

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12 Structured Questions

Key messages

Strong responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully. This will help them understand exactly what is being asked and will give them the opportunity to write focused and balanced responses.

Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted so that responses only include details within the timespan of the question. If candidates are asked to compare two given factors or individuals identified in the question, answers should be focused on these specific factors or individuals.

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and instead write in continuous prose. In **part (b)** and **(c)** questions, candidates should look to provide explanation of separate points, divided into distinct paragraphs, thus avoiding points becoming blurred together or a loss of focus on the question.

In **part (c)** responses, it is a good idea for candidates to practice writing evaluative, rather than purely summative, conclusions. In their conclusions, they should make a judgement and justify this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in the response.

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.

Weaker responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the actual question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts, lacking in explanation. Other less successful responses tended to include incorrect factual details. Some very brief and generalised responses were seen, with few supporting factual details.

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

Candidates should be aware of the specific demands of each type of question:

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

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and should write in continuous prose, rather than using a 'listing' approach. Most **part (b)** questions ask 'why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than giving a description of what happened. Two relevant explanations with supporting contextual detail featured in the strongest responses. These answers were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Some less successful responses included narratives about the topic and did not 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. Valid conclusions avoided repeating points already made in the essay and tried to explain and analyse how far the argument both supported and disagreed with the focus of the question. Other conclusions just asserted 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument was stronger than the other. Weaker responses often provided well-organised explanations but only on one side of the argument. They could have been improved by including relevant explanations, supported with contextual examples, on both sides of the argument. Some less successful responses included narratives about the topic and neglected to address the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Question 5

- (a) This question was well answered and many candidates gained full credit for identifying four relevant points regarding Lloyd George's views of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Some examples include: 'he thought that the treaty was too harsh', 'the reparations were too high', 'the harsh terms would lead to Germany wanting revenge in the future' and 'it would damage British trade with Germany'. Credit was also gained for identifying why he was pleased with the treaty, such as: 'he was pleased that the German navy was reduced' and that 'Germany lost her colonies'. Some responses also included the views of Clemenceau and Wilson, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) Most candidates were very familiar with why the Treaty of Versailles mattered to Germany in the years 1919–23 and were able to identify two reasons. The most commonly identified reasons were the economic and political consequences of the treaty. Strong responses also included supporting details in order to develop an explanation of each of these points. For example, the economic consequences were explained by referring to the high reparations and the difficulties that the Germans had in paying them, resulting in the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr in 1923. Many candidates also used this as an opportunity to explain the German government's reaction to the Ruhr invasion, leading to hyperinflation, and the serious impact this had on the German population. The impact of the political consequences was less well known, but strong responses were able to explain that the German population blamed the German government for signing the treaty and referred to them as the 'November Criminals'. This resulted in unrest demonstrated through the Kapp Putsch, Munich Putsch and political assassinations. Another reason often identified and explained by candidates was the military restrictions laid down in the treaty. Many candidates were familiar with these terms and were able to say that they mattered, because the Germans had been proud of their army and the great reduction in armaments had led to increased unemployment and anger that Germany was now vulnerable to attack. Weaker responses gained credit for listing the terms of the treaty but could have been improved by explaining why these mattered to Germany, rather than labelling them 'harsh' as a whole. The strongest responses to this question took a term of the treaty and explained the impact it had on Germany and thus why it mattered.

- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses identified specific terms from the Treaty of Versailles and explained why Clemenceau and Wilson were dissatisfied with them. For example, Clemenceau aimed for France to be secure against future threats from Germany, so he wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state. This did not happen, as he had to compromise with Wilson and Lloyd George, and the Rhineland was only demilitarised. Other good examples included Clemenceau's disappointment with the military clauses and the size of the reparations. Many candidates tended to be more confident in explaining why Clemenceau disliked the treaty, and some candidates only gave explanations on his side of the argument. To produce a balanced argument, strong responses also explained Wilson's dislike of the treaty. In these responses, many referred to Wilson's Fourteen Points and how he had hoped for total disarmament and complete self-determination. By linking these to the military terms of the treaty and the term relating to German colonies, stronger responses explained why Wilson did not achieve these aims. For example, Wilson wanted self-determination for all peoples, however German colonies were taken from Germany and given to Britain and France as mandates, thus strengthening their empires. In making a judgement, most candidates came to the conclusion that Clemenceau disliked the treaty the most, because he wanted the terms to be much harsher on Germany, such as the complete destruction of its armed forces so that it could not invade France again, whereas Wilson did achieve the setting up of the League of Nations, which was one of his most important aims. Weaker responses devoted too much time to explaining the aims of the two men and why they wanted these aims, without specifying why they disliked the treaty. Some other weaker responses laid out all the terms of the treaty together, and then at the end stated that Clemenceau found them too harsh, without specifically saying why.

Question 6

- (a) This question was answered well. Most candidates were familiar with what happened in the Saar in January 1935, and in many cases, gained full marks. Strong responses included details, such as: 'a plebiscite was held', 'this was legal under the Treaty of Versailles', 'it was to decide if the Saar was going to reunite with Germany' and 'over 90 per cent of the population voted to be reunited with Germany'. Credit was also gained for identifying points such as unifying with France or staying as League territory, as well as the propaganda campaign organised by Goebbels. Weaker responses often knew there was a plebiscite but confused this with the plebiscite that Hitler held in Austria in 1938, which was not relevant.
- (b) Most candidates were able to identify the common interests of Hitler and Mussolini, which brought them together to form the Rome–Berlin Axis. Strong responses also noted that Hitler and Mussolini had the same ideology and that both sought to unite against communism. These responses considered their fascist traits and desire for expansion, as well as the ways in which their relationship developed through their support of General Franco in the Spanish Civil War. Other strong responses referred to the fact that Hitler realised that finding agreement with Mussolini would help him to achieve Anschluss, as his first attempt in 1934 had failed due to Mussolini's opposition. Some weaker responses confused the Rome–Berlin Axis (1936) and the Anti-Comintern Pact (1937). Others included details on the reasons why Japan joined a pact with Hitler, which was not relevant to this question.
- (c) The most successful responses to this question were well organised, and they identified and explained why Britain and France missed their best chance to stop Hitler when he remilitarised the Rhineland. To support this assertion, some responses included examples such as the fact that Hitler was taking a gamble when he invaded the Rhineland, as he knew that the German army was not as strong as the French army, and he had given his generals orders to withdraw if they met with any resistance. On the other side of the argument, strong responses explained that Britain and France had good reasons for not taking any action against Hitler. For example, they were both occupied with the Abyssinian crisis, the French had financial problems and a general election looming, and many in Britain felt that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh on Germany and the Germans were only going into 'their own backyard'. Other strong responses noted that there were other opportunities to stop Hitler. Two opportunities commonly identified were stopping rearmament in 1935 and standing up to Hitler during the Munich Conference in 1938. The strongest responses explained that if Britain and France had stood up to Hitler at Munich, they could have prevented the invasion of Czechoslovakia, as Czechoslovakia had strong defences and Britain and France would have had the support of a large Czech army. Alternatively, many understood that the policy of appeasement used by Chamberlain during the Munich Conference had serious consequences. These included further increasing Hitler's confidence and the abandonment of Czechoslovakia and led to Stalin forming the Nazi–Soviet Pact with Germany. The

strongest responses used contextual knowledge to explain both sides of the argument and to reach a supported judgement. Most agreed with the assertion that Britain and France missed their best chance to stop Hitler when he invaded the Rhineland. Many concluded that despite the desire for peace and the effects of the 1930s depression on both countries, not stopping Hitler in 1936 increased his confidence and gave him more time to implement his rearmament programme. Although some weaker responses were able to describe Hitler's foreign policy, including his aims, the events of the invasion of the Rhineland in 1936, the Anschluss in 1938, the invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 and Poland in September 1939, they would have benefitted from a more direct reference to the question.

Question 7

- (a) This question was very well answered, with many candidates able to provide four facts about how the Revolution of 1959 changed Cuba. Relevant points made by candidates included, 'Fidel Castro became the leader of Cuba', 'he overthrew Batista', 'he received arms from the Soviet Union' and 'land was taken over and distributed to the peasants'. Credit was also awarded for describing Castro's popularity due to his vision for a better Cuba, including improved healthcare and free education.
- (b) This question was well answered, and many candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the reasons for the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion. The strongest responses identified and explained two reasons. Some common reasons identified were the lack of proper planning and secrecy from the Americans and the readiness of Castro's forces to face the invasion. For example: 'Castro was expecting an invasion and was well prepared, so that the 1400 poorly trained Cuban exiles were met by 20 000 Cuban troops who were armed with tanks and modern weapons. Castro's forces were also able to keep control of the air, which gave them an advantage, and as soon as the forces invaded, they were attacked and either captured or killed.' Other responses explained how Kennedy had taken over Eisenhower's plans for invasion and was prepared to use the poorly trained Cuban exiles rather than American forces. Some weaker responses identified the reasons for failure, such as the assumption that the Cuban people would support the invasion and Castro had control of the air, but supporting contextual details were needed to fully develop this identification into an explanation. A few responses confused the Bay of Pigs invasion with the Cuban Missile Crisis, but this was not relevant to the question. Some others included details of the results of the failed invasion, which drifted too far from the focus of the question.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question about whether the United States viewed communism in Korea or Vietnam as the greater threat. Many strong responses began by outlining the American policy of containment in relation to both Vietnam and Korea. Strong responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the threat of communism in Vietnam, including specific issues that caused problems, for example, the Gulf of Tonkin incident in 1964 and how Vietnamese guerilla warfare tactics made it difficult for the Americans to make progress. These responses clearly explained the Domino Theory, which argued that if Vietnam fell to communism other neighbouring countries such as Laos, Cambodia and India may also fall to communism, and this was a threat to American interests. Balanced answers also explained the threat of communism in Korea, including the fact that the North Korean army was armed and supplied by Russia and had potential support from China. The North Korean army had also invaded South Korea, and again with the Domino Theory as a main factor, America was concerned that if South Korea fell to communism, Formosa and Japan might fall next. The strongest responses produced a clear judgement. Many of these responses argued that the threat of communism was more serious in Vietnam, giving examples such as the fact that the war lasted longer, it cost more and it resulted in South Vietnam falling to the communists, whereas communism was contained in Korea and the border remained on the 38th parallel, where it was before the war started. Candidates tended to be more confident in their responses when discussing the threat of communism in Vietnam. Some weaker responses found it difficult to address the threat in Korea, giving a one-sided response. Other less successful responses contained too much narrative and description of events in Vietnam and/or Korea and would have benefitted from focusing more on the question.

Question 8

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question in terms of knowledge and understanding. Most candidates were able to state some points about what the Brezhnev Doctrine was trying to prevent. For example: 'to prevent opposition to communism' and 'to prevent countries leaving the Warsaw Pact'. Stronger answers included other relevant points, such as: 'to avoid the recurrence of events such as the Prague Spring of 1968' and 'to limit the independence of countries in Eastern Europe'.
- (b) This question was well answered, with most responses able to explain at least one reason why the East German government began construction of the Berlin Wall. Many responses demonstrated understanding that the wall was built to stop people leaving East Berlin, especially skilled workers, as this was having a negative impact on the German economy. Strong responses were able to provide a second reason, most often noting the standard of living between East and West Berlin as a point of difference and suggesting that the East German government built the wall so that communism would not be undermined. Some weaker responses only gave one reason, or they drifted from the focus of the question to discuss the results of the wall being built, for example 'Checkpoint Charlie', which were not relevant.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Many candidates were confident explaining how the policies of Gorbachev brought about the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe, but fewer were able to identify or explain other factors that brought about this collapse. Many responses demonstrated a good knowledge of Gorbachev's policies of Glasnost and Perestroika and the reasoning behind them. These responses explained that Gorbachev realised that the Soviet Union was facing serious economic problems, so he chose to stop propping up communist regimes in Eastern Europe because it was costing too much money. He also withdrew the Red Army from Afghanistan to save money. Stronger responses also assessed the contribution of other factors to the collapse, including the growth and actions of Solidarity, the protests of Eastern European peoples due to poor economic conditions and the tearing down of the Berlin Wall in 1989.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Stronger answers showed a clear understanding of the special emergency powers, such as: 'they were written in an Emergency Decree for the Protection of the German People', 'they were signed by Hindenburg', 'Hitler could use them to arrest Communists' and 'he could send them to concentration camps'. Weaker responses confused the special emergency powers that Hitler gained immediately after the Reichstag Fire (February 1933) with the Enabling Act (March 1933).
- (b) This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding of why the Night of Long Knives was important to Hitler. Strong responses were able to identify two reasons, most commonly by explaining that Hitler was able to remove the threat of the SA and that he secured the support of the army. Strong responses developed the first reason into an explanation by referring to the threats that the SA posed for Hitler, including Rohm's aims, the increasing strength of the SA and Hitler's concern for his own security. Explanation of the second reason could be supported with details such as, Hindenburg and the German army supported Hitler's dealing with the SA, as it lessened their concerns about the increasing strength of the SA. As a result, in 1934 the Army Oath was signed. Some strong responses also stressed the importance of the fact that Hitler took the opportunity to have other critics and opponents murdered, such as von Schleicher and Gregor Strasser, which resulted in Hitler securing his position and growing even more powerful. Less successful responses were characterised by lengthy descriptions of the events of the Night of Long Knives, which was not the focus of the question.
- (c) There were many strong, well organised responses to this question, with many candidates able to demonstrate the reasons why the Nazis had little success in the years 1924 to 1930. Many of such answers explained that the Nazis' poor planning and organisation, the arrest and humiliation of

Hitler and the banning of the Nazi Party were reasons why the Munich Putsch failed. On the other side of the argument, some argued that the Munich Putsch could not be considered a failure because it gave Hitler and the Nazis publicity at his trial, and they learnt lessons from their failure. Many other responses on this side explained that the lack of success of the Nazis at this time was due to Stresemann's diplomatic, economic and cultural achievements. These responses explained that due to Stresemann's economic achievements, including introducing a new currency and, with the help of the Dawes Plan, ending hyperinflation, Germans were content and less likely to turn to extremist parties. The strongest responses explained both sides of the argument and included a valid judgement on 'how far'. Most considered that despite the failure of the Munich Putsch, it helped the Nazis in some ways. Hitler became more of a national figure at this trial, and he decided that if the Nazis were going to win power, they would have to do it legally within the political system, not by using violence. So, in the long-term, the failure of the Munich Putsch led to success. However, in the short-term, people were very happy with the economic and political stability under Stresemann and had no desire to support an extremist party. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of relevant supporting information for their statements. Other less successful responses drifted from the focus of the question by including details of why Hitler came to power after 1930, which were not relevant.

Question 12

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses demonstrated sound knowledge of how the 'Swing' groups tried to oppose the Nazi regime and were able to identify four ways in which they showed their opposition. For example: 'they refused to join the Hitler Youth', 'they wore English style clothes', 'they listened to American jazz music, which was unpopular with the Nazis' and 'the girls wore make up which went against Nazi ideas of a Germanic woman'. Other responses gained credit for noting the ways 'Swing' groups opposed the regime. For example: 'they openly mixed with Jews' and 'they made fun of Nazi Volk songs and the Nazi salute'. A common misconception was that the Edelweiss Pirates and White Rose Movement were the same as the 'Swing' groups. Less successful responses described the activities of these two groups, which were not relevant to the question.
- (b) This question was well answered, and most candidates were very familiar with the reasons why the Nazis persecuted the Jews. Strong responses were able to identify and explain two reasons, most commonly by explaining Hitler's belief that the Aryan race was superior to all others and thus he saw the Jews as inferior. Another reason to explain their persecution was that the Nazis believed the German state was being undermined by Jews, and they claimed that all Germany's problems were caused by them, including Germany's defeat in the First World War. Other explanations included the fact that the Nazis despised the wealth of the Jews and thought that they were taking away Nazi jobs, as well as Hitler's personal hatred of the Jews stemming from when he was a student in Vienna. Weaker responses drifted from the focus of the question, often describing at length how Hitler persecuted the Jews, details of which were not relevant to this question.
- (c) There were many strong responses to this question, with many demonstrating a very good understanding of which was more effective in keeping the Nazis in power: the SS or mass rallies. In strong responses, the role of the SS was well explained, and the impact of their activities on the German population was clearly articulated. For example, these responses explained that the SS dealt with anyone who opposed the Nazis, detained them without charge, and often tortured and killed them. Strong responses provided evidence of the role of the different branches of the SS, such as the Death Head Units and the Waffen. On the other side of the argument, many candidates were able to provide details of the rallies, but the link to Hitler's maintenance of power was not always made. Weaker responses identified how people liked to go to the rallies because they were spectacular, with marches, speeches and torchlight processions. However, these responses could have been improved by developing these points into an explanation. This could be done, for example, by explaining that these rallies, such as those at Nuremberg, were large, emotional events, which gave people a sense of belonging and convinced them to support Hitler, and they aimed at maintaining Hitler's cult of personality. Some weaker responses included details about the Hitler Youth, the indoctrination of school children through the school curriculum and the imposition of censorship as other ways Hitler maintained power, which were not relevant. In a comparison question such as this, it is not necessary to explain factors other than those given in the question.

Question 13

- (a) This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the work of Stalin's secret police. Strong responses were able to describe their role, such as: 'they removed any opposition to Stalin', 'they were behind the purges', 'they used informers among ordinary people who would tell on each other' and 'they carried out political kidnappings'. Many also emphasised the fact that the secret police helped Stalin keep the Russians under control, because people were terrified of them.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question, with some variation in knowledge and understanding of why Stalin used show trials. Strong responses explained that he wanted to remove opposition largely because he was paranoid, and he always thought that people around him were plotting to replace him. Stalin used the show trials to remove people he suspected were critical of his policies, including Bukharin, Kamenev and Zinoviev. The strongest responses gave a second explanation, often by illustrating how show trials were used to instil fear within the public and to show what would happen if you criticised Stalin. People were so afraid that comrades often accused each other, and most people pleaded guilty. Weaker responses tended to be limited to examples such as, 'he wanted to remove opposition' and 'he wanted to instil fear in the public in order to stay in power', which lacked enough supporting knowledge to create an explanation.
- (c) Strong responses created a balanced argument by explaining how Trotsky's mistakes led to Stalin becoming leader of the Soviet Union. Trotsky's assumption that he would automatically succeed Lenin and his unpopular idea of permanent revolution were commonly cited as his two main mistakes. On the other side of the argument, many explained the importance of Stalin's role as General Secretary of the Party, his determination to undermine Trotsky and his policy of socialism in one country. Many concluded that Stalin became leader of the Soviet Union, not because of Trotsky's mistakes, but because he was a clever, wily politician who, as General Secretary, had built up a power base within the party. He was also someone who people related to, due to his humble origins. Weaker responses, although they showed some understanding of Trotsky's mistakes, would have benefitted from including more contextual information to support their argument. Some of these responses also included long descriptions of how Trotsky came to miss Lenin's funeral, without linking this point to the question.

Question 14

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

Question 15

- (a) This question was well answered by most. Strong responses demonstrated a very good understanding of Al Capone and his activities. Four relevant points were required, for example: 'he was a gangster', 'he was from Chicago', 'he was active at the time of Prohibition' and 'he ran a bootlegging business'. Other valid points could cover a wide range of activities, for example, Capone's involvement in the St Valentine's Day Massacre, gambling and prostitution, and his violence towards rival gangs.
- (b) This question was very well answered, and most candidates had a good understanding of why there was enormous growth in the entertainment industry in the 1920s. Strong responses identified a type of entertainment, most commonly the cinema, and then included details of its development, for example, the cheap cost of the tickets, the rise of Hollywood, names of the stars, the excitement of the big screen and the intervention of talkies in 1927. Other responses explained the impact of the increased sale of cheap radios, the development of jazz music around this time and the growth of sports clubs and teams. Some weaker responses were able to identify valid reasons, including that people had more disposable income because of the economic boom, more time because the average working week decreased, and more choice as more people had cars and could drive to places of entertainment; however, these responses would have benefitted from more explanation.

- (c) There were many good, well organised responses to this question, with many candidates able to demonstrate to what extent women's lives had changed in the 1920s. Strong responses explained several changes, including their dress, hairstyle and make-up, their freer lifestyle, and the different career opportunities open to them. On the other side of the argument, strong responses explained that these changes did not affect all women and that those in rural areas were quite happy to continue with their traditional way of life. Additionally, many middle-class women were still very conservative, and, although they watched the new films and film stars, they had no wish to copy them. Strong responses often made reference to the fact that, although women had the vote, they were still not equal in politics, as they could not be a political candidate. The strongest responses were those that gave at least one explanation on each side of the argument and came to a judgement. Many agreed that the lives of some women had changed dramatically, but this was mainly limited to the lives of young women who lived in the towns or those who could afford the changes. At the time, most women workers were still paid less than men and could not afford the labour-saving equipment that would have given them more time to enjoy a freer lifestyle. Weaker responses tended to show more confidence explaining changes, rather than any lack of change, which produced an unbalanced answer. Additionally, some of these responses tended to list all the changes together in one paragraph, rather than identifying a change and providing some contextual details to develop the response.

Questions 16, 17 and 18

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22 Document Questions

Key messages

Candidates should take time to think about the source and use notes to work out roughly what the answer is going to be before writing it down.

When a question asks, 'how surprising?', 'how useful?' or 'how reliable?', candidates should ensure to make a clear statement in the opening sentence of the answer, stating if the source is surprising, useful or reliable. They should then use the rest of the answer to support the statement.

When asked about 'usefulness', responses should not be based solely on reliability, as biased or unreliable sources can still be useful to historians.

Candidates should read the questions through carefully and decide which ones require evaluation of the sources. Candidates should ensure to evaluate properly and avoid making generic assertions.

When using a cartoon or a written source, candidates should try to infer its overall point of view. Interpretations of the sources should be supported by using their content.

When using a quotation from a source, it should be written out in full, not abbreviated. When ellipses are used, the quotation often loses its meaning, and what is left of the quotation is not adequate.

General comments

Almost all candidates answered on the twentieth century topic. The overall standard was good, with most candidates demonstrating a range of source skills. There were a number of very strong scripts and few weak ones. Most candidates appeared to have no time issues. The contextual knowledge of many candidates was strong and was often brought into answers in an effective way, allowing for a better use of the sources. Candidates' strengths included comparing sources and interpreting cartoons. There were two areas for improvement. Firstly, candidates did not always realise where evaluation of the sources was required. Secondly, there were a number of candidates who were able to write meaningfully about the sources but neglected to directly answer the question set. Candidates could improve their responses by thinking through their answers before writing them down and by starting their responses by directly addressing the question in the first sentence.

Comments on specific questions

Section 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 produced many good responses. Many candidates were able to identify and explain both agreements and disagreements. The strongest responses were clearly based on careful thought and preparation. This meant that once candidates were ready, they were able to explain several agreements point by point and then move on to disagreements. Good comparisons will assess common criteria, for example, 'Both Sources A and B say that Greece wanted the League

of Nations to deal with the issue.' When identifying disagreements, strong responses stated clearly what each source said, rather than simply noting the area of disagreement. For example, 'The sources disagree over when Mussolini made his demands' could be improved by explaining that 'Source A states that Mussolini made his demands on 29 August, while Source B claims it was on 27 August'.

There were many agreements and disagreements for candidates to find. The most commonly identified agreements were: Italian commissioners were killed, the Italians invaded on 31 August, Greece had to pay Italy compensation and the Italian public regarded the incident as a victory. The most commonly identified disagreements were: in Source A Mussolini's demands were reasonable but in B they were unacceptable; in Source A the Greeks rejected the demands but in B they accepted most of them; and in Source A the Italians freely left Corfu while in B they were forced to leave by the British. The strongest responses explained the overall disagreement between the two sources. This involved explaining that the sources have conflicting points of view about the crisis. Source A is pro-Italian and anti-Greece, while Source B is critical of Italy and in favour of Greece. These answers made it clear that the sources were writing about different points of view, and they were well-supported from both sources. The small number of candidates who struggled with this question either did not match agreements and disagreements on common criteria, or they summarised each source with only general assertions about how far they agreed.

- (b) When asked to compare cartoons, it is important to decide on a clear point of comparison based on a common feature that the cartoons share. Most candidates realised that the common feature in both cartoons is Mussolini. However, there were a few who misread the cartoons, which meant the comparison did not work. For example, some thought that the figure of war in Source C was Mussolini, when he is actually sitting at the side smiling or smirking. Mussolini is delighting in the discomfiture of the League. It was acceptable to argue that Mussolini is warlike or threatening, as long as it was clear that the large figure in Source C is not actually him. It was also not accurate to claim that both sources show Mussolini was causing problems for the League of Nations. This is only true of Source C, because there is no mention of the League in Source D.

Strong responses focused on Mussolini and compared what can be inferred about him from the two sources, for example, 'In both sources Mussolini is shown as aggressive and ready for war. In Source C there is a large, dominating figure with a huge sword. This is the new member of the League and is in favour of war and ready to fight against the peaceful intentions of the League. Mussolini is sitting next to the figure smiling and approving, showing that he wanted war and was the mastermind behind the Corfu incident. Source D is similar as it shows Mussolini ready to take control of the Adriatic Sea by force, shown by his standing on Corfu, over the entrance to the sea.' The strongest responses went further and focused on points of view, explaining how both cartoonists are criticising Mussolini. These responses were supported by reference to the cartoons. A very small number of weaker responses were based only on the provenance of the sources and just described the content of the cartoons.

- (c) Some good responses were seen to this question. Most candidates were able to explain that Source E does make Source F surprising because of what they both say about Mussolini. A common way of making this comparison was to use the 'minimum' demands in Source E to infer that Mussolini is being shown as reasonable and then compare this with Source F, which describes him as 'not a reasonable, cool-headed person'. Strong responses used a similar argument but based it on an explanation of how the two sources have different points of view about Mussolini. A good number of candidates went even further and used the provenance of the sources to evaluate at least one of them. Many of these stated that Source E does not make Source F surprising, because F is British, so it is not surprising that it is critical of Mussolini. These answers could have been strengthened even further by fully developing the explanation of one of the sources, for example, 'It is not surprising that Source F criticises Mussolini because it is from a British newspaper. Britain was a leading member of the League and wanted the dispute settled there. It was very angry that Italy was defying the League, and this explains why it talks about Mussolini forcing a crisis on Europe.' Weaker responses contained good comparisons of the two sources but did not state whether Source E makes Source F surprising. Others identified what was or was not surprising, but did not provide an explanation.
- (d) There were some mixed responses to this question. A number of candidates wrote about reliability but neglected to address usefulness. Some of these responses explained reasons such as, 'Mussolini is making himself look good in his autobiography', and then argued that the source was biased and unreliable without mentioning utility. It is important to address the question of

usefulness, because an unreliable source can still be useful to a historian. The strongest responses realised Mussolini was trying to create a positive image of himself as a great hero ('I made myself the messenger of the righteous anger of Italians'), and this is useful evidence for the historian because it tells us how Mussolini used the incident for his own political ends. A good number of candidates used cross-reference to other sources or to their own contextual knowledge to check the claims made by Mussolini in the source. Some weaker responses took the information in the source at face value and claimed it all as useful, while others wrote sensibly about the source but lacked a statement about usefulness.

- (e) This question was generally answered well. Many candidates were able to correctly identify the relevant sources on each side of the hypothesis and explain how some sources support the hypothesis and others do not. In strong responses, candidates either clearly listed which sources support the hypothesis and which disagree with it at the start and then explained each source in their lists, or they made a clear statement about each source as they were writing, stating on which side of the debate the source lies. Valid explanations can come in a variety of forms, depending on the nature of the source. Sometimes a well-chosen quotation can be adequate on its own and does not require further explanation, for example, 'Source E agrees that Mussolini was justified because it says he was 'the messenger of the righteous anger of Italians everywhere''. It is important that the quotation chosen is adequate in itself. Giving only partial quotations, especially by using ellipses, can cause the quotation to become inadequate, so this should be done with care. Because not all quotations are adequate on their own and, of course, they cannot be used with pictorial sources, an alternative and oftentimes stronger approach is to explain how a source agrees or disagrees with the hypothesis. For example, 'Source C shows that Mussolini was not justified in his behaviour Corfu. It shows him getting great pleasure from the fact that the crisis and the violence he has caused over Corfu has caused enormous problems for the League of Nations, which was meant to be keeping the peace.' Some weaker responses showed good understanding of the sources but did not explicitly state on which side of the debate each source lies.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03 Coursework

Key messages

Coursework requires candidates to assess historical significance. The title used is crucial. It should explicitly require candidates to assess the significance of an event, development or individual.

Significance needs to be assessed, rather than just described or explained.

Candidates should use a range of criteria to assess significance.

It is important to assess how far an event, development or individual was significant in different ways and for different reasons. Assessing significance involves reaching a judgement about why the impact of an event or individual mattered.

Candidates should focus on the event, development or individual named in the title and not on other factors.

It is important to come a final, overall and supported conclusion about significance at the end of the answer.

General comments

Centres administered the coursework process swiftly and efficiently, with all paperwork correctly completed. There was some excellent work from candidates, but there was also some work that contained too much description and narrative and not enough focus on significance, most often because the titles used did not effectively allow candidates to assess significance. Some adjustments were made to the marks.

Comments on specific questions

The best titles are those that encourage candidates to assess significance. The strongest answers are produced in response to an appropriate title. The best way to construct such a title is to place the emphasis on assessment and significance, for example: 'Assess the significance of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor', 'Assess the significance of propaganda in Nazi Germany' and 'Assess the significance of Stresemann for Germany.' These titles allow candidates to consider how far their subject was significant in different ways and for different reasons. For example, the title about propaganda enables candidates to assess how significant it was for different groups of German people, as well as how significant it was for Hitler's regime. They could also consider whether it was more significant early in the regime or in later years. This kind of title enables candidates to produce a well-rounded assessment of significance.

Titles that were not clearly tied to significance did not work as well. Titles such as 'How successful was Weimar Germany?' and 'Why was there so much change in Russia between 1917 and 1922?' tend to be more challenging for candidates to demonstrate an understanding of significance and produce answers where significance is incidental to the main point of their argument. Also, titles that push candidates towards causation, even if they contain the word 'significant', encourage candidates to compare the importance of several causes rather than focus on a rounded assessment of the significance of one factor. A title such as 'How significant was the Depression in Hitler's rise to power?' will probably lead to candidates comparing several factors that contributed to his rise to power, with the Depression being one factor, rather than focusing on the significance of the Depression.

There were some thoughtful and well-argued answers where candidates focused on significance. The best answers explained the impact of the given event or individual and then explained why this impact mattered in different ways and for different groups. Less successful answers attempted to write about significance but did not go further than describing or explaining the impact. In these cases, it was assumed that the impact was significant because it was an impact. For example, if an event led to changes, rather than assuming that this alone made the event significant, stronger answers explored of how far these changes mattered at that time or later. Some weaker answers tended to equate success with significance and failure with insignificance. History is full of examples where failure had enormous significance.

Another strength of the best answers is that they did not spend time on lengthy background introductions and did not become too descriptive. These answers remained focused on significance throughout and did not wait until the conclusion to make a reasoned argument. Some candidates used counter-argument to do this, by examining the possible reasons why an event or individual could be considered not so significant. Stronger answers also used criteria. This was sometimes done explicitly, with the candidates setting out a list of criteria at the start of the answer, such as social, economic and political factors. Other candidates adopted a more subtle approach, with the criteria implicitly embedded in their answers. Some considered long- and short-term significance, while others assessed how far significance varied from one group to another. Using criteria enabled candidates to assess significance and gave their arguments scope.

Most of the marking was completed with care and with close attention to the mark scheme. This 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 are most useful when they indicate where candidates are, for example, becoming too descriptive or, alternatively, where they are making good points about significance. They are less useful if they suggest that a candidate has reached a certain level in the first few paragraphs of the answer. Summative comments by the centre can be very helpful. These should sum up the key reasons why an answer has a whole has been placed in a particular level.

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 conclusions.

General comments

A range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. There were too few attempts at Depth Study A: The First World War or 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 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 did not focus on the discussion posed in the question. Many candidates were able to provide more than one facet of the given discussion but neglected to properly explain 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 chosen Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Candidates should read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response keeps 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** were answered by a large number of candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates often gave very detailed and well sequenced, chronological accounts of the economic developments in Weimar Germany between 1923 and 1929. Many strong responses organised descriptions chronologically and typically examined the financial crises in 1923, such as the economic impact of the Ruhr occupation and hyperinflation, as well as Stresemann's successful actions to remedy this through the introduction of the Rentenmark. This was then followed by a detailed description of the financial help provided through American loans in the Dawes Plan in 1924 and the reduction in reparations negotiated in the Young Plan in 1929. Finally, many candidates completed the account by examining the impact of the Wall Street Crash on Germany and the recall of American loans. These responses contained a good level of detail and well-deployed examples to add depth to the account. Weaker responses tended to contain simple errors, with some confusion seen when providing information on the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan. Some responses neglected the parameters of the account and examined events prior to 1923 in too much detail or went beyond 1929 and examined the impact of the Depression on Germany in the 1930s.

In **part (b)**, many responses were able to identify and describe one or more facets on the importance of the Dawes Plan and Young Plan for Germany. Stronger responses cited the economic importance of the Dawes Plan in stabilising the German economy and kickstarting growth, with many linking this to social and cultural changes, for example, in German cities. Some candidates also examined the political importance of these plans. In particular, some identified that the Dawes Plan led to a sharp reduction in support for extremist and anti-Weimar parties in the Reichstag elections and growing support for moderate parties and the Grand Coalitions that were formed. A few candidates also noted the lack of importance of the Young Plan in comparison to the Dawes Plan, as the same year of 1929 saw economic collapse in Germany initiated by the Wall Street Crash and onset of the Great Depression. Some stronger responses provided supported explanations and attempted substantiated judgements in their conclusions. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive accounts, often mimicking the material in **part (a)**.

Question 4 was also generally well answered, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality and were sometimes less well answered compared to **part (a)** of **Question 3**. In **part (a)**, strong accounts organised descriptions either chronologically or thematically and included good knowledge of the actions taken by the Nazis to persecute minorities in Germany. Many candidates tackled the account thematically and examined the persecution of different minorities one at a time. Many examined in detail the persecution of the Jews from 1933, with Nazi-organised boycotts of Jewish businesses through to the Nuremberg Laws, Kristallnacht and the Final Solution – although the latter point had to be discussed in the context of the Jews in Germany, rather than the rest of Nazi-occupied Europe, to fit the parameters of the question. Many also examined the plight of other minority groups such as the Roma population, homosexuals and, in a few instances, black Germans from the Rhineland. Strong responses showed detailed knowledge of the different methods used by the Nazis, which included references to legal segregation and discrimination, organised violence and murder. Weaker accounts tended to be disorganised or lacked contextual knowledge. Others included political opponents of the Nazis, such as communists and trade unionists or women, as examples of minority groups in Germany, which lacked relevance to the question.

Part (b) responses were generally strong and saw candidates able to identify more than one facet of the discussion on the impact of Nazi antisemitism. This discussion allowed a broader response that was not limited to Germany but could include all of Nazi-occupied Europe. Many candidates considered the impact antisemitism had on the Jewish communities in Nazified countries and the creation of ghettos, and later the organised mass murder carried out as part of the Final Solution. Some candidates also considered the economic impact antisemitism had on Jewish business, with many citing the huge fine imposed on the Jewish population in Germany after the destruction caused by the Nazis on Kristallnacht. Another popular facet examined by candidates was the social impact of antisemitism on young people in Germany, who were exposed to indoctrination in school and in the Hitler Youth. Many strong responses provided well-supported explanations on the impact of antisemitism, and a few attempted to draw conclusions about which impact was the most significant. Weaker responses showed a lack of understanding of the definition of antisemitism, which led to errors in the responses.

Depth Study C: Russia 1905–41

Both **Question 5** and **Question 6** were attempted in equal numbers.

Question 5 produced some good answers, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality. In **part (a)**, good answers gave a sequenced account of the events that led to the announcement of the October Manifesto in 1905. Strong accounts tended to consider the political issues facing Russia at the time, specifically increasing demands from both liberals and radicals to reform the system of tsarist autocracy and replace it with a constitutional monarchy, parliamentary democracy or social democracy based on soviet power. Many accounts then examined the plight of the workers in the cities and the poor pay and conditions faced in industry, as well as the land issue faced by many of the poorer peasants in the countryside. This was then followed by descriptions of the impact of the Russo-Japanese War on the Russian Home Front. Many then moved on to Bloody Sunday and finally the outbreak of revolution in 1905, finishing with a brief overview of the terms announced in the October Manifesto. Strong accounts contained good structure, organisation of material and depth of knowledge with key dates and events included. Weaker responses tended to only focus on one or two events immediately preceding the Manifesto, namely Bloody Sunday and the 1905 Revolution, and therefore lacked the full narrative of the events.

In **part (b)**, responses were generally strong. Most candidates were able to cite one or more facets of the discussion and provide some explanation or detailed description of the impact of Stolypin on Russia. Many examined agrarian reforms introduced by Stolypin and considered how this affected the lives and livelihoods of the peasant class, particularly the growing class of kulaks in Russia, who were aided by the ability to opt

out of the mir and use the Peasant Land Bank to increase their private plots. Some responses linked this to a political impact, whereby Stolypin hoped to increase support for the tsarist government by creating a conservative, rural middle-class. However, they also considered how many poorer peasants remained unsatisfied by the reforms and were increasingly radicalised. Many responses also examined the impact Stolypin had on the tsarist regime in terms of increasing political repression using military courts. The best responses contained supported explanations of the impacts and then considered which impact was the most significant for Russia to reach a final judgement. Weaker responses tended to be mostly descriptive and lacked developed explanations of impact.

Question 6 was similarly well answered compared to **Question 5**, although there were some especially thorough accounts given by candidates for **part (a)**. The best accounts for **part (a)** provided many details of the events leading up to the Bolshevik seizure of power in November 1917. Strong responses considered the background context by examining the increasing popularity of the Bolsheviks in the major soviets of Moscow and Petrograd, especially after helping to defeat the Kornilov uprising. This saw the organisation of the Red Guard, who were instrumental in November. Most accounts then detailed the events that led up to the storming of the Winter Palace and collapse of the Provisional Government, and finished with a brief overview of how the Bolsheviks under Lenin began to establish power in Russia. Weaker accounts tended to lack specific contextual knowledge of the seizure of power or went too far back and examined the March Revolution, confusing it with the seizure of power in November. A few responses also went beyond the parameters of the question and examined the consolidation of Bolshevik rule up to and including the Russian Civil War from 1918.

In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers where candidates discussed multiple facets of the importance of the Kornilov Affair. Most commonly, these responses considered the impact the revolt had on the popularity of the Bolsheviks, as they were viewed as saviours of the revolution by many in the working class in the urban areas of Russia. Responses also considered how the release of Bolshevik leaders from imprisonment allowed them to form Red Guard units that would later be used to seize power from the Provisional Government. Many candidates also examined how the attempted coup weakened the position of the Provisional Government and its Prime Minister Kerensky and increased the power of the soviets in Russia as an alternative to Dual Power. A few weaker responses considered the economic consequences of the coup, but these tended to be more descriptive or only provided assertions supported by more generalised material.

Depth Study D: USA 1919–41

Both questions were chosen by candidates, but **Question 7** was slightly more popular.

Question 7 was generally well answered by candidates, though sometimes quality varied in terms of depth and accuracy of contextual knowledge. In **part (a)**, many candidates were able to give an account which contained some important details of the development of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s. Strong responses tended to use a chronological sequence, but a few successfully approached the account thematically by considering themes such as membership, aims and methods used. Most responses began by examining the rebirth of the KKK in 1915 after the release of 'The Birth of a Nation'. They considered how the KKK used American nationalism and the fear of mass immigration, the Red Scare, racial prejudice and Protestant churches to increase their membership, especially in the South and Midwest of the USA. Many accounts also detailed the different methods used by the KKK, especially the use of racial intimidation and violence by more radical members of the organisation. A few examined how Klan members infiltrated the American political system at different levels, from municipal and county authorities up to the federal government. Most accounts finished by describing how the KKK sharply reduced in membership after the media publicised and exposed the scandal surrounding the Indiana Klan leader D C Stephenson, who was found guilty of murder, leading to further crackdowns on Klan corruption and bribery in the political system. Weaker accounts provided few specific details and tended to be very generalised, lacking information on the key events about the KKK's development in the 1920s.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to provide at least one valid facet to the discussion on the impact of segregation on the USA in the 1920s. Some of the strongest responses considered how segregation affected black Americans in the South economically and politically, as well as from a socio-cultural perspective. Most considered how black Americans were forced into the lowest paid jobs, with many becoming sharecroppers and thus financially indebted to white landowners. Some responses also considered how segregation through Jim Crow laws denied most black Americans the right to vote and therefore any political voice or representation, furthering their plight. Other areas of Jim Crow were also explored, such as segregation in housing, medical care, education, transport and public facilities. Finally, many discussions examined how these conditions led to some migration northwards or to California, with

some noting the later birth of the Jazz Age in cities like New York and Chicago, as some black Americans became blues or jazz musicians. Some weaker responses lacked contextual knowledge of Jim Crow laws, leading to generalised statements, and there were some misconceptions over the definition of the term 'segregation', leading to some inaccurate assertions.

Question 8 was well answered, although slightly fewer candidates opted for this question. In **part (a)**, many candidates were able to give a detailed account of the measures taken by Roosevelt to help farmers as part of his New Deal reforms. Many sequenced their accounts chronologically by examining the agencies set up by the First New Deal and then the Second New Deal. Some strong accounts detailed the work of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) in the First New Deal and gave examples of how the agency used quotas to decrease agricultural production to increase prices. Many also noted that the AAA was later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1936 over the imposition of illegal taxes. This was often followed by descriptions of the work of the Farm Security Administration (FSA), and later the Resettlement Administration (RA), which were introduced to help tenant farmers and sharecroppers as part of the Second New Deal reforms. A few candidates also considered the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority and how it used dams to help irrigate the Tennessee Valley Area, which allowed for better farming output. Some weaker responses lacked detail of the different agencies or an accurate sequencing of events, but this question was generally well answered by candidates due to strong contextual knowledge of the New Deal reforms.

In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to give some very strong, multi-faceted discussions on the impact of the alphabet agencies. This question gave scope to consider the impact of many New Deal agencies across both the First and Second New Deal reforms introduced by Roosevelt. Most candidates considered the economic impact that job creation agencies, such as the PWA, CWA, CCC and later PWA, had in increasing employment during the Depression and how this stimulated the economy through consumer spending. Many answers also considered the social impact that agencies like the FERA had in providing relief to those worst hit by the Depression, and they noted how farmers' income doubled through the work of the AAA, which reduced the number of farms and farmhouses being repossessed. Strong responses explained these impacts with supporting examples and reached valid conclusions about the most important impact of the agencies on the USA. There were some misconceptions about what constituted an alphabet agency, including the Emergency Banking Act as an agency or the Wagner Act and Social Security Act of the Second New Deal as agencies. These reforms were part of the New Deal, but they were not alphabet agencies.

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.