HISTORY

| Paper 0977/11 |
| Paper 11 |

Key messages

Candidates need to read the question carefully before starting their response and ensure that they just focus on the issue in the question.

Successful responses demonstrated good historical knowledge and understanding of the question and were characterised by the inclusion of relevant contextual details to support arguments.

Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to ensure that responses only include knowledge within the time span of the question.

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in continuous prose. In more extensive responses, they should organise their ideas into distinct paragraphs - otherwise points can become blurred together or, alternatively, candidates can lose focus on the question.

General comments

Strong responses reflected sound understanding and good knowledge in both the Core and Depth Study questions, supported by a wealth of factual detail. These responses included 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. These included conclusions that were more than purely summative and in which they came to a judgement and justified this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their essay.

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

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

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question:

Part (a) responses reward recall and description. There is no need for background information. Explanation is not required. Most candidates realised that responses to **(a)** questions can be short and concise. Many answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph which was an appropriate approach.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and always write in continuous prose, rather than using a 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than a description of what happened. Strong responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative answers or long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. A valid conclusion 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. Some conclusions just asserted 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was stronger than the other.

Weaker responses often focussed only on one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

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 question in the Core Section.

(a) Many candidates wrote well informed, strong responses to this question. Most mentioned Wilson and the Fourteen Points and were able to define the meaning of 'self-determination' as the right of a people or nation to decide their own form of government. Strong responses identified application of the principle in Central and Eastern Europe, especially with reference to the break-up of the Habsburg Empire, though fewer candidates named the countries created. Some also included how the principle could not be applied to British and French colonies because of the resistance of the respective governments. In a number of other responses candidates struggled with the meaning of 'self-determination' and wrote in very general terms about strength of purpose or resolve, with little relevant information.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. In a small number of strong responses candidates were able to explain two reasons for Turkish discontent with the Treaty of Sevres. In these answers candidates homed in on territorial losses and the break-up of the Ottoman Empire, with the establishment of British and French mandates in the Middle East and the much-resented loss of Smyrna to Greece being the provisions most frequently cited. Candidates could also write effectively about the decision to impose Allied control on Turkey's finances. However, in many responses, candidates identified military reductions and territorial losses without adequately explaining their impact. Also, where candidates were uncertain of the provisions of the Treaty, there was a tendency to transfer two German grievances to the Turkish settlement: reparations and war guilt, neither of which were relevant to this question (with reparations never applied and war guilt not a provision of the Treaty of Sevres). Nearly all of the candidates were able to make reference to the harshness of the Treaty. A small number of candidates lacked knowledge of the Treaty of Sevres and often confused it with the treaties that Germany and Hungary received. Less successful responses sometimes included material about the revolt against the Treaty led by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and the resulting Treaty of Lausanne which lacked relevance to this question.

(c) Overall, this question was answered well. Most candidates were familiar with the main terms of the Treaty of Versailles, though some were unable to explain how these provisions caused bitterness among the Germans. Reference to the war guilt clause, for example, was often explained only with a comment that Germans did not feel that they alone had caused the First World War, when a reference to Russian mobilisation or Austria-Hungary's uncompromising attitude towards Serbia would have secured the explanation. In weaker responses, the coverage of the link between reparations and hyperinflation was either too superficial or unclear. Nevertheless, there were many strong responses which included explanations on both sides of the argument. These responses explained well the impact of reparations on a country whose economy was already in great difficulty and explained how this resulted in the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr and hyperinflation. On the other side of the argument candidates gained credit for explaining the German reaction to the perceived 'Diktat', war guilt, disarmament and territorial losses. Some candidates believed mistakenly that Germany lost the Sudetenland in 1919.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

©

Question 6

This question was also very popular among candidates.

(a) This question was well answered, responses naming the specific agencies such as 'the Slavery Commission', the 'Health Organisation', the 'Refugee Organisation' and the 'Mandates Commission'. In some strong responses candidates named two organisations but gave descriptions of the work that they carried out. For example, 'The Health Organisation was an agency of the League which worked to eradicate leprosy and malaria.' A number of candidates also included details of the key bodies of the League of Nations such as the Assembly, the Council and the Secretariat. These descriptions were outside the scope of the question. A small number of responses were left blank.

(b) Many candidates gained credit for identifying features of the Aaland Islands dispute. For example: 'It involved minor countries', 'It was between Sweden and Finland' and 'The League awarded the islands to Finland'. Stronger responses developed these points by including an explanation such as, 'Both Sweden and Finland wanted ownership of the Aaland Islands and took the dispute to the League of Nations. Despite many of the islanders wanting to be ruled by Sweden, the League awarded them to Finland. As they had put safeguards in place to protect Swedish interests on the islands, Sweden accepted the ruling.' A second reason explained revolved around the timing of the dispute, the fact that it was a dispute between minor powers and there was no aggression involved in the conflict, unlike the Japanese and Italian aggression that the League had to deal with in the 1930s. Weaker responses were characterised by incorrect information, often citing the wrong countries, stating the islands were awarded to Sweden or describing the wrong dispute, most commonly the Vilna dispute.

(c) This question was well answered and there were many strong responses in which candidates showed a good understanding of whether 'Failure to bring about disarmament was the most important problem facing the League in the 1930s.' Successful responses were able to explain the difficulties arising from the 1932 Disarmament Conference in which the victors of the First World War refused to disarm because of their concerns over unemployment and security. It was also important to include the viewpoint of Hitler at this time, who wanted the powers to reduce their arms to the level of Germany or allow Germany to rearm to match the size of the armies of the big powers. As a result of the lack of agreement at the Conference, Hitler left the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations in 1933 and started rearming. In order to give a balanced answer, successful responses identified and explained other problems that faced the League in the 1930s, most commonly the issues caused by Japan's invasion of Manchuria and Italy's invasion of Abyssinia. It was important to identify the exact problem the League faced with these invasions, rather than giving a lengthy description of what happened. The structure of the League was another relevant problem explained in stronger responses, such as the absence of the USA, the fact that the League didn't have an army and League members were usually motivated by self-interest. Weaker responses often included details of disputes in the 1920s, which lacked relevance to this question. Other responses drifted from the focus of the question to give a description of Hitler's Foreign Policy, including the Allies' policy of Appeasement, which was not a policy of the League of Nations.

Question 7

(a) This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates were able to describe Truman's policy of containment and how he was worried that if South Korea fell to communism, other Asian countries could be next. Stronger responses identified that Truman blamed the Soviet Union for the attack, which was seen as part of Moscow's attempts to gain world domination. Credit was given for responses describing his attitude such as: 'He was suspicious of the Soviet Union's role' or 'He was determined to take action against this aggression by North Korea'. Credit was also given for 'He appealed to the United Nations for support'. Less successful responses drifted from the question by writing generalised accounts of the events of the Korean War.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most responses were able to identify reasons why North Korea invaded South Korea in 1950, including to spread communism and to unite North and South Korea. The strongest responses were able to explain two reasons. For example: 'Kim Il Sung felt that his forces were stronger than those of South Korea and as he saw himself as the legitimate ruler of Korea, he wanted to remove capitalism from South Korea and unite Korea under communist rule'. Another reason explained included details of the expected support from other

Communist leaders such as Stalin and the fact that Kim II-Sung thought the US would not get involved. Weaker responses included lengthy details on the events of the Korean War which were not relevant to this question.

(c)   Generally, most candidates were familiar with the main events of the Korean War. Strong responses were aware that the American government had been empowered by the UN to select a commander and had chosen General MacArthur. They highlighted his role and explained his initial success in driving the North Korean Forces over the 38th parallel. They further explained that he made a controversial move when he continued to push the North Koreans further north and suggested bombing cities in China that were thought to be aiding the North Korean troops, leading to his dismissal. These responses argued that it was more a victory for the US because although the UN included forces from 16 different nations, they were largely made up of Americans. The United Nations was therefore dominated by the Americans, which made the United Nations look weak. Few responses could present a case about the United Nations in combatting communism, rather than being an organisation to secure and maintain peace. They did gain credit for explaining the armistice and the fact that South Korea remained capitalist.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

(a)   This question was very well answered, and most candidates were familiar with and could describe the main features of a trench. Marks were awarded for features such as, 'trenches were dug into the ground', 'they were protected by barbed wire and sandbags' and 'duckboards were often used to prevent soldiers getting their feet wet'. Other points credited included the use of parapets and the existence of specific dugouts for resting.

(b)   Most responses identified reasons why an attack on the Somme was launched in July 1916. They were rewarded for stating, 'to relieve the French troops at Verdun', 'to divide the German troops between two battle sites' and 'to weaken German morale.' Some responses would have been improved by developing these identifications into explanations. These less successful responses often tended to give a description of what happened at the Somme, rather than explain why the attack on the Somme was launched, which was the focus of the question. They also tended to confuse who was fighting where. Strong responses were able to explain the historical importance of Verdun to the French, placing emphasis on the tactics of the Germans and the increasing number of French casualties - therefore the attack was launched on the Somme to take pressure off the French, because Germany would have to switch some of its troops to the Somme. A second explanation was developed around achieving a decisive breakthrough on the Western Front and subsequently winning the war.

(c)   The best responses used specific examples of the defensive strategy on the Western Front, most commonly the workings of the trench system. They used the British attack on the Somme to show how, because the enemy was so well dug in, it meant that huge numbers of troops were killed as they left their trenches and tried to advance across No Man's Land. This meant that for many years there was little progress made on the Western Front. They also evaluated the impact of the introduction of new weapons on the Western Front, such as tanks and machine guns. In order to produce a balanced argument, strong responses then explained successful attacks, for example how in the Ludendorff Offensive the German army advanced over 35 miles in the first three weeks; however, once the land was taken, it had to be defended and this caused problems for the German army. Weaker responses were characterised by general accounts of warfare, including conditions in the trenches, without any reference to either attack or defence, and often information such as details from the War at Sea and the Eastern Front, which lacked relevance here.

Question 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

(a)   This question was very well answered, and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the Reichstag Fire. Among the responses were, 'the fire took place in 1933', 'the accused was a Dutchman, Van der Lubbe', 'he was a communist' and 'Hitler claimed that it was part of a communist plot to overthrow the government'. Candidates also gained credit for stating that, 'Hindenburg issued an emergency decree' and 'many thought that the Nazis had started the fire on purpose to discredit the Communists'. A very small number of candidates confused the Reichstag Fire with Kristallnacht.

(b)   Most candidates were familiar with the events of the Night of Long Knives and were able to outline events. The focus of the question was why it took place. Many responses identified that Rohm was a threat to Hitler, but weaker ones neglected to explain why. Strong responses cited Rohm's leadership of the SA, with up to 4 million supporters, and pointed out that his views were different as he wanted a second revolution, which was considered by Hitler and industrialists to be too much like communism. Hitler needed the support of the industrialists, so Rohm had to be removed. Other reasons explained included Rohm's aim to merge with the army and that the SA's continued violence was becoming an embarrassment to Hitler. A small number of responses confused the SA with the SS and also again confused the Night of Long Knives with the Night of Broken Glass. Some drifted from the focus of the question and included the results of the Night of Long Knives.

(c)   There were some mixed responses to this question, some being one-sided as a number of candidates were unfamiliar with how the support of wealthy industrialists helped Hitler to become Chancellor. Strong responses identified how they funded the Nazi Party to promote their campaigns, and also how they shared Hitler's anti-communist views, and developed explanations using contextual details to support these two points. Candidates were much more confident explaining other reasons why Hitler became Chancellor, including his extensive use of propaganda, his promise to create jobs to solve the unemployment problem and his determination to destroy the Treaty of Versailles. The best responses also demonstrated a good understanding of the political turmoil in the early 1930s, of which Hitler took advantage. They cited the failures of von Papen and von Schleicher to deal with the problems caused by the Depression. They explained that eventually von Papen persuaded Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor, with him as Vice Chancellor, so that they could control Hitler and use the popular support for the Nazis to benefit the government. The key focus of this question was why Hitler became Chancellor, which was in January 1933. The chronology used by some candidates was incorrect and they included details of both the Reichstag Fire and the Night of Long Knives, which happened after he became Chancellor. Other responses appeared to be discussing how he maintained his power.

Question 12

(a)   Many candidates were unfamiliar with the term 'justice system' and wrote generally about the changes Hitler made in Germany, most commonly changes to the school curriculum and the role of women. This lacked relevance to the question. Credit was given for, 'the Nazis took control of the courts', 'all magistrates and judges had to take an oath of loyalty to Hitler', 'Jewish judges were sacked' and 'crimes carried out by Nazi agents were ignored'. The special courts set up for political crimes and the death penalty for telling anti-Nazi jokes could have been mentioned by more candidates.

(b)   Most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of one reason why the Nazis persecuted racial minorities in Germany by explaining that they believed in the Master Race theory. Stronger responses included a second explanation which often emphasised how Hitler blamed the Jews for the problems facing Germany, for example, he blamed Jewish businessmen and bankers for Germany's defeat in the First World War, as he thought that they had forced the surrender of the German Army in 1918.

(c)   There were mixed responses to this question, with some one-sided answers seen. These responses included general details on the opposition from the churches. Stronger responses included specific supporting detail, such as the activities of Pope Pius XI, Bishop Galen, Pastors Niemoller and Bonhoeffer. Candidates were more confident in explaining the other side of the argument, including opposition from Youth Groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement. Others explained the activities of the White Rose Group and details of the July bomb

plot. Strong responses needed to develop a balanced argument by explaining specific opposition from the churches and other opposition. A small number of responses included opposition to the Weimar Government in the 1920s such as the Spartacists, which lacked relevance to this question.

Questions 13

(a) Descriptions of events around Bloody Sunday, on which most candidates were knowledgeable, featured in responses, while the establishment of the St. Petersburg Soviet and the Potemkin mutiny were rarely mentioned. There was a tendency to give reasons for the revolutionary activity (for example poverty, bad living and working conditions), rather than details of the activity itself.

(b) This question was well answered. Most responses included a good explanation of the impact on Russia resulting from its defeat in the Russo-Japanese War. Other explanations emphasised the difficult conditions faced by industrial workers in the cities and by Russian peasants in the countryside, including unequal land distribution and food shortages. Most had a good understanding of the privileged position enjoyed by the nobility and the Church, as well as the oppressive nature of the tsarist regime. Weaker responses often described factors which applied to the revolution of February/March 1917, rather than 1905.

(c) There were some sound answers to this question. Strong responses usually firstly explained why there was hatred of the Tsarina and how this contributed to the downfall of the Tsar in 1917. The association of the Tsarina with Rasputin was well known and well explained in many instances, often with reference to rumours about the extent of their involvement with each other and the consequent hostile publicity. A second explanation that was used by a few candidates on this side of the argument usually made reference to her German origins and perceived disloyalty or the nature of the appointments and decisions made in conjunction with Rasputin. Though these reasons were missed by some candidates, most could identify other reasons for the downfall of the Tsar, especially his decision to go to the Front and subsequently taking the blame for Russia's defeats, food shortages and the growing dissatisfaction among Russian soldiers. Strong responses developed these identifications into explanations. In a very small number of responses there was some confusion with events leading to the Bolshevik Revolution later in 1917, so that the activities of Lenin and his followers were explained.

Question 14

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

Question 15

(a) Many candidates were well informed on the technical innovations which helped industry to develop in the 1920s. Most mentioned the assembly line used by Henry Ford to mass produce cars. Strong answers identified that the widespread use of electricity meant that homes and businesses had an efficient source of power. The advances made in chemicals, which brought new products such as Bakelite and cellophane, could have been included in more responses.

(b) Candidates were very familiar with the reasons why more Americans were able to buy consumer goods in the 1920s and there were many successful responses containing two explanations. The best responses identified and then explained the point. For example: 'In the 1920s hire purchase was introduced. This meant that workers could buy a new appliance, such as a car or vacuum cleaner and pay for it in instalments. They didn't have to pay the full price up front, and this made it easier to buy an expensive item, resulting in many more people buying household goods'. Many other reasons were put forward including high employment, rising wages and cheaper prices as a result of mass production, the use of advertising and the low taxation policy of the Republican government. Other responses identified reasons but would have been improved by the inclusion of supporting contextual detail.

(c) Answers here were variable in quality, some being one-sided. Strong responses demonstrated understanding and explained the impact of the tariff system on farming. They understood why America had introduced the tariffs and emphasised that the impact of this policy was that foreign countries could not afford to buy US farm produce and, as the US after the First World War was overproducing anyway, this meant that farm prices in the US dropped and therefore farmers became poor. On the other side of the argument, they explained other issues that were facing

farmers at this time, most commonly the competition from Canada and Argentina, and the fact that farmers had borrowed money from banks and that, with lower prices, they could not pay their debts. Less successful responses were characterised by a lack of understanding of American tariffs and the inclusion of details from the 1930s, for example the dust bowl, which lacked relevance to this question.

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

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

HISTORY

Key messages

Answers to **Question 6** should be based on what the sources say, which should be used to test the hypothesis.

When comparing sources, it is important that candidates do this point by point, rather than by summarising each source in turn.

It is important to decide which questions require the sources to be evaluated.

When evaluating sources, it normally helps to consider the purpose of the author or artist. The provenance of sources can often be useful for this, but it needs to be used in conjunction with what the sources say.

For each question, candidates need to read the sources, think carefully about the question, and only start writing their answers when they know exactly what they want to say.

It is important that candidates consider all the parts of a cartoon when trying to interpret it.

When asked is a source is surprising, or if it can be trusted, it is important that candidates clearly state whether or not they think it is surprising or to be trusted.

General comments

The overall quality of responses was variable. A number of candidates struggled with **Question 6,** making no, or little, use of the sources in their answers to this question or not using the correct hypothesis. There were also a number of candidates who used the surface meaning of sources uncritically and did not recognise when it was necessary to carry out some evaluation. However, many good answers were seen, demonstrating skills such as interpretation, cross-referencing and evaluation, as well as the ability to use sources in their historical context.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth-century topic

Question 1

Many candidates found it straightforward to find valid agreements between the two sources, and there were many, for example Germany sent the Panther, Germany was given land, and there was tension between the British and French navies. Fewer candidates found disagreements. The most commonly used one was over whether the crisis came close to causing war. Disagreements require more explanation than agreements. It is necessary to state both sides of the disagreement, rather than just identify what the disagreement was about, for example 'Source A states that Britain knew what German intentions were, but Source B states that Britain did not know German intentions.' Some candidates paraphrased each source in turn and asserted that they agreed, when what was required was a point-by-point comparison of the two sources.

Question 2

A reasonable number of candidates were able to explain the big message of Source C– the tension between Germany and France, while many were able to explain sub-messages such as large navies were bringing

war closer. In a number of less successful responses, candidates did not engage with the cartoon at all and wrote a narrative of the Moroccan Crisis, while others thought that Britain was represented in the cartoon and based their answers on that misunderstanding. Some candidates used the text at the bottom of the cartoon literally and claimed that both Germany and France genuinely wanted peace.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to find key disagreements between Source D and Source E and use them to argue that Source E does make Source D surprising. Source D shows concerns about a possible German naval attack and worries about the lack of preparedness of British ships, while in Source E a British admiral boasts about the strength of the British navy and dismisses any possibility of war. However, whether or not Source E does make Source D surprising depends on whether either or both of these sources can be trusted. In stronger responses candidates realised this and attempted to evaluate. There are many possibilities for this, for example in Source G Tirpitz claims that Germany did not want to go to war, thus questioning the claims made by the British newspaper in Source D, or the candidates' contextual knowledge of Britain's programme of Dreadnought building would give them a reason for supporting Source E. Weaker answers either made assertions based on the provenance of the sources and without relating it to the content of the sources, or compared the sources perfectly adequately but made no attempt to address the issue of surprise.

Question 4

One way of explaining why Heydebrand made this speech in November 1911 is to refer to the political context. The provenance of the source mentions the Franco-German agreement of that time, but a good number of candidates were able to add that the agreement was a disappointment to the Germans, thus explaining Heydebrand's tone. Another approach adopted by some candidates involved explaining Heydebrand's message. The better answers showed understanding of his threat of war aimed at Britain. Weaker answers paraphrased the source and lacked an understanding of what he wanted to say. This is a 'purpose' question and the best answers attempted to explain what Heydebrand was trying to achieve in this speech. In other words, what impact did he want to have on his audience? A small number of candidates suggested valid possible purposes, for example to persuade the German government to take a more aggressive position against Britain, or to persuade the Reichstag to oppose the Franco-German agreement or put pressure on the German government to act against Britain.

Question 5

The better answers to this question attempted to evaluate Tirpitz's account. This was best done by considering Tirpitz's possible purpose, for example to distance himself from German actions and to try and protect his own reputation. This needed to be supported by reference to the contents of the source. Some candidates cross-referenced to other sources to check his claims. However, some candidates struggled to answer this question well because they just paraphrased the source and then asserted that its account of events in 1911 was accurate. To make this approach work, it is necessary to use clear and specific contextual knowledge to check what Source G says. Some candidates referred to the information in the provenance of the source but would have benefited from going on to use it in conjunction with what Tirpitz says.

Question 6

A number of candidates struggled with this question. It is important that candidates test the hypothesis exactly as it is stated in the question. Some answers contained no use of the sources. The question asked candidates how far the sources support the hypothesis. This means that the question is about the sources and that answers must be based on them. When sources were used by candidates, they were sometimes not used properly. Candidates need to explain how a source supports or does not support the hypothesis, rather than, for example, assert that it does. The following example demonstrates the proper way to use the sources: 'Source D supports the idea that Europe was very close to war in 1911 because it claims that German destroyers planned a night torpedo attack on Portland and the German main fleet planned to attack the British fleet. This would have caused a European war. On the other hand, Tirpitz in Source G says that Germany, 'did not want to go to war' and backed down. This shows that it was determined to avoid war.'

The most straightforward, and effective, way of answering **Question 6** is to explain the sources that support the hypothesis, one by one, and then to do the same with the sources that do not support it. It is important that for each source use candidates make clear which source they are using and on which side of the argument the source lies. Often a well-chosen quotation from the relevant source will be enough to make the

point, but sometimes there needs to be a brief explanation of how the source supports or does not support the hypothesis.

Option B: Twentieth-century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered very well. Most candidates attempted a point-by-point comparison. They found agreements easier to find than disagreements. The most common agreements to be found in answers included: the Soviets were worried by Nagy, Khrushchev did not want to appear as weak and the Soviets sent tanks into Hungary on 4 November. Disagreements included: Source A claims that the Soviet decision was made over a number of days, while Source B says that the Soviets changed their minds suddenly, and Source A says that the use of force was inevitable, while Source B says it was a surprise. When writing about an agreement, it is sufficient to say, for example, 'Both sources say that the Soviets were worried by Nagy's actions.' Disagreements require rather more explanation, for example, 'In Source A the Soviets were worried that demands for independence would spread to Eastern Europe, but Source B says that the Soviets were mainly worried about counter-revolutionaries. It is not sufficient to simply identify what the sources disagree about. A small number of candidates summarised each source in turn and did not focus on particular points while others just wrote about the events. It is important that candidates read both sources carefully and identify the main points of agreement and disagreement before starting to write their answers.

Question 2

When answering a 'message' question about a cartoon it is important that candidates use all the details in the cartoon to help form and reach their interpretation. They must go beyond the details of the cartoon and explain what overall point the cartoonist was trying to make. The cartoon (Source C) has two parts – Khrushchev dealing with Hungary, and the UN dealing with the crisis over Suez. Reaching the big message of the cartoonist involves putting these two parts together to explain that the UN is punishing those countries involved in Suez, while ignoring Soviet actions in Hungary. Candidates needed to go further and explain the cartoonist's point of view – criticising the UN. Most candidates were able to explain a valid sub-message of the cartoon, for example the UN is punishing Israel, Britain and France, and Hungary is suffering from Soviet violence. Fewer explained the big message, and only a small number demonstrated an understanding of the point of view of the cartoonist. A number of responses were limited to descriptions of the cartoon, for example a man is holding Hungary down or/and Israel, Britain and France had to write lines.

Question 3

Most candidates were able to find disagreements between Sources D and E and use them to explain how Source E makes Source D surprising, for example in Source D Khrushchev's main concern was helping the Hungarian working class, while in Source E it was to prevent the USSR from looking weak. An good number of candidates explained that in Source D Khrushchev was claiming that he wanted to help the Hungarians, while in Source E he was acting for the good of the Soviet Union. This led some of them to use both the content and the provenance of the sources to produce some evaluation, for example in Source D he was writing in his memoirs and wanted to create a good impression of himself for posterity, in Source E he was speaking to the leaders of the Soviet Union and wanted to impress them with his concern for the USSR. Both of these points cast some doubt over whether Khrushchev can be trusted in one of both of the sources. It is important that, having carried out this evaluation, candidates use it to answer the question – does Source E make Source D surprising? Weaker answers either used the provenance of the sources but neglected to use their content, or analysed or evaluated the sources but did not state whether they thought that Source E made Source D surprising.

Question 4

Most candidates understood Source G and explained that it was pro-Hungarian and critical of the Soviets. However, Source F proved to be more challenging for some candidates, with many thinking that the figures under the coat were Soviet soldiers or agents. A small number of candidates realised that Source F is pro-Soviet and critical of the Hungarians and argued that they were not genuinely interested in 'democracy, freedom and independence'. A reasonable number of candidates were able to compare sub-messages of the two sources, for example the Soviets are in control in both, but few compared the big messages, because of the difficulties they had with Source F.

Question 5

The key to producing a good answer to this question was to realise that it required Source H to be evaluated. Kovacs had very good reasons for expressing anti-Soviet and pro-revolution ideas in the interview. The US newspaper also had clear motives for reporting the interview in the way it did. Good answers were based on candidates asking themselves, what was their purpose and does this affect the usefulness of the source? Many candidates, however, took an uncritical approach towards the source and used its contents to simply demonstrate how it was useful. Some of these answers used any information in Source H, but the better ones focused on the key point that Kovacs was making about the revolution – that it was not a counter-revolution. The weaker answers just made assertions based on claims that, for example, Kovacs was anti-communist or that the newspaper was American and therefore could not be trusted. If candidates are going to use the provenance of the source to evaluate, they need to do so in conjunction with what the source says. This will take them to a possible motive or purpose.

Question 6

A number of candidates found this question challenging. Some did not read the question closely enough and only used the first part of the hypothesis. This meant that they were testing whether or not the Soviets used military force in Hungary, whereas the full hypothesis was that the reason why the Soviets used military force was to put down counter-revolution. Some answers contained no use of the sources. The question asks candidates how far the sources support the hypothesis. This means that the question is about the sources and that answers must be based on them. When sources were used by candidates, they were sometimes not used properly. The candidates needed to explain how a source supports or does not support the hypothesis, rather than just asserting that, for example, it does support it. The following example demonstrates the proper way to use the sources: 'Source B supports the idea that the reason the Soviets used military force was to put down counter-revolution because it says that the Soviets decided to end the revolution violently because, 'Hungary could fall to counter-revolutionaries'. Source E, on the other hand, does not support it because it says that the Soviets used military force because they would have given the Americans a great boost if they had withdrawn their troops.'

The most straightforward, and effective, way of answering **Question 6** is to first explain the sources that support the hypothesis, one by one, and then do the same with the sources that do not support it. It is important that for each source use candidates make clear which source they are using and on which side of the argument the source lies. Often a well-chosen quotation from the relevant source will be enough to make the point, but sometimes there needs to be a brief explanation of how the source supports/does not support the hypothesis.

HISTORY

Paper 0977/03
Coursework

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

HISTORY

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

Paper 0977/41
Alternative to Coursework

</div>

Key messages

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

General comments

A range of Depth Studies was undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919-41. A number of centres also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18, Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41, Depth Study E: China c.1930-c.1990 and Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940–c.1994. There were too few attempts at Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945 to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, and a small number few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 was the more popular choice this session, with only a small number of candidates choosing **Question 2** for their response.

Question 1 was generally well answered. Candidates had a good knowledge of the Battle of Mons and were able to describe or explain how this battle impacted the course of the war up to the end of 1914. Many candidates made reference to the entry of the BEF into the war and the important prevention of the outflanking of the French Fifth Army, as well as the casualties to the German forces. This was then balanced by examining other factors that impacted the course of the war such as Belgian resistance, Russian mobilisation, the Battle of the Marne, the race to the sea and the First Battle of Ypres. Many candidates also acknowledged the important roles played by new weapons and technology and the development of trench warfare in their responses. The strongest answers were able to provide accurate and detailed descriptions and explanations, often in a logical sequence, and began to assess the relative importance of each factor using examples to support their arguments. Weaker responses tended to provide more confused accounts, which struggled with the chronology and resulted in unsubstantiated assertions.

Question 2 produced a small number of good responses which were able to give details of the significance of the Turkish defences in the Gallipoli Campaign and explain how these preparations and strategic advantages, particularly over the terrain, eventually led to the defeat of the Allies. This was then compared to other significant factors such as the poor planning and leadership provided by the Allies, environmental problems, including the weather and climate of the region, and the lack of experience of the Allied and ANZAC troops of fighting in the region. A few very good answers gave in-depth examples in their

descriptions and explanations and were able to reach valid and convincing judgements and conclusions. Less successful responses tended to lack detail and only provided a brief narrative of the campaign, often with a number of errors or inaccuracies.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45

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

Question 3 was generally well answered. Candidates had a sound knowledge of the period of hyperinflation and the impact it had on Germany. Many responses focused on the socio-economic issues prevalent in Germany during the hyperinflation period, as well as some of the political repercussions, including the Munich Putsch. This factor was then compared to other relevant factors that led to unrest such as the Ruhr invasion, the financial, military and territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and political violence caused by far right and far left groups such as the Spartacist Uprising in 1919 and the Kapp Putsch in 1920. Good answers were able to explain how each of these factors caused unrest in Germany and provided detailed contextual knowledge to support their arguments. Some of the best responses were able to explain the various links and connections between the different factors. Other responses would have been improved by a better grasp of the chronology, particularly relating to the causes of the hyperinflation, and by providing the greater depth and detail necessary for convincing arguments.

Question 4 was also well answered, with a small number of very strong responses. The best answers had a good grasp of the different actions taken by the Nazis against the communists between 1933 and 1934. Many candidates gave detailed descriptions of the Reichstag Fire and the subsequent Reichstag Fire Decree passed by Hindenburg, which increased Hitler's powers to crush the communists in Germany. Some candidates also linked this to the March elections and the Enabling Act, where the Communist Party was formally banned. A few candidates also examined the use of paramilitary violence by the SS, SA and Gestapo to shut down the Communist Party by force. This was then compared against other factors that consolidated Hitler's position in Germany such as the Night of the Long Knives, the death of Hindenburg and the German army's oath of loyalty to Hitler. Many of these responses contained well-deployed and precise examples to support focused explanations and conclusions. Weaker responses often strayed outside of the parameters of the question and examined the period before Hitler's appointment as Chancellor in January 1933, instead focusing on the Nazi electoral success between 1930 and 1932. It is important to keep responses within the focus of the question, which in this case is Hitler's consolidation of power, rather than how the Nazis increased their electoral support.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41

A number of centres attempted this Depth Study. Both questions were attempted, although **Question 5** was the more popular choice among candidates.

Question 5 produced some responses in which candidates were able to give some relevant detail about the 1905 Revolution and explain how the strikes, riots and political upheaval increasingly led to the weakening of the Tsar's position. Many candidates began by examining the Bloody Sunday incident, which was often described in precise detail. However, most candidates struggled to give very much detail about the revolution itself, and a few candidates viewed the Bloody Sunday incident and the 1905 Revolution as the same event. Some stronger responses were able to provide adequate balance by examining other factors that weakened the Tsar, such as the limitations of the October Manifesto and the passing of the Fundamental Laws, the limits of Stolypin's reforms, as well as his repressive methods against opponents. Weaker responses tended to lack an in-depth knowledge of the period and some answers strayed beyond the cut-off date of 1914.

On **Question 6** most responses were able to give some examples and detail about the different methods of Stalinist propaganda in the Soviet Union and how it shaped the lives of Soviet citizens in the 1930s. Many candidates cited the use of the media and the rewriting of Soviet history and the development of the cult of personality around Stalin and, to a lesser extent, Lenin. Balance was provided by comparing propaganda against other significant factors such as the use of the gulag system, the purges and show trials, and the impact of the Five-Year Plans and collectivisation. Some answers strayed outside of the chronological parameters of the question and focused on Stalin's rise to power in the mid-1920s. A few of the stronger responses were able to reach convincing conclusions and provided well-supported explanations of each factor.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919-41

This was the second most popular topic. **Question 7** was the more popular choice among candidates.

Cambridge Assessment
International Education

©

Question 7 was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to give some explanation of why Henry Ford was important to the economic prosperity of the USA in the 1920s. Many cited the use of the assembly-line production methods in the Ford factories and how this led to a cheaper, more efficient method of mass production of the Model T. It was also common to see explanations of how the mass production of the motor car led to other industries benefiting, such as rubber, plate glass and steel, as well as road building, petroleum and the leisure and tourism industries. The best answers were able to explain how the increased consumerism led to increasing company profits and decreasing unemployment and better wages for many workers in these newer industries. This was then balanced against many other factors, for example Republican economic policies such as low taxation and protectionist tariffs, advertising, the availability of credit and the First World War. A small number of candidates were able to reach a judgement about which factor they thought was the most important, although a number of other responses would have benefited from more detailed contextual knowledge in order to reach much more convincing conclusions.

On **Question 8** a small number of candidates had a good knowledge and understanding of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and were able to explain how significant it was in dealing with the issue of unemployment in the USA during the Depression. These answers gave detailed descriptions of the various job creation opportunities used by the WPA and cited statistics of the impact it had. This was then compared against other alphabet agencies such as the CCC and the CWA, which were also created to deal with unemployment in the First New Deal. Some conclusions were reached in these responses, with some pointing to the fact that it was ultimately the Second World War which more permanently dealt with the issue of unemployment. Less successful responses lacked knowledge of the WPA and its actions or confused this agency with other agencies, leading to some inaccurate or irrelevant material being cited in the responses.

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

Question 9 was generally well answered by candidates. Most responses had a good understanding of the different actions taken by the Nationalist government during the Second World War which led to the Communist victory in 1949. These answers commonly cited the misuse of foreign funds from the USA, the hoarding of weapons and the failure of the Nationalists to engage the Japanese invaders and, instead, the focus on removing the threat of the Communists. This was then balanced against a range of other factors that resulted in a Communist victory in 1949 such as Mao's leadership and ideology, the support of the peasant classes, the Long March and the settlement in Yenan. Some answers contained a good level of detail and selected precise examples to support explanations about which factor was the most important. A small number of the weaker responses tended to be narrative in style or purely descriptive, with little attempt to assess relative importance.

Question 10

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

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

Both questions received a number of responses from candidates.

Question 11 was generally well answered. A small number of very strong responses were able to provide a detailed contextual knowledge of the government legislation on land ownership, such as the Natives Land Act, and explain how it enforced segregation in South Africa before the period of apartheid. Explanations were often convincing and well supported by precise examples. This was then compared against other important factors that maintained segregation such as the Pass Laws, legislation on housing and voting rights. Substantiated conclusions and judgements were reached by a few candidates who explained the relative importance of each of the pieces of legislation before 1948. Weaker responses tended to lack this detailed contextual knowledge of the period before 1948, and a few confused this legislation with laws passed during the period of apartheid, after 1948.

Question 12 produced some good answers which had a decent knowledge and understanding of Steve Biko and the South African Students' Organisation and the development of the Black Consciousness movement. This was then compared against the actions of other key individuals who challenged white minority rule in South Africa such as Mandela, Tambo and Buthelezi, as well as the actions of groups such as the ANC and PAC. Some candidates would have benefited from greater contextual knowledge of the challenges made against white minority rule, and only provided a brief narrative of the life of Steve Biko in their responses, resulting in a lack of balance. Other responses would have been improved by going beyond very generalised material and commentary relating to the period. These responses lacked the necessary depth to fully engage with the question.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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