

HISTORY

Paper 0977/11
Paper 11

Key messages

It is very important that candidates read the question carefully before they begin their response, in order to give themselves the opportunity to write focused and balanced responses. Any given dates in the question should be closely noted to help ensure that their responses only include relevant information.

Successful responses to **parts (b) and (c)** were carefully organised into separate paragraphs for the different issues which were being explained.

When a question asks 'why' a particular event happened it is important that candidates direct their response to address and explain the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened.

General comments

Many candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study Questions for which they had been prepared. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect and communicated their ideas clearly and accurately. They wrote well developed explanations and arguments in answer to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the question set. These responses tended not to be divided up into paragraphs and often consisted of a descriptive list of facts.

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

Part (a) questions required recall and description. Responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. Generally, candidates performed well in giving answers to **(a)** questions that were short and concise, with little unnecessary background information.

Part (b) and (c) questions required understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions but were unable to develop these identification points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than using a purely narrative approach. They could identify a factor/reason and then use a link such as 'this means that' which will lead them into an explanation.

Part (b) questions require recall and explanation. Most **(b)** questions ask 'why' a particular issue happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, using a separate paragraph for each different reason that was being explained. Narrative accounts or long introductions which 'set the scene' were not required.

Part (c) questions require recall, explanation and analysis. Most candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure a balanced answer. The most successful responses argued both for and against the focus of the question and reached a supported judgement. A valid conclusion will go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated in the response by addressing, 'how far', 'how successful' or 'how important', depending on the actual question set. Weaker responses were characterised either by a 'listing' narrative approach with few attempts to link the points made to the question or a concentration on only one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 3

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

Question 4

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates wrote about the second Moroccan Crisis which was in 1911. Other weaker responses included general and inaccurate description. However, there were some good responses which showed an understanding of the events of the Morocco Crisis, 1905 - 06. For example, responses included details such as: the Kaiser's main aim was to prevent France from occupying Morocco. To do this he visited Tangier to give his support to the Sultan and a conference was called at Algeciras in 1906 to discuss the situation.
- (b) Strong responses understood that this was a friendship alliance between Britain and France and identified and explained the reasons why the Entente Cordiale was agreed. The most common reasons explained were the increasing threat from Germany and the protection of each other's colonial interests. Less successful tended to be inaccurate by including Russia in the Entente and assuming that it was an aggressive military alliance.
- (c) This question produced some good responses which included well balanced, supported explanations on both sides of the argument. Candidates wrote confidently about the role played by Austria in causing the war. They understood the long-standing rivalry with Serbia and the impact of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The other approach most commonly used to counter-balance the argument was the actions of Germany. Candidates were well informed on Germany's military and naval expansion prior to the outbreak of war, the formulation of the Schlieffen Plan and the 'blank cheque' given to Austria. Others included the role of Russia and Serbia as well. These responses often made references to the Alliance System and imperialism to support their argument. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive lists of the causes of the First World War. These responses could have been improved by linking each identified point to the question.

Questions 5

This was the most popular question in this section.

- (a) Most candidates had a good knowledge of the use of plebiscites in the peace settlement, 1919 – 1920. The strongest responses included four specific details about the use of plebiscites, for example, plebiscites were when people voted, often to do with to which country they wanted to belong. There was a plebiscite in Upper Silesia in 1921 which resulted in the area being divided between Germany and Poland. Candidates could have used other examples, including that a plebiscite was held in 1920 which saw Schleswig divided between Germany and Denmark. A small number gave no response. Weaker responses included general details, usually on the Treaty of Versailles, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. The most successful responses explained an aim of the French at the peace conference and linked it to a specific term in the Treaty of Versailles to illustrate their dissatisfaction. For example, Clemenceau wanted Germany to be disarmed because France had been invaded twice by Germany in the last fifty years and they did not want to be invaded again. They were very dissatisfied because Germany was not completely disarmed - they could have 100,000 men in their army and this could be a future threat to France. Other common reasons for dissatisfaction often included in stronger responses was the fact that Germany was not broken up into separate states as Clemenceau wished, nor were the reparations high enough. Weaker responses were characterised by descriptions of the aims of French delegation going into the peace conference with no specific reason as to why they were dissatisfied. Others compared the aims of the 'Big Three' which lacked relevance to this question.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced responses to this question which discussed the extent to which political turmoil was the most serious consequence of the Treaty of Versailles

for Germany up to 1923. Strong responses explained the political turmoil in terms of accepting the Treaty made the government look weak and many Germans thought that 'Germany had been stabbed in the back' and referred to the politicians who accepted the Treaty as 'the November Criminals'. They explained the threats to the government from the Kapp Putsch of 1921 and Munich Putsch of 1923 and their determination to overthrow the Weimar Government and abolish the Treaty of Versailles. Such responses produced a balanced answer by then explaining other serious consequences of the Treaty of Versailles, not least the terms of the Treaty, the most common being the economic and military terms and their effects on Germany. They showed how the terms of the Treaty seriously affected the German economy because of the failure to pay reparations which resulted in the French and Belgian invasion of the Ruhr and subsequent hyperinflation. It is important that candidates read the question carefully as some responses included details from 1924 onwards which were not relevant. Weaker responses included descriptions of the terms of the treaty with no direct linkage to the question. A small number of candidates misunderstood the term 'political turmoil' and wrote generally about why the Weimar Republic was weak.

Question 6

- (a) Strong responses were familiar with the Anti-Comintern Pact and gained credit by identifying the Pact's signatories, the year or years in which they joined and its anti-Soviet intention. A number of candidates gave no response or included incorrect Pact members and reasons as to why it was formed. These responses would have benefited from accurate knowledge of the Pact.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most candidates were able to identify one or two reasons why the British-French guarantees to Poland failed to prevent war in 1939. Strong responses gave two good explanations. The most commonly cited reason was that of the British-French policy of appeasement in 1938 and 1939 and then examples were given to enhance the explanation, most notably the Munich Agreement and their reaction to Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. This boosted Hitler's confidence to the extent that he believed Britain and France would not follow their guarantees through, were he to invade Poland. Successful responses then explained the importance of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in August 1939 to Hitler and how this ruled out the danger of Soviet intervention against Germany should Hitler invade Poland. Other responses often only included one explanation, usually omitting the Nazi-Soviet Pact, or missed the phrase 'British-French guarantees to Poland' in the question and wrote generally about why war had broken out in 1939.
- (c) This question produced some good answers. Strong responses examined both sides of the argument, giving evidence in support of the hypothesis and then explaining that Britain and France did have a choice and did not need to allow Hitler to remilitarise the Rhineland. Most candidates were able to identify at least two factors to support the argument for non-action on the part of Britain and France. These most commonly included the impact of the Great Depression on the two countries, the Rhineland as Germany's backyard, the perceived severity of the Versailles Treaty, elections in France and the greater importance that seemed to be accorded to the Abyssinian crisis. Some of these strong responses also referred to the Anglo-German Naval Treaty of 1935 to show that, in effect, Britain had already embarked on a conciliatory attitude towards Germany and the restrictions of the Versailles Treaty. Arguments in favour of Anglo-French action were less numerous and less well supported, and less successful responses were one sided. However, strong responses explained with confidence that Britain did have a choice to try and stop the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. These responses explained that Hitler's move into the Rhineland was a gamble and that Britain and France missed an opportunity and that they would have succeeded easily in resisting his army. Many made the point that this was a breach of both the Versailles settlement and the Locarno Treaty and that the two powers were therefore bound to enforce it. Weaker responses were often characterised by the inclusion of less relevant information, including reasons why Hitler invaded the Rhineland which was not the focus of the question.

Question 7

This was the second most popular question in this section.

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and they displayed a good understanding of Marshall Aid. Many very strong answers identified key features, such as: It was introduced by General George Marshall in June 1947, the aim being to stabilise the economies of Western

Europe after the damage caused by World War Two. This was done to prevent the spread of communism.

- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses contained two detailed explanations of why Stalin wanted control over the governments of the states in Eastern Europe. Most responses identified the same two reasons, the desire to spread communism and the need to create a buffer state between the USSR and the West. Strong responses went on to explain why Russia wanted to create a buffer zone, by including that Russia had been invaded twice by the West in both the First and Second World Wars, had suffered heavy casualties and Stalin did not want this to happen again. He wanted neighbouring states such as Poland to be under his control for protection. Weaker responses often identified reasons, for example, to spread communism but gave no explanation.
- (c) This question invited candidates to say how far they agreed with the statement, 'Truman was the main cause of tension at Potsdam.' Successful responses explained Truman's attitude and stance at Potsdam, usually comparing it to that of Stalin. Credit was awarded for the explanation of Truman's anti-communist attitude and his feelings of mistrust towards Stalin, resulting in differences of opinion, including on whether reparations should be imposed on Germany. Truman also raised tension at the meeting by telling Stalin that America had successfully tested an atomic bomb in a desert in New Mexico. Stalin saw this as a threat. A common misconception was that Truman told Stalin at the meeting that he had dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima; this was after the meeting at Potsdam. Well balanced responses also examined Stalin's contribution to the tension, most commonly explaining that he had not carried out the promises he made at Yalta, to organise free elections in Poland. He had liberated Poland, yet the Red Army remained there. Some candidates misread the assertion and included details after Potsdam which lacked relevance to this question. Some responses also confused the agreements made at Potsdam with those of Yalta a few months earlier. It is important for candidates to read the questions carefully to ascertain the focus of the question. Weaker responses, whilst identifying causes of tension, needed to put them into context using supporting details.

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9

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

Question 10

- (a) Most candidates were familiar with the contribution of the US forces to the Allied war effort. Successful responses gained full credit by describing the number of troops arriving on the Western Front from March 1918 onwards, the provision of destroyers and merchant ships and the morale boosting effect for the allies of the US intervention. Candidates could also have included that the US troops were fresh and not tired of fighting and their intervention devastated German morale. Some responses could have been improved by including more specific details than just statements such as 'they provided more resources'.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Weaker responses just identified reasons for Germany's surrender, such as the high casualty rate, unstable conditions at home and the fact that they were war weary. Contextual knowledge could have been used to develop these reasons into explanations. For example, the Germans agreed to surrender because they could not fight any longer. The Ludendorff Offensive had made progress in March and April 1918 but a counterattack by Allied forces drove the Germans back, resulting in 400 000 casualties. In August, another 400 000 Germans were taken prisoner. Faced with such severe losses the Germans could not fight for much longer.
- (c) A number of well-developed and balanced responses to this question were seen, with candidates explaining that the German people were starving as a result of the blockade of the German ports and the resulting severe shortage of food. Strong responses then went on to explain other reasons

for the outbreak of revolution in Germany in October 1918. Most commonly, responses stated that the stresses of the war had led to mutinies at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven, both of which were well understood by most candidates. Other responses could have been improved by supporting their identification of reasons with more detailed explanations. Some candidates included events after October 1918, for example the events of November 1918.

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was well-answered. Strong responses included a variety of details including the re-grouping of the Nazi Party after the failure of the Munich Putsch and the realisation that violence would not work and they would have to gain power legally to gain popularity. Others included details on the improved organisation of the party, such as Goebbels being put in charge of propaganda and Hitler's speaking talents. Credit was also given for the foundation of the SS in 1925 and the Hitler Youth in 1926. Some also noted that the Nazi Party made limited progress during this time and often made reference to Stresemann's success in the period as a reason for this. Strong responses commented on how relatively poorly the Nazis performed in the Reichstag elections of 1924 and 1928. Weaker responses included details outside the time period of the question.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Successful responses contained two detailed explanations for the Nazi failure in the Munich Putsch. The most common reasons identified and explained were the inadequate planning and Hitler's over optimism about the level of popular support he could gain. Weaker responses were characterised by simply identifying reasons for failure without explanation or they included detailed accounts of the Putsch but made no reference to why it failed. Some responses revealed uncertainty about the course of events.
- (c) There were many one-sided responses to this question, as candidates found it easier to explain reasons other than creating jobs as part of why the Nazis gained support. These responses cited the popularity of the NSDAP, including Hitler's oratory skills, Goebbels' use of propaganda and their widespread opposition to communism. Strong responses were well-balanced and also explained the severity of the high levels of unemployment in Germany in the 1930s after the Great Depression. They showed how the Nazis gained support from the unemployed as they proposed to tackle unemployment through public works and military regeneration. Less successful responses often misunderstood the scope of the question and discussed how the Nazis maintained power, rather than explaining the reasons for their appeal, which enabled them to get into power. In these responses there was a concentration on Hitler's ruthlessness in 1933 – 1934 (his reaction to the Reichstag Fire and the Night of Long Knives) and on the coercive methods the Nazis used through the 1930s to ensure compliance rather than support (for example, the use of the Gestapo) which lacked relevance to this question.

Question 12

- (a) This question was well answered and there were many very strong responses. These responses included descriptions such as: that it was expected that culture would praise Hitler, the Nazi regime and show pro-Nazi attitudes. They described how paintings had to show images of the ideal Aryan family. Credit was also given for the Nazi use of censorship and what was banned; for example, the works of Jewish artists and writers were banned, whilst any books considered 'undesirable' were burnt.
- (b) Good understanding was shown of one reason why the Nazis wanted to gain control of the Churches, usually how they wanted their support because they had a considerable influence over a large part of the German population. Many candidates found it a challenge to find a second reason and weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons but not going on to provide explanation, such as the Church had a lot of power or the Churches were a possible source of opposition. Strong responses included the Concordat signed by Hitler and the Catholic Church as a relevant explanation. These responses explained that the agreement was significant for Hitler in that the Catholic Church agreed to keep out of political affairs, therefore not criticising the Nazis and reducing the possibility of serious opposition, while the Church would be left to concentrate on religious and pastoral duties.

- (c) Successful responses were well balanced by arguing for and against the focus of the question. Candidates needed to identify and then explain which persecutions were racially motivated and which persecutions were for other reasons. Good understanding was shown of the persecution of the Jews, both because of racial and other reasons. Explanations included that Hitler hated the Jews for racial reasons because during his years of poverty in Vienna he was obsessed by the fact that Jews ran many of the most successful German businesses and this did not fit in with his idea of the superiority of the Aryan Race. He also blamed them for other reasons, including Germany's defeat in the First World War. He thought that Jewish businessmen and bankers had forced the surrender of the German army. It is important to read the question carefully because the emphasis in this question is on 'why' rather than on 'how'. Weaker responses often included extensive details about Nazi policies against the Jews and details of the conditions and deaths in the concentration camps. Strong responses also included explanations on the non-racial persecution of other groups such as the disabled, homosexuals and drug addicts – the persecution occurring largely because Hitler thought they were a drain on the resources of the German state.

Questions 13 and 14

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

Question 15

- (a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of the problems facing American farmers in the 1920s. Maximum credit was achieved for identifying the following features: falling demand from Europe, competition from Canada, which was much more efficient at producing wheat, and overproduction, which resulted in falling prices. Many responses also stressed that a big problem was that some farmers went bankrupt and were evicted from their land.
- (b) There were many strong responses which contained two detailed explanations as to why Republican policies encouraged economic growth. The most common policies explained were the belief in import duties and the policy of laissez faire. For example, strong responses explained that the Republicans believed in tariffs, such as the Fordney-McCumber tariff which made it expensive to import foreign goods. This meant that American businesses were protected from foreign competition and could keep their prices down. This encouraged people to buy products made in the US and allowed American companies to grow rapidly. Weaker responses often correctly identified the policies but encountered challenges explaining them. Others wrote details about what happened, for example the expansion of the car industry, but would have benefited from providing an emphasis on the policies.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question. Strong responses explained both sides of the argument, manufacturing industries which prospered and those that did not. These responses most commonly used the car industry to explain how manufacturing industries prospered. They explained how mass production and advertising had led to the rapid growth of the car industry and, because of the increased demand for cars, other industries such as steel, glass, and rubber also boomed. On the other side of the argument, strong responses addressed which traditional manufacturing industries went into decline and explained examples of such industries, most commonly, cotton textiles. Other responses were usually one-sided, often confining their answers to the car industry.

Questions 16 to 22

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

HISTORY

Paper 0977/21
Paper 21

Key messages

- Candidates should provide a direct answer to the question. For example, if a question asks whether a source proves a certain point to be correct (as in twentieth century option, **Question 5**) it is sensible to begin an answer with, 'Source G does/does not prove'.
- When comparing sources, this should be done point by point and then candidates should try to compare how far they agree in their overall messages.
- Working out which questions require the sources to be evaluated and carrying out such evaluation is important.
- When answering **Question 6**, candidates should base answers on the sources.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered questions on the twentieth century option, although there was a reasonable number of responses to the nineteenth century option. Nearly all candidates answered all six questions but a very small number did not answer **Question 6**. There were many scripts demonstrating a reasonable grasp of the issues raised by the sources and the skills required to tackle these issues. Most candidates could interpret the sources, apply their contextual knowledge to use the sources effectively, and cross reference between sources. The ability to evaluate sources was not so evident. Candidates need to think carefully about whether each question requires the sources to be evaluated. Many candidates demonstrated good contextual knowledge and understanding but it is important that this is used to analyse the sources more effectively rather than take the place of the sources.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well, with a good number of candidates managing to explain agreements and disagreements between the two sources. Most candidates compared the two sources point by point. Agreements included by candidates were: Brown expected slaves to join him, Brown's force was small, Brown attacked the arsenal and Brown's actions led to the Civil War. The disagreements listed were: Source A says that Brown had 18 men while Source B says 21, and A claims that Brown was hanged in Richmond, while B says Charleston. Only a few candidates summarised each source in turn without making any specific comparisons. A reasonable number of strong answers explained the differences between the overall big messages of the two sources, with Source A focusing on Brown being mad and destructive ('mad visionary', 'Brown's insanity', 'uncoiling a terrible chain of events'), while Source B gave a more positive representation of Brown (fulfilling 'a pledge to God', 'his honest blood', 'moral courage', 'single-hearted devotion').

Question 2

Many candidates would have answered this question better if they had realised that it requires at least one of the sources to be evaluated. The use of the word 'prove' is a strong indicator that evaluation is required. Some candidates thought that because Source D differed in its views from Source C it proved C to be wrong. They based their answers on the fact that Source C praises Brown, while Source D is strongly critical of him. However, both sources are problematic and cannot be trusted. Source C is from a speech by Frederick Douglass and Source D from a newspaper from a Southern slave-holding state that later seceded from the Union. These are issues that needed to be investigated before deciding whether Source D proves that

Source C was wrong. Some very strong responses did this. Some candidates analysed and compared the sources well but did not address the issue of proof in their answers.

Question 3

This question was answered reasonably well. Many candidates were able to go beyond the details of the two illustrations and made inferences about the impressions they were intended to create about Brown. Some excellent comparisons were made, with most focusing on contrasting impressions. Weaker responses tended to focus on small details, while others wrote about the two illustrations separately and did not make any comparisons.

Question 4

Only a small number of responses focused just on the surface information in Source G, constituting an uncritical use of the source. There were a few weaker answers that failed to address the issue of usefulness, simply paraphrasing Source G. Most candidates realised that to judge usefulness they needed to evaluate the source using its content in conjunction with its context and provenance. This realisation opened up different, and more satisfactory, ways of answering the question. Some candidates used the context and provenance to dismiss the source as biased, while others argued that as Brown was speaking after he had been sentenced, he had no reason to lie. Better answers used contextual knowledge or cross-reference to other sources to check the claims being made by Brown. All of these answers rested on the assumption that the source was or was not useful because it was or was not reliable. However, a few candidates were able to go beyond this and explained how the source is useful for showing us how Brown wanted to be remembered, and how he was trying to create a version of himself for posterity.

Question 5

This question required candidates to make use of their contextual knowledge to decide whether or not there were good reasons for being surprised by Source H. This source is somewhat ambivalent about Brown. The author expresses admiration for Brown but at the same time is clear that the North cannot interfere with slavery in the South and that Brown should be punished for his acts. The key to whether one would be surprised by Source H is to be found in the details about the provenance of the source. It comes from a Republican newspaper in the State of Illinois which was a strong supporter of the Union in the Civil War. This led some candidates to be surprised by some parts of Source H and some to be not surprised by other parts of the source. There were also candidates who realised that there were good reasons for being both surprised and not surprised. All of these answers achieved good marks provided that they contained some contextual explanation, for example 'I am surprised by Source H because it supports the execution of Brown. This is surprising because the source is from a Republican Northern newspaper which you would expect to be supporting Brown. This was Lincoln's party which was against slavery.' The best answers went beyond this and demonstrated understanding that there is no inconsistency within the source and no reason to be surprised by any part of it. They explained that many Republicans were willing to admire Brown's anti-slavery principles, but they did not support his actions. They believed that his actions at Harpers Ferry were illegal, could worsen relations with the South and might hasten the end of the Union. Weaker answers would have benefited from the use of contextual knowledge. They either expressed surprise by the apparent contradictions within the source, or they identified what in Source H they were surprised or not surprised by, without producing a valid explanation.

Question 6

It is crucial that candidates attempt to answer this question and that they use the sources when doing so. The question asks whether or not the sources provide convincing evidence that Brown was a hero. The wording of the question makes clear that the question is about the sources rather than the candidates' contextual knowledge of the period. The most straight forward way to answer it is to use the sources in the order in which they appear in the paper, explaining whether each one supports or disagrees with the hypothesis given in the question. It is crucial that candidates make clear which source they are referring to, which side of the debate they think each source falls on, and that they then explain why they think this. A number of candidates provided answers such as this: 'Source D certainly does not support the view that John Brown was a hero. It says he was a 'cowardly villain' and that he deserved to be hanged. It also says that the New York Times newspaper should be ashamed of itself for supporting him. Source A agrees he was not a hero and describes him as mad, his actions as 'a ridiculous fantasy' and accuses him of causing war and rebellion.' Candidates that similarly explained sources on the other side of the debate provided the much stronger responses. A good number of candidates did not use the sources or did not use them in a valid way.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well. Agreements most commonly identified included: Khrushchev not consulting Castro, Castro being furious, Khrushchev backing down and Soviet-Chinese relations being threatened. The most commonly identified disagreement was Kennedy promising not to invade Cuba in Source A, but not making such a clear promise in Source B. Most candidates made a point by point by comparison and only a small number made unsupported claims about the sources or summarised the two sources without directly comparing them. It is important to remember that disagreements need rather more explanation than agreements. It is not enough to simply state what the disagreement is about, for example 'The sources disagree over Kennedy's promise not to invade Cuba.' Instead, a full explanation is required such as, 'Source A states that Kennedy had promised not to invade Cuba, but Source B claims that Kennedy did not give an 'absolute assurance' that he would not invade.' Although a good number of candidates produced good answers by explaining agreements and disagreements, only a smaller number of stronger ones went on to compare the overall messages of the sources. Source A has a balanced view about how far Khrushchev had been successful, while Source B sees the Crisis as a disaster for him.

Question 2

This question produced many excellent answers. These contained and combined three elements: the exact context of 29 October, the message of the cartoon and the purpose behind publishing the cartoon. Less successful answers contained just one or two of these elements. In other words, when faced with a 'purpose' question like this one, candidates need to consider the intended impact on the audience of sending out this particular message, and why this was being done then. The question asks why the cartoon was published on a certain date – 29 October 1962. This was the day after Khrushchev agreed to take the missiles out of Cuba and Kennedy agreed not to invade Cuba and to remove missiles from Turkey. The message of the cartoon is that the Soviets had been humiliated by the power of the US. Its purpose was to make the American public proud of the US or to get them to despise the weakness of Soviet communism (or something similar). Most candidates focused at first on the context and many referred to the precise context and to the agreements of 28 October. Weaker answers used a more general context. However, many candidates were then able to address the message of the cartoon, and then go on to consider the intended impact on the audience.

Question 3

This question proved challenging for some candidates. Some based their answers only on agreements or disagreements between the two sources. There is some logic to this approach. It is possible, although not very convincing, to argue that Source D makes Source E surprising because it disagrees with it, for example in Source D, Communist actions are not justified but in Source E they are. Stronger responses evaluated either, or both, of the sources. For example, when one considers the fact that Khrushchev was desperately trying to justify his actions to the Supreme Soviet and was fighting for his political career in Source E, then Source D fails to make what is said in Source E surprising.

Question 4

This question was generally answered reasonably well. A small number of candidates did not recognise Khrushchev and thought that the figure on the right was Kennedy. Most candidates were able to explain valid sub-messages, for example that neither Castro nor Khrushchev welcomed the fact that the missiles had to be withdrawn, or that their withdrawal would weaken Cuba, or that it would weaken the Soviet Union. A few candidates managed to get beyond this type of answer. To do this, candidates had to consider whether Khrushchev really meant the words at the top of the cartoon or whether these were just to appease Castro who he had let down badly. In other words, Khrushchev was lying to Castro and the cartoonist's message is that Khrushchev is willing to sacrifice Cuba.

Question 5

This question, like **Question 3**, required candidates to do provide some evaluation. The key word in the question that candidates needed to focus on was 'prove', and the best way to start their answers was by directly referring to the issue of proof in the first sentence, for example 'Source G does not prove that Khrushchev's motive was to protect Cuba because'. Some candidates missed the issue of proof and just showed how Source G does, or does not, suggest that Khrushchev's motive was to protect Cuba. There is

plenty of evidence in Source G for these answers but they missed the crucial issue of whether or not Khrushchev can be trusted. Source G is from a letter to Castro sent immediately after the crisis. In Sources A and B, it was evident that Castro was furious with Khrushchev and that there was a danger he might prefer China to the Soviet Union as an ally. A small number of very strong responses suggested that in Source G Khrushchev was trying to keep Castro on side and therefore we cannot necessarily trust the claims he was making about his motives. Other candidates used their own knowledge or cross-referenced to other sources to identify other possible motives for Khrushchev or to confirm the claims made in Source G.

Question 6

It is crucial that candidates attempt to answer this question and that they use the sources when doing so. This question was about how far the sources provide convincing evidence that the Crisis was a success for Khrushchev. The most straight forward way to answer it is to use the sources in the order in which they appear in the paper, explaining whether each one supports or disagrees with the hypothesis given in the question. It is crucial that candidates make clear which source they are referring to, which side of the debate they think each source falls, and that they then explain why they think this. A number of candidates provided answer such as this: 'Source A supports the idea that Khrushchev was successful in the Cuban Missile Crisis because it says that he was able to claim victory because Kennedy had agreed not to invade Cuba. Source E also supports this idea by claiming that the Crisis had 'guaranteed the existence of a Socialist Cuba'.' Candidates that similarly explained sources on the other side of the debate provided the much stronger responses. A good number of candidates did not use the sources or did not use them in a valid way.

HISTORY

Paper 0977/03
Coursework

Key messages

- The title used must be appropriate i.e. it focuses candidates on the assessment of significance.
- Candidates should use a range of criteria to assess significance.
- Candidates should focus on assessment, rather than on description or narrative.

General comments

The administration and moderation of coursework worked very efficiently. Nearly all the titles used were appropriate and were based on topics from one of the Depth Studies in the syllabus. Nearly all candidates stayed within the 2000 words limit. The overall standard of work was high, and many candidates demonstrated a good understanding of what was required when assessing significance. A small number of centres had their marks adjusted by the Moderators.

Comments on specific questions

Crucially, most of the coursework titles used by centres were appropriate and allowed candidates to focus on the assessment of significance. Titles that are not about the assessment of significant should not be used, for example 'What was the role of technology in the First World War?' The title also needs to allow candidates to make a broad assessment of the historical significance of their subject. Titles such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression in allowing the Nazis to come to power' are too narrow. They limit candidates to assessing just one aspect of the Depression's significance (as a causal factor in the Nazi rise to power), and encourage them to write about other factors and compare their importance with that of the Depression. This is not what is required. Titles such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany' are more open and allow candidates to use a range of criteria to assess different ways in which the Depression may have been significant.

The choice of subject is also important. It must be an individual, group, organisation, development, place or event, and needs to come from one of the Depth Studies in the syllabus or from an approved centre-devised Depth Study. It is not advisable to choose subjects that are so large in historical terms that there is little doubt about their significance. For example, 'Assess the significance of Hitler' would not be easy for candidates to write about in 2000 words. Candidates need to be able to assess significance (not just explain it) through argument and counter-argument, and titles need to allow them to do this. A wide range of titles featured this year but examples of the types of title that worked well are:

To what extent was propaganda a significant factor in Germany, 1918 to 1945?
How significant was Lenin in Russian history in the period 1917 to 1930?
How significant was the Treaty of Versailles for the Weimar Republic?
Assess the significance of the First World War for the USA, 1918 to 1941.
Assess the significance of the reparations imposed on Germany.
Assess the significance of Stresemann for Germany.

The alternative to using key terms such as 'assess' and 'significance' in the title is to ask how far an event was a turning point, for example, 'How far was the New Deal a turning point for the USA?' If this approach is used, it is important that candidates have a good understanding of the concept of 'turning point'. In their answers they should test their subject against the key elements of turning points to make their assessment.

The best responses all shared certain characteristics. First, they went further than just explaining why their subject was significant and assessed its significance using argument and counter-argument. They explained how it was significant in some ways, but not in others or how it was significant from one perspective but not

from another, or how there are perfectly good arguments on both sides of the debate about their subject's significance. They also reached, and supported, a conclusion about the most important way in which their subject was significant. Secondly, they used a range of criteria to assess significance. These were not necessarily listed at the beginning of the response but were integral to the responses all the way through. Candidates should decide for themselves which criteria would be most useful to use with their particular topic. Criteria can range from depth and breadth of impact to economic and political impact to short and long-term to iconic significance. Thirdly, they did not just explain the impact of their subject but assessed how far the impact mattered in different ways and for different reasons. Finally, these responses were carefully organised as a whole, and showed clear signs of an overall argument developing as they unfolded, leading to conclusions that developed naturally from the main body of the responses.

Less successful responses tended to regularly slip into description and narrative. They often described the impact of their subject but did not assess this impact beyond assertions. These responses also spent too long on the 'background' events, before focusing on the subject named in the title. Sometimes they made assertions about significance in the conclusion that were not related to the main body of the answer.

The candidates' responses were marked with care and expertise. Many centres had their marks left unchanged and most of the adjustments that were made were minor. Most centres provided brief and helpful comments at the end of responses that summed up their overall qualities and that clearly related to key parts of the mark scheme. If there were key sections within a response, these were signalled by teacher in the margin. Importantly, the mark scheme was used holistically, and the summative comments provided were very useful for Moderators.

HISTORY

Paper 0977/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

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

General comments

A small range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941. There were also a number of attempts at Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918, Depth Study C: Russia: 1905 – 1941 and Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990. There were too few attempts at Depth Study F (South Africa) or Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced answers with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but many would have benefited from providing a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote lots of information about the topic or Depth Study in general, rather than focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also missed the chronology set out in the question which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates need to read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response has the appropriate focus.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 – 1918

Question 1 was the more popular choice, with very few candidates attempting **Question 2**.

Question 1 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to get to grips with the focus of the question and were deeply knowledgeable about the use of gas weapons during the First World War. Candidates were able to give specific examples of the impact gas weapons on the Western Front from 1915 and give details about the number of casualties it caused. This was then balanced by examining the relative importance of other weapons such as machine guns, artillery and underground mines. Many candidates also explained the importance that aircraft, tanks and other technological innovations had on warfare, as well as the development of new tactics such as the creeping barrage and combined arms' offensives. Some explanations and conclusions were well supported and provided convincing evaluations of the relative importance of gas. Weaker responses tended to lack detail or refer too much to events in the early stages of the war and why it was not over by Christmas which, while relevant, was not the main focus of the question this session.

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

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945

Question 3 and **Question 4** were both popular choices among candidates, though more candidates opted for **Question 3**.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Many candidates were aware of the economic problems in early Weimar Germany between 1918 and 1923, and provided a good level of detail about the impact of the First World War, the rising unemployment and decreasing living standards for many Germans and the impact of reparations, particularly the Ruhr occupation and the subsequent period of hyperinflation. Balance was provided in most responses by examining other terms of the Treaty of Versailles, such as the military, territorial and war guilt clauses, the increasing political extremism and the weaknesses inherent in the new Weimar Constitution which all contributed to disorder in Germany. The best answers provided detailed explanations which were well supported by accurate and in-depth examples and focused on the relative importance of the different causes of disorder. Other responses tended to be narratives of the period, with a few candidates going beyond the 1923 parameter of the question.

Question 4 was generally less well answered than **Question 3**. Candidates struggled to focus on army opposition during Nazi rule and often cited material pre – 1933 such as the Munich Putsch, which was not relevant to this question. The stronger responses examined the role of the army during the Night of the Long Knives and many also made reference to the July 1944 Bomb Plot, often with a good level of detail and insight. This was then compared with other forms of opposition, such as resistance from youth groups like the Edelweiss Pirates and White Rose movement and Church opposition from the Catholic and Protestant churches. Good answers had breadth and depth in terms of examples and provided some evaluation of how significant the opposition actually was in resisting Nazi rule. Less successful responses tended to lack contextual knowledge of opposition in Nazi Germany and provided few relevant examples; some candidates provided just an overview of Nazi rule after 1933.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941

Question 5 was answered by more candidates than was **Question 6**.

Question 5 had some strong responses, and most candidates were able to address how important political reform was to the survival of the Tsarist regime by 1914. Many candidates were able to cite the importance of the October Manifesto and the creation of the Duma and how this divided the opposition during the 1905 revolution. This was then balanced by examining other reasons for the survival of Tsarism such as Stolypin's economic reforms, the increasing use of repression by the army and Okhrana and the industrial growth that took place in the period. The best answers were analytical and provided convincing evaluations of how important each factor was, using specific examples to support their explanations. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive in their approach and often lacked the depth and breadth required for a balanced and detailed answer. A few candidates neglected the parameters of the question and examined the First World War, which, while relevant in 1914 in terms of the initial patriotism it created in Russia, is irrelevant from 1915 onwards in this question.

Question 6 had fewer responses than **Question 5** and was generally less well answered. Some good responses were able to provide a good range of examples of strong leadership in the Bolshevik Party that allowed them to seize power in November 1917. Most commonly cited were Lenin's April Theses, his decision to launch the seizure of power and Trotsky's role as Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet and Red Guard. This was then balanced by other factors such as the failures of the Provisional Government to solve the land issue for peasants, its continuation of the war and its inability to fix the fuel and food shortages in the cities. Many would have been improved by greater breadth and depth in fully addressing the question and more responses could have assessed the relative significance of the different factors. Many answers were descriptive or gave a narrative of events, rather than an analysis. A few candidates went beyond November 1917 and examined the period of the Russian Civil War, which was not required.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941

This was another popular Depth Study, with **Question 7** producing more answers than **Question 8**.

Question 7 was the more popular choice with candidates. Many candidates were able to give a wide range of examples of the entertainment industry such as cinema, radio and sports, and explain how it changed the lives of women in the 1920s. Good responses also noted how these changes tended to only affect women in urban, as opposed to rural areas of the USA, which added depth to their evaluations. This was then balanced by examining other important factors such as the winning of the vote, the impact of the First World War on women's employment and the increasing leisure time some women gained from new household appliances, such as vacuum cleaners. Other responses did not focus on women specifically and gave generic answers about the impact of the entertainment industry on US society as a whole.

Question 8 was well answered in most cases. Candidates had a great deal of contextual knowledge about the role and function of the TVA and its impact on the Tennessee Valley area. Strong responses examined how the building of dams and hydroelectric power stations and improvement of irrigation for farmers helped the economy in these states during the Depression and provided cheap power, jobs and services for many Americans. This was then balanced by comparing the TVA with other alphabet agencies, most commonly the CCC, AAA, PWA and FERA, as well as other reforms introduced by the First and Second New Deal during the Depression. The best answers focused on how significant each reform or agency was in dealing with the effects of the Depression, provided well supported explanations and drew convincing conclusions. Some of the weaker responses lacked the contextual knowledge to properly analyse the impact of the TVA and other reforms or confused the aims of the different alphabet agencies.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990

A small number of candidates attempted **Question 9** but too few attempted **Question 10** for any meaningful comments to be made.

Question 9 was generally well answered. Some candidates had a deep knowledge and understanding of how the USA supported the KMT with financial aid during the Second World War and how this was rarely used to fight the Japanese and instead used to focus on the Communists, which led to its withdrawal by the USA. Explanations focused on how this led to claims of corruption in the Nationalist government and how it impeded their ability to effectively fight the Communists during the Civil War which followed. This was then balanced by examining the tactics and leadership of the Communist Party under Mao, its focus on attracting peasant support in the countryside and its effective use of guerrilla warfare against the KMT. The best answers explained their arguments well and supported these with a good range of accurate examples and remained focused on addressing importance. Other answers tended to lack knowledge on the role of the USA and its financial support to the KMT, though often gave detailed accounts of other factors.

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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