

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/11</b> <b>Structured Questions</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

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

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

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in continuous prose. In **part (b)** and **(c)** questions, candidates should look to explain separate points in 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 their knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts which lacked explanation. Other weaker responses included incorrect factual details. Some of the weaker responses were very brief and generalised, with little supporting factual detail.

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. Explanation is not required. Most candidates recognised that responses to **(a)** questions could 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 give a description of what happened. Two relevant explanations with supporting contextual detail are required. Strong responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Some less successful answers included narratives about the topic and neglected to address the question.

**Part (c)** requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argued both for and against the focus of the question and reached 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 of the best responses consisted of two good, supported explanations (one on each side), and a valid reasoned judgement. However, some candidates found that they were better able to provide a top-level judgement, having provided more than two valid explanations to

draw upon. Weaker responses often provided well organised explanations but only on one side of the argument. These responses could have been improved by including relevant explanations, supported with contextual examples on both sides of the argument, in order to produce a balanced response. Responses which included narratives about the topic without addressing the question were also seen.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Section A: Core Content**

#### **Questions 1, 2 and 3**

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

#### **Question 4**

- (a) This question was well answered and most candidates gained credit for identifying features of the Black Hand. Four relevant points were required for full credit such as, 'It was a secret Serbian nationalist society', 'It was anti- Austrian', 'Gavrilo Princip was one of the members' and 'He was involved in the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand'. Marks were also awarded for the group being involved in acts of sabotage and political murders, and that members included many radicals and professional people.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most knew that the Triple Alliance was formed between Germany, Austria- Hungary and Italy, and a small number were able to develop explanations around it being formed for security, as the countries promised to support each other if attacked. Some responses provided a reason for the development of the Alliance System built around the position of Britain. For most of the nineteenth century Britain had been in 'splendid isolation' but, at the beginning of the twentieth century, with the industrial and military power of Germany increasing and the Kaiser's pursuit of 'world power' status, Britain began to co-operate with France and Russia, forming informal alliances - the Entente Cordiale with France in 1904 becoming the Triple Entente in 1907, when Russia signed the agreement.
- (c) Strong responses to this question often started their response identifying and explaining how Kaiser Wilhem's policy of Weltpolitik created tension between Britain and Germany because of Wilhelm's desire to transform Germany into a global power through aggressive diplomacy, the acquisition of overseas colonies and the development of a large navy. Events in the Morocco Crises of 1905 and 1911 were often effectively used to explain colonial rivalry and the tension that arose between Britain and Germany. In order to create a balanced response, other reasons for causes of tensions were explained - most commonly the naval rivalry between Britain and Germany that developed in the early twentieth century. Weaker responses demonstrated more confidence on this side of the argument and gained credit for explaining that Germany, by building up its naval strength and establishing the German High Seas Fleet, was threatening Britain's strong naval tradition and economic superiority, and encouraged Britain to start a programme of Dreadnought building. Germany also started building more powerful ships and the naval race which followed suggested that both sides were preparing for war. The least successful responses just identified reasons for tension between the two countries, such as, 'The Kaiser wanted colonies' or 'There was an arms race going on between the two countries', with no further comments provided.

#### **Question 5**

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

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated understanding of the workings of the League of Nations' Slavery Commission and were awarded for identifying four features such as, 'The Commission aimed to abolish slavery', 'It wanted to end the 'white slave' trade', 'The Commission wrote reports which pressurised governments to end slavery' and 'The Commission organised raids against slave owners'. Successful responses often included examples of where the Commission had made a significant impact, such as Iraq, Burma, Nepal, Sierra Leone and Jordan. There were a significant number of candidates who were not familiar with the work of the League of Nations' Slavery Commission and either did not answer the question or wrote about refugees, prisoners of war and improving working hours, thus confusing the work of the Slavery

Commission with other Commissions, such as the ILO and Refugee Commission, set up at this time by the League of Nations. There were other responses that strayed away from the focus of the question and wrote generally about the work of the League of Nations.

- (b) The best answers to this question consisted of two explained reasons. Most responses gained credit for identifying reasons why Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931. The most commonly identified reason was that because of the Great Depression Japan needed more markets and resources. To develop this point into an explanation, strong responses supported the identification with contextual knowledge and explained that the US had stopped buying Japan's main export silk because of the Depression and, as a result, Japan could not afford essential imports and so looked to Manchuria, which was rich in coal and minerals. Other reasons for the invasion such as the need for fertile land to feed the growing population, the Japanese military wanting to build an empire or the alleged incident on the Mukden Railway were rarely explained enough to become a creditable explanation. Some weaker responses were characterised by details of the events of the invasion and the failure of the League of Nations to deal effectively with the problem, which was not the focus of the question.
- (c) There were some well-developed and balanced responses to this question. Most candidates were able to identify weaknesses of the League. The strongest responses tended to first discuss the weakness of the League of Nations decision-making procedure, usually highlighting the need for unanimous votes in the Assembly, the use of the veto in the Council, resulting in slow decision making, and then gave an example to demonstrate this weakness. The most commonly used example was the League's lack of action and slowness during the Manchurian Crisis, with the Lytton investigation and report. A common explanation used on the other side of the argument was the absence of big powers being members of the League, such as the USA, Germany and the USSR. This meant that economic sanctions would not be successful if these powers carried on trading with the offending country, such as the USA continuing to supply Italy with oil during the Abyssinian crisis. Weaker responses included the USA's reasons for not joining the League, rather than discussing the impact of USA's absence. Another weakness of the League commonly explained was the lack of a standing army and that members were reluctant to volunteer troops; this was evident in 1920 when Poland took over Vilna, the capital of Lithuania. When Lithuania appealed to the League, it ruled that Polish action was illegal and asked the Poles to withdraw. The Poles refused and the League had no army to enforce their decision. Some responses explained the weaknesses but also explained the successes of the League of Nations. This lacked relevance to the question.

## Question 6

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

- (a) This question was about the terms of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Though many candidates could write about the context of the Pact and its implications for Germany and Soviet Russia, it was the terms of the Pact which were required. Most candidates gained marks for knowing that it was, 'A non-aggression pact' and that 'The two powers agreed to divide Poland' but they struggled to include two more terms. Reference to the duration of the Pact and the secret nature of the agreement over Poland would have improved many responses. Only a few were able to refer to the agreement over spheres of influence in Eastern Europe and to any of the other terms. A small number of candidates erroneously referred to the Pact as an alliance in which the two powers agreed to go to the other's defence in the event of war. The weakest responses showed no knowledge of the Pact, confused it with other treaties or treated it as an internal German policy.
- (b) Most candidates were able to identify Hitler's wish to test his tactics and his forces and many also identified his closer ties with Mussolini or his search for allies, through joining the conflict, as reasons why German involvement in the Spanish Civil War was important to Hitler. Stronger responses explained the two points above. They were able to refer to Hitler's future warlike intentions in explanation of the use of German forces (often referring to the use of bombing at Guernica as a prelude to Germany's tactics in the Second World War). In the case of Hitler's wish for closer relations with Mussolini, responses referred to either the development of the Rome-Berlin Axis and the Anti-Comintern Pact or to the fact that Mussolini's opposition to Hitler's aim of Anschluss with Austria was removed. Hitler's wish to eradicate communism was also frequently identified as a motivation for German involvement in Spain but candidates had more difficulty in developing this as an explanation. Though some candidates correctly asserted that Hitler also

wanted to secure Franco as a future ally, quite a number of these wrote mistakenly that he was successful in this quest.

- (c) This question was well answered, with many candidates able to identify and explain the reasons for the anxiety of Britain and France over the dangers posed by communism and then linking this to Germany's vulnerability to communism and Hitler's strong opposition to it, making Germany a potential buffer against its spread. Weaker responses found 'the fear of communism' side of the argument difficult to explain and most found it difficult to provide more than one explanatory point on this side of the argument. (Very few, for instance, referred to the possibility that the aim of appeasement was to turn Hitler's attention to the east and the perceived communist threat from Soviet Russia.) Even so, on the other side of the argument, many were able to explain other reasons for the adoption of the policy, most frequently citing Britain and France's perceived need for time to prepare for war, the fear of repeating the suffering of the First World War, the feeling that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh and that Hitler's isolationism claims had some justification. Some stronger responses were able to refer to the US and lack of support from British Dominions and explain how this fed into the justification for appeasement. Where these points were supported by reference to events and relevant information, candidates often achieved high marks. Weaker responses were able to list the other relevant factors for appeasement but would have benefitted from developing a sound explanation. A few candidates had an insecure understanding of events, and some common misunderstandings appeared across a number of scripts. One of these was that it was Hitler who was seeking to spread communism. Another was that it was Hitler who led the policy of appeasement.

#### Question 7

- (a) This question was very well answered. Most candidates included four facts about Fidel Castro. Most knew that 'He was the leader of Cuba'. Others were rewarded for: 'In 1959 he overthrew Batista', and 'He received arms from the Soviet Union'. Credit was also awarded for aspects of his personality, including being clever, charming and ruthless. Many also gained credit for describing his popularity due to his vision for a better Cuba, including improved healthcare and free education.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why the United States objected to the Soviet Union placing missiles in Cuba. They gained credit for identifying and explaining two reasons, most commonly, the threat the missiles posed to America and peace, as Cuba was close to the USA, and the upset in the balance of power, as it appeared that Khrushchev was gaining the upper hand in the Cold War. Most weaker responses were able to identify that the missiles posed a threat but could not explain why. For an explanation they needed details of the proximity of Cuba to the USA, the threat of an imminent nuclear attack and that, should the missiles become operational, there would have been huge destruction of American cities and massive casualties. Less successful responses rarely put the missiles into the context of the Cold War. Some drifted away from the focus of the question and included details on how the missiles were discovered, which was not the focus of the question.

- (c) Strong responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the actions of Kennedy and Khrushchev during the Cuban Missile Crisis and were able to provide evidence to illustrate who gained the most. The best responses explained how Kennedy had come out of the Crisis with an improved reputation (especially after the Bay of Pigs disaster), that he stood up to hardliners in his own government who wanted him to invade Cuba, by imposing a blockade, and that he was viewed as a responsible peacemaker. Most importantly, he got Khrushchev to remove the missiles from Cuba and thus made Americans feel much safer, as he had avoided a nuclear war. Then, to produce a balanced argument, they explained Khrushchev's position, including that Cuba had remained communist and that US missiles were removed from Turkey. In judgement, many strong responses came to the conclusion that Kennedy gained the most from the Crisis because although US missiles had to be removed from Turkey, this part of the arrangement was kept secret, so many thought that Khrushchev had been unable to strengthen his position at home as he'd been forced to back down and remove his missiles from Cuba and, as a result, he was removed from office two years later. Some weaker responses confused the Cuban Missile Crisis with events in the Bay of Pigs of April 1961 and gave detailed accounts of what happened there. Less successful responses contained much narrative and description of the events of the actual crisis.

### Question 8

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

## Section B: Depth Studies

### Question 9

- (a) Most candidates were well informed on the Schlieffen Plan and identified four relevant features, for example: 'It was proposed in 1905', 'It was Germany's plan to win the First World War', 'It was designed so that Germany would not have to fight a war on two fronts' and 'It was later modified by Von Moltke'. Marks were also awarded for how Belgium, France and Russia were to be involved in the Plan and the fact that 'speed' was the essence of the Plan.
- (b) Most responses could identify and explain one reason why trench warfare developed on the Western Front - most commonly trenches were dug for defence as they gave protection from snipers and shells. Only a small number of candidates gave two relevant explanations. The best responses were also able to put the building of trenches into the context of the events of the war, by explaining that the Battle of the Marne and the Battle of Ypres had led to both sides suffering heavy casualties, and neither side making much progress, so both sides dug trenches to hold onto their positions and the war of movement ended. Weaker responses drifted from the focus of the question and included details of the conditions in the trenches which was not directly related to the question.
- (c) The best responses demonstrated a good understanding of the Schlieffen Plan and how speed was key to the Plan succeeding. They stressed that neither the Belgians nor the Russians did what the Schlieffen Plan expected them to do. Most firstly explained how the resistance of the Belgians held up the Germans, giving examples such as the Germans taking over a week to take Liege because it was well defended by the Belgians. Others emphasised the impact of the delay caused by Belgian resistance and how it allowed the BEF to meet the Germans at Mons and bought time for Russian and French troops to mobilise. It meant that the Germans did not reach Paris in the expected six weeks. A balanced response was achieved by explaining that, in theory, the Plan assumed that Russia would take a long time to mobilise. However, in practice the Germans were surprised. Russian troops were ready and moved more quickly than expected, meaning that the Germans had to transfer some troops to the Eastern Front and therefore ended up fighting a war on two fronts, which the Schlieffen Plan had wanted to prevent. Weaker responses, although showing some understanding that speed was key to the plan, needed to include more contextual examples to emphasise their point. Some strong responses also gained credit for including how Von Moltke made alterations to the Plan, which reduced the size of the army which invaded Belgium, and that this made it more possible for Belgian resistance to take place.

### Question 10

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

### Question 11

This was a popular question among the Depth Studies.

- (a) Many candidates were well informed on Friedrich Ebert and were able to identify four relevant points about him. They usually identified the positions held by Ebert at the start of the Weimar Republic (first Chancellor and then President), the years he held office, his leadership of the Social Democratic Party and his association with Germany's acceptance of the Treaty of Versailles.
- (b) The best responses to this question had a clear understanding of how proportional representation worked and could explain the problems it created for Weimar Germany (mainly fragile coalition governments that did not last long, difficulties reaching decisions and disproportionate influence for extremist parties). Strong answers were also able to achieve higher marks by focussing on the disagreements and short-lived nature of the coalition governments and also by focusing on the use of Article 48 to break deadlocks, particularly during Ebert's presidency. However, while most answers referred to the need for coalition governments under the Weimar system, many candidates appeared to be muddled in their understanding of how the system worked. Some believed that it gave all parties equal representation or that extremist parties could control the government.
- (c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question in which candidates were able to demonstrate the diplomatic, economic and cultural achievements of Stresemann in the 1920s. Some candidates explained both sides of the argument and included a valid judgement on 'how far'. Some considered his improvement of Germany's standing in foreign affairs to be most important because he was able to turn Germany from a distrusted and friendless country in 1923 to one that, as a result of admission to the League of Nations in 1926, was seen as peace-loving and an equal. He did solve Germany's problem of hyperinflation with the help of loans from America but unfortunately the economic prosperity that this created was short-lived because of the Wall Street Crash and subsequent Great Depression. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of accurate information. Some candidates included such achievements as the Dawes Plan in their explanation of foreign policy achievements, while others included these in economic achievements. Where explanations were clear, both of these approaches could be awarded as an explanation. Many candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the Locarno Treaty and Germany's admission into the League of Nations and explained how these aspects represented Germany's return to diplomatic equality. Others identified them without explaining their significance. Knowledge and understanding of Stresemann's economic achievements was variable, with strong responses able to explain Germany's difficulties in 1923 – 24 (the occupation of the Ruhr and the consequent hyperinflation) and the changes made to address them (ending passive resistance and the introduction of a new currency). Other responses would have been improved by providing more supportive knowledge or more explanation of the impact of Stresemann's achievements, for example the Dawes Plan (the American loan) was often mentioned without any reference to its impact on Germany's economic recovery in the 1920s. Fewer candidates mentioned the cultural developments of the Stresemann era and often the accounts here were superficial, where further details on, for example, new developments in art or architecture or cinema could have resulted in the award of marks for an explanation.

### Question 12

This was also a popular question among the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was well answered and almost all candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of Hitler's vision of the 'perfect' family. Four relevant points were required, such as 'The family would be Aryan', 'The family structure would be traditional', 'The parents would be married' and 'They would be loyal to Hitler'. Many candidates also gained credit for describing the roles of the parents and giving details of what was expected of the children.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most responses identified that the main way that members of the working class benefitted from Nazi rule was that jobs were provided for them but more could have explained that when Hitler became Chancellor there were six million people unemployed, so he reduced that figure dramatically by providing employment in the armed forces, in armament factories, in the building of autobahns and in his public works schemes. Very few candidates identified or explained a second reason, which could have been the benefits gained

through the Strength Through Joy and Beauty of Labour movements. Strong responses included details of these movements, including how Strength Through Joy provided cheap theatre and cinema tickets, organised sports events and offers to workers of cut-price cruises. Workers gained benefits from the Beauty of Labour with improved working conditions such as washing facilities and low-cost canteens. Unemployment was almost removed. Other aspects a small number of candidates mentioned were the benefits farmers gained from Nazi rule and the maternity benefits and child allowances which working families received.

- (c) Strong responses demonstrated a very good understanding of how successful Nazi policies were in winning the support of young people. They explained how support and loyalty to Hitler was created by the indoctrination of young people through propaganda, changes to the school curriculum and through the activities of the Hitler Youth and the League of German Maidens. Good understanding was evident in many explanations on the success of the Hitler Youth. These included details of the varied leisure activities on offer, including hiking, camping, athletics and map reading, which the young enjoyed. The parades and excitement of wearing a uniform and marching with loud bands resulted in a feeling of belonging to a great nation. As a result, the Nazis did seem to win the support of young people. To create a balanced argument, strong responses included evidence that the Nazis did not succeed in winning over the young. Most commonly included were the anti-authoritarian feelings and activities of the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement. Candidates appeared to be less familiar with the Catholic Youth Organisation and the White Rose Group, which could have been used as evidence as lack of success. To achieve full credit, both sides of the argument needed to be explained and then a valid judgement made. Successful responses often cited that the numbers who did not support the Nazis were small compared to the seven million who had joined the Hitler Youth by 1939. However, in 1936 Hitler had made it mandatory for all non-Jewish boys and girls to join Hitler Youth. Initially this compliance was not universal but a new law in 1939 included punishment for those who did not obey, so it is difficult to tell whether young people joined because they really enjoyed the activities or whether it was because they were put under pressure to join. Weaker responses tended to be one sided, often only explaining the school curriculum and Hitler Youth. A small number of responses missed the word 'young' in the question and wrote in general about whether Hitler's policies won the support of 'people', including his use of the Gestapo and concentration camps, and whether they were successful.

### Questions 13 and 14

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

### Question 15

- (a) Candidates were very familiar with the development of leisure activities in the 1920s and most gained high marks by including new inventions such as the radio, dances such as the Charleston, the popularity of jazz music and visits to baseball matches. Marks were also awarded for the development of other activities such as the cinema, where the first 'talkie' was released in 1927.
- (b) This question was very well answered, and most candidates were able to identify and explain two reasons why prohibition was difficult to enforce. The two most common reasons identified and explained were that people wanted to drink and made their own alcohol at home and the many officials who were supposed to enforce prohibition could be bribed. Strong responses were supported by the inclusion of contextual details such as moonshine, speakeasies, gangsters and illegal alcohol from Canada. Some weak responses drifted from the focus of the question and included details on how prohibition came about, which lacked relevance.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question and many one-sided answers. Candidates were more confident on explaining why the fear of communism was the main reason for restrictions being placed on immigration to the USA. Good explanations included details on the happenings in Russia in 1917 and how the Red Scare had made many Americans more afraid of immigrants because they thought that immigrants from Eastern Europe were bringing communist ideas into the country. The Palmer Raids and other acts of violence had increased their anxiety. There were few explanations on the other side of the argument and although many identified the racist undertones in American Society at this time, they often drifted into the activities of the Ku Klux Klan and the social position of black people at this time, which were not the focus of the question. Stronger responses made reference to the fear that Anglo-Saxon supremacy would be diluted and that in the USA's big cities, recent European immigration had led to competition for the best jobs and housing.

**Questions 16, 17 and 18**

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



# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/12</b> <b>Structured Questions</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

Answers to **part (a)** questions should be succinct and focused on the question. Very lengthy descriptions should be avoided. Answers to **parts (b) and (c)** questions should be focused on explaining the particular question, rather than on narrating events. For **part (c)**, analysis is also required, and candidates need to provide balanced explanations and a substantiated conclusion. The conclusion should be evaluative and address the command words such as 'How far do you agree?'. The conclusion should not be a repetition of points made earlier in an answer.

Candidates should take note of any dates included in a question and restrict their answer to the dates provided. This will help to ensure that their answer is fully relevant.

## **General comments**

Candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding in both the Core Content and Depth Study topics. Many answers contained good supporting evidence which was accurate and detailed, and used in well-developed explanations and arguments in response to the chosen question.

Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, struggled to use their knowledge effectively to answer the particular question set. These candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but they needed to develop these identified points into explanations for **parts (b) and (c)**. A focus upon using factual knowledge to explain events, rather than the deployment a purely narrative approach, would have improved a number of answers. In response to **part (c)** questions, candidates often demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers. They need to ensure that they then use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make. A careful focus upon the question set is required; in some instances, candidates wrote in considerable depth about the main topic of the question but would have improved their responses with a clear focus on the specific question set.

Some rubric errors were seen. The most common was candidates who answered more than the required number of questions, particularly in the Depth Study. Time management was generally good, and very few instances were seen of candidates who did not finish or had to shorten their final answers.

## **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**

This was the most popular question in the Core Content.

- (a) Some good answers were seen, with candidates secure in their knowledge of the actions taken by the League of Nations to improve working conditions. Candidates understood that the International Labour Organisation was set up to help workers and were often able to provide examples such as through collecting data and supporting trade unions. These answers also recognised the ILO campaigned for a 48-hour week and many also stated that dangerous lead was banned from paint.

Weaker answers often made general statements about the League of Nations or neglected to focus their answers on the work of the ILO.

- (b) There were some effective answers that were able to identify a reason why Italy invaded Abyssinia, and to support their answer by providing an example of this. These answers were able to explain, for example, that due to the economic context of the Great Depression, Mussolini was hoping that a successful invasion would distract the Italians and bring him support. Other reasons explained included that the aim was to revenge the previous humiliation in 1896, or that the incident at Wal Wal provided Mussolini with the opportunity to launch an attack. Less successful responses were able to identify reasons such as the weakness of the League of Nations but were unable to explain how this resulted in the Italian invasion.
- (c) Some very good responses to this question were seen. Many candidates were able to produce balanced responses that considered both the successes and failures in peacekeeping by the League in the 1920s. When considering successes in peacekeeping, responses often discussed the actions of the League during the Aaland Islands dispute, considering that it was successful since protection was given to the Swedish population, and that both countries agreed to the solution. Other responses explained the success of the Bulgaria dispute, explaining that Greece agreed to pay compensation, and that war was averted. In order to provide a balanced response candidates often argued that the League failed over Vilna since Poland refused to leave, despite the League's ruling. Weaker responses sometimes described the attempts at peacekeeping without explaining why these could be considered as a success or failure. Other answers missed the timeframe given in the question and included events such as Manchuria and Abyssinia, which lacked relevance.

#### Question 6

- (a) Candidates were confident in their general understanding of the main features of Hitler's foreign policy, particularly its aims, but were less assured in describing specific events that occurred from 1933 to 1935. Many responses were able to identify that Hitler wanted to unite German speakers, and that Germany started rearming in this period. Stronger responses were also able to describe some of Hitler's actions, such as the attempted Anschluss in 1934, or removing Germany from the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations. Weaker responses missed the dates given in the question and described events such as the reoccupation of the Rhineland or the successful Anschluss of 1938, lacking relevance to the question.
- (b) There were some good answers seen to this question, with candidates confident in their ability to explain why Britain and France failed to take action against the Anschluss in 1938. The most common explanation seen was that they were trying to appease Hitler - neither of the countries were prepared to risk the situation escalating into another war since they were unprepared and did not want to risk a repeat of the horrors of World War I. Other responses explained that the failure to take action was because the Anschluss was welcomed by the Austrians, shown by the results of the plebiscite, and therefore Britain and France did not have good cause to prevent it. Few inaccuracies were seen, although some responses, having identified reasons, were not supported by specific evidence.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates able to assess the importance of the Munich Conference in causing the outbreak of war. Arguments agreeing with the question often considered that acceding to Hitler's demands gave him the confidence to continue his aggressive foreign policy, thereby leading to the invasion of Poland, since he believed that the Allies would continue appeasing him. Some strong responses also considered the ways in which the Sudetenland strengthened Germany, for example through the acquisition of resources necessary for war and the Skoda arms works. In order to provide balance, candidates argued that the invasion of Poland was the direct cause of war or considered the long-term causes such as the Hitler's expansionist foreign policy, or appeasement throughout the 1930s. Many candidates argued the importance of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in causing war as it emboldened Hitler to invade Poland since he would no longer have to worry about a war on two fronts. The strongest responses could use this explanation as part of an evaluative conclusion considering the links between the Pact and the Munich Conference due to Stalin's resulting distrust of the Allies. Weaker responses took a descriptive approach of events leading to the war which lacked focus on the specific question or provided a line of argument which lacked the necessary support to be considered as an explanation.

### Question 7

- (a) This was generally well answered, with a majority of candidates able to achieve good marks through their knowledge of events in Korea between June and September 1950. The most common points made were identifying that the North attacked the South and was quickly able to capture Seoul and force the South into a small area in Southeast Korea. Responses also recognised that the UN and US forces arrived in Korea and were able to push the North Korean forces back. Few errors were seen, but some responses neglected the given timeframe and contained identifications of events that followed September 1950, such as pushing the North beyond the 38th Parallel.
- (b) This question was answered well, with many candidates able to achieve at least one explanation of why General MacArthur was dismissed from command of the UN forces in Korea. The most common reason given explained President Truman's dissatisfaction with MacArthur's actions, often focussing on his wish to invade China or use nuclear weapons. These explanations were able to show why this alarmed Truman, leading to him dismissing MacArthur. These responses were often well developed, although candidates were less confident in providing a distinct second explanation. Some responses described MacArthur's actions, but did not link these to why they caused him to be dismissed due to the impact of his ideas.
- (c) This was answered well by many candidates who attempted to provide balanced answers to consider whether North Korea or the USA was more successful in the Korean War. When considering North Korea's success, candidates often argued that, despite not turning South Korea communist, in the long-term they had shown strength and gained support from China and the Soviet Union. When considering the success of the USA, candidates explained that they had achieved their aim of preventing South Korea becoming communist, thereby protecting their economic interests, such as Japan, in the area. Weaker responses had a broad understanding of the relative successes and failures, but these were often stated rather than explained with supporting evidence.

### Question 8

- (a) Some good answers were seen which were able to state the impacts of the building of the Berlin Wall on the people of Berlin. Many candidates showed an awareness that families were divided and that people in the East could no longer work in the West. Other responses considered the effect on people who attempted to escape to the West, and the overall impact on living standards which deteriorated. Few errors were seen, but some responses described the building of the wall, rather than the impact of it. The weakest responses confused the Berlin Wall with the Berlin Blockade.
- (b) Many candidates were able to display some knowledge and understanding of why there was a demand for change in Czechoslovakia in 1968, but more could have provided supported explanations. The most common response was to consider the nature of Soviet rule, and how this was resented in Czechoslovakia, for example through the economic difficulties or the lack of freedom due to the repressive measures. An alternative approach was to focus on Dubcek's desire for reform, for example through 'Socialism with a human face'. The strongest responses were able to therefore provide two explanations. Other responses understood that the Soviet control was unpopular or that the economy was poor but would have benefitted from providing support specific to Czechoslovakia.
- (c) Mixed responses were seen to this question, with weaker answers struggling to show both agreement and disagreement as to whether the reaction of the USSR to the uprising in Hungary in 1956 differed from its reaction to events in Czechoslovakia in 1968. A small number of candidates produced balanced answers, explaining both similarities and differences and these responses were notable for their contextual understanding of the uprisings. For example, when considering similarities, candidates argued that both uprisings ended in a Soviet invasion and the removal of the respective leaders. When considering differences, responses argued that the leaders suffered different fates, or that the fighting in Hungary was more extensive. Many candidates were able to provide explanation on one side, but arguments were not always supported by specific support. Some weaker responses focused on the causes of the uprisings, rather than the Soviet reactions to them. There was also some confusion as to what happened in each country.

## **Section B: Depth Studies**

### **Questions 9 and 10**

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

### **Question 11**

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was generally answered well, with candidates required to describe the effects of hyperinflation on the German people. Responses were often able to describe that the money lost value and were able to provide examples of how this impacted the people, for example through the use of wheelbarrows to collect wages. Many candidates were also able to describe the effect on specific groups, such as pensioners and those with savings. Some candidates also considered the positive effects, such as people who were able to pay off money they owed. Few errors were seen, but weaker responses described the causes of hyperinflation, or the reaction of the German people to the Treaty of Versailles.
- (b) This question was generally answered well, with candidates confident in their knowledge of the topic, and able to provide at least one explanation of why Germany was able to recover from hyperinflation. The most common approach was to explain the role of Stresemann to show the effects of the currency changes he initiated, or his role in establishing the Dawes Plan. Stronger responses considered these as separate explanations. Other reasons considered included the ending of passive resistance, and France and Belgium leaving the Ruhr. Weaker responses were rare, but some focused on the Young Plan, rather than the Dawes Plan, which was more appropriate when considering the end of hyperinflation.
- (c) Some good responses to this question were seen, with candidates able to attempt a balanced answer, explaining whether right-wing opposition posed a more serious threat to the Weimar Republic than left-wing opposition in the years up to 1923. Agreeing with the statement, responses often explained that right-wing opposition was a threat since it contained trained and armed ex-soldiers, who were organised. Responses also explained the threat in terms of the difficulty that the Weimar Republic had stopping uprisings such as the Kapp Putsch, eventually having to rely on a general strike from the public. Balance was most often provided through a consideration of the Spartacist Uprising and other left-wing attempts to seize power, although these were most often dismissed as being disorganised, and more easily put down through the use of the Freikorps. Some evaluative conclusions were seen which, for example, argued that overall, the right wing posed the greater threat since, without their armed support, the Weimar Republic was vulnerable to both right and left-wing uprisings. Whilst weaker responses often had a good knowledge of the uprisings, these answers needed to be less descriptive and more focused on the extent to which they could be considered a threat. Some responses would have benefitted from being more secure in their understanding of which uprisings were from the right or left wing.

### **Question 12**

- (a) This question was answered well, with many candidates gaining good marks through their knowledge of what autarky was. A common approach was to initially explain the overall meaning of self-sufficiency before stating why that was needed – to help Germany during a future war due to the problems Germany had faced during the First World War. This was often linked to the need to reduce reliance on imports in case of a future naval blockade. Stronger responses were then able to provide examples of some substitutes that were created, such as artificial rubber known as 'Buna'. Few errors were seen, although some responses would have been improved by greater contextual understanding.
- (b) Some good responses were seen to this question, with most candidates able to show at least a general understanding of why conditions deteriorated for German civilians during the war. Common reasons that were identified were the problems caused by the bombing of cities or food shortages leading to the introduction of rationing. Other responses also recognised that women were required to work, to replace men who were fighting. Stronger responses were able to explain these aspects in the context of the situation in Germany, for example by referring to the bombing of Dresden. Few errors were seen, but weaker responses lacked the specific support required for explanation, and

some responses neglected the question focus of civilians and wrote about deteriorating conditions for soldiers.

- (c) Candidates were confident in their knowledge and understanding of the Nazi policy towards women and were able to use this to provide at least a one-sided argument, usually agreeing with the given statement. Responses often argued that the policy was consistent through considering the traditional views that the Nazis held, intending for women to focus on the domestic sphere through policies such as removing women from the workplace and encouraging them to have children through initiatives such as the Mother's Cross. Stronger responses also considered inconsistency in their policy, for example through arguing that during the war the policy needed to change as women were encouraged to work in factories for war production, or to work in the armed forces. Evaluative conclusions were rare, but some responses argued that, even during the war, the policy remained consistent since even when working, women were still expected to look after their home and children. Other responses often displayed knowledge of the topic but would have been improved by being less descriptive and more balanced.

### Questions 13 and 14

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

### Question 15

- (a) This question was answered well, with many candidates able to identify several ways in which Americans were encouraged to buy consumer goods. Responses showed an understanding that adverts were widely used on billboards and in cinemas. Other responses recognised that hire purchase schemes meant that people were able to buy goods that they would otherwise not be able to afford at that point. Some stronger responses also stated that the availability of new consumer goods such as fridges and hoovers also encouraged consumerism.
- (b) This question was often answered well, with responses displaying a good level of knowledge and understanding of why the boom brought changes to the lives of many women, although weaker responses tended to be descriptive, rather than considerations of causation. A common explanation was that the increase in employment opportunities resulted in women having greater economic security, resulting in a more independent lifestyle. Other responses explained that the boom changed societal attitudes, allowing women to adopt a less traditional lifestyle, for example by socialising without a chaperone or by becoming a 'flapper'. Less successful responses described the changes accurately, but did not link these to the boom, which was the question focus.
- (c) Many very good responses were seen to this question, with candidates able to provide balanced answers considering whether farming or traditional industries suffered more in the 1920s. When considering farming, candidates often argued that it suffered due to overproduction, caused by competition from grain producing countries such as Canada, or due to lack of demand from European countries after the end of the war. Other problems considered were poverty caused by falling prices and problems paying the rent on the land. When providing balance, responses were confident in their understanding of the problems facing the traditional industries, such as coal being replaced by electricity, or cotton being replaced by newer textiles such as rayon. Very few evaluative conclusions were seen, with most attempts being summative. Some responses wrote about the dust bowl, which was not within the timeframe of the question.

### Questions 16, 17 and 18

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

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/13</b> <b>Structured Questions</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- Questions should be read very carefully to ensure that responses are relevant. Candidates 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 the command words such as 'How far do you agree?'.

## General comments

A significant majority of answers to this year's questions reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and possessed a great deal of information and they were able to put this to good use in the **part (a)** questions, which reward recall and description. Appropriately, many candidates answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph.

The best answers to **part (b)** and **(c)** questions were able to apply knowledge precisely to the question, avoiding both lengthy introductions which 'set the scene' and the inclusion of irrelevant information. Candidates achieved some credit for the identification of relevant factors, but the strongest answers went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the 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 statement) but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Some conclusions were assertive, rather than genuine judgements of which side of the argument was stronger than the other. Some of the best responses consisted of two good explanations (one on each side) and a valid reasoned judgement. However, candidates were more likely to reach a valid judgement when 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 meaningful comments to be made.

#### **Question 5**

This was a popular question among candidates. In **part (a)** many candidates were able to state four separate, but specific aims supported by Clemenceau at the peace settlement. These included that Clemenceau wanted security, reparation and revenge for France.

**Part (b)** was answered well. Responses focused on the argument that Germany was made to accept the War Guilt clause because, by doing so, it accepted full responsibility for the war. That meant the Allies were

able to punish Germany by restricting its armed forces and making it pay reparations for the damage which it had caused during the war. High quality answers identified two points, explained them, and supported this with specific contextual knowledge.

Most candidates constructed good arguments in **part (c)** about the extent to which Wilson's Fourteen Points determined the nature of the Treaty of Versailles. The best answers were characterised by balanced explanations. For instance, on the one hand, it could be argued that Wilson believed in 'self-determination' and he wanted the different peoples of the colonies and of Eastern Europe to rule themselves. Therefore, in the Treaty, some new states were established, such as, Poland. In addition, Wilson's Fourteen Points intended to shape a future world based on peaceful international relations; this found expression in the term which laid the foundations for a League of Nations.

On the other hand, candidates could explain ways in which the Versailles Treaty did not reflect Wilson's Fourteen Points. For instance, there was no mention in the Fourteen Points of war guilt or that Germany should make reparations. Wilson wanted all nations to disarm and although Germany was required to do this, there was no part of the treaty which required the victorious nations to do the same. Although some countries were given independence under the principal of self-determination, this did not apply to German speaking countries such as Austria. Some candidates also gained credit on this side of the argument for explaining the extent to which both Lloyd George and Clemenceau pursued aims which could be linked to specific terms of the Treaty. The best responses were able to substantiate a judgement on the hypothesis given in the question, rather than just restating points already made in the answer. For instance, some candidates claimed that elements of the Fourteen Points were included in the final treaty but overall, they had a limited impact on the terms. The reaction of the German people to the treaty supports this judgement. They thought that the peace settlement would be based on Wilson's ideas. When they discovered the terms, such as accepting war guilt, they felt they had been betrayed.

### Question 6

In **part (a)** most candidates knew a great deal about the events in 1923 which happened during the dispute over Corfu, many providing four points of detail including causes, events and results.

Candidates knew details of the League of Nations' work with refugees, but a number of responses would have benefitted from applying their knowledge to the question of importance posed by **part (b)**. Describing relevant details gained credit, but the best answers focused on 'importance'. For example, this analysis of the scale of the work: 'The League's work with refugees was important because it helped over 400,000 people who had been prisoners of war during the First World War or had been made homeless during the Turkish War of Independence, to return home or set up new homes. The scale of international cooperation and its success highlights its importance.' Other explanations seen on importance included that the League was gaining credibility because of its success in humanitarian efforts, compared to the problems it faced settling military disputes.

In **part (c)**, candidates gained credit for explaining points for and against the proposition that it was the lack of an army which led to the failure to take effective action over the Manchurian crisis. There were some strong answers which explained that the League did not apply military sanctions as it would have involved sending a naval task force to the other side of the world with little chance of success. If the USA and the USSR had been members of the League, their military forces would have been ideally placed to tackle the Japanese. Even if military sanctions were imposed, it would have been difficult for France and Britain to raise forces to travel to the East to impose the will of the League and they may have been defeated. Explanations must be accompanied by context; for instance, the slowness of decision making, the absence of the USA or the point that the League was dominated by European attitudes are valid factors but reference to events in Manchuria is required for them to be counted as explanation. For example, 'Many members of the League were not interested in what was happening in Manchuria. The League was very Eurocentric in its attitudes. Asia seemed very distant to many League members. It did not consider an Asian crisis as vital to the countries in Europe. Some people even thought that Japan's action was a good thing, and that Japan had been provoked by China. This is what the Lytton Commission concluded.'

### Question 7

In **part (a)** most candidates knew the 'draft' was a form of conscription. The best answers mentioned the lottery process, how men tried to avoid it, that 2.2 million were drafted and those drafted were mainly from poor and working-class backgrounds.

Quality responses to **part (b)** kept precisely to the demands of the question, which focused on the disastrous impact of the Tet Offensive for the United States. Candidates identified several causal factors, such as the impact on the US press and public opinion, the perception of defeat and how some soldiers reacted to the offensive at My Lai. The best answers identified two points, explained them, and included supporting evidence. Restating key words from the question is a helpful device which helps candidates focus precisely on what is required, rather than just to describe the events which took place. For example, 'The impact of the Tet Offensive was disastrous for the United States because a small group of US soldiers attacked a village called My Lai in retaliation for the attacks on US bases by North Vietnamese troops. Hundreds of unarmed Vietnamese civilians were killed. There was a public outcry in the US against this action and it was one of the main reasons why President Johnson decided not to stand for re-election.'

The aim in **(c)** was to write a balanced answer and explain how far Vietnamisation was responsible for the end of the Vietnam War. There were many good answers which explained alternative reasons such as the impact of public opinion in the US, and the better tactics employed by the Vietcong. However, a number of responses were unbalanced because candidates were unclear about the Vietnamisation side of the argument. There were responses in which Vietnamisation was clearly explained, such as 'Vietnamisation was the name for Nixon's policy for removing the US from the Vietnam War. He claimed he wanted to achieve 'peace with honour' and to do that he decided to encourage the South Vietnamese to fight alone. The US would support the South Vietnamese army with weapons and money, but US troops would gradually be withdrawn. Between December 1970 and September 1972, over 300,000 US troops were removed from Vietnam. Removing US troops meant the end of the war could be achieved more quickly. Although a peace treaty was signed in 1973, fighting broke out again. South Vietnamese forces were no match for the North Vietnamese army and the South was captured in 1975. This process might have taken longer if US troops had remained in Vietnam.'

## Question 8

Candidates were secure in their knowledge of the Prague Spring in **part (a)**. References to the reforms introduced by Dubcek to reduce government control and allow public meetings and criticism of the government were all valid answers. The inclusion of the USSR's reaction and Brezhnev sending in tanks were also creditworthy.

**Part (b)** asked for an explanation of the Hungarians' resentment of Soviet control in 1956. Some answers included generalised narratives of suppression and lack of freedom. Others were able to use identified points as the basis of a good explanation: 'Rakosi's rule was very harsh, and he created many problems for the Hungarian people and because of this, he was resented. Rakosi was a hard-line communist who was committed to Moscow. He used the secret police to keep control by creating a climate of fear and arresting anyone who opposed communist rule. Many Hungarians disliked his rule and wanted reforms.'

**Part (c)** enabled candidates to construct valid arguments about why the Berlin Wall was built; on one side there was an appreciation that the Soviet Union needed to prevent the 'brain drain' to the West. Between 1949 and 1961, over 2.6 million people from the East went to West Berlin and West Germany. Many of them were skilled workers such as engineers and teachers. East Germany seemed to be losing its best workers to the West, and this needed to be stopped, or it would damage the economy in the East. On the other hand, candidates presented the view that the Wall was built to stop communism and its leadership from appearing to be weak. The large number of people leaving showed that life in West Germany was more attractive and people from a communist state were choosing to move to a country which was run democratically and where there were economic opportunities. Khrushchev had been criticised for his ideas by other communist states, including China, and wanted a tough solution to the problem in Berlin to prove he was powerful. The best responses added a valid judgement, for example concluding that the Soviets wanted to save face because communism could not be seen to be failing.

## Section B: Depth Studies

### Question 9

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



### Question 10

The best answers to **part (a)** described the British policy of conscription. Typically, these included details that over a million men between the ages of 18 and 41 were called up to fight, and that appeals could be made to local tribunals on the grounds of conscience or for family reasons.

Candidates presented largely generalised information about why Russian civilians faced severe food shortages during the First World War in **part (b)**, although the best answers explained two reasons, among them the impact of a poor railway system, rising prices, peasants hoarding grain, the military being prioritised with food supplies and losses of land in Poland.

Many answers to **part (c)** quite rightly 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 explanation when placed in the wider context of the war and why the Blockade contributed to Germany's defeat. The best responses also explained the other side, on the importance of convoys, 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, and Britain was not forced out of the war.

### Question 11

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)** on the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. Credit was given for: the Reich Citizenship Law which defined a citizen as a person who was of German or related blood; that Jews were defined as a separate race and could not be full citizens of Germany; the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour, and the banning of intermarriages between Jews and Germans.

In **part (b)**, many candidates knew a great deal about the use of radios in the Nazi state and the best answers went beyond description by developing the idea of 'importance', for example: 'Radio was very important to the Nazis to the extent that they made available cheap radio sets called 'The People's Receiver'. This shows that they understood that if people heard all about Nazi policy in their own homes, with the content controlled by the Nazis, they would be able to win people over to their ideas.' Other explained points were related to the scale of ownership or that radios broadcasted via loudspeakers in cafes, factories and elsewhere, so it was difficult to escape Nazi propaganda.

**Part (c)** produced some unbalanced answers. There was often good knowledge of the police state, and many candidates 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 given credit. Stronger responses explained both sides of the argument, and the best ones provided a clinching argument in the conclusion which went beyond restating points already made. The question generated an analysis of the dangers posed by resistance to Nazi control; identified factors most often mentioned were opposition from youth groups, individuals such as Niemöller 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 would have benefited from more assessment of the extent of the threat they presented.

### Question 12

Candidates in **part (a)** were required to describe measures to promote marriage. The Law for the Encouragement of Marriage and the provision of loans, as well as the social and legal obstacles faced by single women in the Nazi state, were referenced in good answers. Some of the less successful responses focused on Nazi efforts to encourage Germans to have large families.

Responses in **part (b)** often included a great deal of general information about Goebbels' work as Minister of Propaganda. Good answers explained his importance to the war effort, thereby meeting the precise requirements of the question. Typically, responses credited Goebbels with the launch of a national campaign for the mobilisation of German resources for the war effort. This was introduced in 1943 after the German defeat at Stalingrad. He delivered rousing speeches asking Germans to contribute everything they had to the war effort. He used the slogan, 'Total War is the Quickest War'. Apart from wartime propaganda, Hitler made Goebbels responsible for the war economy in the last few months of the war.

A number of candidates struggled to apply relevant knowledge to the **part (c)** question about changes the war brought to life in Germany. Candidates wrote most confidently about how life changed significantly for women because of the war. Good answers argued about 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. Hours were long and the work was hard. Coupled with this, they still had to feed their families in the face of ever worsening food shortages. On the other hand, alternative changes were less well known but better answers were able to provide explanations on this side, for example that Total War brought huge changes – rationing was often mentioned by candidates, but more typically, bombing, which had a serious impact on civilians as it meant everyone was at risk. Arguments were supported by statistics such as those from the two-day air raid on Dresden, which alone killed around 150,000 people. That over 3.5 million German homes were destroyed and roughly the same number of civilians were killed, and many made homeless, also featured in responses.

### Questions 13

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

### Question 14

A small number of candidates attempted this question, and they coped well with each part. **Question (a)** produced some details about the Kulaks, including land ownership, wealth and opposition to the communists.

For **part (b)**, candidates tended to write descriptively about how women had more access to education and trained as engineers and doctors. Explanations of changes were not always developed. For example: 'Up until the 1930s, women had much greater freedom, but Stalin was worried that the family was in decline and that society would suffer as a result. Therefore, a new family policy was introduced in 1936. Stalin went back on some of his earlier policies, such as making divorce easier for women, to try and ensure that families were strengthened, and the birth rate did not drop.'

**Part (c)** was well answered as there was good understanding of Stalin's political motives on the one hand, and economic strategy on the other, to explain the introduction of the Five-Year Plans. Some candidates compared the destruction of the Kulak class (linking it to control and the Marxist ideal of an industrial working class) with the need to industrialise quickly for trade and defence. There were some valid, analytical conclusions, for example, 'Economic and political motives were interwoven. The Soviet economy was behind and needed to be modernised. However, in making plans for rapid industrialisation, Stalin wanted to secure his own position, improve the position of the USSR and create a Communist state which was based on an industrial proletariat. Economic motives existed but they were all subject to political motives as well.'

### Question 15

In **part (a)**, candidates were sometimes unclear about agriculture at the start of the 1920s and confused it with the problems associated with the Dust Bowl. Better answers focused on falling demand from Europe, over production (sometimes linked to declining population), US tariffs and competition from Canada.

**Part (b)** asked about the plight of traditional industries such as cotton, woollen textiles and coal production. The key was explaining why these industries failed to capitalise on the boom of the 1920s because of changes in demand and/or competition from other products. For example: 'Cotton textiles did not increase their sales despite the increased demand for clothing. New synthetic fabrics such as rayon were more desirable and new clothing styles meant less material was needed. This meant the demand for cotton cloth went down and those who worked in the industry faced unemployment or lower wages.'

For **part (c)** it was important to balance the impact of technical advances with that of tariff policies with regards to the boom of the 1920s. Candidates wrote more confidently about technical changes such as the results of mass production through assembly lines in the car industry. On the other hand, explanations of tariffs would have benefitted from better development, for example, 'Tariffs, such as Fordney-McCumber, meant it was difficult for European companies to export their goods to the United States. As a consequence, Americans were much more likely to buy home-produced goods, rather than imports. In turn, this increased demand for American products, creating jobs and more wealth for Americans at the same time.' The best answers argued from both sides, but it was more common to read unbalanced answers. A valid top level judgement could have been made in responses, for example that technical advances were more important than tariff policies in causing the boom. High tariffs meant that people in the US were encouraged to buy US

goods, rather than imports. However, there would have been fewer products to buy had it not been for technical developments and innovation, such as mass production. These advances meant that output increased dramatically, and this fuelled the boom.

### Question 16

Candidates knew a great deal about Roosevelt's campaign for the 1932 Presidential election in **part (a)** and were able to describe many features, including the promise of hope, a 'new deal', help for the poor and elderly and to get rid of Prohibition. A common misunderstanding was that the policies later known as the New Deal had taken specific form during the campaign.

In **part (b)** some candidates wrote generally about the Depression, rather than focussing on the specified factors of poverty and unemployment. Nevertheless, there was good knowledge about the impact of the Wall Street Crash on banking, business confidence, savings and the vicious circle of reduced demand, lower production, reduced wages and a shrinking economy.

Many answers to **part (c)** would have benefitted from greater balance. There were some good attempts to explain the long-term weaknesses in the economy. For example, references were made to mass production, which had led to overproduction and demand for goods falling. Factories could not sell their goods and began to make people unemployed, which made things worse because they did not have any money to spend on goods. Other factors included problems with banking, over production in the farming sector and tariffs. Candidates were less confident when dealing with speculation, the other named factor. Many described it in detail but struggled when explaining the precise causal links between it and the Wall Street Crash. One good example argued that 'Speculators had bought shares hoping to make a profit. This meant that share prices went up until they were overvalued. When they started to go down, speculators panicked and sold their shares at massive losses. This caused banks to collapse which then led to business failures and unemployment. So, the speculators started it all.' The best responses, having argued both sides effectively, then provided a valid judgement. In this case, some answers showed an understanding that while speculation had dramatic results, in the long-term weaknesses such as saturation of the market and uneven distribution of wealth meant that the economy would have run into trouble eventually.

### Question 17

A small number of responses to this question were seen. **Part (a)** was answered well. Candidates demonstrated impressive knowledge of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

For **part (b)**, valid identified points included US aid to China, Japan attacking a US gunboat in 1937, Japanese rearmament and the US cutting off oil, iron and steel supplies to Japan. Better responses went on to develop and explain the impact of these factors in relation to the question.

Answers to **part (c)**, about Japan's military success in 1942, tended to be and descriptive. A number of answers would have been improved by beginning the question by explaining the impact of the stated factor. Those who followed this approach were able to make a valid case that the weakness of British forces was important to Japan's success in the Asia-Pacific region in 1942. Britain was focused on the war in Europe and the forces left to defend Malaya and Singapore were weak and poorly trained. Also, the attack on Singapore took the British by surprise, as they were expecting that it would come from the south, rather than from Malaya in the north. The alternative side of the argument tended to be less well developed. Credit was given for the fact that other forces were weak, and Japan was able to take over other areas in the region. More responses could have included a valid judgement in conclusion, such as that the weakness of British forces definitely contributed to the success of Japan in the Asia-Pacific in 1942. However, it was not the main reason as other countries were invaded by Japan in 1941, such as Indonesia and Thailand, and these were not part of the British Empire. These countries were easily overwhelmed by Japan, which made it much easier to occupy British colonies in 1942.

### Question 18

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

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/21</b> <b>Document Questions</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

- Candidates should give direct answers to questions. They should think about the answer before writing anything and then address the question in the first sentence of the answer. Whether the question asks about the message of a cartoon, or if sources agree, or why the speaker gave such a speech, candidates need to try to give a direct answer and then provide support.
- When using a written source, the source should be interpreted, rather than just paraphrased. In other words, candidates need to try to work out what point the author wanted to make.
- When using a written or a pictorial source, thought should be given to the purpose of the author or artist. This will always be useful when answering questions.
- Candidates should look carefully for questions that require evaluation.
- When using pictorial sources, especially cartoons, candidates should interpret, rather than describe them. Contextual knowledge should be used to work out what the people and actions shown in the cartoons are meant to represent and what the overall message is.
- When using quotations from the sources in answers, the quotation should be given in full. Using ellipses can leave the quotation short of providing the intended support.

## **General comments**

The overall standard was good. Candidates appeared to have time to read the sources and think carefully about their answers. The candidates' contextual knowledge was strong and was often used to enable and support the interpretation of sources, although some wrote about their knowledge, rather than about the sources.

Particular strengths included: using the content of sources to compare them, explaining why sources were spoken, written/produced at a particular time, and interpreting cartoons. Candidates were less comfortable when they were required to evaluate sources, many using the sources uncritically.

The question answered least well on both options was the final question, where candidates are required to use all the sources to test a hypothesis. There are some crucial things to remember when answering this question. The question is about the sources. Candidates are not being asked to use their knowledge of the topic to test the hypothesis. Candidates need to test the hypothesis given in the question, rather than a slightly different one. Candidates need to explain how some sources support the hypothesis and how some do not. These explanations need to make proper use of the sources (see the examples in the comments below). In answering source questions, it is important that candidates use their knowledge of the historical context, the content of the sources and the information provided about the provenance of the sources. Often, candidates will need to make use of all three in their answers.

Looking at these three aspects in more depth:

Contextual knowledge – this can be used in several ways. It can help candidates understand the points being made by the author of a written source and is crucial when interpreting a cartoon. It can also be used to directly check claims being made by a source. Finally, it can be used to make use of the information given about the provenance of a source to infer possible purpose or bias. Although candidates should use their contextual knowledge to enable them to answer the questions, it will not by itself provide the answer. Answers to the question, rather than detailed accounts of the context, are required.

The content of sources – what sources are saying is crucial to answering all the questions. An unsupported claim about the message or point of view of a source is not sufficient. The same applies to supporting answers by reference only to the provenance of the source. The content of the source should be used to

support interpretations of sources in answers. Also, candidates need to work out what the author or artist wanted to say. What message were they trying to give? This involves going beyond the surface of the source and making inferences from it.

The provenance of the sources – candidates are often given important information about a source, for example the name and position of the artist or author, the date of the source, the country of origin of the source, and sometimes other useful information. This can often be used to help work out the meaning, purpose or bias of a source.

When used together (rather than in isolation), these three aspects will help candidates to write good answers.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Option A: Nineteenth century topic***

##### **Question 1**

- (a) Some candidates struggled with this question because Source A does not say what an American source might be expected to say about the sinking of the Maine. These responses stated that Source A should make Source B surprising but neglected to produce convincing reasons, other than the provenance of the two sources. Candidates should not base their answers on provenance alone. What sources say, is important. Long's opinion in Source A is that the sinking was an accident. This means that he does not believe the Spanish were responsible, which agrees with the Spanish newspaper in Source B. There are other agreements between the two sources, for example what they say about the jingoists. A reasonable number of candidates explained such agreements and used them as evidence that Source A does not make Source B surprising. There were also some interesting answers that explained how, given Long's reasonable views, the attitude of the Spanish newspaper towards the USA is surprising. Few candidates attempted to evaluate the sources. Some wrote about the sources, and even found agreements or disagreements, but did not state whether Source A makes Source B surprising.
- (b) There were many interesting answers based on the tone, language and methodology of the two sources. A good number of candidates, for example, focused on the cautious nature of Source D and its use of a range of evidence and compared it with the unsupported claims being made by Source C. However, not all these responses related these points to disagreement over who or what was responsible for the sinking. Only a few answers were based on cross referencing to other sources in the paper. This could have been a good approach for many candidates. Some candidates tried to argue that Source C is more reliable but did not suggest any valid reasons, while others wrote about the sources without properly addressing the issue of reliability.
- (c) This is a 'purpose' question, and candidates need to explain why the front page was published then. Many answers used the context as a reason. They explained about the sinking two days before. Other candidates focused on the message of the source as the reason for publication. Some explained sub-messages, while others provided a higher-level response by explaining the big message – that the Spanish blew up the Maine. A reasonable number of candidates were able to go further and consider what the newspaper was hoping to achieve by the publication of the front page. Most explained that it wanted the US government to go to war against Spain. It is important that candidates use the context, message or purpose as a reason for publication. Some responses would have been improved by clearly stating this in the answer. Some candidates wrote about one or more of these aspects but needed to go on and state that they were doing this because they were reasons for publication.
- (d) In this type of question (a 'message' question), candidates need to explain the main point that the cartoonist wanted to make. Most candidates were able to infer some kind of valid message. Some wrote that the text at the top of the cartoons represents the view of the cartoonist – that he is saying they should be sure before they went to war with Spain. These answers were given some credit, although the interpretation is unlikely, as the cartoon comes from the New York World and candidates have been given the information that this was a newspaper that was demanding war against Spain. Rather better answers suggested that the cartoon is telling us that the US is being cautious about going to war, while the best answers read the cartoon as a criticism of the caution of

the US. The main weakness in responses was to interpret the cartoon but not support this from the cartoon.

- (e) A number of candidates struggled with this question. Some missed the part of the hypothesis that refers to people in the United States blaming the Spanish, and just wrote about examples of the Spanish being blamed, without demonstrating how these examples represented the views of Americans. Some responses would have benefitted from making at least some use of the sources, while others would have been improved by using the sources to properly support their answers. The following response was given by some candidates: 'Source C shows that the Spanish were blamed for the sinking of the Maine because it is very critical of them and suggests they were guilty.' The following answer was much better because it focused on the Americans and used evidence from the source: 'Source C is from an American newspaper and so it shows an American point of view. It shows that the Americans blamed the Spanish because it says that Spain will be blamed unless evidence can be found of Spain's innocence.' Many candidates made good use of Sources A and B but struggled to use the other sources. Candidates should use as many sources as they can when answering this question.

**Option B: Twentieth century topic**

**Question 2**

- (a) There were a good number of agreements and disagreements for the candidates to find. Many candidates were able to explain both agreements and disagreements. Agreements included that there was opposition to the Marshall Plan, that the USA wanted Europeans to work together and that the Plan was a success. Disagreements included the cost of the Marshall Plan, whether or not the USA was simply acting in its own interests and what the main aim of the Plan was. When explaining disagreements, it is important that candidates explain both sides. They need to go further than to just identify what the disagreement is about. For example: 'The sources disagree over the main aim of the Marshall Plan. Source A says it was to get Europe to act together, while Source B claims it was to keep communism out.' A small number of weaker answers summarised each source, without making any matches between them.
- (b) This is a 'purpose' question. It is asking candidates to explain why Vyshinsky made this speech (Source C) at that time. To answer this question well, candidates need to take into account who was making the speech, what he said, when he made the speech and the circumstances in which it was made. Focusing on only one of these aspects produced some reasonable responses, but the best answers used several aspects to explain Vyshinsky's possible purpose. When answering this question, it was important that candidates used what they wrote about as a reason for Vyshinsky giving the speech. Some responses described the context or explained the message of the speech, but did not use these as reasons for the speech. Vyshinsky's main message is that the Marshall Plan would lead to the USA controlling Europe. Candidates who used this as a reason for the speech, and supported it from the source, achieved good marks. Many candidates set the speech in the context of the start of the Cold War, and as long as this was used as a reason for the speech, such answers achieved reasonable marks. The best answers considered Vyshinsky's purpose and explained that he was trying to persuade European governments to reject the Marshall Plan. These answers had to suggest a valid and specific audience for the speech, rather than just state that Vyshinsky was trying to persuade people in general against the Marshall Plan.
- (c) Most candidates were able to provide at least a reasonable response this question. Very few misinterpreted the cartoons or just described surface details. The most common weakness in answers was explaining one or both of the cartoons but neglecting to compare them. Most candidates were able to compare sub-messages of the cartoons, for example they both suggest that the USA cannot make its mind up about the Marshall Plan, and a good number compared the big message – that a failure to pass the Marshall Plan would increase the threat from the communists. The best answers went on to compare the points of view of the cartoonists – they are both in favour of the Marshall Plan, they both think that the Plan should be passed, or they are both critical of the Americans for delaying the passing of the Plan.
- (d) A number of candidates explained both sources but did not connect them, except by asserting that Source F does support Source G. Some candidates managed to find similarities between the two sources without really addressing the idea of 'support', for example both sources are about the Marshall Plan in action. Better answers focused on Marshall's claims in Source G, and on the idea of support. They first identified some of the claims that Marshall makes, for example to help

countries recover and to fight against hunger and poverty, and then used Source F to explain how it supports these claims. For example, Marshall is helping Britain with food so that it can keep going and he is helping Britain to recover, so that it will be able to produce what it needs for itself. A number of candidates realised that some of Marshall's claims are not supported in Source G, for example that the USA will not help governments that block the recovery of other countries. Few candidates understood that Source F is propaganda from the British government and therefore cannot necessarily be used as evidence to support Marshall in Source G. It is important that candidates are able to recognise when a question requires them to evaluate the sources.

- (e) A good number of candidates were able to explain how some of the sources supported the hypothesis and how some did not. However, a number of candidates struggled in their responses to this question, after providing good answers to the other four questions. Some missed the opportunity to use the sources and just wrote about whether they thought the Marshall Plan was designed to protect the West from the Soviet Union. Others used a slightly different hypothesis from the one given in the question. They wrote about whether the sources support the idea that the Plan was designed to protect the West (rather than to protect the West from the threat of the Soviet Union). A number of other candidates chose appropriate sources, used the correct hypothesis, but struggled to use the sources to properly support their answers. For example, some of these responses stated: 'Source E indicates that the Marshall Plan was designed to protect the West from the Soviet Union because it shows that Western Europe was in danger from the Soviet Union.' Much better responses wrote, 'Source E indicates that the Plan was designed to protect the West from the Soviet Union (the bear) because it shows Western Europe under increasing threat from the Soviet Union. It shows that the Marshall Plan could save the West, but it is being delayed, which puts the West in danger.' Other answers would have been improved by indicating which source was being written about and by making it explicit which side of the argument sources were being placed on.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/22</b> <b>Document Questions</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- Candidates should read through all of the sources before starting to think about the questions. Knowing what all of the sources say can be helpful in answering any of the questions, and particularly those that address issues of reliability, utility and surprise.
- The time allocation should be used to read the sources, plan answers and write responses to all five of the questions in the chosen option.
- Direct answers to the questions should be given. A direct answer focuses on the specific wording of the question. For example, if asked why a source was published at a given time, candidates should give reasons for its publication. Answers which just repeat what the sources say or describe what they show are not required.
- If a quote from a source is included in an answer, the quote should be given in full. An incomplete quote, using ellipses, may be unclear and not provide the answer with the intended support.

## General comments

Almost all candidates answered on Option B (20<sup>th</sup> century), and it was rare to see an incomplete script. The overall standard of answers was good. In a very small number of scripts there were weaknesses in skills such as source comparison, which had an impact on **Questions 2(a)** and **2(c)**, and examples of not directly addressing the question, affecting particularly **Questions 2(b)** and **2(d)**. Contextual knowledge about the Berlin Blockade, important both for comprehending the sources, and for providing a basis for cross-reference, was generally sound, though references to the Berlin Wall appeared in a few answers.

## 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) Sources A and B contained many agreements and disagreements. Those candidates who were aware that valid comparisons need to be based on a common criterion (i.e. a point of similarity or difference which the sources had in common) had no difficulty in finding ways to match the content of the two sources. Often the agreements were on the dispute being over the issue of currency, or on the amount of food delivered by the airlift. The disagreements included the dates given for the start and finish of the blockade, or on whether or not the blockade was planned. The key was directly to match content from the two sources, whether on agreement or disagreement. Weaker answers did not do this, instead summarising first the content of Source A, then the content of Source B.
- (b) Less successful answers did not include a valid reason why the source was published at the specified time. They wrote about the source, or about its context, or about what the source meant, which appeared to assume that a valid reason would be implied. This did not constitute a direct answer to the question. All valid answers contained one or more reasons for publication. This was often contextual – that it was published because of the crisis that was going on at the time. It could also be because of its message – what it was designed to tell the audience. The best answers



understood that behind the message and the context there had to be a purpose to the publication – an intended outcome on the behaviour of the audience. Given that the newspaper was British, it was reasonable to assume that the targeted audience was the British public, and that the intended impact was to boost support for the Western resistance to the Soviet blockade of West Berlin.

- (c) This question required candidates to compare two cartoons and determine whether or not the cartoonists would have agreed with each other. This meant that the cartoons had to be interpreted correctly before any valid comparison could take place. A number of candidates struggled with this, especially on Source D. Some candidates thought it showed the Allies genuinely trying to defend West Berlin. These answers could still earn some credit for an accurate interpretation of Source E. Better candidates understood that the cartoonists would disagree on the central idea of whether or not the Allies were genuinely prepared to assist West Berlin, and the best answers pushed their explanation a little further to show that the cartoonists' opinions differed, with Source D being critical of the Allies and Source E approving.
- (d) Candidates were asked whether they found Source F surprising. Successfully answering this type of question requires two things. First, a clear statement on exactly what in the source is seen as surprising or not surprising. Second, an explanation of why this is the case, which will generally be based on cross-reference, either to the candidate's knowledge of the topic, or to what another source says on the matter. Less successful responses were unaware of these requirements. A number of these wrote about the source without making any reference to the issue of surprise. Some largely paraphrased the source, with an assertion on whether or not it was surprising. Others tried to provide an explanation, but without making clear what it was that they were trying to explain as surprising (or not surprising). Many answers missed the point of surprise that an American would be arguing that the Allies should pull out of Berlin. These responses could still work on some other aspect of the source – maybe that the USSR was said to hold all the advantages in Berlin – and use cross-reference to test whether it was surprising, but this would effectively be looking at a point of detail, rather than judging the source as a whole.
- (e) This question asked candidates to test a hypothesis against the evidence offered by the set of sources. Most answers successfully located some evidence both for and against the hypothesis, and, overall, this was a well answered question. There were some weaker responses, and this seemed more a matter of technique than of difficulty in comprehending the sources. Though small in number, some answers made no use of the sources, being based only on writing about the hypothesis. There were candidates who appeared to be answering on a different hypothesis – generally on whether or not the airlift was a success. Others would have improved their responses by understanding that using the sources meant demonstrating how the content of the source either supported or questioned the hypothesis. These answers would refer to the sources in a general manner, but not specify the content that constituted evidence for or against the hypothesis.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/23</b> <b>Document Questions</b></p>
---

## Key messages

- Candidates should read through the background information and all the sources before attempting to answer the questions. This should give them an understanding of the main focus of the paper and of a range of perspectives. This understanding should then inform all their answers and help them to identify opportunities for cross-referencing.
- It is crucial that candidates respond to the specific question set. For example, in the twentieth century option, answers needed to address whether Source C made Source D surprising in **part (b)**, the issue of trust in **part (c)** and why Source F was published at that time in **part (d)**. The most helpful strategy is for candidates to directly address the question in the very first sentence of their answer, for example, 'Source C does/does not make Source D surprising because' or 'Source F was published at this time because' or 'Khrushchev's account can/cannot be trusted because'.
- There were very few issues with candidates not using the time allowance. All but a few scripts included responses to all five questions. Candidates should be wary of leaving insufficient time to answer the final question, **part (e)**, effectively though.
- On **part (e)**, candidates must ensure that the sources form the basis of the answer. They should avoid writing a general commentary using their own knowledge in response to the question asked. Candidates should engage with the content of each source, and it must be made explicitly clear whether a source 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 and ensure that it is clear which source is under consideration by referring to it by its letter and by explicit reference to its content. This could be, for example, 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.
- If quotations from the sources are used, 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

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 options. Candidates were able to effectively use the information provided by the sources, and whilst this was usually understood in context, more candidates could have provided effective evaluation. Candidates should avoid literal readings of the sources, which should be considered as the product of the people who created them, with all the opinions, purposes, inclusions and omissions this inevitably involves. The level of contextual knowledge demonstrated in candidates' answers was sound. Some questions invite the use of knowledge more than others, and when appropriate, many candidates were able to select relevant recalled information to use in their answers. This was particularly apparent on **part (d)** of **Question 2**.

**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) This question asked candidates how far two cartoonists would have agreed with each other. In a question of this kind, a comparison is needed and the best answers looked for a major point that both cartoonists are saying something about to use as the basis of this. In this case, the cartoonists agree about Stalin's actions. They both are disapproving of him taking over countries. While relatively few responses recognised this overall comparison of the cartoonists' points of view, reasonable marks were achieved by many candidates by comparing sub-messages. For example, the USSR is not peaceful, the USSR uses force, or the USSR is controlling in both sources. A comparison of the overall messages of the cartoons characterised some of the stronger responses; some understood that in both cartoons Stalin is taking over countries or taking away countries' freedom. Some responses struggled to reach the highest marks because, despite presenting valid interpretations of the sources, no direct or valid comparisons were made. However, in all but a few instances the question, that is the issue of agreement between the cartoonists, was directly addressed.
- (b) This question focused on two written sources that both address Soviet aims in foreign policy and British attitudes towards the Soviets. The question asked whether Source C, a report by the British Ambassador in Moscow to Bevin, makes Source D, a report by Bevin for the British government, surprising. Many candidates were able to gain reasonable marks by identifying disagreements about Soviet policy between the sources and using these to explain surprise or lack of surprise. For example, many compared Source C's depiction of Soviet policy as being driven by the need for security with Source D's conclusions that policy was dictated by the Soviets' desire to expand and extend their control in Europe and further afield and concluded that this was reason to be surprised. Better answers compared what the sources said about British attitudes towards the Soviets. The attitude displayed in Source C is positive and trusting, while in Source D it is negative and distrustful, and this could be a reason for surprise, or a lack of surprise being expressed. To achieve the strongest answer to this question, candidates needed to compare the sources for differences over British attitudes towards the Soviets and evaluate at least one of the sources. At this level candidates recognised that their responses should be based on more than the content of the sources; an appreciation of who had written them and the importance of this was apparent. While some responses recognised that the provenance of the sources and/or purpose of the two authors were relevant, generally such ideas would have benefitted from great development. Overall, few candidates attempted evaluation. However, nearly all candidates, in their responses, were able to clearly state whether Source C made Source D surprising or not.
- (c) This question produced a wide range of responses, but more candidates could have attempted to evaluate the sources. This question asked how far Khrushchev's account in Source E can be trusted. Many candidates were able to pick out a detail from Source E and use either their own knowledge or cross reference to another source to justify an opinion about whether or not Khrushchev's portrayal of events can be trusted. Details most commonly checked were Stalin's interest in Eastern Europe, that the Cold War had started, that Churchill had made his Iron Curtain speech and that events in Czechoslovakia were cause for concern. In good answers, some candidates used their knowledge or referred to another source to check Khrushchev's central claim about the reason for Stalin's policies being the need for security. Stronger responses were provided by candidates that recognised the need for an evaluation of Source E. For example, an answer could have evaluated Source E based on Khrushchev's purpose being to justify Stalin's policies or, at the very top level, the evaluation could have focused on Khrushchev's purpose being to distance himself from Stalin's decision making. The best answers addressed this issue and provided a contextual explanation of why Khrushchev would do this.
- (d) Overall, this question was answered well. Candidates were asked to explain why the cartoon (Source F) was published at that time, that being 1949. Questions such as this, that essentially ask why a source was produced, require three explanatory elements in the response. Firstly, it is necessary to consider the context in which the source was produced. Secondly, the message that

the creator, in this case a Russian artist, was trying to convey, must be understood. Thirdly, the purpose he had in relaying his message must be examined. A number of context-only answers were seen and these tended to include information about the Marshall Plan and the way that it was perceived by the Soviets. Many candidates were also able to explain valid sub-messages or part of the big message; for example, that the Marshall Plan prevented the spread of communism. The cartoonist's overall message, that the Marshall Plan had been designed to put all of Europe under US control, was recognised by many candidates. Likewise, many understood the purpose of publication - to get countries to reject Marshall Aid or prevent Soviet controlled countries turning away from this. The best responses explained this purpose in the context of events at the time.

- (e) There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates achieved strong responses by carefully explaining how some of the sources (A, B and D) can be seen as providing convincing evidence that the Soviet Union was the aggressor in the early years of the Cold War, while others (C, E and F) argue that Soviet Union was not the aggressor. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Other responses neglected to make it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. A helpful strategy is to begin an answer to **part (e)** 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 C disagrees that the USSR was the aggressor in the early years of the Cold War as it states that Soviet policy was driven by 'the constant striving for security'.' On 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

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/03</b> <b>Coursework</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

In coursework, candidates are required to assess historical significance. The title used is of crucial importance. The title should allow candidates to demonstrate their understanding of significance and to assess, rather than just describe or explain, the significance of an event, individual or development.

The best answers are often those that, explicitly or implicitly, use a range of criteria to assess significance.

Candidates should try to keep the focus of their answers on the factor named in the title.

Lengthy introductions are not needed, especially when they are not directly addressing the question.

Candidates should try to use arguments and counterarguments. This will help them to assess. They should reach and support conclusions about these conflicting arguments.

## **General comments**

Most of the centres followed the instructions carefully and sent all the required documentation with the sample of candidates' work. Generally, the titles used were suitable and targeted significance and assessment. However, there were some exceptions to this. Nearly all centres used the generic mark scheme, which can be found in the syllabus booklet and must be used. The marking of the coursework was generally sound.

## **Comments on specific questions**

Most of the titles used were appropriate and were set on one of the Depth Studies from the syllabus, avoiding the Core Content. It helps candidates if the words 'assess' and 'significance' appear in the title, for example, 'Assess the significance of the Russian Civil War.' Appropriate titles used included the following:

How significant were the consequences of the failure of the Schlieffen Plan?

Assess the significance of the economic policies of Nazi Germany.

Assess the significance of Gustav Stresemann for Germany.

How significant was the Battle of Amiens (1918) in the First World War?

How significant was the use of propaganda in Germany, 1933 to 1945?

Titles such as these give the candidates opportunities to use a range of criteria to assess the broad significance of an event, individual or development. For example, the significance of Stresemann can be measured economically and politically, as well as in terms of both immediate impact (mid-1920s) and longer-term impact (late-1920s and early 1930s). It is also possible to investigate opposing arguments about Stresemann's significance. It would be appropriate to explain the scale of the problems he faced at the beginning as a way of measuring his significance.

The best answers often shared common characteristics. First, they explained the challenges, or the situation, at the beginning of the period they were covering. This was done not to provide descriptive background but to provide some context against which the impact of the individual, event or development, could be measured and assessed. Secondly, they used a range of criteria to assess significance. In other words, they assessed significance in different ways. These included examining significance from political, social or economic perspectives, and from the perspectives of different groups, as well as short-term and long-term judgements. Thirdly, they developed arguments and counterarguments about significance. This might, for

example, argue that an event had much greater political than economic significance, or was less important in the long term than in the short term. Finally, supported overall conclusions were reached about the degree of significance. An important feature of these answers was that they focused on arguments about significance and rarely lost sight of this focus.

Reasonable answers explained ways in which their subject was significant, but they lacked counterarguments. However, they did explain why the impact of their subject mattered. Weaker answers were those that explained the impact of their subject but neglected to explain why this mattered. They appeared to just conclude that the impact, whatever it was, was important. These answers also often drifted into narrative or description. Other answers at this level appeared to believe that only successful outcomes can be judged to be significant. The weakest answers described what happened but did not engage with the idea of significance, apart from assertions. Significance can be viewed from different perspectives. Judgements about it change over time and according to the questions asked about it. It is never fixed and there are no 'right' judgements about it. Successful impacts might lack significance, while failures might be very significant.

Much of the marking was accurate and based on good understanding of the generic mark scheme in the syllabus, which must be used. Many of the marginal comments were very helpful. 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. If an answer displays performance at a range of levels, the important question to ask is: which level does the candidate's coursework, taken as a whole, best match? Judgements about whether or not an answer has reached a certain level can only be made by considering the whole answer. Marginal comments by markers are most useful when they indicate where there is, for example, good, supported argument, or different criteria being used, or a lapse into description. These all feed into a final, overall judgement about the level which should be awarded at the end of the answer.

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/41</b> <b>Alternative to Coursework</b></p>
--

## 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 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, 1919-1941 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)** questions 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, development 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 trench system on the Western Front to the end of 1914. Most candidates firstly focused on the Battle of the Marne and how the German defeat led to the first defensive trenches being dug by both sides. This was then followed by some description of how the race to the sea saw the trench system expand in size and complexity and how new weapons of war such as artillery and the machine gun led to increasing defences being developed by both sides, such as dug outs. The logical end point for 1914 was the First Battle of Ypres, which demonstrated that a stalemate had developed on the Western Front, with both sides resorting to a war of attrition. The best responses were able to logically sequence their accounts in chronological order. Weaker responses tended to provide detail outside of the parameters of the question, with some describing events after 1914.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to identify and describe more than one facet of the discussion on the importance of the First Battle of Ypres. Most candidates identified military or strategic facets such as how the battle decimated the BEF or how the battle pushed both sides into fighting a war of attrition when the stalemate set in. Stronger responses identified multiple facets. A few were able to explain why these facets were important. Weaker responses struggled to provide very much historical information to support

descriptions, and some candidates confused the Battle of Ypres with other battles in 1914, such as Mons and the Marne, which led to inaccurate answers.

**Question 2** produced variable responses. In **part (a)**, some candidates were able to give reasonably detailed accounts of Russia's campaign on the Eastern Front. The strongest answers took a chronological approach, beginning with Russian mobilisation and early conflicts with Germany and Austria such as Tannenberg and Masurian Lakes. Many looked at the logistical issues faced by the Russian army in 1915, as well as the assumption of command by Tsar Nicholas II; this was then followed by some description of the Brusilov Offensive in 1916 and the losses faced by Russia. Most candidates finished their accounts by examining the impact of the campaign on the Russian Home Front in 1917 and Russia's eventual armistice with the Germans. Weaker accounts confused the order of the different events or lacked historical knowledge. Others focused too much on events on the Home Front, rather than on the campaigns on the Eastern Front.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to engage with the question, which wanted the discussion to consider the impact of Russia's defeat in the First World War. The strongest discussions contained multiple facets and good supporting knowledge, with some candidates able to explain impact, either on Russia or on the war in general. Many candidates focused on the political impact of Russia's defeat, such as the abdication of the Tsar during the March Revolution of 1917 or the Bolshevik seizure of power in November, and their subsequent consolidation of power. Other candidates looked at socio-economic impact and examined the loss of territory after the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk or the growing anti-war sentiment in the soviets. It was important to note that this question required candidates to focus on Russia's defeat, rather than Russia's fighting in the war.

### 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 gave very detailed and well sequenced, chronological accounts of the invasion of the Ruhr in 1923. Strong responses tended to begin with the causes of the invasion and made reference to Germany's failure to pay its 1922 instalment of the reparations. This was then followed by descriptions of the invasion, French hostilities towards German workers and the passive resistance ordered by Ebert's government. Most candidates finished their accounts by describing how the printing of money to pay for the striking workers led to hyperinflation and the appointment of Stresemann as chancellor, who ordered the paper mark burnt and a new currency issued, the Rentenmark. The best answers contained excellent detail, including precise facts and figures, as well as good chronological order to the account. Weaker responses tended to make historical errors- commonly with dates or statistics.

In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and at least describe one or more facet of the impact of hyperinflation on Germany. The strongest discussions considered more than one facet. Most commonly, candidates focused on socio-economic facets and political facets such as the rapid rise in prices and resulting barter economy, the spike in unemployment and loss of savings and pensions, and the scrutiny faced by Ebert's government from the far-left and far-right, with many pointing to the Munich Putsch launched by the Nazis, when passive resistance was called off by Stresemann. Some candidates were able to explain impact, though most discussions remained descriptive or undeveloped. Weaker responses made historical errors- most commonly, the confusion between the hyperinflation period of 1923 and the Depression era after 1929.

**Question 4** was also generally well answered by candidates, although **part (a)** produced some mixed responses. In **part (a)**, the stronger accounts organised their descriptions chronologically and detailed how the Reichstag Fire led to the use of Article 48 by Hindenburg to allow Hitler to crush the communist opposition and suspend personal freedoms in Germany. Many were able to include precise statistics and examples to support their accounts, a good number ending their account with reference to the March elections in 1933, which was a logical end point for this question. Weaker responses would have benefitted from greater historical knowledge of the Reichstag Fire and the subsequent events in February to March 1933. A few examined events in the 1920s, which lacked relevance to this question.

**Part (b)** responses were generally strong and saw candidates able to identify more than one facet of the discussion on the importance of the Enabling Act. Candidates commonly cited different political facets of the discussion, such as how it led to increased personal control over German political life by Hitler, the creation of a one-party state with the banning of other political parties or increased Nazi control over the workers with the banning of trade unions. A few candidates were also able to consider other aspects, such as how Hitler



used the Enabling Act to legalise the Night of the Long Knives in 1934 and combine the offices and powers of the Chancellor and the President into the position of the Fuhrer. Some candidates went too far in their discussions and suggested how the Enabling Act led to events such as the Final Solution, which was initiated at a time when the Nazis had complete control in Germany and when war had broken out in Europe. Weaker responses were often repetitive or did not understand the implications of the Enabling Act and confused it with the Reichstag Fire Decree issued by Hindenburg in February.

### Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

**Question 5** was the much 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 sequenced or thematic approach to the Purges initiated by Stalin in the 1930s, with the thematic approach more commonly seen. Most good accounts began with the murder of Kirov, which was used by Stalin to launch the Purges on different sections of society such as the Bolshevik Party, in particular those labelled 'Old Bolsheviks' by Stalin, the military, the intelligentsia and counter-revolutionary elements in society and, finally, the NKVD, who were largely responsible for executing Stalin's Purges to being with. These accounts contained some impressive examples and statistics on the numbers purged and were thematically sequenced in the account. Less successful responses tended to lack consistent historical knowledge and provided very generalised descriptions.

In **part (b)**, candidates generally struggled with their responses. Some were able to cite at least one facet of the discussion on the importance of Stalin's 'cult of personality'. Most candidates argued that it was important for political reasons, allowing Stalin to centralise power and project himself as Lenin's legitimate successor. Some also considered its impact in terms of how it rewrote history, particularly with Trotsky being removed from the early revolution in Russia. Weaker responses tended to interpret this discussion as one solely on propaganda and censorship, without focusing specifically on the cult surrounding Stalin's leadership. This led to discussions with some relevance but also to generalised assertions and undeveloped arguments.

**Question 6** saw some very thorough accounts given by some candidates for **part (a)**. The best accounts were able to give many details on the process of collectivisation. Most candidates sequenced their accounts chronologically, although some chose a more thematic approach. In both cases, accounts described how the process began with the First Five-Year Plan in 1928, which ordered private peasant plots to be incorporated into collective farms or state-run farms. Some good descriptions were provided on how this process was undertaken and many candidates also acknowledged Stalin's war on the kulak class and the famine created by the process, leading to devastating consequences for the peasant class in the USSR. Some accounts would have benefited from better structuring and the inclusion of more specific historical material. Others would have been improved by focusing on more than just one or two aspects of collectivisation.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers, where candidates had discussed multiple facets of the impact of the Five-Year Plans. Most of these accounts considered the economic impact, such as the rapid growth in heavy industry achieved or the new industrial towns created by plans. The social impact was also commonly considered by candidates, including the human impact such as the forced labour used from the gulags, or the strict punishments issued for failing to achieve targets. The best answers explained the impact of the facets on Russia and its population. Weaker responses tended to focus too much on the reasons why Stalin introduced the Five-Year Plans, which was not the focus of the discussion.

### Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was the second most popular topic. Both questions were chosen by candidates, but **Question 7** received the most responses.

**Question 7** was generally well answered by candidates. In **part (a)**, most candidates were able to give an account which contained some of the most important details of the problems faced by older industries in the USA in the 1920s. The best accounts were constructed thematically rather than chronologically by examining a different industry in each section of the account. Most of these accounts examined the plight of the farming industry, the problems faced in the coal mining industry and the textile industries. These accounts contained some good examples and details on the problems they faced either from overproduction after the end of the war in Europe or from new innovations such as rayon or new sources of energy like oil and natural gas. There was some confusion between the synthetic fibres rayon and nylon - rayon being a product used from 1924, and nylon not announced until 1938.

In **part (b)**, candidates were often able to give a multi-faceted response to the discussion on the impact of new methods of manufacture and selling of goods in the 1920s. Most candidates considered the adoption of Ford's assembly line production method and how it led to increased employment and the lowering of prices due to the standardisation of parts and increased efficiency in the workplace. Many then also examined the impact of hire purchase, advertising and the creation of chain stores and catalogues. The best responses were able to provide convincing explanations of the impact of these facets in the US in the 1920s. Weaker responses tended to only examine one aspect posed in the question rather than both or were mainly descriptive in approach. However, there were many strong responses to this question.

**Question 8** saw variable responses. In **part (a)**, some candidates were able to give a sequenced account of how speculation on the stock market developed in the 1920s. Most opted for a chronological approach to their accounts, although some were more thematic. Most of the good accounts examined how speculation increased in the 1920s, with buying on the margin allowing many Americans to invest in the stock market as the decade progressed, due to high confidence. Many also alluded to the growing slump in production by 1927 and the loss of confidence experienced by big investors, leading to the Crash of 1929. A few answers were detailed and included precise figures on the number of speculators and detail of how buying on the margin worked. Weaker responses tended to be generalised or only focused on the era of the Wall Street Crash in 1929 and the subsequent Depression of the 1930s, whereas the question asked about developments during the 1920s.

In **part (b)**, some candidates were able to give some very strong multi-faceted discussions about the impact of the Wall Street Crash on the USA. Most strong responses considered the social impact it had, as it was arguably one of the major causes of the Depression era with increased unemployment, homelessness and wage reduction in industry. Most, however, focused on the economic facets to this discussion and examined bank failures and the rapid drop in production, as businesses folded and exports decreased. A few answers did consider the political impact of the Crash, especially on the Republican president Herbert Hoover, who became a target for those who had lost much in the Crash. Weaker responses tended to focus on the Depression era as a whole, rather than on the impact of the Crash. This led to many generalised answers which lacked focus.

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

There were 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 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, 1919-1941 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41. A significant number of candidates also attempted. There were too few attempts at Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and 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)** questions 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, development 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**

There were too few responses 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 gave very detailed and well sequenced, chronological accounts of Stresemann's foreign policy. The strongest accounts tended to be organised in chronological order and gave impressive details on the Dawes Plan in 1924, the Locarno Treaties in 1925, Germany's admittance into the League in 1926 and the Young Plan in 1929. Historical knowledge often demonstrated in-depth and precise examples to describe each of the events and a well-sequenced structure. Weaker responses tended to confuse dates or provide inaccurate details about the events. A few candidates did not focus completely on foreign policy and examined some of Stresemann's domestic policies instead, which led to material lacking in relevance.

In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and at least describe one or more facet of the importance of cultural developments in Weimar Germany. Most commonly, candidates discussed the importance of cultural development by considering its contribution to social attitudes and behaviours, such as the increasingly progressive opinions found in the cities like Berlin towards sex, nightlife and leisure activities. Some of the

stronger responses also considered the importance that cultural developments had on political stability in Germany and noted the increased support for moderate political parties and the rapid decline of far-right, nationalist orientated groups like the Nazi Party. A few candidates also examined facets linked to economic progress and were able to explain how an increasingly consumer-based society emerged during the Golden Age. Less successful responses tended to focus too much on the reasons for cultural developments in Weimar Germany, rather than considering why they were important – how they impacted Germany and its people.

**Question 4** was also generally well answered. In **part (a)**, the stronger accounts were often organised thematically and examined different forms of propaganda employed by the Nazis after 1933. Most began by focusing on Goebbels' pivotal role in Nazi propaganda and described how he controlled the arts, media and culture through his government department to promote the Hitler myth and Nazi ideology. The accounts then examined the different methods employed by the propaganda machine to reach the German population after 1933, such as the People's Receiver, loudspeakers, and rallies like those at Nuremberg and the Berlin Olympics. A few strong accounts also mentioned wartime propaganda which focused more on the war effort on the German Home Front and promoting total war after 1943. Other accounts would have been improved by better historical knowledge and more specific examples. Some responses also focused too much on censorship of the media and press, rather than on propaganda techniques. Whilst both of these methods were linked and largely controlled by Goebbels, they represent two distinct approaches to the control and distribution of information in Nazi Germany. Some weaker responses focused too much on the Weimar period and the use of propaganda for the elections in 1930 and 1932, which was not the focus of this question.

**Part (b)** responses were generally strong and saw candidates able to identify more than one facet of the discussion on the importance of Goebbels to Nazi Germany. This question required a focus on the period post-1933 and some weaker discussions focused too much on the Weimar period. Good answers often identified and explained facets linked to Goebbels' importance to Nazi control in Germany. Many cited his use of propaganda and censorship to control and distribute Nazi ideology to the masses through various mediums such as radio and posters. The strongest responses examined other facets such as his importance after the outbreak of war in Europe and how he used propaganda to promote the war effort, boost nationalistic pride in the Germany's foreign policy achievements and promote war rationing. Some candidates also considered his importance from an ideological viewpoint and noted that much of the propaganda used by the Nazis contained antisemitic messages to promote Nazi race theory and justify euthanasia. Many of these responses contained valid and convincing explanations of Goebbels' importance in Nazi Germany, with some answers reaching valid conclusions. Weaker responses tended to be more descriptive or lack historical understanding, resulting in generalised assertions rather than explanations.

### Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

A number of candidates answered on this Depth Study. **Question 5** received a greater number of responses.

**Question 5** was sometimes well answered, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality. In **part (a)**, good answers gave a sequenced account of Rasputin's role in Tsarist Russia. Most logically started their accounts in 1905, when Rasputin first met the Romanovs in Saint Petersburg, and then wrote about how he then began to visit in the royal family as a healer by 1906. Accounts then tended to examine how Rasputin became a close advisor to the Tsarina after 1908 and how he was increasingly despised by some at court over his private conduct. Most completed accounts by examining Rasputin's role during the First World War, especially after 1915 when Tsar Nicholas II left the capital to lead troops on the Eastern Front, finishing with his assassination by Russian nobles in 1916. The best accounts were chronologically organised and contained some strong historical knowledge. Other responses would have benefitted from better structuring and the application of better or more specific historical knowledge in the descriptions.

In **part (b)**, responses were generally stronger. Most candidates were able to cite one or more facets of the discussion and provide some explanation or detailed description of the impact of the First World War on Russia by March 1917. Most candidates began with exploring facets linked to Russia's military defeats and how this led to increasing mutinies on the front and growing resentment towards the Tsarist government on the home front. Many also cited facets linked to the socio-economic impact the war had on Russia and examined the food and fuel shortages which plagued Russia and the growing war weariness it created, which drove many in the peasant class and the working class to more radical political parties. The best discussions contained convincing explanations of the impact the war had on Russia, its people and the government, with some responses forming valid conclusions and judgements. Weaker responses were often mainly descriptive accounts and lacked explanation, with some candidates providing examples after March

1917, primarily examining the Bolshevik seizure of power in November 1917, which lacked relevance to this question.

**Question 6** saw some very thorough accounts given by some candidates for **part (a)**. The best accounts for **part (a)** were able to give many details on the gulag system used in Stalin's Russia. Some candidates organised their accounts chronologically, whilst others chose a more thematic approach. Both methods yielded valid accounts. Most candidates were able to describe in some detail the numbers incarcerated by Stalin, who used the NKVD as his instrument of terror. Many described the different groups that were sent to the gulags such as the kulaks, counterrevolutionaries and even party and Red Army members. Some candidates also described how the gulags were used as part of the forced labour system to build public works such as the Moscow Metro. Weaker accounts tended to be overly short and lacked historical knowledge, with some responses offering only a few generalised comments.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers where candidates discussed multiple facets of the importance of the NKVD in the Soviet Union. Most of these tended to firstly focus on the political importance of the secret police in removing potential opposition for Stalin during the Purges such as the Old Bolsheviks, the perceived threats within the Red Army and the intelligentsia. Many also examined their importance from an ideological perspective and argued that the NKVD were important in rooting out class enemies such as the kulaks and NEPmen. A few candidates considered how they were important in Stalin's creation of a totalitarian police state which centralised power in the General Secretary. The best responses contained good explanations on why the different facets were important and some candidates were able to draw valid and convincing judgements on relative importance. Less successful responses tended to be descriptive. These answers would have been improved by better understanding, and the inclusion of greater historical knowledge, which may have resulted in explanations, rather than generalised assertions.

#### Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was the second most popular topic. Both questions were chosen by candidates, but **Question 7** was answered by more candidates.

**Question 7** 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 how Henry Ford contributed to economic growth in the USA in the 1920s. Many opted for a thematic approach, which worked well for this question. Nearly all candidates noted Ford's use of the assembly line production method used to build the Model-T and described how this had a knock-on effect with related industries such as rubber, glass and steel amongst others. They also commented on how Ford's production methods saw a rapid decrease in prices, increased efficiency and employment opportunities in the cities. Weaker responses would have benefitted from greater depth, and more in the way of precise examples, to add detail to the accounts.

In **part (b)**, candidates were often able to give a multi-faceted response to the discussion on the impact on the United States of increased car ownership in the 1920s. The best responses focused their discussions firstly on how car ownership led to economic growth in the United States and explained how it helped decrease unemployment and stimulated other industries including the leisure industry, road construction and the petroleum industry, as well as glass, rubber and steel. Most then examined its impact on socio-cultural facets such as how the car led to greater freedoms, changes in lifestyle and entertainment, and the ability for many American families to live outside of the city centres in the growing suburbs. Good discussions explained importance convincingly, using precise historical knowledge and understanding, with some candidates drawing valid conclusions. Weaker responses were overly descriptive or generalised assertions.

**Question 8** produced, in **part (a)**, some sequenced accounts of the effects of the Jim Crow laws on the lives of black people in the South. The best accounts tended to be sequenced thematically and examined different aspects of the Jim Crow laws. Many examined how public transport and public facilities were segregated in the South, as well as other amenities such as hospitals and schools, resulting in a two-tier system. Some candidates also noted how the Ku Klux Klan promoted the segregation using local churches and influencing political leaders. A small number of responses mentioned the growth of new pressure groups like the NAACP to combat segregation and promote integration in the South. Some other accounts lacked good historical knowledge and only provided one or two valid examples of segregation, with a few candidates demonstrating a lack of understanding over the term 'Jim Crow'.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to give strong multi-faceted discussions about the impact of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s. Most candidates considered the socio-cultural importance of the Ku Klux Klan in the South and Midwest, and described or explained how it used violence against non-white Americans and

Catholics to promote white supremacy and Protestantism. Some candidates also examined its political importance in the USA, particularly how members infiltrated local, county and state level offices or influenced political decisions and electoral results in some states. Some of the strongest discussions also considered religious importance and how some Protestant churches in the South promoted the Ku Klux Klan who, in turn, promoted segregation and Prohibition. Weaker answers tended to lack strong historical knowledge, resulting in generalised answers that lacked convincing explanations on importance.

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

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

# HISTORY

---

<p><b>Paper 0470/43</b> <b>Alternative to Coursework</b></p>
--

## 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 conclusion.

## General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918-45, Depth Study C: Russia, 1905-41 and Depth Study D: The United States, 1919-41 were the most popular among candidates. A limited number of candidates 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)** questions 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, development 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, struggled to fully focus on the discussion posed in the question or to provide explanations. Some 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 some rubric errors where candidates wrote responses to more than one question. Candidates must answer one question with both **part (a)** and **part (b)** from the same question. Some candidates wrote overly long answers to **part (a)**, leading in some cases to insufficient time to answer **part (b)** properly or at all. Some candidates started with **part (b)** but then did not complete **part (a)**.

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**

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

#### **Question 2**

- (a) This question required candidates to outline the conditions faced by German civilians specifically towards the end of the war. Many candidates had a very limited knowledge of the German Home Front. Some responses provided generalised knowledge about food shortages and the blockade and would have been improved by the inclusion of additional detail.
- (b) **Part (b)** required candidates to consider the importance of the German Offensive of 1918. Some candidates were able to provide valid facets of this. A number of responses would have benefitted from greater detail and more convincing explanations. A small number of candidates showed a lack

of knowledge of the Offensive and wrote more generally about the end of the war, including the reasons for the USA's entry.

### **Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45**

#### **Question 3**

- (a) This question required a good knowledge of election results over a specific period and so lent itself to a chronological approach. There was some good knowledge demonstrated, with candidates recalling precise dates and numbers of seats and percentages, among other aspects. Less successful responses were more generalised and gave more background descriptions of the state of Weimar at the time.
- (b) Some candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the role of Hindenburg as President and were able to identify facets which demonstrated his importance. Specific knowledge of his political beliefs, as a Nationalist who did not fully agree with democracy and his persistently ruling by decree, was not well known. However, most candidates were able to show his importance in appointing Hitler as Chancellor. Some candidates wrote long descriptions of the Night of the Long Knives but neglected to demonstrate why Hindenburg was important to this event.

#### **Question 4**

- (a) This question required a specific focus on Nazi economic policy. Many responses would have been improved by a greater depth of knowledge. There were a number of very generalised accounts of life in Nazi Germany. Some candidates did not keep within the period of 'from 1933' and wrote instead about the policies employed by Stresemann during the 1920s. Some responses demonstrated knowledge of the Public Work Schemes, and some stronger accounts were able to outline the main points of the New Plan and Four-Year Plan.
- (b) There were some good attempts at this question, as candidates were able to identify different facets of the discussion. Rearmament was generally understood as a concept, although some candidates focused more on conscription. The importance of rearmament to foreign policy and the retaking of lost territory was very well known.

### **Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41**

#### **Question 5**

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

#### **Question 6**

- (a) This question required a knowledge of how once the Bolsheviks gained power, they were able to establish their rule. Some responses demonstrated a good knowledge of the period after November 1917 and outlined actions like Lenin's decrees, setting up the Cheka and victory in Civil War. Less successful responses confused the revolutions of March and November and wrote about Bolshevik actions in overthrowing the Provisional Government. Others misunderstood 'consolidate' and so wrote about an earlier period.
- (b) This question required a detailed knowledge of the New Economic Policy (NEP) and its impact on Russia. Some candidates were able to identify relevant facets of the discussion; others would have been improved by much greater knowledge of what the NEP was. Some linked it to Stalin and wrote about the Five-Year Plans.

### **Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41**

#### **Question 7**

- (a) This question required candidates to outline reactions to the introduction of, rather than reasons for, Prohibition. Some candidates were able to outline some reactions such as the opening of speakeasies, the illegal distillation of moonshine and bootlegging, among other aspects. Less successful answers included material focused on the reasons for Prohibition. Some accounts were



very generalised and showed misunderstandings, including confusing bootleggers with speakeasies.

- (b) This question required candidates to explore the impact of organised crime. Successful responses were able to write about different facets or impacts such as the political impact caused by the spread of bribery and corruption, which affected democratic institutions. Less successful responses mainly described the activities of gangsters such as Al Capone and did not identify specific facets. Some struggled with the term 'organised crime' and wrote more generally about the police and law enforcement.

#### **Question 8**

- (a) There were some very detailed accounts of the New Deal in response to this question. Many candidates had a good knowledge of the First New Deal and were able to organise the material into a logical structure. Less successful answers showed less awareness of the role of the Agencies, and some confused the details. Others wrote mostly background descriptions of the reasons behind the New Deal, neglecting to include relevant material about the Agencies.
- (b) Successful responses included well defined facets and a good understanding of the breadth and depth of improvements made by the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). This included the point that the TVA had a big impact because it helped multiple states. Less successful responses demonstrated a weaker knowledge and were more generalised.

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

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