HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Structured Questions

Key messages

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

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

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.

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. There were conclusions that were more than purely summative and in which candidates came to a judgement and justified this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in the response.

Weaker responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the 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 had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

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

Part (a) responses reward recall and description. There is no need for background information. Explanation is not required. Most candidates 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 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 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

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

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) Many candidates wrote well informed responses to this question. Four relevant points were required, such as: 'Wilson aimed for a fair and lasting peace', 'He encouraged self-determination', 'He wanted to set up the League of Nations' and 'Wilson wanted to bring about general disarmament.' Any of the Fourteen Points were credited, in addition to the fact that Wilson did not want to treat the Germans too harshly. A small number of responses were overly long, as a result of explaining the characters of the 'Big Three', which lacked relevance to this question.

(b) To achieve full credit in this question, two explained reasons were needed. Weaker responses were restricted to identifying issues such as: 'the reparations bill of £6 600 million was a problem and Germany struggled to pay it.' Responses needed to explain why it was difficult for Germany to pay, for example, 'As a result of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany had lost the use of the industrial Saar Basin, parts of Silesia and the German colonies, which earned income for Germany.' The second reason most commonly explained was the failure of Ebert's government to pay the second instalment of the reparation payments, which led to the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr, and the subsequent government action of printing money, leading to hyperinflation. There were some detailed explanations of what it was like to live with hyperinflation for the ordinary German family. There were many strong responses to this question. Some also explained that the economic consequences of the Treaty of Versailles were exacerbated by the fact that the Kaiser's government had left enormous debts. A few candidates included details of the Dawes and Young Plans, but this was outside the limits of the question, which stated the years 1919 to 1923.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses were well structured and produced a balanced response by explaining why the issue of land was difficult for the Allies to deal with in deciding the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and, on the other side of the argument, explained other issues which caused difficulty for the Allies such as reparations, disarmament and the severity of the Treaty. Most responses identified areas of land which caused disagreement between the Allies but to responses needed to go on and explain why it was difficult for the Allies to make a decision on the Saar Basin, the German colonies, Silesia and the Rhineland. It was important to explain the different views of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson on the areas chosen in the response. Weaker responses acknowledged that there were other issues apart from land which caused disagreement but tended only to identify the issue, for example: 'There were arguments over reparations and on the final figure of £6,600 million' and 'There were disagreements over the size of the future German armed forces.' To gain more credit, explanation was needed, including the difference of opinion of the 'Big Three' and their reasons for it. A number of strong responses were able to assess and weigh up which caused the Allies the most difficulty, the land issues or the other problems mentioned. Most responses demonstrated a very good understanding of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles but, in weaker responses, the coverage of the link between specific terms and difficulty to deal with, was either too superficial or unclear. Other weak responses drifted off the focus of the question to explain why the Germans hated the Treaty. Some responses included details on what happened to the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Empires. This lacked relevance to the question, which concerned the Treaty of Versailles, rather than the whole Versailles Peace Settlement.

Question 6

(a) The strongest responses made four relevant points. These included: 'It was signed in 1936', 'It was between Germany and Japan', 'It was an alliance against the Soviet Union' and 'It was anti-Communist'. Credit was also awarded for other countries who later signed the agreement, including Italy in 1937, and the fact that it became known as the Axis Alliance. Weaker responses largely

© 2024

knew that it was 'anti-Communist' but were unsure which countries were involved. Others confused the pact with the Nazi-Soviet Pact.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question, with some candidates including a narrative of the events of both the 1934 failed attempt at Anschluss and the success in 1938, without addressing the question. The focus of the question was on 'why' the Anschluss was important to Hitler, rather than the events. Many candidates were able to identify features of the importance of the Anschluss for Hitler. For example: 'It was one of his aims to unite German speaking people', 'He showed he could break the terms of the Treaty of Versailles' and 'He could acquire Austria's resources.' Stronger responses developed these points by including an explanation such as, 'One of Hitler's aims when he came to power was to unite all German speaking people. Hitler was born in Austria and as Austria is German by language and culture, achieving Anschluss would mean that he was fulfilling one of his promises to the German people, uniting German speaking people in one country.' A second reason explained revolved around his aim of breaking the Treaty of Versailles where one of the terms forbade the union of Austria and Germany. Strong answers highlighted that when Hitler achieved Anschluss in 1938, without any military confrontation from Britain or France, it gave him confidence to look for further conquests. Two common misconceptions were that Hitler wanted to re-unite Austria and Germany and Anschluss was important as he was looking to expand into Austria for lebensraum.

(c) The most successful responses to this question were well organised, showing a clear understanding of Chamberlain's aims at the Munich Conference. The main aim most commonly discussed was peace; others included protecting Czechoslovakia, and gaining time so that Britain could prepare for war. Carefully selected details from the events of the Munich Conference were used to explain Chamberlain's aims such as: 'Chamberlain got what he wanted because Hitler promised that once he received the Sudetenland, he had no further ambitions in Czechoslovakia and in future Britain and Germany would settle their disputes by talking, not war. He returned to Britain pleased that as a result of his agreement with Hitler, he had secured his main aim, peace.' Supporting details such as the Appeasement policy, the abandonment of Czechoslovakia, the guarantee to Poland and the Nazi-Soviet Pact were also often used effectively to construct a coherent and substantiated argument. On the other side of the argument, strong responses noted that Chamberlain's satisfaction was short lived because Hitler had no intention of keeping the promise made at Munich. In March 1938 he invaded and took over Czechoslovakia and continued his expansion by invading Poland in September 1939, causing the outbreak of World War II. The best answers included both sides of the argument explained and were supported by a valid judgement on 'how far' Chamberlain got what he wanted in the Munich Conference. Weaker responses were characterised by a description of the events of the Munich conference, without making any explicit reference to Chamberlain's aims. In some of these responses, candidates would have benefited from an accurate chronology and by being able to make a distinction between the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia.

Question 7

(a) This question was well answered, and the majority of candidates were able to show that it was an organisation of communist countries in Europe set up by Stalin. Four relevant points were required, such as 'It was the Communist Information Bureau', 'Countries such as Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia were members', 'It allowed Stalin to keep a close eye over communist countries' and 'It was set up in 1947.' Wide ranging knowledge was demonstrated, including that the original offices were in Belgrade, Yugoslavia but were moved to Bucharest, Romania in 1948. Weaker responses confused Cominform with Comecon.

(b) This question was well answered. Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why Stalin prevented European countries from applying for Marshall Aid and were able to explain two reasons. Most commonly explained was how he saw it as an American plot to destroy communism, thus threatening his position, and how it was motivated by American self-interest, especially to create new markets for American goods. Less successful responses were characterised by identifying reasons such as: 'It would weaken his position' and 'It was based on dollar imperialism'. Supporting details were needed to develop these identifications into explanations. Other weaker responses included lengthy descriptions on why the Marshall Plan was introduced and the details of the Plan, which was not the focus of the question.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses were familiar with the personnel and terms of both the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Weaker responses either confused the

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

personnel or the terms and occasionally both. Strong responses were well organised, often explaining the mood of the peacemakers and then the agreements of the Yalta Conference, most commonly regarding the division of Germany and Berlin into four parts and the agreement to join the new United Nations Organisation. These responses also included the disagreements of the leaders at Yalta, especially the issue regarding the Polish border, where Stalin wanted the border of the USSR to move westwards, to which Churchill and Roosevelt disagreed. The fact that a compromise was negotiated was explained and credited as an achievement. On the other side of the argument, strong responses explained how at Potsdam the mood of the conference had shifted with the change of leaders and that this conference was characterised by disagreements over three main areas: reparations, what to do about Germany and Soviet policy in Eastern Europe. Some very strong responses included supported explanations (including one on each side of the argument) and made a valid judgement of 'how far.'

Question 8

(a) This question was well answered, with most candidates showing a good understanding of the events at the Bay of Pigs in 1961. Four relevant points were needed, such as: 'Kennedy planned to overthrow Castro,' 'He supplied anti-Castro exiles with arms and equipment', '1400 exiles landed on the beaches' and 'They were met with 20 000 Cuban troops armed with tanks and modern weapons.' Marks were also awarded for the lack of secrecy of the US attack, the superiority of the Cuban forces and the dreadful failure for Kennedy.

(b) The strongest responses included two explanations as to why it was important that Kennedy refused to accept the Soviet Union building missile sites in Cuba. The two most common reasons explained were the danger that the missiles posed to the US as they were so close and the resulting change in the balance of power between the USA and the USSR. Specific contextual knowledge was used to support these reasons, resulting in a sensible structured response. Another creditable explanation put forward was related to Kennedy's position. He had been humiliated by the failure of the Bay of Pigs expedition and he was refusing to accept the missiles to prove that he wasn't weak. Weaker responses, although demonstrating some understanding of the question, tended to just identify reasons, rather than develop them into an explanation, for example: 'Kennedy refused to accept the building of missiles on Cuba because missiles fired from Cuba could reach the USA' or 'The USSR was an enemy of the USA.' Some responses drifted from the focus of the question to give details of the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses were aware of the dates of Nixon's presidency and demonstrated a good understanding of his policies, most notably Vietnamisation and his bombing campaigns in North Vietnam and Cambodia. In these responses, evidence of his successes was clearly stated, built around the withdrawing of troops from Vietnam and the 1973 Paris Peace Agreement. To achieve a balanced response, the failure to stop Saigon falling to the Communists, the student protests at Kent University and the failure to prevent the communists from winning and uniting Vietnam were used to prove the lack of success of Nixon's policies. Many responses appeared not to know the dates of Nixon's presidency and wrote at length about policy and events in Vietnam prior to Nixon becoming President, including Search and Destroy, the My Lai massacre and the Tet offensive.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question among the Depth Studies.

(a) This question was very well answered, and most candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the aims and activities of the Spartacists in 1919. They gained marks for stating that, 'They wanted to overthrow the Weimar Republic', 'They were communists and wanted a revolution similar to the 1917 Russian Revolution', 'They wanted the state to own all means of production' and 'They set up soviets in many towns.' Candidates also gained credit for the activities of the Spartacists in Bavaria and Berlin and that they were crushed by the Freikorps.

© 2024

(b) Most candidates were familiar with the occupation of the Ruhr by French and Belgian troops in 1923. However, weaker responses included details of the reasons for the occupation and the events, without making any explicit link to the question. It is important to read the question carefully in order to establish its focus. The emphasis of this question was on the importance for Germany of the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr. The economic impact was most often explained in terms of the cumulative effect of having to pay reparations, having valuable industrial areas taken away by the Treaty of Versailles and the German workers' strike in the Ruhr, resulting in the German government printing more money, which led to hyperinflation. Others considered that the occupation was more humiliation to Germany and thus increased their hatred towards the Treaty of Versailles and the German government.

(c) This question was well answered, and many responses demonstrated a good understanding of both Stresemann's economic and foreign policy achievements. Strong responses were well structured to consider Stresemann's economic achievements in turn, emphasising their impact on Germany. They considered the effect of the introduction of the new currency, the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan. The Dawes Plan was the most commonly explained as an achievement due to the fact 'that it resulted in reparation payments being spread over a longer period of time and a loan of 800 marks to support the German economy. Some of this money went to replacing German equipment with the latest technology and also into public works such as swimming pools which, as well as providing facilities, also created jobs.' On the other side of the argument, evidence of achievements in foreign policy included explanations on the impact of both the Locarno Treaties and Germany's entry into the League of Nations. Strong, evaluative responses came to a judgement of 'how far', often suggesting that economic achievements were not as important: 'They were only temporary because the American loans could be called in at short notice, as they were in 1929, which led to the economic collapse of Germany and provided a great opportunity for the Nazis to capitalise on the situation.' A few weak responses did not select the most appropriate examples to illustrate their argument or only focused on one factor, such as the replacement of currency. These responses would have been improved by a wider scope. Some responses included descriptions of the political stability and cultural developments of the time, with no link to the question.

Question 12

(a) Many candidates were well- informed on the role of the SA in the Nazi Party and provided four relevant points such as: 'It was the paramilitary wing of the Nazi Party', 'They protected Hitler at Nazi meetings and rallies', 'They disrupted the meetings of other parties' and 'They intimidated and attacked Jews and communists.' Marks were also awarded for the rapid growth of the SA in the early 1930s and the loss of power in 1934.

(b) Strong responses explained two reasons why Hitler made changes to the Nazi Party when he was released from prison. The most common explanation included details of the failed Munich Putsch and how the failure had made Hitler realise that to gain power he would have to use legal means to get into power, rather than violent revolution. A second explanation put forward was that if Hitler was to gain support and win elections, he realised that the organisation of the party needed to be improved. Widening the support base and the increase of propaganda were given as examples of ways in which he intended to improve organisation. However, there were a large number of responses in which candidates identified reasons such as: 'That violence didn't work', or 'He had to use elections to get into power,' without any development of why he had realised this. Weaker responses also often included narratives of his time in prison including prison conditions, his trial and the writing of Mein Kampf, which lacked relevance to the question.

(c) This question was well answered, and many responses demonstrated a good understanding of both the Reichstag Fire and other factors in Hitler's consolidation of power in 1933-34. Strong responses were well structured and often first explained how Hitler used the Reichstag Fire to his advantage. Explanations included details of the timing, the culprit, and how Hitler persuaded Hindenburg that it was the beginning of a communist plot to take over Germany, in order to gain emergency powers from Hindenburg to deal with the 'communist threat. As a result of these emergency powers Hitler could arrest communists and other opponents, leading to the Nazis doing much better in the elections and thus making Hitler stronger and consolidating his power. On the other side of the argument, strong responses explained alternative reasons for Hitler's consolidation of power, most commonly the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives. Others mentioned more events of 1933-34 that helped to consolidate his power such as purging the Civil

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

Service of Jews and Nazi opponents, the banning of trade unions and the death of Hindenburg. The best responses made a judgement, supported with evidence, as to the most important factor in Hitler's consolidation of power. Weaker responses, although showing some understanding of events, often confused the chronology, including the misconception that Hitler didn't become Chancellor until after the Reichstag Fire, and they sometimes confused the emergency powers with the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives with the Night of Broken Glass.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

(a) This question was very well answered, most responses including four relevant points such as: 'It was a motor car', 'It was produced by Henry Ford', 'It was produced using the assembly line' and 'It was mass produced.' Marks were also awarded for its affordability and the changes that it bought to the lives of many Americans.

(b) Candidates were very familiar with the reasons why some Americans did not benefit from the boom of the 1920s and there were many successful responses containing two explanations. The best responses identified and then explained the groups that did not benefit. For example: 'In the 1920s farmers did not benefit from the boom. This was because after the First World War there had been overproduction, which led to a fall in prices. This was made worse by cheap Canadian corn flooding the market. As a result, farmers were evicted because they couldn't pay their rents or mortgages, and many had to move to the towns to find work.' Examples of other Americans who did not benefit from the boom were also put forward including native Americans, black American labourers and workers in the traditional industries such as textiles and coal. Strong responses supported these identifications with relevant contextual knowledge in order to develop an explanation. Weaker responses identified reasons but did not include any supporting contextual detail.

(c) There were many strong responses to this question, in which many candidates demonstrated a good understanding of republican government policies and their importance to the economic boom in the 1920s. They most commonly identified the policies of laissez-faire, low taxation, allowing the development of trusts and protective tariffs and then developed each one into an explanation using supporting details. For example: 'The republican government introduced protective import tariffs like the Fordney-McCumber tariff in 1922 which made imported food expensive and so protected American producers from foreign competition and allowed them to prosper.' A balanced argument was achieved by then examining other factors that made the American economy boom in the 1920s, including mass production in the car industry, the introduction of hire purchase and the vast natural resources which were available in the US. Overall, the republican government policies of the 1920s, as well as the other reasons for the boom, were well known. However, in other responses, they tended to be written as a list which lacked an assessment of their impact on the American economy.

Questions 16, 17 and 18

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

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Document Questions

Key messages

It is important to answer the question set. On questions requiring comparison, candidates should ensure that they compare sources. When asked if a source is surprising, candidates should explain whether it is surprising or not. It is particularly important to work out which questions require source evaluation, and which do not.

When using a quotation from a source, candidates should avoid the use of ellipses. Their use often means that what is left of the quotation is not adequate. The quotation should be given in full. This is particularly important in answers to **Part (e)**.

When they are asked if a source is surprising or useful, candidates must clearly address this issue. This is best done in the first sentence of the answer. This also helps to ensure that the answer will be focused on the question, for example, 'This source is useful because' and 'Source F does not make Source G surprising because'.

Many of the sources contain a lot of different types of information. It is important to work out, in relation to the question, the crucial point that the author or artist of the source is making.

In questions about cartoons, candidates should always think about the point of view of the cartoonist.

When asked to compare sources, it is important that candidates compare the sources point by point, in order to produce a clear comparison.

General comments

All candidates answered the questions on the twentieth century option. The overall standard was good, with most candidates understanding the sources and what the questions were asking them to do. There were a number of very strong scripts and very few weak ones. Most candidates appeared to have no time issues and almost all of them managed to attempt all of the five questions. Strengths included interpretation of sources, especially the cartoons, and using sources in their historical context. There were three areas for improvement. Firstly, some candidates spent a long time describing the sources, without directly addressing the question. Secondly, some candidates neglected to state in their answers to **Question 2 (d)** whether or not Source F does make Source G surprising. Finally, candidates did not always realise where evaluation of the sources was required.

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 answers. A number of candidates considered the overall message of each source and explained that while Source A claims that the Soviets were putting pressure on Poland, they did not intend to invade, while in Source B they did. In the strongest

© 2024

responses, candidates made clear that they were explaining and then comparing the overall big messages of the two sources, and not just another disagreement. Many candidates produced good answers by explaining at least one agreement and one disagreement. The small number of candidates who struggled with this question either just summarised both sources or made assertions about agreements or disagreement, for example, 'The sources disagree about when the exercises started.' These types of answer do not explain how the sources agree or disagree. The following example shows how to make a comparison: 'Source A states that the preparation by the Soviets was different to what they did for the invasion of Czechoslovakia, but Source B claims that the preparations were similar.'

(b) A reasonable number of candidates realised and explained that the crucial piece of information in Source C is that an invasion was being planned by the Soviets. There is much other information in the source and less successful responses just listed incidental details from it. In 'usefulness' questions, it is always important to decide what in the source really matters. The best answers were based on an understanding that Source C needed to be evaluated before its usefulness could be properly judged. This was done in two ways. Some candidates cross-referenced to other sources to check the claims being made in Source C, while other candidates focused on the fact that the source comes from a spy, and explored how this might affect its reliability.

(c) When a question requires the messages of cartoons to be considered, it is necessary to consider the points of views of the cartoonists. When asked to compare cartoons, it is important to make a clear and direct comparison between the messages. A small number of candidates realised that both cartoons criticise Brezhnev/the Soviet Union. Rather more candidates were able to compare the messages of the cartoons, without getting as far as the points of view of the cartoonists. However, there were also a number of candidates who interpreted one or both cartoons but were unable to produce a valid comparison. When answering comparison questions, writing about each source separately often means that proper comparisons are not produced. Candidates should start their comparison in the first sentence of their answers.

(d) Like **Question 2 (b)**, good answers to this question needed to be based on the crucial points being made in the source material, in this case in Sources F and G. The important difference between these two sources is over Soviet intervention in Poland. Source F claims that the Soviets had no plan to intervene, while Source G claims that the Soviet Union was already interfering. Good answers were based on this difference. Better answers moved on from this to evaluate at least one of the sources, for example by setting Source G in the context of the Cold War and suggesting a valid motive for Reagan. There were also some weaker answers that were either based on a very general reading of the sources, for example the Soviets being nice to Poland in Source F, while being unpleasant in Source G (candidates were impressed by the sending of 30 000 tons of meat to Poland), or did not state whether they were surprised or not. The latter weakness was sometimes found in answers that had produced excellent comparisons and analyses of the sources.

(e) Most candidates were able to explain how some of the sources support the hypothesis, while others do not. Only a very small number of candidates did not use the sources. The best answers contained several ingredients. Firstly, they made clear which sources they were referring to. Secondly, they made clear which side of the argument the source they were writing about lay on. Finally, the crucial aspect of good answers to this question was the quality and clarity of the explanations of how sources either supported or disagreed with the hypothesis. Candidates need to do more than just assert that a source is for or against the hypothesis. Valid explanations can come in a variety of forms, depending on the nature of the source. Sometimes a well-chosen quotation can be adequate, for example Source C says, 'there is a plan for introducing troops of the Soviet armies to Poland'. What is crucial about this quotation is that it is adequate in itself. However, not all quotations are adequate and, of course they cannot be used with pictorial sources. An alternative approach is to explain how a source agrees or disagrees with the hypothesis, for example: 'Source D does not support the idea that the Soviet Union might use military force against Poland. It shows that Brezhnev looks afraid of Solidarity and is desperately trying to protect Eastern European countries from it. He looks to be scared and on the defensive, and there is no suggestion that he is going to attack Poland with troops.'

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

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 significance.

It is important that causation titles are not used.

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

Candidates should avoid writing lengthy introductions or background descriptions.

A range of criteria should be used to assess significance. It is also useful to consider the significance of a person, event, place or development from different perspectives.

Candidates will find it useful to use argument and counter-argument.

Candidates should avoid explanations of why other factors were significant. They need to keep the focus on the factor named in the title.

General comments

Centres completed all the paperwork efficiently. There was some good work, with candidates focusing on the assessment of significance, but some of the titles used did not allow candidates to assess significance properly. The marking was carefully carried out, with useful marginal and summative comments. Some modest adjustments were made to the marks.

Comments on specific questions

Most of the titles used were appropriate. They were worded in such a way that candidates were given opportunities to assess significance. It is important that the word ‘significant’ appears in the title. This increases the chance that candidates will write about it. The following title is an example of this: ‘Assess the significance of Goebbels for Germany’. This focuses candidates on assessment, rather than just description or explanation, and allows them to use a range of criteria to assess his significance, for example, this could be examined in terms of his impact on the German people in various ways, as well as his impact on the Nazi Party. A title such as ‘How far was Goebbels Hitler’s most important minister?’, would not work so well because it encourages candidates to compare him with other ministers. The problem with such a title is that much of the answer is likely to be about individuals other than Goebbels.

The best answers were those that focused on assessment of significance. Some candidates used argument and counter-argument to do this. They showed an understanding that they needed to explore ways in which their subject might not be significance, as well as ways in which it was significant. They also made use of criteria which gave their answers scope and made possible more complex judgements. For example, the significance of an event can often be assessed by considering its economic, political and social impact, as well as its impact on different groups. Some candidates just explained the impact of their subject, but better answers discussed how far that impact mattered in different ways to different groups and for different reasons. Another strength of the best answers is that they did not spend time on lengthy ‘setting the scene’ introductions and did not fall into description.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

Most of the marking was completed with careful 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. It is not possible to award a level after reading the first few paragraphs of an answer. This is why summative comments by the centre can be very useful for moderators. They should be used to identify and sum up the key qualities of the work and explain why a particular level has been finally awarded.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

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. A number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E: The Second World War in Europe and the Asia–Pacific, 1939–c.1945 to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses to **part (a)** questions gave logically sequenced accounts with in-depth contextual knowledge and precise examples to support the descriptions. The very best answers tended 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

Question 1 was the more popular choice, with few choosing **Question 2** for their response.

Question 1 was generally well answered. In **part (a)**, candidates were generally able to provide a well sequenced account of the actions of the British Expeditionary Force in 1914. Most responses began their account with the BEF's entry into the war after the invasion of Belgium, its actions in the Battle of Mons and later at the Marne, the race to the sea and the First Battle of Ypres. The best accounts were detailed in terms of contextual knowledge and were sequenced chronologically. Weaker responses tended to show some confusion over the chronology or continued the account past 1914, sometimes as far as 1916. It is important that candidates remain within the parameters set out in the question. In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to identify and describe more than one facet of the discussion on the impact of Belgian resistance on the German attack on the Western Front. Most candidates examined the impact Belgian resistance had on the German Schlieffen Plan, with stronger answers explaining how this contributed to the Plan's ultimate failure. The strongest responses also discussed other facets such as the impact on German morale and its effect of bringing Britain into the war, amongst others. Weaker responses would have benefited from providing good contextual knowledge to support descriptions. More valid explanations could have been provided by candidates. Some wrote generalised and unsupported assertions.

Question 2 produced too few responses for any meaningful comments to be made.

© 2024

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 Hitler's leadership of the Nazi Party up to 1924. Many good responses examined Hitler's role in the Party under Drexler, described how Hitler took over the leadership of the Party and set up the stormtroopers (SA), decided on and led the Munich Putsch in 1923 and wrote Mein Kampf whilst in prison for much of 1924 after his trial had made him a figure of national interest. Many candidates pointed out the time spent in prison allowed Hitler to change the tactics of the Nazi Party. Weaker responses tended to give accounts that went well beyond the chronology set out in the question and included general material on Hitler's early life and time in the war, as well as material up to and including his appointment as Chancellor in 1933. In **part (b)**, most responses were able to identify and at least describe one or more facet of the impact of the Munich Putsch. Many of the best discussions explained how the Putsch impacted the publicity and popularity of Hitler and how it impacted the strategies of the Nazi Party from one of revolution to one where the Party would try to win elections. A few of the best answers included valid or partially substantiated judgements in their conclusions. Other responses tended to provide a detailed narrative of the Putsch and an account of the events afterwards, neglecting to engage in the discussion over its impact. Some of these answers did manage to identify facets within their descriptions, but these were often very implicit in nature.

Question 4 was also generally well answered. In **part (a)**, the stronger accounts organised their descriptions either chronologically or thematically and included precise contextual knowledge and well selected examples. Most accounts focused on the antisemitic racial policy of the Nazi Party from 1933 and examined the period of boycotts in 1933, the Nuremburg Laws of 1935, Kristallnacht in 1938 and the Final Solution during the Second World War. A few candidates also chose to sequence their account of Nazi racial policy differently and examined antisemitism, the persecution of the Roma and other racial minorities in Germany, education in schools and racial policies targeted at the family. Both variations were valid, as long as the accounts remained within the chronology of 1933–45, although some candidates gave material on Hitler's antisemitism pre–1933, which lacked relevance to this question. **Part (b)** responses were generally strong and saw candidates able to identify more than one facet of the discussion on the impact of Kristallnacht. Many candidates described the impact of Kristallnacht on the Jewish population, including the damage done to Jewish property and synagogues, and some candidates also considered the impact it had on future Nazi Party antisemitic policies. A small number of candidates also considered the impact it had internationally. The best answers explained the impacts with good supporting contextual knowledge and a few answers managed to reach a valid or partially substantiated conclusion. As on **Question 3**, weaker responses tended to provide an account of the night, without engaging properly with the discussion on its impact. Some lacked explanations which were valid, and some provided unsubstantiated assertions only.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

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

Question 5 was sometimes well answered, although responses to **part (a)** varied in quality. In **part (a)**, good answers gave a sequenced account of the economic problems faced in Russia between 1905 and 1914, often taking a chronological approach to the account. Most accounts examined the background to the economic problems by 1905, such as the peasant land issue, famines at the start of the century and the underdeveloped industry in Russia and the problems this caused in living and working conditions in the towns and cities. Most then described how the Russo-Japanese War exacerbated these issues. Stolypin's economic reforms were also described in good detail. However, a number of accounts lacked sufficient contextual knowledge or focused too much on events from the time period that were more political in nature, such as the October Manifesto, resulting in a more generalised account that lacked focus. In **part (b)**, responses were generally able to identify at least one facet of the discussion on the impact of the Russo-Japanese War on Russia. Many candidates were able to describe the socio-economic impact of the war for many Russians and provided details on how conditions worsened for many civilians. Stronger responses also identified and explained the impact of other facets of the discussion, such as the political impact and even the military impact of the war. The best answers were detailed and gave supported explanations of the impact the war had on Russia. Weaker responses sometimes confused the Russo-Japanese War with the First World War or made very generalised assertions which lacked contextual support.

Question 6 was less well answered than **Question 5**. In **part (a)**, some good responses were able to give a detailed account of Kerensky's role in the Provisional Government, from his time as both a member of the Soviet and the Provisional Government in March, his decision for an offensive in June as War Minister and

© 2024

the time period when he took over from Prince Lvov as Prime Minister during the July Days and the subsequent Kornilov Affair and Bolshevik seizure of power in November. Less successful responses lacked contextual knowledge and tended to be very generalised accounts of 1917, often with a number of chronological errors. In **part (b)**, responses varied in quality. There were some very strong answers where candidates had discussed multiple facets of the impact of the July Days. Most commonly, responses explained how the July Days impacted the Bolsheviks, including the Bolshevik leaders, many of whom were imprisoned or went into exile, and also how the July Days led to the appointment of the counterrevolutionary General Kornilov, who attempted a coup against the Provisional Government. The best answers demonstrated a good level of contextual knowledge to support explanations. Weaker responses tended to be more descriptive or only provided assertions supported by more generalised material.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

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

Question 7 produced some good answers, although **part (a)** often lacked focus. In **part (a)**, many candidates focused their account too much on the issues in the 1920s, rather than the Depression era of the 1930s. Some good answers were able to provide a sequenced account, starting with the Crash in 1929 and then describing the downfall of many American banks during the Depression. Some candidates had a very strong contextual knowledge of this aspect. The best answers also considered the how Roosevelt tried to reform the banking system in 1933 through the Emergency Banking Act. In **part (b)**, candidates were often able to give a multi-facetted response to the discussion on the impact of unemployment on the USA in the 1930s Depression era. Most good responses considered the impact unemployment had on society, such as homelessness and poverty, and also its political impact on Hoover's administration and his defeat in the 1932 election to Roosevelt. These responses provided convincing explanations, with some answers also able to provide comparative judgements in the conclusions. Weaker responses lacked explanation and provided only generalised assertions. A few candidates also focused too much on the causes of unemployment in the period, rather than on its impact on the USA.

Question 8 also produced some good answers. In **part (a)**, many candidates were able to give a sequenced account of right-wing opposition to the New Deal. Most candidates opted for a thematic approach and described opposition from businesses, including the Liberty League, from the Republican Party, as well as the Supreme Court, which was dominated by conservative justices. Weaker responses sometimes confused right-wing opposition with radical opponents of the New Deal such as Huey Long and Doctor Townsend, which led to material being included in the account which lacked relevance. In **part (b)**, many candidates were able to give some very strong multi-facetted discussions about the impact the Supreme Court had on the New Deal. The impact of the Supreme Court politically for the New Deal was best served by examining the declaration by justices that both the AAA and NRA were unconstitutional, which disrupted Roosevelt's reform programme. Some candidates provided very detailed descriptions and explanations of the impact it had on the New Deal, with excellent supporting examples used to substantiate their arguments. Many answers also considered Roosevelt's reaction to this by attempting to pack the court with more progressive leaning justices and, although failing, led to less interference by the Supreme Court, with future New Deal reforms. Weaker responses would have been improved by being less narrative in style. These responses were unable to properly explain the different facets identified and tended to provide generalised material, with unsupported assertions.

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.

© 2024