led some candidates to not recognise Napoleon in Source C and Bismarck in Source D.

(c) Good answers used the content of the two sources to explain that they disagree over who was to blame for the war. Source E contains Bismarck's claim that he cleverly engineered the war, while making it look as if France was the aggressor. Source F, on the other hand, clearly makes France responsible for the war. These answers took Source E at face value to argue that it does, therefore, make Source F surprising. The best answers, however, focused on evaluating Source E. They explained that E is from Bismarck's memoirs, published nearly thirty years later. In them, Bismarck was trying to show how he planned the unification of Germany, and how his manipulating France into declaring war was part of his plan. These candidates used this to argue that Source E does not necessarily make Source F surprising because Bismarck's account cannot be trusted. Weaker answers argued that both sources say that France was to blame, while others selected and tried to compare isolated details from the two sources. Some candidates did all the hard work with the sources but did not go on to address the issue of whether Source E makes F surprising.

(d) Candidates who answered this question well used their understanding of the context to explain Bismarck's purpose – to make France believe that Prussia had plans for a war. Almost as good, were those answers that explained that Bismarck's claims that he did not want a war with France were false. Weaker answers focused on the logic of some of Bismarck's claims in Source G, for example, it would not be a good idea to go to war with a good trading partner, while others just used the provenance of the source, for example, he would lie to a journalist.

(e) This question was answered quite well. A good number of candidates were able to explain how Sources A, D and E can be used to support the hypothesis, while Sources B, C, F and G can be used to refute the hypothesis. It is important that candidates make clear for each source they use, (i) which source they are referring to, (ii) which side of the argument that source is on, and (iii) how that source is supporting or disagreeing with the hypothesis given in the question. This last step was achieved by using a key part of the relevant source, for example, 'Source A states that Prussian attempts to make a Prussian prince the King of Spain were a threat to France and the general balance of power in Europe' and 'Source F tells us that France unexpectedly declared war.' There were some weaker answers where candidates did not use the sources so effectively or did not use the sources at all.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to find and explain at least one agreement between the two sources, for example, Mussolini was sure the League would not act, and Italy faced economic problems. The

sources agree in several ways, but a number of candidates explained just one agreement. Many candidates found it harder to find valid disagreements. Some attempts were invalid, for example it cannot be argued that the sources disagree over why Mussolini invaded by stating that Source A says it was because of the lack of rewards after the First World War and that Source B says it was the defeat at the Battle of Adowa. The problem with this is that both sources give the peace treaties of 1919 as a reason. It is also important to understand that disagreements need more explanation. An agreement can simply be identified, for example, 'The two sources agree that Mussolini wanted to develop Abyssinia.' However, both sides of a disagreement need to be explained, for example, 'Source A says that Abyssinia was right for economic development, but Source B disagrees because it says Abyssinia was poor and without raw materials.' The best answers made point by point comparisons of the two sources, but some other responses summarised each source in turn, without identifying any particular agreements or disagreements. Another approach which was problematic was to list two or three points from one source and then claim a comparison with a list of two or three points from the other source. The approach which always works best is to go through the sources highlighting or underlining agreements and disagreements and then writing about each one separately. Some candidates tried to compare the overall messages of the two extracts, but this led to many referring to most of the points in the sources and not producing a clear and concise comparison such as: 'Source A does emphasise psychological motivations and Mussolini's need for 'a triumph and glory', while Source B focuses much more on Italy's internal problems.'

(b) This question produced many good answers. These responses used the date of the source and what Mussolini is saying to argue that he must have been speaking to the Italian people about the intended invasion of Abyssinia planned for the next day. This led them to use the content and tone of the speech to argue that he was either trying to persuade the people to support the invasion or he was trying to justify it. There is much in the source that can be used as support for the idea of justification. Mussolini refers to 'injustices' that have been inflicted on Abyssinia such as the peace treaties of 1919, and the fact that Abyssinia is 'barbarian' and 'unworthy'. The best answers took a further step and inferred from the attempt at justification and the reference to 'millions of Italians marching in unity', that he was trying to persuade them to support the forthcoming invasion. Among the weaker answers, some explained the context (some immediate and some general) but did not make any valid use of the content of Source C. Others used the content of the source but failed to relate it to the impending invasion. The weakest answers either paraphrased the source or neglected to use their answers as reasons for Mussolini making the speech. It is important when answering questions that candidates relate what they are writing to the question being asked.

(c) The best answers explained how Sources D and E differ and then used their contextual knowledge, evidence from other sources or the provenance of one of the sources to evaluate at least one of the sources. The most straightforward way to do this was to use the fact that the Italians had carried out a terrible, brutal attack on the Abyssinians (either from Source F or the candidate's knowledge) to confirm that Mussolini was lying. Other answers explored the possibility that Mussolini was 'sugar coating' what he told the Grand Council to persuade it to support his future actions over Abyssinia. Some candidates tried to use the provenance of Source D by arguing that Badoglio would know what was happening because he was an experienced and senior soldier. These attempts were often quite generic in approach and not so convincing. Another way to provide a very strong answer was to explain that the two men are actually saying the same thing, but Mussolini is hiding what he means. There are hints of this when he talks about 'natural expansion' and not blocking the expansion of Fascist Italy. Candidates explained that this suggests that he probably meant the same as Badoglio in Source D. Most candidates were able to use appropriate parts of the two sources to explain how they differ and as proof that Mussolini was lying, for example, 'the complete destruction of the Abyssinian army and the total conquest of Abyssinia' in Source D, compared to 'no question of territorial conquests' in Source E. Better answers of this type also explained how the two men also appear to agree in places, but they did not go as far to suggest that fundamentally the two are saying the same thing. The least successful answers tried to compare the two sources but chose parts of Sources D and E that did not give agreements or disagreements. Other answers worked hard with the sources but missed the opportunity to address the issue of whether Mussolini was lying.

(d) A majority of candidates understood that the cartoon is criticising Mussolini and the Italians. They were able to explain how the cartoonist is claiming that Mussolini was a callous murderer who did not care about the suffering he was causing. A reasonable number of candidates went further and focused on the text below the cartoon. Many suggested that Mussolini is being shown to be a hypocrite. They explained that he is describing Abyssinians as 'uncivilised savages', while acting

as a savage himself. Demonstrating understanding of this led to good marks. To achieve a stronger response, candidates needed to explain how details of the illustration work with the text under the source to make a mockery of Mussolini. The cartoonist is not just saying what a dreadful person Mussolini is, he is also making fun of him. The best answers explained two points about the cartoon's message: Mussolini is an uncivilised savage, the Abyssinians are not. Some candidates wrote at length about the cartoon being a criticism of the League of Nations, while a few others attempted to argue that the cartoonist is showing how primitive Abyssinia was. However, it is clear that the cartoon is a criticism of Mussolini.

(e) A good number of candidates were able to use the sources properly to explain how some of them support the hypothesis and some do not. Most candidates knew which sources fell into which category but not all of them were able to use the sources in a valid way. It is important that candidates make clear for each source they use, (i) which source they are referring to, (ii) which side of the argument that source is on, and (iii) how that source is supporting or disagreeing with the hypothesis given in the question. The last stage is the one at which a number of candidates have difficulty. The best answers used key phrases from sources that clearly supported their argument. These were given as quotations from the sources or close paraphrases. For example, Source B supports the claim that Mussolini invaded Abyssinia because he thought it was uncivilised by stating that he tried to win over Italians to the idea of a conquest of Abyssinia by claiming it was their mission to help the country progress from its primitive state. On the other hand, several sources suggest other reasons for the invasion. Source B suggests that Mussolini wanted to 'turn the attention of Italians away from the dreadful state of their own country', while in Source C he claims Italy was let down badly after the First World War. Weaker answers referred to the sources generally and did not select key passages from them. It is important that candidates use the sources separately, rather than grouping them and making general claims about each group. It is possible that some individual sources can be used to support both sides of the issue. It will always be possible to use the set of sources to support both sides of the argument. Candidates should not stop after they have used sources on one side.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23
Document Questions

Key messages

- All candidates should read through the background information and all the sources before attempting to answer any of the questions. This should give them an understanding of the main focus of the paper and the range of perspectives under consideration. This understanding should then inform all of their answers and help them to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question being asked. For example, responses needed to address whether Source D made Source E surprising in **Question 2(c)** and the issue of usefulness in **Question 2(d)**. Candidates should directly address the question in the very first sentence of their answer, for example, 'Source D does/does not make Source E surprising because...' or 'Source F is useful to a historian studying the Hoare-Laval Pact because ...'.
- Nearly all scripts included responses to all five questions on the chosen option. Some spent too long on **Question 2(a)**, leaving insufficient time later on to answer **Question 2(e)** effectively.
- For **Question (e)** on both the nineteenth and twentieth century options, candidates must ensure that the sources form the basis of the answer. They should avoid a general commentary using their own knowledge in response to the question asked. Candidates must engage with the content of the sources, and it must be made explicitly clear whether it is being used to agree or disagree with the given statement. Answers must explain how the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question. Candidates should also ensure they make it clear which source is under consideration by referring to it by its letter and by explicit reference to its content. This could, for example, be in the form of a quote or by relaying what can be seen in an image. It is crucial that candidates use the sources to both support **and** challenge the given hypothesis. More than one side of the argument needs to be addressed.
- If quotations from the sources are used, and this was particularly useful in answers to **Questions 2(a)** and **2(e)**, candidates should not use an abbreviated form of quotation that misses out some of the words and replaces them with ellipsis points. The words that are used must make sense and support the point the candidate wants to make, so giving the quotation in full is crucial.

General comments

A large majority of the scripts were on the twentieth century option. There were too few responses on the nineteenth century option for meaningful comments to be made. Most candidates completed all five questions. There were very few instances of rubric errors where candidates attempted both the nineteenth and twentieth century options. In general, the sources were understood well, and candidates demonstrated a good level of contextual knowledge with which to support their answers, where appropriate. Successful source evaluation was not frequently seen. This was required on **Questions 2(c)** and **2(d)** but was rarely attempted. Most responses were based on source content taken at face value. Questions asking for interpretation and comparison of source content were generally answered better than those requiring evaluation.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 2

(a) The two sources under examination offered several agreements and disagreements of detail, and most candidates managed to successfully match the sources for at least one of these. Better answers provided examples both of agreements and of disagreements. In less successful responses, some candidates summarised the content of the first source and then continued 'However...', before going on to summarise the content of the second; these responses would have been improved by the explicit matching of details from the content of both sources. On an agreement or disagreement question such as this, candidates must match 'like with like' – in essence, there must be a common criterion on which the comparison is based. Some answers, in attempting a comparison, put content from both sources together but the material used did not constitute a genuine match. The best answers looked beyond the detail of the two sources and considered instead the opinions or points of view of the two authors, noting that the writer of Source A was positive about the Hoare-Laval Pact and viewed it as a lost opportunity for peace, whilst the writer of Source B viewed it negatively and saw it as a lost opportunity to stand up to aggression or an aggressor.

(b) This question produced many strong responses. When candidates are asked about the message of a source they should always try and consider the author's voice or opinion; in this source, the cartoonist is critical of the Hoare-Laval Pact and condemns the actions of the British and French for their involvement with it. The strongest responses recognised this and were able to support their conclusion by reference to the cartoon. There was little misinterpretation seen in responses to this question and, with very few exceptions, candidates were able to move beyond a surface description of the cartoon and explain one or more of the cartoon's numerous sub-messages, for example, that Selassie is angry, the League of Nations is not effective or that Britain and France are not acting. It is worth noting that very few candidates recognised the overall message of the cartoon - being that the Pact is not good for Abyssinia or that Selassie is upset by the Pact. In fact, despite the Pact being the very focus of the cartoon, many responses did not refer to it at all.

(c) This question focussed on two written sources that give differing opinions about the Hoare-Laval Pact. Candidates were asked whether Source D, a speech by Hoare made to the British parliament in December 1935, makes Source E, an extract from Eden's memoir, surprising. Many candidates were able to gain some marks by identifying disagreements about the Pact and using these to explain surprise or lack of surprise. For instance, many compared the view that the Pact is justified in Source D with Source E's depiction of it as being too harsh and not justified and concluded that this provides reason to be surprised. Other reasons to be surprised included that in Source D Britain and France should give Italy what it wants to avoid war, whereas in Source E they should not; in Source D Italy is being punished whereas in Source E Italy is being rewarded and, in Source D, the Pact is less favourable to Italy whereas in Source E, it is less favourable to Abyssinia. In the best responses to this question, candidates compared the sources for differences about the Pact and evaluated at least one of them. The most common approach to this was to evaluate Source D with reference to Hoare's purpose in the context of the time, more specifically by reference to the public outcry once details of the Pact were leaked, or Hoare's resignation the day before the speech was made. In most instances, candidates were able to clearly state whether Source D makes Source E surprising or not.

(d) There were many reasonable answers to this question. Among the less successful answers were those based on a simple copying or paraphrasing of the source, and those that did not address the crucial issue of usefulness at any point. There were also a number of candidates whose assessment of usefulness was based on an undeveloped use of the source's provenance; such responses tended to dismiss the source as not useful due to bias as it was written by Maisky, a Soviet Ambassador, or because it was not published until 2015. Better responses were able to explain that the source is useful because of what can be learnt from it about the Pact; this could be a detail about the Pact from Source F or, at a higher level, the overall message that the Pact was a disgrace and a bad thing. From here, candidates could then use their contextual knowledge, or cross reference to other sources on the paper, in order to arrive at a judgement about usefulness. In the best responses candidates explained how the content and the provenance of the source made it useful. The source is useful as it provides a distinct Soviet perspective on the Pact. Alternatively, candidates could have explained how Source F must contain useful information as Maisky had to wait until 2015, after the fall of the Soviet Union, to publish his diary. A small number

of candidates attempted an evaluation of Source F based on the Soviets not being in the League of Nations, when they had become members in 1934.

(e) There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved strong answers by carefully explaining how some of the sources (A and D) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that Hoare and Laval were justified in devising the Hoare-Laval Pact, while others (B, C, E and F) argue that they were not justified. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supports or disagrees with the given hypothesis. Some responses would have been improved by making it clear whether the source under discussion supports or disagrees with the given statement. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer by stating which sources support and which reject the given statement. Candidates can then continue by writing about the sources in order, or by addressing those that support the statement, before moving on to deal with those that reject it. What is crucial is that clear explanations about how the content of a source provides evidence to either support or dispute the hypothesis are given. This can be done by selecting an appropriate quote from a written source or by referring to the messages of cartoons. A clear example of this could be: 'Source A agrees that Hoare and Laval were justified in devising the Hoare-Laval Pact as it states that oil sanctions were too risky and Britain was militarily weak, so therefore the Pact was the best way to avoid war'. One issue that remains is the grouping of the sources. It is advisable to always examine the sources one by one as any comment about a group must be valid for every source in the group. Candidates must also ensure that they use full quotes in their answers.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03

Coursework

Key messages

- It is crucial that titles are focused on the assessment of historical significance.
- Candidates should try to develop arguments about significance all the way through their answers.
- Explaining significance involves more than explaining impact. It involves explaining why that impact mattered.
- It is important to remember that an event, development or individual can be significant in several different ways, and for different reasons.
- The focus should be on the factor named in the title.
- Success does not necessarily equate to significance; failure can be significant.
- Candidates should try to reach an overall conclusion at the end of the answer – for example: what are the most important reasons why the event or individual was significant? Were they significant for some people at the time, but not for others?

General comments

The overall quality of the work submitted was high, with many candidates demonstrating that they can construct a lengthy, focused and analytical piece of work. The knowledge and understanding of the period studied was often excellent, and a good number of candidates showed a high level of understanding of the concept of significance, although many were more comfortable with explanation, rather than assessment. Most titles were suitable but there were some titles which did not give candidates a proper opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of significance. The administration of most centres was excellent, with all the required forms accurately completed. However, a small number of centres did not complete all the forms appropriately and did not send the complete sample of work requested. It is important that centres show where internal moderation has taken place and ensure that marks changed as a result of this are submitted correctly.

Comments on specific questions

It is crucial that appropriate titles are used. Titles should be clearly focused on the assessment of significance. It helps if both the words 'assess' and 'significance' appear. A title such as 'Explain the significance of...' will produce answers that explain significance, rather than assess it. It also helps if the title does not identify an outcome, for example: 'Assess the significance of Stresemann for Germany', rather than 'Assess the significance of Stresemann in the economic recovery of the Weimar Republic'. The latter title narrows the scope of study down too much, meaning that candidates would not be able to explore how far Stresemann was significant in different ways and for different reasons. The first title allows candidates to do this. Including an outcome in the title nearly always results in responses about causation, rather than significance. In other words, candidates compare the relative importance of a range of reasons for the economic recovery of Weimar. In these answers, Stresemann becomes merely one factor alongside several others, instead of the whole focus of the answer being on him. Another example of what appears to be a suitable title, 'Assess the significance of propaganda for Hitler's authoritarian state' is likely to result in many answers about how important propaganda was in keeping the Nazis in power and comparing its importance with that of other factors, such as the use of terror. A title such as, 'Assess the significance of propaganda in Nazi Germany' broadens the scope of the exercise, where candidates can measure the impact of propaganda for the Nazi regime, for the targeted groups and for the general German public (or groups within it). They can also consider whether some types of propaganda were more significant than others and whether the significance of propaganda changed in the period 1933 to 1945.

The choice of subject to be assessed for significance is also important. Candidates find it challenging to assess the significance of major individuals such as Hitler and Stalin. It can be difficult to develop counter-arguments to claims that they were significant. Individuals in the 'next level down', such as Goebbels, Stolypin, Huey Long, Rasputin, Stresemann or Al Capone, are often easier to manage. Ideas such as communism, intolerance and terror can be more difficult to cope with than more definite events, such as the 1905 revolution or the Night of the Long Knives. However, some very good coursework has been produced about, for example, intolerance, but these aspects are worthy of consideration when choosing a subject for coursework.

In some centres candidates produce assignments on different titles and subjects. It is important that all titles should allow candidates plenty of scope to use argument and counter-argument, to use a range of criteria and to explore how far their subject was significant in different ways and for different reasons. Sometimes, when a range of titles is used, it can be difficult to ensure consistency in the demand they place on candidates.

An alternative approach in question setting to that described above is to ask whether an event, development or individual was a turning point. If this approach is used, and it was used very effectively in this examination session, candidates must have a good understanding of what is meant by 'turning point' and base their answers on this. The main characteristics of a turning point are usually taken to be:

- changing the course of events in a major way that lasts for a significant period of time
- having a profound and lasting impact on at least some groups of people
- taking the direction of events in an unexpected way, and in a way that would not have occurred without the turning point.

Appropriate titles used this session included:

- How significant was the Depression for Germany, 1929 to 1935?
- Assess the significance of the 1905 revolution.
- How significant was Britain in the Second World War?
- Assess the significance of Japan in the First World War.
- Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch.
- How significant was Stolypin?
- How significant were the first Hundred Days of the New Deal?
- How significant was the bombing of civilians in the Second World War?
- How far was the February Revolution of 1917 a turning point?

The best answers demonstrated that the candidates were in control of their material. These responses were clearly planned, had a structure and a clear direction, with consistent arguments that gradually built towards the conclusions about significance.

There were many thoughtful and well-argued answers. These answers explained the impact of the event or individual and then assessed how much this impact mattered in different ways and for different groups. Good use was made of counter-argument to explain how some impacts were significant for some groups but not for others. Other answers would have benefited from going further than describing or explaining the impact. In some of these responses, it appeared to be assumed that the impact was significant because it brought about some change.

Another characteristic of the best answers was the use of criteria. This was sometimes done explicitly, with the candidates setting out a list at the start of the answer, for example social, economic and political. Other candidates adopted a more subtle approach, with the criteria implicitly embedded in their answers. Many very good answers considered long and short-term significance, while others assessed how far significance varied from one group to another. Using criteria provides a structure and focus for the answer, a way for candidates to assess significance, and it helps them to consider it in the broadest sense.

Candidates need to ensure that answers do not become causation answers. Even with appropriate titles, some candidates wrote about a range of other factors, as well as the one named in the title. In this coursework component, candidates are not required to compare the importance of one causal factor with that of others. They are asked to assess how far an event, development or individual was historically significant in the broadest sense – were they significant in different ways? How far did their impact affect different people to different extents? Did they have a long-lasting impact that mattered and were they significant in some ways but not in others?

The main characteristics of the best answers were:

- consistent focus on significance throughout
- explaining not just the impact of an event, development or individual but assessing why, and how far, the impact mattered
- using of a range of criteria (these will vary from subject to subject) to explore possible significance in different ways and for different reasons
- understanding that judgements about significance are not permanent and can shift according to different perspectives
- using argument and counter-argument to assess significance, rather than just explaining it
- inclusion of a substantial conclusion that says something new, for example explaining how the subject was significant in some ways but not in others and then balancing these against each other to reach an overall judgement.

The most common weaknesses in answers included:

- too much of the answer dealt with 'setting the scene'
- not addressing the issue of significance until the conclusion, and then only briefly
- narrative and description (a candidate's contextual knowledge and understanding is best shown by explaining why something was significant)
- stating that impacts were significant because they caused changes (what is important is how far, and in what ways, the changes mattered to people)
- equating success with significance, and failure with insignificance (the latter can be very significant)
- assuming that an event or individual was significant and simply describing all the ways in which it was.

The candidates' work was often marked with care and with close attention to the generic mark scheme in the syllabus. Many centres provided both marginal comments and summative comments on the candidates' work which were most helpful. Marginal comments are most useful when they identify important features of an answer, such as explaining significance, using a counter-argument or irrelevance. The levels are to be awarded to the answer as a whole, taking into account strengths and weaknesses. This is why the summative comments are important, because they can be used to sum up the overall qualities of the answer and make a match with a particular level in the mark scheme.

The mark scheme should be used with a 'best-fit' approach. Candidates do not have to meet all the requirements of a level before an answer can be placed in that level. It is common to find answers that display performance at a number of different levels. When this happens, it is important to ask, which level does the candidate's coursework, taken as a whole, best match? Demonstration of the skills and understandings in the mark scheme should be rewarded when they are used to develop and support a relevant answer about the assessment of significance.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Some candidates have developed a good understanding of the examination.

Part (a), which has a total of 15 marks, provides the opportunity to achieve marks through the recall and deployment of knowledge. To succeed, it is important to note the precise dates and focus of the question. Candidates should construct a logical structure. This could be either thematic or chronological but should provide accurate and detailed knowledge within this. Some candidates struggled to adopt this approach. Others provided more general outlines which lacked depth. It is important to remember that this examination is a depth study and as such a deep level of knowledge is required. This could be shown, for example, through specific names or dates. There is no requirement to provide explanations or background material in **part (a)**.

Part (b), which has a total of 25 marks, was well attempted in many cases. Candidates were able to identify and support different facets relating to the focus of the question. Some were also able to explain these impacts convincingly, although more could have attempted a judgement as to which was the most important. Some wrote more generally and missed the focus of the question. The focus should be on the specific event or person mentioned in the question. A judgement should be made by comparing the importance of the different facets. Some candidates tried to use facets which were inappropriate for the question. Although facets such as economic, social and political are appropriate for some questions, they may not be appropriate for every question. Candidates who tried to use all the facets they identified often became confused. Successful responses were able to identify the strongest facets, making it easier to explain them. Two valid facets which are explained will produce a strong answer, and if a valid clear judgement on relative importance is also provided, the top level can be achieved.

It is extremely important that candidates read the question carefully and take note of the start and end dates. This would have helped a number of candidates to improve their answers.

Writing overly long answers to **part (a)** is not necessary and in some cases led to candidates having insufficient time to answer **part (b)**. Some other candidates started with **part (b)** but then did not complete **part (a)**. Answering **part (b)** before **part (a)** is not recommended.

There were some rubric errors where candidates wrote responses to more than one question. Candidates must answer one question with both **parts (a)** and **(b)** from the same question.

General comments

Very few candidates answered questions from Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939-c. 1945. The most popular Depth Studies were Depth Studies B, C and D on Germany, Russia and the United States. There were a limited number of responses to Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18.

Most candidates demonstrated some knowledge of their chosen study. However, many responses would have benefited from being able to provide valid explanations in **part (b)**.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1

(a) There were very few answers to this question. Those who did answer the question demonstrated a good knowledge of the trench system, although many responses were very generalised. Most included extensive descriptions of conditions in the trenches which were valid but tended to lack breadth. Many responses would have been improved by reference to the different designs of trenches or any defensive weapons which were developed as a result.

(b) This question asked candidates to show how machine guns had an impact on fighting on the Western Front. Although there were some good responses, many candidates wrote very little on machine guns and more on other forms of warfare, like tanks and poison gas.

Question 2

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 45

Question 3

(a) This question was popular among candidates and leant itself to a chronological approach. Most candidates knew the events of the Kapp Putsch and were able to show how it progressed in a logical manner. There were also some confused responses in which candidates showed a lack of knowledge of the event and instead wrote about either the Spartacist Revolt or the Munich Putsch.

(b) Some candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of reparations and were able to identify facets which demonstrated their impact. There were also candidates who wrote long background accounts outlining the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. This material was not necessary, as the whole focus needed to be on reparations. There was some confusion about inflation and hyperinflation which affected attempts to explain the economic importance. Inflation did occur before 1923, but the main period of hyperinflation occurred following the invasion of the Ruhr by French and Belgian troops in 1923. Most candidates could outline the main impacts of hyperinflation. Some responses described in detail how Hitler gained power, thereby going beyond the requirements of the question. Some candidates provided valid material on how the timing of the Munich Putsch was influenced by the reparations.

Question 4

(a) This was also a popular question. Many candidates demonstrated a good depth of knowledge. Others provided very generalised accounts of life in Nazi Germany. Some candidates attempted to compare the roles of women before and after the Nazis gained power and this often led to generalised material. Some candidates were able to demonstrate a good depth of knowledge and include references to the Mothers' Cross, Law for the Encouragement of Marriage and the Nazi Women's Bureau.

(b) There were some good attempts at this question as candidates were able to identify different facets of the discussion and keep this focused on the Hitler Youth. Other responses were much more generalised and focused almost entirely on Nazi education policy and its impact. Better answers were more carefully focused on the Hitler Youth organisation and why it was important. Examples of importance might include its political role in the indoctrination of youth and preparing them for future roles in the Nazi Party or the Military importance of training youths in military drills in preparation for future military service.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 41

Question 5

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

Question 6

(a) This question was popular but proved challenging to some candidates. These candidates struggled to keep the focus on how Trotsky was affected. Most knew about his role in the Red Army and that

he missed Lenin's funeral because of Stalin's misinformation. However, apart from his death, most candidates provided limited information about Trotsky. They tended to provide more detail on how Stalin was able to achieve power.

(b) Some candidates had a good knowledge of the Purges and were able to show the impact they had on the Soviet Union, using detailed material. Less successful responses were generalised accounts of Stalin's use of repression. They would have benefited from focusing on the Purges. In these responses the purge of the Bolshevik Party was largely missed and there was more focus on the impact on civilians. Successful candidates identified facets such as the political impact with the purge of Communist Party members, the military facet with the purge of the army and the social/cultural impact, showing how civilians were affected.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 41

Question 7

(a) This question focused on how society changed during the 1920s. Many candidates were able to outline how life changed for people during this period. There were many relevant areas such as the change in balance between urban and rural America, falling working hours and leisure, sports and cinema, and the changing role of women. Less successful responses had a more economic focus and wrote about the reasons for the boom, rather than the social impact.

(b) Some candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of jazz and its history. Some of the less successful responses just outlined this history and neglected to discuss its impact. More successful responses included facets such as the cultural impact of jazz, as traditionally black American music was adopted by the larger population, leading to the development of new fashions and dances. The economic impact was also recognised, showing that employment was created and radios grew in popularity, as a way of listening to the music.

Question 8

(a) This question required a focus on the Depression and its impact on society. Successful responses recognised this and were able to outline impacts such as farmers' income falling, unemployment, the growth of homelessness and the introduction of soup kitchens and bread lines. Less successful attempts included much focus on the background causes of the Depression, outlining the reasons for the fall of the Stock Market and general economic examples. This resulted in an analysis of the reasons for the Depression, rather than the social impact. Others wrote about the impact of Republican policies and Hoover's inability to solve the problem. These responses would have been improved by a focus on social aspects.

(b) This question asked about the importance of Roosevelt's election as president in 1932. Many candidates had a good knowledge of the New Deal and the measures taken by Roosevelt to solve the problems of the Depression. Some were able to outline the differences in policy between the Republicans and Democrats and show why this was so important in gaining support for Roosevelt. Others included knowledge of the Fireside Chats to demonstrate Roosevelt's use of modern technology and his empathetic approach. New Deal agencies were described to show the practical improvements brought about during the period. Less successful attempts focused on Hoover and included limited material for the period of the question.

Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939-c. 1945

Questions 9 and 10 received too few responses for any meaningful comments to be made.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Responses to **part (a)** require a logically sequenced account of a specific event or time period and **part (b)** responses require an extended answer that explains the importance or impact of multiple facets of a discussion. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach a conclusion.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. A significant number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia–Pacific, 1939–c.1945, to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses to **part (a)** of the question gave logically sequenced accounts with in-depth contextual knowledge and precise examples to support the descriptions. The very best answers tended to be thematic or chronological in approach. Less successful answers often lacked specific contextual knowledge of the event or time period or missed the chronological parameters of the question. Good responses to **part (b)** questions explored more than one facet of the discussion and used well-selected examples to support explanations and judgements. Less successful answers often provided only general material on the topic or struggled to fully focus on the discussion posed in the question. Many candidates were able to provide more than one facet of the given discussion but would have improved their responses by properly explaining the impact or importance in sufficient depth or detail. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both of the questions from the Depth Study choices or multiple Depth Studies. Candidates must read the questions carefully before answering and ensure that responses stay within the time period.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was the more popular choice, although a number of candidates opted for **Question 2**.

Question 1 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates were able to provide accurate and sometimes detailed accounts of the development of the German offensive on the Western Front up to the end of the Battle of the Marne. Most good responses took a chronological approach to the account, beginning with descriptions of the German invasion of Belgium and Belgian resistance, the entry of the BEF into the war and the Battle of Mons and the rapid Russian mobilisation on the eastern front, and finished with an account of the Battle of the Marne, the German retreat and digging in, and the subsequent race to the sea. The best accounts provided a good level of detail, some including precise dates and statistical information as examples. Weaker accounts often confused the chronological order of the events or went beyond the parameters set out in the question and examined events in later 1914, such as the First Battle of Ypres and sometimes beyond.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to identify and describe more than one facet of the discussion on the importance of Moltke in the failure of the Schlieffen Plan. Most good responses examined the importance of Moltke's changes to the original Schlieffen Plan, such as his decision to attack France directly through Belgium and his decision to reduce the number of soldiers in the East to defend against Russia. Many candidates also considered Moltke's failure to consider Belgian resistance and British entry into the war or

the speed of Russian mobilisation. The strongest discussions contained convincing explanations on how important each facet was and used precise examples to support. Less successful responses tended to be more descriptive in style and often neglected to address importance after identifying facets.

Question 2 produced some good responses. In **part (a)**, candidates were often able to give reasonably detailed accounts of Japan's contribution to the Allied war effort. The strongest answers took a chronological approach to the account, commonly beginning with a detailed description of the Siege of Tsingtao from August to November of 1914. A good amount of in-depth knowledge was showcased in many of the accounts, including precise statistics and examples. Most candidates went on to mention the Japanese forces aiding the British defeat of a mutiny by Indian troops in Singapore in 1915, and then finished by examining the help the Japanese navy gave in securing the sea lanes to defend Allied shipping, including engaging with German U-boats. A few of the weaker accounts lacked good historical knowledge, resulting in overly short responses.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to engage well with the question, which required the discussion to consider the importance of Japan's naval assistance to the Western Allies. The strongest discussions contained multiple facets and good supporting knowledge, with some candidates able to explain how and why it was important to the Western Allies. Many considered how the Japanese navy secured the sea lanes for the Allies, which allowed vital supplies to reach the Western Front and allowed ANZAC troops to be deployed, safely bolstering Allied military power. Some also examined the importance Japan's navy had in destroying German U-boats. Many of the good responses contained multiple explanations and a few attempted to reach a conclusion on which facet was the most important to the Western Allies. The small number of weaker responses to this question tended to be descriptive and more like a **part (a)** response.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Both **Question 3** and **Question 4** proved to be popular choices among candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates often approached their accounts thematically, although a few responses took a chronological approach in describing the methods used by the Nazis to increase their electoral support up to 1932. The strongest accounts tended to begin with the change in strategy by Hitler after the failure of the Munich Putsch. Accounts considered how Nazi leaders were trained to give speeches, offer flexible promises and hold rallies using the SA to give an image of strength and order. Most accounts described how Nazi propaganda was used to try and appeal to different classes in Germany, and how this was then adapted during the Depression to whip up fear of a communist revolution, via negative cohesion tactics. Weaker responses tended to focus too much on the period before 1924 when the Nazis were not seeking electoral victory, but seizure of power by revolution. Some candidates also went beyond the stated date of 1932 and examined how Hitler was appointed Chancellor.

In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and at least describe one or more facet of the impact of the SA in Germany to 1932. Most accounts considered both the negative and positive impact the SA had on the image of the Nazi Party, how the SA helped increase Nazi membership, especially during the Depression, and how the SA were used to protect Nazi meetings and attack political opponents. The best discussions explained impact clearly and referred to historical knowledge to support their arguments. Other responses took a descriptive approach and often went beyond 1932 and examined events such as the Night of the Long Knives. It is vital to remain within the parameters set out in the question to ensure the information is relevant.

Question 4 was also generally well answered by candidates this session, with some good **part (a)** responses. Candidates often organised their descriptions chronologically and gave detailed accounts of the Night of the Long Knives. Most accounts began with descriptions of why the purge took place, with many citing fears from the German army that Rohm wanted to make the SA the new German army or that Rohm was planning a 'second revolution'. A few also mentioned the fact that Hindenburg was threatening martial law if SA violence did not stop. This was followed by some very detailed descriptions of the purges that took place between 30 June and 2 July and gave examples of those that were eliminated by the Nazis. Many accounts finished with details of the aftermath, including how Hindenburg congratulated Hitler and the German army gave Hitler their support. Weaker responses would have benefited from greater historical knowledge of the event. A few candidates confused the event with the Night of Broken Glass, which was an organised attack on Germany's Jewish population in 1938.

Part (b) responses were mixed, with a number of candidates finding it challenging to consider facets on why Hindenburg's death was important. Many candidates were able to identify at least two valid facets - firstly, Hindenburg's death allowed Hitler to abolish the office of President and combine the powers of the President

with those of the Chancellor to create the new office of the Fuhrer, making him head of state and head of the government, with no constitutional office that could threaten his position. Secondly, Hindenburg's death allowed Hitler to make the German army swear an oath of loyalty directly to him, removing the last organisation that could have potentially removed him from power, as well as allowing him to carry out his future foreign policy aims. There were some good explanations of how Hitler already had dictatorial powers since the Enabling Act, and candidates used this material to reach a valid conclusion. Weaker responses often provided great depth about how Hindenburg's death led to increased propaganda or allowed Hitler to set up concentration camps, but these things had already been established in 1933.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Both questions were attempted. **Question 5** was the more popular choice among candidates.

Question 5 was sometimes well answered, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality. In **part (a)**, good answers gave a thematic account of Stolypin's reforms. Most considered the carrot and stick approach in Stolypin's government and although most of the reforms were part of the carrot approach, the stick approach was also credited. Accounts examined Stolypin's agrarian reforms, allowing Russian peasants to leave the mir commune system and borrow money from the Peasant Land Bank to expand their land holdings and increase agricultural production. Most candidates also recognised that this was also done to increase the number of wealthy peasants or kulaks who would support the tsarist system and reduce radicalism in the countryside. Most accounts also described how Stolypin encouraged peasants to migrate to lands in Siberia with incentives. Accounts then often looked at Stolypin's use of military courts to persecute political opponents and the reforms he made to the Second Duma. Weaker responses lacked detailed historical knowledge on the reforms, with a few candidates confusing Stolypin with a communist politician.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. Some candidates were able to cite at least one facet of the discussion on the importance of the peasants in Russia up to 1914. Most candidates considered how the peasant class made up the majority of the population and worked the land in an agrarian-based economy which was vital to Russia's survival. Many noted the numerous famines and food shortages faced by Russians and how this led to socio-political problems in Russia. Some candidates focused on the military importance of the peasants, as they formed the bulk of the conscripted soldiers in the Russo-Japanese War and the start of the First World War; others focused on peasant radicalism and how some poorer peasants supported groups such as the SRs, demanding an end to Tsarism in Russia. Most responses did not explain why the peasants were important and often described the peasants instead, giving lengthy accounts, rather than a discussion with explanations to reach a conclusion.

Question 6 saw some very thorough accounts given by candidates for **part (a)**. The best accounts for **part (a)** were able to give many details of the first Five-Year Plan. Most accounts took a thematic approach and considered why the Plan was introduced by Stalin, how it was carried out and the results. Strong answers examined how Stalin wished to increase the rate of industrialisation and end the NEP to make the USSR a world power and provide security against invasion from the West. Many candidates then examined how GOSPLAN was used to set targets in heavy industry and the process of collectivisation was used in the countryside, to bring agriculture under centralised control and remove the kulaks as a class. The best accounts finished with statistics, sometimes comparing results with the targets set, which was very impressive. Weaker responses were often overly brief due to a lack of historical knowledge on the topic, and some went on to describe both the second and third Five-Year Plans, which lacked relevance to this question.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers, where candidates discussed multiple facets of the importance of Stalin's policies against the kulaks. Most of these responses considered how Stalin viewed the kulaks as a class enemy and, along with NEPmen, a by-product of the NEP, which partially led to the process of dekulakisation in the countryside. Many responses also examined how the kulaks were forced to collectivise and join the collective farms set up by the Communists, with many kulaks and other peasants resisting by slaughtering livestock and burning crops. Some of the less successful responses did not address importance and approached the question like an account of Stalin's policies against the kulaks, which was closer to a **part (a)** response.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was a popular topic. Both questions were answered by a good number of candidates.

Question 7 was generally well answered by candidates this session. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account which contained many of the important details of new developments in industry in the

1920s. Most accounts were thematic rather than chronological in approach and examined developments such as electrification and how this impacted industry, such as the assembly line production method and the use of new materials like Bakelite and Rayon, which replaced older materials and textiles, partially resulting in the decline of some traditional industries in the 1920s. A few of the strongest and most impressive accounts also considered developments in advertising, hire purchase schemes, the growth of the aviation industry and developments in the entertainment industry, such as the introduction of talkies in 1927. Weaker accounts often neglected to consider new developments and instead gave accounts of industry in general in the USA, often focusing too much on the motor industry alone.

In **part (b)**, candidates were often able to give a multi-faceted response to the discussion on the impact of electrification on the USA in the 1920s. There were some very strong responses in which candidates provided supported explanations and attempted conclusions which considered which facet of the discussion had the greatest impact on the USA. Most of the good responses examined the economic impact of electrification and how it made assembly-line production methods possible, leading to the mass production of many consumer goods at lower prices such as cars, radios and telephones. This often led to candidates then considering the socio-cultural impact electrification had on the USA due to the greater availability of consumer goods, particularly labour-saving appliances, which increased available leisure time for many, or the impact it had via street lighting, which allowed nightlife to expand rapidly in the cities. Other responses would have been less confused and more accurate if the term 'electrification' had been more defined more appropriately.

Question 8 was generally well answered by candidates this session. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account which contained some of the most important details of the changes experienced by women in the 1920s. Most candidates chose a thematic approach to this question, rather than a chronological one. Many began the account by looking at why women experienced some of the changes they did in the 1920s by describing women's war work and the winning of the vote nationally in 1920, although some responses spent much time describing what life was like for women before the 1920s, which was not the focus of the account. Most strong accounts then examined themes such as the increase of women in work such as administration and clerical positions, the increase in leisure time partially due to labour saving devices and the change in attitudes towards women and the behaviour of younger women in the cities, notably the flappers. The best responses contained extensive historical knowledge and gave some excellent examples to support their accounts. Less successful answers tended to include too much material describing women's experiences before the 1920s.

Part (b) was generally answered, with some outstanding responses seen. The best discussions contained well-supported explanations of multiple facets on the impact of the entertainment industry in the 1920s, with a few providing valid conclusions. These responses most commonly considered the cultural impact of the entertainment industry – on the attitudes and changing behaviours of young people, particularly women, due to the impact of movies, music and sports, as well as the impact on the black American population in cities like New York and Chicago, due to the growth in popularity of jazz and blues music. Many also then examined the economic impact of the entertainment industry and its contribution to the economic boom of the 1920s, as consumers spent increasing amounts of their disposable income on the cinema, sports and nightlife. Weaker responses tended to be more descriptive and lacked the explanation of impact but were still often able to cite numerous valid facets linked to the discussion.

Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939–c.1945

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Responses to **part (a)** require a logically sequenced account of a specific event or time period and **part (b)** responses require an extended answer that explains the importance or impact of multiple facets of a discussion. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach a conclusion.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. A significant number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18, although only **Question 1** produced enough responses for meaningful comments to be made. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia–Pacific, 1939–c.1945 to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses to **part (a)** of the question gave logically sequenced accounts with in-depth contextual knowledge and precise examples to support the descriptions. The very best answers tended to be thematic or chronological in approach. Less successful answers often lacked specific contextual knowledge of the event or time period or missed the chronological parameters of the question. Good responses to **part (b)** questions explored more than one facet of the discussion and used well-selected examples to support explanations and judgements. Less successful answers often provided only general material on the topic or struggled to fully focus on the discussion posed in the question. Many candidates were able to provide more than one facet of the given discussion but would have improved their responses by properly explaining the impact or importance in sufficient depth or detail. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both of the questions from the Depth Study choices or multiple Depth Studies. Candidates must read the questions carefully before answering and ensure that responses stay within the time period.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was the more popular choice among candidates, with very few **Question 2** responses.

Question 1 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates were able to provide accurate and sometimes detailed accounts of the Battle of Verdun. The strongest responses took a chronological approach to their account and candidates tended to examine the reasons for the battle first, namely the belief by the German High Command that a decisive victory at Verdun, where a ring of fortresses protected the industrial town, would wear France down and force them into an armistice. Many candidates then went on to give details of the battle, often providing excellent examples and statistics about the artillery bombardment and the French resistance. Most accounts finished by mentioning how the Somme campaign was designed to relieve the French forces at Verdun and the total casualties suffered by both sides. Weaker accounts tended to lack the in-depth historical knowledge required to give full descriptions of the events and a few were vague, sometimes referring to other battles on the Western Front in error.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to identify and describe more than one facet of the discussion on the importance of tanks in the fighting on the Western Front. Most candidates acknowledged the obvious military importance of the tank as the war continued with the development of combined arms tactics by the Allies, which proved vital in the Hundred Days Offensive in 1918. Many candidates also considered the importance

the tank had on Allied morale, especially during the period of attrition, as well the psychological impact the tank had on the German forces when first used at the Somme in 1916. Some of the best responses also examined how the tank's importance was limited, especially in 1916, due to high numbers of tanks breaking down and later due to the development of effective anti-tank weapons by the Germans. The best discussions explained the importance of each facet individually and compared importance in the conclusion to reach a judgement. Weaker discussions lacked depth and breadth, often providing generalised assertions or descriptions only.

Question 2

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Both **Question 3** and **Question 4** proved popular choices among candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates often approached their accounts thematically, although a few responses took a chronological approach in describing the political instability in Germany between 1919 and 1923. Most candidates opted to examine the threats posed by the far left and far right, specifically the Spartacist Uprising, the Kapp Putsch and the Munich Putsch. Historical knowledge on these events was often very strong, with the best accounts offering detailed examples and statistics to add depth to their descriptions. Some of the strongest accounts also considered the more than 350 political assassinations and the political chaos caused by the invasion of the Ruhr region and the subsequent period of hyperinflation in 1923. Less successful responses sometimes confused left-wing and right-wing rebellions and muddled their historical knowledge. Some responses lacked structure and sequence, which is a key requirement for **part (a)** answers.

In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and at least describe one or more facet of the importance of Stresemann in Weimar Germany. The best responses considered a variety of facets and gave detailed and convincing explanations in their discussions. Most candidates considered the political importance of Stresemann by considering the stability he brought by ending the Ruhr occupation and agreeing to restart reparations payments to the Allies, as well as his economic importance in replacing the worthless Papiermark with the Rentenmark, negotiating US loans through the Dawes Plan and reducing reparation payments. A few candidates also considered how Stresemann was important internationally through the successful negotiation of the Locarno Treaties and Germany's admittance into the League in 1926. Weaker responses would have been improved by including explanations. They tended to just describe all of the policies linked to Stresemann, although most were still able to accurately identify valid facets of the discussion when doing so.

Question 4 produced mixed responses to **part (a)**. Stronger accounts took either a chronological or thematic approach to organise their information, with most considering the change of tactics by Hitler after the failure of the Munich Putsch as the starting point. Many accounts examined the 'Wilderness Years' and described how the Nazis trained leaders to give effective speeches and make flexible promises to the electorate. There were some good descriptions on the use of propaganda, particularly in the Depression era, where many candidates focused on the use of negative cohesion to whip up fear of an imminent communist revolution. However, many other accounts were very generalised and neglected to provide detailed historical knowledge, with some focusing too much on the Nazi period before 1924, when Hitler was planning to seize power, rather than win votes.

Part (b) responses were also mixed, with a number of candidates finding it challenging to consider facets on the importance of anti-communism in the Nazis' rise to power. A small number of strong responses were able to explain how the Nazis used the SA, the Reichstag Fire and other events to stir up fear amongst the wealthy classes of a communist uprising, and how this both led to increased votes and Hitler's further consolidation of power in Germany, after he was made Chancellor in January 1933. Some candidates also examined how anti-communism was important to the Nazis financially, as industrialists and business elites were increasingly prepared to help fund the Nazi electoral campaign when Hitler promised to crush the communist threat in Germany, if the Nazis came to power. Less successful responses lacked explanation and often only provided generalised assertions or descriptions of events, sometimes only vaguely linked to the theme of anti-communism.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Both questions in this Depth Study were attempted. **Question 6** was more popular among candidates.

Question 5 was sometimes well answered, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality. In **part (a)**, good answers gave a chronological account of the work of the Duma from 1905 until 1917. Most examined the creation of the first State Duma in the October Manifesto in 1905 and the subsequent Fundamental Laws in 1906, which severely limited the impact of the fledgling parliament. A few stronger accounts were able to give details of the first two Dumas, with some candidates providing good detail on their composition and early policies. Most were able to identify the changes made to the third Duma by Stolypin to favour the more conservative parties in Russia and the lack of influence of the fourth Duma, particularly after the outbreak of war in Europe. Other accounts were, however, lacking in historical knowledge on this topic and provided only generalised accounts of the Duma or only focused on its creation in 1905 and no further.

In **part (b)**, responses also varied in quality, but there were some strong answers. Some candidates were able to cite more than one facet of the discussion on the importance of the actions of Tsar Nicholas II between 1905 and 1917. Most considered the Tsar's importance politically by considering the introduction of the October Manifesto to help end the 1905 Revolution, establishing some limited democracy at a national level in Russia for the first time in its history, as well as the introduction of the Fundamental Laws in 1906, which recodified tsarist autocracy again. Some responses also considered how the Tsar was important economically through his appointment of Stolypin as Prime Minister in 1906, and others focused on the military importance of the Tsar during both the Russo-Japanese War and, more commonly, the First World War, particularly his decision to take personal command of the Russian army in 1915. There were many answers with well supported explanations and some with valid conclusions, but many discussions remained descriptive in style and offered only generalised assertions.

Question 6 saw some very thorough accounts given by a number of candidates for **part (a)**. The best accounts for **part (a)** were able to give many details of Bolshevik economic policies between 1917 and 1921, with most candidates opting for a chronological approach in their accounts. The best responses examined the various decrees issued by Lenin in 1917, such as the Decree on Land and Decree on Workers, then proceeded to describe the economic changes brought about by War Communism and then, in 1921, the New Economic Policy. Some accounts provided much accurate and detailed information, all sequenced precisely and logically. Weaker responses tended to only focus on one or two of the main policies of the period or to organise the information in the account in a way that lacked structure.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers where candidates discussed multiple facets of the impact of War Communism on Russia. Most candidates considered political, military and socio-economic impacts in their discussions, with some answers providing detailed explanations and conclusions. These discussions examined how War Communism increased Bolshevik control by removing opponents, helped the Reds win the Russian Civil War against the Whites and transformed the Russian economy into a highly centralised, planned economic model which resulted in poor working conditions and famine for many. Details were often deployed well to support explanations, helping some responses reach judgements about the most significant impact of War Communism. Other responses would have benefited from being less descriptive and by being able to provide convincing explanations on impact. A few responses confused War Communism with the NEP, leading to answers lacking in relevance and accuracy.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was a popular Depth Study among candidates, with **Question 7** being attempted by the larger number.

Question 7 responses varied in quality. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account which contained some of the important developments in advertising in the USA in the 1920s. Most accounts took a thematic approach to their accounts, which served them well. The best answers gave detailed descriptions on the development of advertising from the propaganda techniques learnt during the First World War and considered how advertising agencies deployed various methods to endorse consumer products, such as billboards, newspaper adverts and the radio. A few answers also mentioned how branding was increasingly used by companies to increase consumer loyalty and how market research was employed by agencies to determine which methods worked best in different parts of the USA. These accounts were often detailed and well organised, although some weaker responses lacked significant historical knowledge on the topic, leading to generalised accounts and limited examples being deployed.

In **part (b)**, candidates found the focus challenging, with many only able to identify one valid facet of the discussion on the importance of hire purchase schemes to the US economy. Most responses recognised the

importance of credit to the growing economy, and how it allowed consumers to buy new products by paying in instalments, leading to rapid economic growth via company profits and via interest payments. A few of the stronger answers considered how credit was important in creating consumer debt, which ultimately led to market saturation and contributed to the volatility in the stock market in 1929, and the economic depression of the 1930s. A few candidates were able to explain the facets they addressed with competence and supporting detail. Other responses were descriptive or generalised assertions which would have benefited from developing the facet properly and convincingly.

Question 8 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account of the intolerance faced by black Americans in the 1920s, although responses varied in quality. Most tackled the account thematically rather than chronologically, which worked well. Many began by examining the issues facing black Americans in the South, with most citing examples of Jim Crow laws and the threats posed by the Ku Klux Klan. However, many accounts had limited historical knowledge on this topic and provided only very generalised information. A few stronger accounts also considered intolerance faced by black Americans in the North, such as the poor living conditions in the cities and the lack of access to higher paying jobs, as well as examples of everyday discrimination and prejudice.

Part (b) was generally answered very well by candidates, with a few outstanding responses. The best discussions contained well-supported explanations of multiple facets on the impact of the Red Scare on American society. These candidates examined the political fallout caused by the Red Scare and cited new immigration laws introduced by the Republicans and the Palmer Raids in their explanations. A few candidates also recognised that the Ku Klux Klan's anti-communist message helped it bring in new members and bolster its influence. Many candidates also considered how American citizens reacted to the Red Scare messages in the media, which resulted in increasing racial tensions in the cities, with some answers citing the Sacco and Vanzetti case as an example. Weaker responses tended to only address one facet of the discussion accurately and often relied on descriptions or generalised material in their discussion.

Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, 1939–c.1945

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