



# CONTENTS

---

<b>HISTORY</b> .....	2
Paper 0470/01 Paper 1 .....	2
Paper 0470/02 Paper 2 .....	7
Paper 0470/03 Coursework.....	10
Paper 0470/04 Alternative to Coursework.....	11

# HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

## General comments

Two years ago the then Principal Examiner, in his Report, commented on the fact that Centres, their Teachers and candidates were becoming more aware of the demands of the Question Paper. This trend has continued with many candidates being well prepared for the demands of the Paper giving responses that contained detailed and accurate historical knowledge. Examiners recorded the view that they saw a number of impressive answers where knowledge was used with understanding, explanation and evaluation, thus meeting fully the demands of the (c) parts of each question. There were relatively few very poor responses and almost without exception these lacked a basic knowledge of the topic being answered. On occasions responses tended to be overlong but this was often related to the desire of the candidate to inform the Examiner of all they had learned in general about the topic, rather than a clear focus on the question set.

Where answers failed to progress in quality, they often tended to rely too heavily on the role of narrative and description, rather than moving into explanation and evaluation or in some instances the question had been misread, resulting in responses that provided an answer to a question different to the one set.

There were very few rubric infringements although some Examiners did report that within the work of some Centres, individual Answer Papers contained responses to two depth studies. This practice reduces the amount of time that can profitably be spent on the other valid answers.

Most scripts were presented in a neat and orderly fashion, which was much appreciated by the Examining Panel. The handwriting was generally good, resulting in very few occasions where Examiners found difficulty in understanding the meaning of candidates' answers. Examiners came across very few instances where there appeared to be a shortage of time.

The most popular questions in **Section A** (Core Content) were numbers **5, 6** and **7**. From **Section B** (Depth Studies) candidates' chose the Depth Studies on Germany, Russia, The USA and China more regularly.

## Comments on specific questions

The following comments are given to aid Teachers in their work with candidates. They reflect where either responses failed to meet the demands of the question or misconceptions were identified. These comments relate to the more popular questions and do not imply that those questions identified were poorly answered.

### **Section A**

#### **Question 4**

- (c) For answers to the part (c) of any question, to gain high marks it is expected that the response will argue the issue or hypothesis posed by the question. In this instance many responses gave reasons why 1914 but often totally ignored 'why not earlier?' This reduced the marks that were available to a more balanced approach.

#### **Question 5**

- (a) This part of the question produced many good answers although a significant number of answers were over long as candidates referred to all the terms of the Treaty of Versailles rather than concentrating on those aspects that weakened the German economy. A significant number of answers confused the Ruhr and Saar.
- (b) In a significant number of responses, candidates erroneously thought that the Sudetenland was part of the German Empire and that the Rhineland was taken over by the French.

- (c) For candidates confident in the technique required for (c) parts of questions, the idea and 'in the circumstances of the time', posed few problems. A significant number of candidates concentrated in general terms on fair/unfair, ignoring the word 'sensible'.

#### Question 6

- (a) The Hoare-Laval Pact was often not known, judging by the number of blank spaces appearing on Answer Papers. In other instances information was totally confused over who was involved, their role and the status of the Pact.
- (b) It was expected that, to gain high marks, answers would include specific detail of the reasons why the League of Nations failed to prevent Italy's conquest of Abyssinia. All too often answers were limited to generalisations about the weaknesses of the League.

#### Question 7

- (a) Some candidates were unaware of the precise nature of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, often equating it with a railway.
- (c) In setting a 'How far' type of question it is anticipated that candidates will realise that there are more reasons for an event than the one given in the question. A significant number of candidates in this instance concentrated solely on public opinion as being not only the 'most important', but also the sole reason.

### Section B

#### Question 9

- (a) Whilst there were many good answers to this question about the Munich Putsch, too many answers ran the events into one day rather than over the 8/9 November. This approach unfortunately produced a very mixed up and simplified version of the events.

#### Question 12

- (a) Far too many candidates ignored the question completely preferring to concentrate their answers on a generalised view of the purges rather than the specifics of the 'show trials'.

#### Question 14

- (a) Here, significant numbers concentrated their answer on the reasons for the Prohibition laws, rather than what the question asked, which was the ways that the USA tried to enforce them.

To help Schools, their Teachers and candidates, the following are examples of candidates' answers, varying in quality, for **Question 5**, the most popular question. A brief explanation as to why the answers were given the level and mark indicated is given, and should be used in conjunction with the mark scheme, which is available from CIE. All of the examples are reproduced as candidates wrote them, with some corrections to spelling and grammatical errors.

#### *Examples of candidates' answers*

#### Question 5

- (a) *In what ways did the Treaty of Versailles weaken the German economy?*

##### Example 1

The Treaty of Versailles had weakened Germany's economy due to the harsh rules imposed on them. Their navy had to be reduced, they were not allowed to enter other countries or trade with them. Germany also had to pay the cost of all the damages and destruction caused. Germany's investments, imports and exports were all stopped. No income means less supply to satisfy their people's needs leading to a weak unstable economy.

Level 1/1 mark

This example is very generalised and only hints at the impact on the Germany economy.

## Example 2

The Treaty of Versailles had weakened Germany greatly. In 1920 when the treaty was put into effect, the German economy had fallen greatly. There was high unemployment and Germany had to pay reparations to the French which caused hyperinflation. As the government was producing more German marks to pay reparations and the coal workers, the value of the German mark went down. Germany had decreased its army. Because the Kaiser was overthrown and the Weimar Republic brought in. Many people in Germany hated them and tried to assassinate them.

Level 2/3 marks

In this response the candidate is beginning to describe how the German economy was affected although the points made are limited and lack clarity.

## Example 3

The Treaty of Versailles was a blow to the German economy. The Treaty stated that Germany had to pay reparations of £6,000 billion. This plunged Germany into debt.

The Treaty, signed in 1919, caused Germany to lose 12.5% of its population, including all those people who lived in land that was taken away from Germany. This included Silesia. This lost land included key industrial and mining sites, and the loss of this meant that Germany had less goods and trade with. This caused more economic problems.

Further more, the limitation of the size of the army and navy meant that those who were employed in these organisations, as well as workers in armament production, were now unemployed. This was a severe economic problem.

In losing a proportion of its population, there were less people to work (a reduced labour supply) and so less taxes were paid and the government revenue fell.

In addition, Germany lost its overseas colonies to the League which made them mandates under British and French protection. This meant no income from abroad, leading to a reduction of resources hence economic crises.

In conclusion, the Treaty of Versailles had adverse impact on the German economy.

Level 2/5 marks

Here the candidate has made a number of detailed points as to how the German economy was affected. Whilst the response lacks accuracy in some of the factual information, this does not detract from full marks being awarded.

**(b)** *Why did Germany dislike the Treaty of Versailles?*

## Example 1

Germany dislike the Treaty because they were the ones to blame. Very harsh punishments was put on Germany allowing only very little freedom. Strict rules were applied leaving Germany with no control of their own country. This was a big shame and losing a lot of their pride. All the loss and damage to other countries was Germany's fault and there were responsible for it. They had a lot smaller armed forces.

The Treaty made Germany very weak. They had no power of their own. It was impossible for them to stand up for themselves.

Level 1/1 mark

This answer is very general. It hints at the reasons for German dislike but fails to identify or explain them.

## Example 2

Germany disliked the Treaty of Versailles for a variety of reasons. This is because the Treaty had a devastating effect on Germany.

Firstly Germany had to payback the 6 billion pounds of reparation fees to the victors of the war. Germany could not feed its people. Another reason was the disarmament of its forces. The worst thing about the Treaty of Versailles was that Germany had to accept war guilt, which many said was not true. The loss of territory also hit Germany.

Overall these were the main reasons for why Germans disliked the Treaty of Versailles.

Level 2/4 marks

In this answer, the candidate identifies a number of reasons but fails to explain why these reasons brought about a German dislike of the Treaty of Versailles.

## Example 3

The Germans were particularly angered by the war guilt clause as they felt that WW1 was not entirely their fault. They didn't like the fact that Germany had had no say in the treaty but had simply been forced to sign – it was a dictated peace. The Germans felt humiliated by the extent of the reduction of their armed forces, which had previously been Germany's pride. Their army was reduced to 100,000 men, their airforce was scrapped, they weren't allowed submarines. This was insufficient to maintain security in the face of foreign aggression. The Treaty of Versailles took away 10% of their land this splitting up the German population and having them in other countries. Germany lost all her overseas colonies, which angered Germany as it made them weaker, less influential and it allowed Britain and France to expand their influence as they ruled Germany's past colonies as mandates.

Level 3/7 marks

The candidate has identified a number of reasons for German dislike and explains the reason for this dislike within the context of the time.

- (c) *To what extent was the Treaty of Versailles a sensible treaty in the circumstances of the time? Explain your answer.*

## Example 1

The Treaty of Versailles represented peace with all the countries. Since Germany was attacking and destroying the countries around them it seemed like a pretty sensible idea for Germany to be responsible and punished for what they did and the consequences for their actions. Germany was put under control to prevent further harm.

Based on the Treaty of Versailles it might have been a little harsh with Germany, but it made them aware of the mistakes they made and to remember not to ever do it again.

The Treaty also made other countries safe and protected it also gives them time to re-build and construct any damages made.

Level 2/3 marks

A simplistic answer that identifies reasons as to the appropriateness of the Treaty.

## Example 2

The Treaty of Versailles was a sensible treaty in the circumstances of the time because it was written after the war by the three victors Britain, France and America. The France at the time was very angry because how most of the devastation was done on French land. The French people had to repair buildings and lots of farmland. This is why the French asked for such a high reparations bill. The French also wanted to weaken the German economy so that they were not able to cause another war. Most people at the time felt that Germany had deserve such a treaty because of 'aggression of Germany and her allies'. At the time the treaty was sensible because they had limited Germany's army and navy. If this had not been done there might have been a World War II earlier.

Level 3/5 marks

This answer contains identification and explanation but only explores one side of the issue.

## Example 3

At the time the Treaty of Versailles was created, many countries were in ruin. France was especially damaged and weakened by the war. Clemenceau blamed the Germans and wanted support, in the form of reparations to help them recover. Therefore the reparations Germany had to pay could be seen as sensible as much of the war had been fought in France.

The reduction of Germany's armed forces could also be seen as quite a sensible term of the Treaty. The Allies would, at the time, be concerned that Germany may attack again and therefore it was sensible to weaken them enough to prevent this. Similarly, the demilitarisation of the Rhineland could be seen as sensible. The French and Belgians would have been particularly concerned about another German attack, particularly as they were already so weak, so the Rhineland acted as a buffer zone to protect them.

The establishment of the League of Nations was also quite sensible at this time. So close after the war, many nations probably felt that the most important issue at the time was to protect the peace and prevent another war from happening again. Therefore the League of Nations was set up as an international 'police force'.

However, the harshness of many of the terms of the treaty could be seen as unsensible. France in particular did not just want to help rebuild and protect France, he also wanted revenge on Germany and to completely cripple it. They wanted to prevent Germany from ever being able to attack Germany again. Therefore huge amounts of reparations, destroying the German economy, could be seen as unsensible as Germany would want to seek revenge for this action. Also the great reduction in the armed forces could be seen as unsensible as it hurt German pride. The countries in the German empire also became mandates to Britain and France. This could be seen as unsensible as the British and French appeared to be expanding their empires.

Also, to prevent future conflicts it perhaps would have been more sensible for all countries to disarm to some extent, rather than just Germany.

The war guilt place on the German people was also not sensible as they were not the only country at fault for the war. These harsh terms also angered the Germans greatly and made them want revenge upon the Allies. This made the Treaty unsensible.

Therefore, although I feel that some of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were sensible and necessary to preserve peace, I also feel that the harshness and extent of German punishment makes the Treaty of Versailles not a sensible treaty, despite the circumstances of the time.

Level 4/7 marks

This answer explains why the Treaty might, or might not, have been sensible at the time. It deals with 'what extent' in this manner rather than explicitly arguing the point and thus remains in Level 4.

**Paper 0470/02****Paper 2****General comments**

A large majority of candidates coped comfortably with the demands of Paper 2 and there were many solid performances worth at least a Grade C. These candidates have been well prepared for the demands of this Paper and although many were unable to sustain a top level performance through all the questions, they did, nevertheless, demonstrate an impressive range of source skills and most were able to reach the top level for some of the questions. There was also a small minority of candidates who appeared to be unfamiliar with the demands of the Paper. They often ignored the sources and when sources were used it was often in an uncritical fashion and at surface level only. Some of the main weaknesses are commented on below. The emphasis in this introduction on these weaknesses should not detract from the fact that many candidates demonstrated the abilities to use their contextual knowledge to interpret and evaluate a wide range of different types of historical sources most effectively.

Some candidates struggled with the idea of sources having a message. When asked to comment on 'message' they simply described the source or repeated its content. Use of contextual knowledge is the key here. If candidates can use their knowledge of the context and of the author of the source, they will be more successful in understanding the message.

Many candidates wasted time by starting each answer by writing for a page or more about what the source under question says. This is not necessary and was rarely rewardable. The Examiner knows what the source says and is much more interested in the candidate answering the question set. Many of these candidates eventually lose sight of the question and never get round to answering it.

Some candidates still struggle with questions asking them to compare sources for agreements and disagreements. These questions need to be answered through a point by point comparison of the sources, not by summarising one source, then summarising the other, and ending with vague assertions about the sources agreeing or disagreeing.

When questions ask candidates to use one source to check another, they must check the reliability of a specific claim made in the first source. Some candidates make vague assertions without ever considering specific points in the sources.

The key to doing well in this Paper is how candidates use their contextual knowledge. Candidates who use no contextual knowledge do not do well. Neither do candidates who try and ignore the sources and answer only from contextual knowledge. This Paper is designed to test candidates' abilities to use historical sources but these sources come from, and are about, particular historical contexts. The best answers will always be those where candidates use the sources and their knowledge of the historical context together. A source is most effectively interpreted when contextual knowledge is used to inform the interpretation. A source is most effectively evaluated when its claims and its purpose are considered in their historical context.

Paper 2 is designed to make candidates think. It sets them puzzles to solve. It is heartening to see so many candidates rising to these challenges with enthusiasm, knowledge, skills, understanding and originality.

**Comments on specific questions*****Option A******19th Century topic*****Question 1**

Some candidates failed to score the marks they should have on this question because they failed to identify specific agreements and disagreements. These candidates often spent a page or more summarising one source and then when they got to their summary of the second source, thought that phrases such as 'on the other hand' constituted a comparison. It is important that answers to questions such as this one are based on point by point comparisons and not on a summary of one source followed by a summary of the second

source. Candidates should identify a point that the sources agree or disagree about and then explain why they agree or disagree. Comparison questions, such as this one, that start 'How far', nearly always allow scope for both agreements and disagreements to be found. Many candidates were able to explain how two sources disagree about Cavour's intentions but only a few went on to explain agreements. A number of candidates scored reasonably high marks on this question, but with better technique many more candidates could have done the same.

### Question 2

Source D needed careful reading as it contains a report of Cavour being friendly towards Garibaldi but then the author of the source dismisses this as 'an act'. Weaker candidates tried to argue that Source C disagrees with Source D because the former shows disagreements between Cavour and the nationalists while Source D shows him getting on well with Garibaldi. Better candidates realised that it was important to consider the authors of these two sources. The least satisfactory way of doing this was to simply dismiss Source C because it is by Mazzini and claim that he would be against Cavour anyway. The better answers used their contextual knowledge to test both Sources C and D.

### Question 3

Many candidates found Source E difficult to interpret. Despite the fact that Garibaldi is shown as the 'man in possession' of Italy, it was common to find candidates claiming that the cartoon shows Victor Emmanuel in charge. The difficulty many candidates had with this source was caused by their failure to use their contextual knowledge to help them work out the message of Source E. Source F also caused difficulties. Most candidates were able to say that the painting shows a friendly relationship/co-operation between them, but few provided a contextual explanation of this, for example, that its message was about the three creators of unification and their relationship. Failure to do this also meant that a meaningful comparison with Source E became very unlikely.

### Question 4

This question was answered well by many candidates because they did use their contextual knowledge and understanding in a relevant way. An encouraging number of candidates reached the top level in the mark scheme by using the fact that Source G was written to Cavour's representative in Paris. They used their contextual knowledge to explain why Cavour would not want to risk French intervention. These were very good answers. Weaker candidates were able to use the information in Source G at face value while better candidates used other sources or their knowledge to comment on Cavour's attitude towards unification, Garibaldi and Piedmont.

### Question 5

Many candidates realised the ambiguity of what Cavour is saying in Source H. He goes out of his way to praise Garibaldi but he still has clear reservations about him. Many candidates used their knowledge of the topic to explain why they were surprised or not surprised and the better candidates did both. There was also a good number of outstanding answers where candidates concentrated on the fact that the letter was going to London, and used their knowledge to explain that Cavour would want to appear to the British to be supporting Garibaldi.

### Question 6

Many candidates simply looked for matches between Source K and Sources I and J. Some reached the next level in the mark scheme by realising that the author of Source K may well have used both sources because neither are necessarily inconsistent with K. Only a few candidates explored how interpretations such as that in Source K are reached.

### Question 7

Candidates seem to have reached a plateau with this kind of question. Answers do not seem to be improving. Some candidates lose sight of the hypothesis they are meant to be testing and end up summarising each source. They might add the odd assertion that sources do or do not support the hypothesis but many fail to explain how they do this. Others discuss the hypothesis with little reference to the sources. Almost no candidates attempt any evaluation of the sources. However, for those candidates prepared for this type of question (and it appears every year as the final question on the Paper) there are some relatively easy marks to be obtained. These candidates were able to score up to 8 marks out of 10 by explaining how some sources support the hypothesis and how others do not.



**Option B***20th Century topic***Question 1**

Candidates should be well aware by now that when comparison questions such as this one begin with 'How far', there will be both agreements and disagreements to find. They should also be aware of the fact that one will probably be harder to find than the other. Most candidates were able to explain ways in which the sources disagree but far fewer looked for the agreements which were harder to find. To score well in this type of question it is important to compare the sources point by point and not to summarise the sources and then offer vague phrases such as 'on the other hand' or assertions such as 'this source says the same'. Examples of agreement and disagreement must be explained.

**Question 2**

Source C posed several challenges to candidates. Firstly, it is a report by Schuschnigg of what Hitler is meant to have said to him. Secondly, the question asked about Schuschnigg's account, not about what Hitler said. Thirdly, all kinds of claims are made by Hitler which need to be checked. Finally, Schuschnigg's account comes from his memoirs not published until 1947. Many candidates used their contextual knowledge to check the claims made by Hitler. This was done well with relevant and detailed knowledge being demonstrated. Up to 5 marks could be earned by this approach. Better candidates realised, however, that they should be concentrating on Schuschnigg rather than on Hitler. They had some interesting points to make about his possible purpose, although not all realised the importance of the date and tried to argue that he was trying to gain sympathy and support from other countries against the threat posed by Hitler.

**Question 3**

This question produced a full range of responses with many good answers. Again, contextual knowledge was used effectively to check the claims being made by Hitler. Better candidates considered his purpose in saying this to a British journalist, and therefore a British audience, in March of 1938.

**Question 4**

Some candidates struggled with the idea of 'a message' and tended to describe the cartoons, but there were also many different interpretations of the two cartoons. The most successful answers occurred where candidates used their contextual knowledge to help them interpret the cartoons. Both cartoons have something to say about the relationship between Hitler and Mussolini and candidates needed to focus on this to reach the top two levels in the mark scheme. However, the cartoons also contain many sub-messages and candidates who concentrated on these were placed in a lower level where as many as 5 marks out of 7 could still be scored. Source E was generally interpreted well with many candidates realising that Mussolini is shown in a dominant position. Source F shows the relationship has completely changed with Hitler able to discard Mussolini if necessary. Some candidates had more problems with Source F and some thought that they were shown as equal partners. They obviously failed to spot Hitler's boot in the back of Mussolini!

**Question 5**

This question produced a wide range of responses. A small minority of candidates ignored the sources and wrote essays on whether they thought that Britain and France should have objected to the Anschluss. There were some excellent interpretations of Source G with candidates explaining Low's point very effectively. There were other candidates who completely missed the point. They argued that as he was showing Britain and France so far away from the action he was approving of their appeasing of Hitler. Many candidates used their contextual knowledge to test Source H. They either used their knowledge to question or support the claims made in the drawing, or explored the purpose behind the production and publication of the drawing.

**Question 6**

Some candidates misunderstood the question and tried to compare both sources with pre-1938 attitudes. However, most did compare the attitudes in Sources I and J. The weaker candidates tended to argue that Chamberlain did change his mind because Source J appears to be stronger, more outspoken than Source I. Better candidates realised that the two sources are not inconsistent - neither is Chamberlain actually threatening to do anything. Some of these candidates develop their answers through the use of their contextual knowledge and demonstrated that Chamberlain indeed had not changed his mind. The top level in the mark scheme was reserved for those candidates who focused on the fact the Source I was private, whereas Source J was for public consumption. They used this distinction to argue that Chamberlain had not changed his mind.

## Question 7

A surprising number of candidates made no use of the sources and simply wrote essays about who was to blame for the Anschluss. It is worrying that the number of candidates answering this final question in this way has increased. Candidates should be aware of the fact that they will not score more than 2 marks out of 10 by using this approach. The question asks candidates *how far the sources support the statement* and answers should therefore focus on the sources. Candidates need to explain how some sources support the statement and how other sources do not. It is not enough for candidates to assert this - it must be explained using the content of the sources. Very few candidates attempted to evaluate the sources. Extra marks are awarded to candidates who attempt this.

**Paper 0470/03**

**Coursework**

## General comments

This year's moderation of coursework marks proceeded very smoothly. There was a significant increase in both the numbers of Centres and candidates using the coursework option. However, it was pleasing to see the high standard established in the coursework of previous years being maintained this year. Much of the work reflected the hard work, enthusiasm, skill and understanding of the candidates. The Moderators' are grateful for the well organised packages of coursework they received. It makes their job much easier when it is clear what the tasks are and what marks have been awarded to each answer. Many Centres provided useful annotations of the candidates' work clearly indicating where and why candidates had reached particular levels. All that is required is a brief note in the margin, for example, 'Level 3 reached here'.

Most Centres now use tasks and marking schemes provided by CIE. This does ensure that the tasks are appropriate and helps in standardising the marking between Centres. The problem of Centres using tasks which do not enable candidates to show what they can do in relation to the assessment objectives, is a distant memory. However, once a Centre has become familiar with the coursework requirements there is nothing to stop it from devising tasks of its own. These can be sent to CIE for approval before they are used with candidates. Part of the reason for using coursework is to allow Centres to devise coursework that relates to the particular circumstances and interests of their candidates.

The Moderators agreed with the marks awarded by the majority of Centres. In those cases where marks were changed, the changes made were small and were caused by Centres marking the work rather leniently, or rather harshly, compared to the agreed standard. Changes to marks by Moderators were not the result of the use of inappropriate assignments or mark schemes. The Moderators agreed with the rank order established in all Centres - a reflection of the care with which internal moderation is carried out within History departments.

## **Comments on Assignment 1**

This assignment assesses Objectives 1 and 2. It is best to use Objective 2 (conceptual understanding) as the main target. If a challenging question about, for example, causation or change over time is set, candidates will have to display Objective 1 skills (selecting, organising and using relevant information) as a matter of course. The questions must give candidates the chance to show their understanding of some of the following concepts: change and continuity, cause and consequence, similarity and difference. Most Centres concentrate on cause and consequence. It is important that candidates are not encouraged to write lengthy narratives. Many Centres find it useful to set assignments that are structured into two or three questions. This enables several aspects of causation to be investigated. The final question should be the most demanding and should require candidates to reach, and support, some kind of judgement, for example were some causes more important than others? Even when perfectly suitable questions have been set it is sometimes the case that candidates are much keener on writing narratives or descriptions than producing causal analyses. They should be warned against this. The Moderator will be interested in the level of their understanding of the historical process of causation, not their ability to write at length or in detail. Candidates should also be warned of the danger of writing everything they know about the topic whether it is relevant to the question or not. An important Objective 1 skill being assessed is the ability to select and use information relevant to the question. Answers containing large amounts of irrelevant information will not score high marks. However, answers using detailed examples to support analyses in a relevant way will score high marks.

## Comments on Assignment 2

Candidates generally perform better in this assignment than in Assignment 1. This is because the centres used by Centres are very tightly organised and are clearly focused on appropriate skills. Each assignment consists of about 6-8 sources on a particular historical issue, question or problem. The sources will represent different versions of the events, different viewpoints and different perspectives. There should be a range of different types of sources, for example, written sources as well as cartoons and photographs. Candidates should be required to answer five or six questions which will take them through the sources in order. The sources will test skills such as interpreting and evaluating sources, and the ability to cross-reference between sources. The final question should require the candidates to come to an overall conclusion about the issue based on a critical use of all the sources, as well as contextual knowledge.

This year it was encouraging to see so many candidates using their contextual knowledge in a useful and relevant way, i.e. to inform their interpretation and evaluation of historical sources. Sometimes, in the past, candidates have commented on the sources and have then tacked onto their answer everything else they knew about the topic. There is a simple piece of advice to give to candidates - all the questions are about the sources so only use contextual knowledge in your answer when it helps you to say something better about these sources. They should also be reminded that an interpretation or evaluation of a source is always improved by using contextual knowledge in a relevant way.

**Paper 0470/04**

**Alternative to Coursework**

### General comments

**Depth Study A, Germany**, remains by far the most popular topic in the Paper. **Depth Studies B, Russia**, and **C, the USA**, have a smaller but still significant clientele. There was an increase in the number of Centres and candidates prepared for and attempting **Depth Studies D, China**, and **F, Israelis and Palestinians**. The May/June session of examinations usually has a smaller number of candidates attempting **Depth Study E, Southern Africa** and this year was no exception. There were a small number of candidates who attempted questions on **Depth Study H, Western Imperialism**, and these usually showed a considerable relevant knowledge. There were a few attempts at **Depth Study G, Creation of Modern Industrial Society**, but some of these were by candidates unable to answer questions on other Depth Studies.

Examiners reported a general improvement in standards. These improvements were founded on one or more of the following phenomena. There appeared to be a better understanding of the questions and their foci. Clearly, the standard of English had something to do with this better appreciation of the thrust of the questions, and in the delivery of more sophisticated answers. Candidates had shown improved techniques in answering source-based questions. Inferences were more easily drawn in **(a)(i)** questions and there were better attempts to achieve a balance in answers to **Questions (a)(ii), (a)(iii) and (b)(iv)**. However, there were still too many one-sided answers to **Questions (a)(ii) and (b)(iv)**. Some candidates wrote with good knowledge, skill and understanding in answer to the last mentioned questions but, because their answers were one-sided, their marks were limited. This season there was less difference in the marks gained for Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions. It was not uncommon to find scripts with more marks for Part **(b)**. The last point showed that many had a better grasp of relevant knowledge and understood how to use it effectively.

The vast majority of scripts were well-presented, organised and clearly written. Very few candidates used faint ink. However, there was evidence that a minority of candidates had not organised time well, and had not attempted **Question (b)(iv)** – the highest tariff in the Paper.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Depth Study A**

*Germany, 1919 - 1945*

Most candidates appeared to enjoy these Part (a) questions. Inferences were drawn from Source A to show that the Nazi Party saw communism as a great threat and were prepared to deal with it ruthlessly and even illegally. Many candidates found that Source B, the election leaflet, was sufficient of itself to explain why Germans voted for the Nazi Party. Only superior candidates demonstrated the limited appeal to 'farmers', or that there were many other issues and promises that had attracted the voters. **Question (a)(iii)**, which requires comparative utility and reliability to be addressed, often became a comparison or analysis of the content of the two sources. This limited the marks. When reliability was addressed, it was common to see assertions like, '*They are both propaganda and exaggerated to show how seriously the communist threat was to the Nazis.*' This may be true but ignores the differences between the two provenances of the sources. The evaluation is incomplete. This 'collective evaluation' was also found in answers to **Question (b)(iv)** in other Depth Studies.

Most candidates knew well the powers the Enabling Act gave Hitler, and also could describe the events of the Night of the Long Knives. It must be added that some candidates were confused as to who was killed by whom, and some confused the event with Kristallnacht. The most serious problem in this section was that many felt that the death of Hindenburg left Hitler in control and able to pursue 'his policies'. Issues like the legal acquisition of power, the totalitarian state and the loss of the last vestige of democracy etc. were ignored. There were some excellent and balanced answers to **Question (b)(iv)** but most were one-sided, showing Hitler to be completely secure in Germany. Some candidates offered examples of opposition to Hitler during the Second World War, for example, the July 1944 Bomb Plot, but these were outside the limit of the question. A number of candidates thought that the question was about foreign policy and activity.

### **Depth Study B**

*Russia, 1905 - 1941*

Many candidates drew good inferences from Source A regarding Stalin but some, having made comments about potential splits, were diverted from the focus of the question to give much correct contextual knowledge about Politburo rivalries after the death of Lenin. Source B was generally accepted as proof positive of the failure of Soviet propaganda. Candidates ignored the 'approval of some' in the source itself and they failed to develop the details that the report was from a British diplomat, his being based in Leningrad and the report being from 1936. These oversights were carried into **Question (a)(iii)** where evaluations were limited. Those with knowledge of Bucharin and the struggle for power were better able to evaluate Source A.

Most were able to nominate groups that had been purged by Stalin, although general terms like 'opponents' were not rewarded. There were good definitions of Stalin's 'Cult of Personality', with many examples that showed good command of the concept. However, other candidates demonstrated ignorance of this aspect of Stalin's rule. Most candidates were able to nominate some of the reasons for the collectivisation of agriculture, but some persisted in giving descriptive/narrative answers when causal ones were required. In answer to **Question (b)(iv)** candidates often only described how miserable life was during the Five Year Plans. However, there were some balanced and creditable answers as well. The most common fault was that some wrote at length about the aims and outcomes of the Five Year Plans with very little information on the focus of the question which was about the impact of the Plans on the lives of the Soviet people.

### **Depth Study C**

*The USA, 1919 - 1941*

It was pleasing to note just how many candidates saw that Source A was not only praising the New Deal, but also was very much a defence of the New Deal. Weaker candidates thought that Source B reflected the agricultural problems of the whole USA. Better candidates saw that the source was commenting on the sharecroppers of the South, and were able to demonstrate other problems than those described in the source. In answer to **Question (a)(iii)**, few used the provenance of the sources to show reliability and, even when this was done, it was usually of the collective evaluation type with no distinction made between the radio broadcast and the report. Candidates were satisfied to point out that both originated from New Deal agencies.

Specific reasons were required for the setting up of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Generally, 'to create jobs' were often not strong enough to secure marks without further qualification. The methods of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration were better known. Candidates often appreciated that poverty, the Dust Bowl and the movement of Okies and Arkies were 'push' reasons for the migration to California, and that 'a new start', the fruit and vegetable base of Californian agriculture were 'pull' factors.

Assertions regarding the 1849 Gold Rush, the freer, more radical personal lives and the drug scene did not score well. Most answers to **Question (b)(iv)** were one-sided, although there were some well-balanced answers that compared Tennessee Valley Authority with other New Deal agencies, both by aims and outcomes.

### **Depth Study D**

#### *China, 1945-c.1990*

All candidates were able to draw inferences from Source A regarding the disintegration of the Nationalist army, and most were able to show through examples and contextual knowledge that the criticism of Jiang Jieshi in Source B was valid. Few, in answers to **Questions (a)(ii)** and **(a)(iii)**, commented that the criticisms in Source B might be those of an impatient and/or frustrated ally. Collective evaluation was seen again in answers to **Question (a)(iii)**, but one candidate tried to differentiate by asserting that, 'Reporters investigate to find the truth: authors who write books say what they like.'

Few found difficulty in nominating groups that supported the Nationalist government after the Second World War, and most could give detail of the People's Courts. Some did confuse the latter with the Hundred Flowers Campaign. The majority who attempted this Depth Study knew of the importance of Taiwan after 1949 and the potential threat it was, both economic and military, to the Republic of China. A substantial number also went on to deal with support of Taiwan from the USA, and its role in the UNO and the UNO's involvement in the Korean War. The question on whether land was the most important problem facing the new government in China in 1949 was almost always answered in the affirmative with a one-sided essay. Others mentioned currency, war damage and a feeble industry. Several asserted that land was not the most important issue, but that famine was, not seeing that there must be an overlap of some size here.

### **Depth Study E**

#### *Southern Africa in the twentieth century*

Candidates must be aware that dates are not only important to give the chronological order of events but they also help to give a context to answers. In answer to **Question (a)(i)**, candidates were able to draw inferences regarding the strength of opposition to the National Party, but rarely did they show how other elements in the source caused a change of policy. In answers to **Question (a)(ii)**, candidates saw that Inkatha was being intimidated but did not appreciate that the letter to the newspaper indicated that it was prepared to resist the intimidation. Choice by way of the content of the sources was usually used to test utility for **Question (a)(iii)**.

Very few candidates were able to offer any proposals made by Joe Slovo in 1992 to break the power-sharing deadlock. Indeed, Joe Slovo was not recognised as a significant figure. In answers to **Question (b)(ii)**, candidates showed that they knew of Inkatha but knew little of its double role as negotiator and troublemaker. **Question (b)(iii)** was better answered because candidates knew of groups that had always opposed apartheid, and of the international pressures on the economy that encouraged white voters to seek reform. All candidates wrote one-sided answers in praise of Mandela – usually in a form of a potted biography – in answer to **Question (b)(iv)**, but were not able to offer any other possible factors in bringing about majority rule.

### **Depth Study F**

#### *Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994*

It was a pleasure to note the quality and number of candidates that attempted this Depth Study. Clearly, there had been some good preparation. The sources in Part (a) presented few problems and candidates drew many inferences about the effects of propaganda from Source A, with some nice comment on the expectations raised by propaganda, and that policy became driven by expectation. Some candidates attempted a balance in their answers to **Questions (a)(ii)** and **(a)(iii)** and, to a large extent, succeeded. It would be good to see more tests for reliability in **Question (a)(iii)**.

The answers to **Question (b)(i)** showed that the reasons for Israel's attack in 1967 were well understood. However, much correct detail was registered about the military tactics used by the Israeli army. However, candidates would have benefited if the mention of tanks, air strikes had been developed to show how they were used and their overall importance to the broader tactical plan. The need for further Israeli preparation and vigilance was understood in **Question (b)(iii)**. However, in **Question (b)(iv)** only a few candidates were able to develop an argument beyond agreeing that Sadat had changed Egypt's policies towards Israel. Some comments about the reaction of other Arab states would have been appropriate to show the significance of Sadat's actions.

### **Depth Study G**

#### *The creation of modern industrial society*

There were a few informed attempts at this Depth Study. Inferences were easily drawn from Source A's vivid description of industrial housing problems, but few could see that there were others to blame besides the builders in Source C. **Question (a)(iii)** was almost always answered by a description or repetition of the content of the sources. The fact that the sources were evidence of specific cities at specific times was ignored, as was any reference to conditions in rural Britain.

Questions from Part **(b)** were poorly answered. Very few knew of any Acts of Parliament that had improved public health, some guessed at the meaning of 'back-to-back houses', while it was extremely rare to find a candidate who understood what a 'cess-pit' was. Candidates used the evidence of the three sources, as well as their own knowledge, to explain why many who lived in industrial towns experienced ill health. **Question (b)(iv)** was usually answered by assertions that cities were healthier places to live in by the end of the century, but the evidence was general, with few specific examples offered.

### **Depth Study H**

#### *The impact of western imperialism in the nineteenth century*

The candidates who attempted this Depth Study and had prepared for it, did well. In drawing inferences from Source A that British imperialism was 'driven by public desire', candidates were already showing a healthy degree of cynicism. This continued when dealing with **Question (b)(ii)**, where candidates enjoyed the story in Source B and its reference to 'Pink Cheek'. All this added to the performances in **Question (a)(iii)** and reliability was thoroughly tested here.

It was disappointing that few could name two countries from East or Central Africa that had come under British control, but candidates understood 'Indirect Rule'. The reasons for the 'Scramble for Africa' were well known and often placed in a generous context. The answers to **Question (b)(iv)** were among the best balanced of all answers to **(b)(iv)** questions in the whole Paper.