

Example Candidate Responses Paper 2

Cambridge IGCSE™ / IGCSE (9–1)
History 0470 / 0977

Cambridge O Level
History 2147

For examination from 2020



In order to help us develop the highest quality resources, we are undertaking a continuous programme of review; not only to measure the success of our resources but also to highlight areas for improvement and to identify new development needs.

We invite you to complete our survey by visiting the website below. Your comments on the quality and relevance of our resources are very important to us.

www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/GL6ZNJB

Would you like to become a Cambridge International consultant and help us develop support materials?

Please follow the link below to register your interest.

www.cambridgeinternational.org/cambridge-for/teachers/teacherconsultants/

Copyright © UCLES 2020

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which itself is a department of the University of Cambridge.

UCLES retains the copyright on all its publications. Registered Centres are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use. However, we cannot give permission to Centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party, even for internal use within a Centre.

Contents

Introduction.....	4
Question 1	6
Example Candidate Response – high.....	6
Example Candidate Response – middle	7
Example Candidate Response – low	8
Question 2	9
Example Candidate Response – high	9
Example Candidate Response – middle	11
Example Candidate Response – low	12
Question 3	13
Example Candidate Response – high	13
Example Candidate Response – middle	14
Example Candidate Response – low	15
Question 4	16
Example Candidate Response – high	16
Example Candidate Response – middle	18
Example Candidate Response – low	19
Question 5	21
Example Candidate Response – high	21
Example Candidate Response – middle	22
Example Candidate Response – low	23
Question 6	25
Example Candidate Response – high	25
Example Candidate Response – middle	29
Example Candidate Response – low	31

Introduction

The main aim of this booklet is to exemplify standards for those teaching Cambridge IGCSE/IGCSE (9-1) History 0470 / 0977 and Cambridge O Level History 2147, and to show how different levels of candidates' performance (high, middle or low) relate to the subject's curriculum and assessment objectives.

In this booklet, candidate responses have been chosen from March 2020 scripts to exemplify a range of answers.

For each question, the response is annotated with a clear explanation of where and why marks were awarded or omitted. This is followed by examiner comments on how the answer could have been improved. In this way, it is possible for you to understand what candidates have done to gain their marks and what they could do to improve their answers. There is also a list of common mistakes candidates made in their answers, where relevant.

This document provides illustrative examples of candidate work with some examiner commentary. These help teachers assess the standard required to achieve marks beyond the guidance of the mark scheme. Therefore, in some circumstances, such as where exact answers are required, there will not be much comment.

The questions and mark schemes used here are available to download from the School Support Hub. These files are:

0470 March 2020 Question Paper 22

0470 March 2020 Paper 22 Mark Scheme

Past exam resources and other teaching and learning resources are available on the School Support Hub:

www.cambridgeinternational.org/support

How to use this booklet

This booklet goes through the paper one question at a time, showing you the high-, middle- or low-level response for each question. The candidate answers are set in a table. In the left-hand column are the candidate answers, and in the right-hand column are the examiner comments.

Example Candidate Response – high		Examiner comments
<p>Kennedy's idea behind Khrushchev's actions come from rage and hatred. He thinks that the USA supervised, & Bay of Pigs invasion did give given Khrushchev a very wrong idea of Kennedy's power.</p> <p>Although the source has no direct relation to the missile crisis as such, it portrays the building tension between Khrushchev and Kennedy. The source also portrays Khrushchev's most probable reaction as "young and inexperienced" of Kennedy's rule but has been pointed out, many times, by Khrushchev himself. This may have also been the reason behind the placement of the atomic missiles on Cuba in the coming</p>	<p>1 The candidate does not address the question about the usefulness of this source as evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis.</p> <p>2 In this paragraph, the candidate makes the points needed for Level 5. They point out that the source is not directly about the Cuban Missile Crisis. However, the candidate explains that the tension between the two leaders and Kennedy's 'inexperience'</p>	<p>Examiner comments are alongside the answers. These explain where and why marks were awarded. This helps you to interpret the standard of Cambridge exams so you can help your learners to refine their exam technique.</p>

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer reached the top level in the mark scheme, showing knowledge of the crisis and how the source was useful. However, to achieve the top mark, the candidate should have made a more explicit statement in the crucial paragraph about how Source A was useful as evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis. The answer implied this, rather than being explicit about usefulness.

This section explains how the candidate could have improved each answer. This helps you to interpret the standard of Cambridge exams and helps your learners to refine their exam technique.

Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- Some responses wrote about the events in Source A without relating them to the Cuban Missile Crisis.
- Explanation of how Source A was useful to understanding the crisis was required for the highest level. However, many candidates simply made assertions that Source A was (or was not) useful.

Often candidates were not awarded marks because they misread or misinterpreted the questions.

Lists the common mistakes candidates made in answering each question. This will help your learners to avoid these mistakes and give them the best chance of achieving the available marks.

Option B – Question 1

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

1	x	<p>Source A talks about the "hostile" activities of Khrushchev, who had gotten into a physical tussle with the contemporary president of USA, Kennedy.</p> <p>Kennedy's idea behind Khrushchev's actions come from rage and hatred. He thinks that the USA, supervised Bay of Pigs invasion had given Khrushchev a very wrong idea of Kennedy's power.</p> <p>Although the source has no direct relation to the missile crisis as such, it portrays the building tension between Khrushchev and Kennedy. The source also portrays Khrushchev's most probable reaction as a "young and inexperienced" by Kennedy's rule but has been pointed out, many times, by Khrushchev himself. This may have also been the reason behind the placement of the atomic missiles on Cuba in the coming years.</p> <p>The reliability of the source is high as it comes from Kennedy himself and poses no major conflicted theories.</p>
---	---	---

- 1 The candidate does not address the question about the usefulness of this source as evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis.
- 2 In this paragraph, the candidate makes the points needed for Level 5. They point out that the source is not directly about the Cuban Missile Crisis. However, the candidate explains that the tension between the two leaders and Kennedy's 'inexperience' help explain why Khrushchev planted missiles in Cuba. This demonstrates knowledge of the Crisis and how Source A is a useful source of evidence.

Total mark awarded =
6 out of 7

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer reached the top level in the mark scheme, showing knowledge of the Crisis and how the source was useful. However, to achieve the top mark, the candidate should have made a more explicit statement in the crucial paragraph about how Source A was useful as evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis. The answer implied this, rather than being explicit about how it was useful.

Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

Question	Part	OPTION B	
1		I agree that the Source A is useful evidence about the Cuban missile crisis. Firstly this source shows that there are hostilities between Kruschev and President Kennedy. Also it talks about the 'bay of pigs' fiasco, due to which hostilities escalated to another level, and because of the humiliation that America had to face also because Kruschev considered America as 'inexperienced and have no guts'. This increased the confidence of Kruschev, and threatened Kennedy, hence this source is useful evidence about the Cuban missile crisis. However, this source did not mention the October Crisis, which was the most important event of the Cuban missile crisis. In the October Crisis, Kennedy was just about to launch nuclear war on Cuba and USSR, but the two leaders negotiated and stopped nuclear apocalypse. Hence, this proves that Source A also did not provide enough evidence about Cuban missile crisis.	
1			1 The candidate directly addresses the question.
2			2 The candidate selects several points from Source A (Khrushchev regarded Kennedy as inexperienced, Khrushchev was confident) and states that this is useful evidence about the Crisis, however, the candidate does not explain why or how. The answer reaches Level 3 here.
3			3 Again, this answer reaches Level 3. The candidate rejects the source because it tells us nothing about what happened in October 1962. As Level 3 is reached twice, 4 marks are awarded.
			Total mark awarded = 4 out of 7

How the candidate could have improved their answer

The candidate identified relevant information in Source A that could be used as evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis but did not explain how it could be useful. To improve the response, the candidate could have selected a development in the Crisis, such as Khrushchev placing missiles in Cuba. If the response explained how Khrushchev thought he could get away with this, because he thought Kennedy was weak and inexperienced, then Level 5 of the mark scheme would have been reached. This crucial move depended on the candidate selecting an aspect of the Crisis and demonstrating how Source A helped to explain it.

Example Candidate Response – low		Examiner comments
Question	Part	
<p>1) Source A is a useful source as it talks about the relationship between Kennedy and Khrushchev from Kennedy's point of view. According to Kennedy, Khrushchev did not respect Kennedy's position as the president of the USA since he was quite young and inexperienced as a politician.</p> <p>The Bay of Pigs invasion which was a plan that had sent Anti-Communist Cuban exiles trained by the American intelligence services and military to overthrow Fidel Castro had failed miserably. This attempted invasion had worsened diplomatic relations between the USA and USSR and made Castro and Khrushchev suspicious of USA's foreign policy.</p>		<p>① The candidate is repeating the information in Source A.</p> <p>② The Bay of Pigs and its consequences are explained, but the candidate does not link this with the Cuban Missile Crisis. The issue of how far Source A provides useful evidence about the Cuban Missile Crisis is not addressed. In fact, the Crisis is not mentioned. For this reason, the response remains in Level 1.</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 1 out of 7</p>

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This response needed to focus more on the Cuban Missile Crisis and how far Source A provided evidence about it. The answer was related to the Bay of Pigs invasion rather than the Cuban Missile Crisis. There were some opportunities in the response for the candidate to develop relevant points. For instance, after making the point that Khrushchev did not respect Kennedy, the candidate could have suggested that this helped to explain why Khrushchev acted as he did during the Crisis. In the same way, the point about the way the Bay of Pigs made Khrushchev and Castro suspicious of US policy, could have been used to explain why missiles were placed on Cuba.

Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- Some candidates wrote about the events in Source A without relating them to the Cuban Missile Crisis.
- Explanation of how Source A was useful to understanding the crisis was required for the highest level, however, many candidates simply made assertions that Source A was (or was not) useful.
- Many focused on what the source said without selecting an aspect of the Crisis that could have been better understood through use of Source A.

Option B – Question 2

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

2 First of all, in this source Krushchev is talking about various decisions that he took while the Cuban Missile Crisis was going on. From this source, you can get a clear picture of Krushchev and what his intentions really were.

To start with, first itself he is trying to depict himself as more responsible leader, during the crisis. Moreover it was him, who started to take actions and most importantly it was him who tried to bring out peace during that time. It was him, who did his best to not for a nuclear war not to come in place between USA and USSR when the issue was so critical that everyone thought a nuclear war could break out at any moment. To add with, he is directly criticising the Kennedy. He sees Kennedy as an inexperienced person, which he indirectly means that Kennedy and USA is weak. It is clearly stated in the source that it was Krushchev took out his arm and military from Cuba purposefully as he thought, Kennedy is so weak that his military will overthrow him, which will result in more problems. That is he is meaning that, he never removed the arm due to pressure from Kennedy but as he thought Kennedy was in danger. Most of them were pretty sure that he was lying. In fact Krushchev removed

1 The candidate gives a general introduction. Level 1 is reached.

2 A number of valid and supported impressions of Krushchev are given, such as he was a responsible leader because he wanted to avoid war. Later, the candidate also explains that Krushchev took the missiles out of Cuba to save Kennedy. This achieved Level 4.

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

	<p>the missiles missiles from Cuba due to pressure from USA, and moreover as US agreed to remove missiles missiles from Turkey later. So in this source, he was trying to justify his actions and to for the public to know that, Khrushchev and USSR won over the issue. That is, his own citizens should never feel that, USSR accepted US's demands but give a view to them that USA and its leader was weak, so to ensure safety they removed missiles from Cuba. In short he wanted to raise his own position in Soviet. Moreover everyone should feel that it was Khrushchev who was more responsible, and it was him more than Kennedy who worked to ensure safety and peace as well as him it was him who wanted a more peaceful place. Anyhow the citizens of both USA and USSR knew the truth. So these are the main ideas that you get of Khrushchev from Source B. In short an impression that he always tried to raise his own position and to ensure that people knew it was always Soviet who won the Cuban Missile Crisis. This is the main impression that the Source B gives of Khrushchev.</p>
--	--

3 The candidate states that Khrushchev really moved the missiles because of US pressure. This does not answer the question. The idea that Khrushchev was a liar cannot be inferred from the source.

4 The response reaches Level 5. There is a clear statement that Khrushchev was trying to justify his actions and that he wanted the Soviet people to see him as the victor in the Crisis. Later, it is stated that 'he always tried to raise his own position'. Although the candidate does not explicitly state that these are negative impressions, they raise the answer into Level 5. The response gets close to Level 6 as it shows that Khrushchev was trying to ensure that the Soviet public should never feel that he had accepted the US demands and that he wanted to improve his own position in the USSR. The response does not directly state that Khrushchev was criticised at the time. To reach Level 6, the candidate needed to be more explicit about this.

**Total mark awarded =
6 out of 7**

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer achieved Level 5 by focusing on valid negative impressions. To be awarded Level 6, the response needed to be clearer about the need for Khrushchev to rescue his reputation. There was not enough specific contextual knowledge about his position after the Crisis. The candidate needed to explain that the common perception at the time was that Khrushchev had given in to Kennedy, or about the fact that he fell from power within two years of the events.

Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

2	<p>It is clear that this source wishes to give an image of a diplomatic Krushchev, who had complete control of the situation. Phrases like 'I started it' and 'I take complete responsibility' show Krushchev as in charge and the one making crucial diplomatic negotiations possible. The second paragraph makes it seem like Krushchev made concessions to protect Kennedy, protect his job adding to his diplomatic image. Krushchev brings out Kennedy's age in order to also make him seem more experienced. However, having being written by Krushchev I find it possible that the entire impression created is biased but also what Krushchev thought of himself and Kennedy. Source A also brings up Kennedy's age as something Krushchev thought made him superior. The overall impression given from this source is one of diplomacy, control and experience.</p>
---	--

1 The candidate provides several valid positive impressions which are supported from the source.

2 The candidate states that Source B is biased as it shows what Khrushchev thought of himself. However, the candidate needs to use this to make a negative inference about Khrushchev. The conclusion in the final sentence reinforces positive impressions.

Total mark awarded =
4 out of 7

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer made several valid supported impressions to achieve Level 4. The candidate was aware that Khrushchev was making positive impressions of himself and could have improved their answer if they had used this to suggest that it showed us that Khrushchev was boastful or self-promoting. This would have raised the answer into Level 5.

Example Candidate Response – low		Examiner comments
2.	<p>Source B tells us that, Khrushchev was not someone who would give up easily and was not someone who could be stopped or silenced by a warning. Kennedy feared that the military well overthrow him. Also, Khrushchev sent a note saying that they agreed to remove the missiles on condition that the president Kennedy would not invade Cuba. Due to this, I feel that a few of the above statements tell tell us what kind of character Khrushchev was.</p>	<p>① The candidate attempts to address 'impressions'. However, the attempt – 'not someone who would give up easily and was not someone who could be stopped or silenced' – does not work well with Source B. It is as much a description as an inference and there is nothing in Source B that directly supports it. However, it is an attempt to draw an inference and is not completely wrong. It can be allowed as Level 2 – a valid inference (just) but not convincing about Khrushchev.</p> <p>② The candidate repeats what is in the source and makes no inferences about Khrushchev. The candidate does not use this information to support an inference.</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 2 out of 7</p>

How the candidate could have improved their answer

The question required candidates to make inferences about Khrushchev that could be supported from Source B. The two attempts at the beginning of this answer were marginal in terms of being justified by Source B. More obvious inferences would have been that he was responsible, understanding or in charge. These inferences needed to be supported from the source. For example, a valid, supported inference would have been, 'The impression of Khrushchev is that he was in charge of events during the Crisis. This is shown by the fact that that he says he started the exchange with Kennedy and was at the centre of the action'.

Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- Many responses took surface information from the source rather than making inferences.
- Some tried to make inferences about Khrushchev which could not be supported using the source content.
- A few responses made inferences about Kennedy rather than Khrushchev.
- Some candidates made valid inferences but did not support them from Source B.
- Many did not recognise that Source B shows Khrushchev in a negative way.
- Few responses explained their answers using their contextual knowledge of Khrushchev's position after the Crisis.

Option B – Question 3

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

3.	<p>Source C is a cartoon published in the American newspaper in October 1962, the time when the blockade began and the Presidents were in direct communication of USA and USSR were in direct communication.</p> <p>In the source, Khrushchev is saying, "I'd reconsider if I were you" to Kennedy. In the source Kennedy is shown to have missiles as a defensive measure in case they're attacked by Cuba, due to the presence of the Soviet missiles in Cuba. Khrushchev and Castro, as well as the arms blockade are shown to be sinking, while Kennedy is firm on his position. There are fish shown getting away from the situation in a scared expression. Kennedy and Khrushchev are shown to be very angry.</p> <p>It was October 1962, when Khrushchev agreed to remove the missiles from Cuba, because the USA assured Cuba that they wouldn't participate in an attack on Cuba and the blockade would be lifted. The arms blockade is shown to be sinking, indicating this incident. Kennedy is shown to have his missiles in Turkey, even though the Soviet Union had to withdraw their missiles from Cuba. What Kennedy says to Khrushchev also conveys the message that USA was somewhat threatening Khrushchev and being decisive, authoritative and firm.</p> <p>Through this source, the cartoonist is trying to give us a message that the USA was superior in this situation and held more power. It demonstrates what had occurred in October 1962. However, since this is a zine cartoon published in the American newspaper, it is somewhat biased towards the USA, showing their superiority. The USA was ahead in both nuclear technology and the number of weapons, but even so the source is somewhat leaning towards the USA, showing them as the winners in this situation.</p>
----	--

1 The candidate does not answer the question.

2 The candidate identifies valid sub-messages such as Kennedy was defensive and Kennedy was firm in his position. Level 3.

3 The candidate identifies further sub-messages stating that Kennedy was decisive and authoritative. Level 3.

4 The candidate gets to the big message that the US was superior and winner in this situation. This goes further than a Level 3 answer that might state the US was strong. This answer refers to the Crisis, 'this situation', and makes a statement about the US in relation to the USSR. The big message of a cartoon refers to the main point that a cartoonist was trying to make.

Total mark awarded =
7 out of 8

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer was awarded Level 4 because it explained the main message of the cartoon. To reach the top level in the mark scheme, the candidate needed to explain the point of view of the cartoonist. The question asked about the 'cartoonist's message'. This meant going further than the big message and explaining what the cartoonist thought of the situation they represented. In this cartoon, the cartoonist approved of the fact that the US had the upper-hand in the Cuban Missile Crisis. This could be seen by the way that characters were portrayed, for instance, Khrushchev and Castro were shown in rather foolish poses compared to the calm authority of Kennedy.

Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

3	<p>The main message of this source is that Kennedy is trying to convince Krushchev not to attack put missiles in Cuba using and attack America. The fact that Kennedy is saying 'I'd reconsider if I were you' to show the threat shows that Kennedy is blackmailing warning Krushchev to remove missiles from Cuba in an implied tone. Also this cartoon was carbon was published in October 1962, during the October crisis, where Krushchev and Kennedy had days of negotiation about Cuba in Soviet missiles in it, they had the hostilities had escalated to a level where nuclear war could be announced any minute. Hence the purpose of this cartoon is to show the people of America what USSR will get if they attacked America which is also one of the messages of the source. Also, the arms blockade is just a banner, it could not do anything to stop Krushchev from supplying arms to Cuba, which shows that the arms blockade was weak. Also the fact that American missiles are larger and more in number shows the strength of America which is another sub-message of the cartoon.</p>
---	---

- 1 There is an immediate attempt to address the question. The candidate identifies some valid sub-messages, such as Kennedy is warning Khrushchev to remove the missiles. This sub-message is supported by reference to Source C. Level 3.
 - 2 This contextual background does not add anything to the answer.
 - 3 This is not quite right. The cartoon is not criticising the arms blockade.
 - 4 There is another valid and supported sub-message that America is strong. Level 3.
- Total mark awarded = 4 out of 8**

How the candidate could have improved their answer

The candidate identified and supported some valid sub-messages. To improve this answer, the candidate needed to explain the big message of the cartoon. The big message was the main point that the cartoonist wanted to make. Here, the big message was that the US had the upper-hand in the Crisis, or that the US had taken control of the Crisis. There were two elements to this big message: (i) it must relate directly to the Cuban Missile Crisis, and (ii) it must show an understanding that the US had taken control of the Crisis. This answer was close to this at the end where it stated that the US was strong, but did not go far enough in recognising both of the elements explained above.

Example Candidate Response – low

Examiner comments

3	<p>The cartoonist's message is that Khrushchev (USSR) had better well equipped arms and equipments compared to USA. It tells us that the support is for USSR as it tells that they would give the nuclear missiles if they were attacked by Cuba. This was to test USA, to see if they would if they get into war. It was also done to to test Trap USA; & To also bargain with USA for some american Concessions in return. It was done to defend Cuba as, Castro's Cuba was great threat and it was in Uncle Sam's backyard. It is also done to strengthen USSR's own position. Kennedy is worried as Cuban exiles fled to USA and that the Bay of Pigs was a failure and Kennedy was humiliated. He also felt like a backstab. Kennedy is watching everything with great alarm in the cartoon.</p>
---	---

1 This answer is weakened by the candidate relying on contextual knowledge rather than trying to interpret what the cartoonist wants to say. Attempts to identify messages are based on misinterpretations of the cartoon. For instance, Khrushchev had better well-quipped arms is not a valid message of this cartoon.

2 Much of this answer is about the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis rather than the cartoon. There is an attempt to return to the cartoon at the end of the answer but 'alarm' is not the right word for a confident looking Kennedy. This answer is in Level 1. It contains misinterpretations and does not identify valid sub-messages.

Total mark awarded =
1 out of 8

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer contained some contextual knowledge of the Cuban Missile Crisis but misinterpreted the cartoon by seeing Khrushchev as 'better equipped' and Kennedy as 'alarmed'. The candidate needed to focus more carefully on the cartoon and its messages. For example, the cartoon suggested that the US was strong, the situation was tense and the US would retaliate.

Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- Some responses were focused on their knowledge of the Cuban Missile Crisis rather than on interpreting the cartoon.
- A number of responses were based on surface descriptions of the cartoon rather than making inferences and explaining messages.
- Some identified relevant sub-messages from the cartoon but did not support these with details from the cartoon.
- A few answers were distracted by minor details in the cartoon, such as the fish, instead of being focused on explaining the big message.

Option B – Question 4

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

4.	<p>Source D and E are both give us some idea about the Cuban missile crisis. Source D is an advertisement in the American newspaper for a book that was published in 2012, much after the crisis had ended. Source E, on the other hand is a cartoon that was published in the British newspaper on 29th October 1962, the very year the crisis occurred. Its captioned "OK, Mr President, lets talk".</p> <p>Source D tends to lean towards the USA, with the powerful statement "With eyeball to eyeball and I think the other fellow just blinked! Its an inclusive account of the historic showdown between Khrushchev and Kennedy. Source D gives us the message that the two superpowers were in a tense stand-off but Khrushchev seemed blinked, indicating that he wasn't as powerful and was threatened by the USA. Both were being very strong willed about what they wanted but Khrushchev let his guard down. This source indicates over the superiority of the USA. Source E is a british cartoon and since USA and Britain were allies, even if were some way leaning towards the USA. Kennedy and Khrushchev</p>	<p>1 The candidate's introductory paragraph compares the provenance of the two sources. Level 2.</p> <p>2 The candidate's response demonstrates understanding the big-message of Source D; the superiority of the USA. This reaches Level 3 as one source was interpreted.</p>
----	--	--

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

	are shown to arm whilst, indicating the arms race. Khrushchev is shown to be sweating, while Kennedy seems to be very powerful and strong. Kennedy's finger is also resting on the switch, and just one click and the USA would launch its missiles. This again signals towards the American superiority. Khrushchev and Kennedy are sitting on each other's missiles, showing how much missiles were in each other's sphere of influence. The caption too indicates that they were having ready to negotiate and take the necessary action. The caption also does have a superiority to it. Khrushchev seems to be struggling, quite opposite of the USA.
4	Both sources D and E go somewhat agreeing about the Cuban Missile crisis because both seem to be signalling more at towards the USA's greater hold on the situation. The two sources also still appear to show Khrushchev as weak. Both the sources represent quite a similar view to the Cuban missile crisis, in the favour of USA, however.

3 The candidate's answer explains that Source E also says that the USA was superior in strength. This is on the borderline for Level 5; the comparison of the two sources. This could be more direct.

4 The candidate's final paragraph secures Level 5. The comparison between the two sources is clearer with the USA controlling the situation better and the USSR weaker.

Total mark awarded =
7 out of 8

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer slowly built towards Level 5 and became secure in the final paragraph. Level 5 could have been reached more quickly if the candidate compared the big messages of the two sources earlier in the response. Instead, the candidate explained Source D first, and then moved on to Source E. The big message of each source was clearly understood but the candidate was hesitant about making an explicit comparison, and this only came at the end.

Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

4).	<p>Both sources D and E agree with each other to a great extent. The big picture of both the sources is that the Cuban crisis was about personal rivalry between Kennedy and Khrushchev and therefore in both sources, a 'showdown' between both leaders is clearly visible. In the advertisement, there is an image of a race competition created as both were 'eyeball to eyeball' against each other and there's a competition on who blinks first. Similarly, even in Source E, the cartoon showcases both leaders to be involved in a fist fight against each other, which too is at the end of the day a competition. Therefore both sources agree to the fact that the cold war tension was very high at that time and the leaders were literally on war with each other.</p> <p>However, there is one one difference between both sources which is evident. Source D portrays both nations to be equal to each other as they were fighting 'eyeball to eyeball' just like equals. However, Source E clearly shows that US was more superior as even though the size of their missile (which is the seat for Khrushchev in this case) is larger than USSR's. Moreover, Kennedy is shown to be sweating less than Khrushchev.</p> <p>Nevertheless, though there are a few slight variations in both sources, however, their big picture is the same and both clearly portray the personal rivalry between the two leaders. This therefore draws the conclusion that both sources agree to a great extent.</p>
-----	---

- 1 The candidate makes a good start to the answer. Level 4 is achieved by the candidate comparing valid sub-messages. The answer explains how both sources show that the Cuban Missile Crisis was about personal rivalry between the two leaders. The comparison is clear and is supported with evidence from both sources.
 - 2 This part of the answer is not so strong. The candidate is correct about Source E showing Kennedy to have the upper hand, but it is not accurate to suggest that Source D shows the two nations as equal.
 - 3 The candidate's answer achieves Level 4. The top mark in this level is awarded because the comparison in the opening paragraph is clear and well-supported from the sources.
- Total mark awarded = 6 out of 8**

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer achieved the top mark in Level 4 with valid sub-messages being compared. The answer then continued to explain that Source E showed the USA (or Kennedy) was getting the upper hand in the Crisis. This was a valid reading of Source E, however, the candidate's claim that Source D showed the two nations as equals was not correct. Source D mentioned that Khrushchev had just blinked and this suggested that he was showing weakness. As a result, this attempt by the candidate to reach Level 5 by comparing big messages was not successful.

Example Candidate Response – low

Examiner comments

4	<p>1 The sources primarily indicate a personal agenda that both Kruschev and Kennedy were pursuing.</p> <p>The Bay of Pigs invasion, conducted by the United States, made Soviet interference in the communist state of Cuba inevitable, considering the fact that USA failed to overthrow Castro and also had to admit full responsibility of attacks.</p> <p>Kruschev's intention by placing missiles in Cuba was to challenge American strength, ensure Cuba is protected, have weapons stationed closer to the United States and have the opportunity to bargain for concessions. Where in the Soviet Union would demand the removal of American troops from Turkey and Italy.</p> <p>Kennedy, despite having a number of options, decided to impose a naval quarantine on</p>
---	--

- 1 The candidate's answer is not valid in terms of 'a personal agenda'. The sources do not address this.

Example Candidate Response – low, continued

Examiner comments

	<p>Cuba.</p> <p>The weapons at were to be lifted and concessions were to be made based on who seemed more reasonable. Kennedy demanded that the Soviet Union retrieve its troops from Cuba while Kruschev retaliated by asking the United States to guarantee termination of interference in Cuba in return. This is indicated in the source where it is not clear who said the statement “I think the other fellow blinked”, indicating that neither of them were willing to back down.</p> <p>The circumstances under which conditions were made are also very critical, indicated by the fact that both the leaders are seated on missiles while the caption has a calmer undertone of “OK president, let's talk”.</p> <p>Kruschev seemed to be under a larger threat, as indicated in the source considering he is sweating more, due to the fact that USA had troops based in Turkey and Italy while Kennedy had also threatened. Kennedy too seems alarmed in the image due to the recent trade of nuclear weapons between USSR and Cuba.</p>
--	--

2 Up to this point, nearly all the answer consists of the candidate writing about the Cuban Missile Crisis rather than the two sources.

3 The candidate's answer is not valid for Source D.

4 The candidate's answer is about Source E and it is valid to say that this source suggests Khrushchev is in a weaker position. This places the answer in Level 3. There is a message from one source but no valid comparison of the messages of the two sources.

Total mark awarded =
3 out of 8

How the candidate could have improved their answer

At the end of the response, the candidate made a valid interpretation of one source. Source E suggested that Khrushchev was the weaker of the two. One way of improving this answer would have been to compare this point about Khrushchev with what Source D suggested about him. This could have led the candidate to realise that Source D agreed about Khrushchev being weaker (the remark that Khrushchev had just blinked). This would have been a Level 5 answer with the big messages compared. Being more precise in the opening paragraph would also have improved this answer. The candidate claimed that the two men were pursuing a personal agenda, which was not what the cartoons showed. However, a statement that both sources showed that the Crisis was a personal struggle between the two men would have raised the answer to Level 4 as a comparison of sub-messages.

Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- Some responses interpreted both sources separately but did not compare them.
- A number of answers focused on minor details in the sources without considering the main point being made by both authors.
- Some candidates misinterpreted Source D and therefore were unable to reach valid points of comparison.

Option B – Question 5

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

5	<p>Source G claims that the United States held a clear advantage over the Soviet Union. Much early and the U.S.S.R was incapable of attacking the U.S.A. But Source F clearly states that missiles placed in Cuba can easily attack and destroy key population centres such as Mexico City, Washington DC and New York. Thus Source G makes Source F surprising as President Kennedy states that cuba is an explicit threat to the U.S which source G contradicts by its claim that the U.S could annihilate the U.S.S.R faster and better.</p> <p>But Source G was published by a staunch Batista supporter who fled to the U.S. This makes Source G much more biased and helps us understand that the book is meant to make the Soviets less threatening and make the 'No invasion' pledge look foolish as the writer was heavily pro-invasion. Thus Source G does not make Source F surprising to a far extent.</p>	<p>1 The candidate's response understands the disagreement between Sources F and G and uses this to express surprise. This places the answer in Level 3.</p> <p>2 The candidate evaluates Source G in terms of its provenance and its purpose. The answer then states that because of these it cannot be used to make Source F surprising. Level 5.</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 7 out of 8</p>
---	--	---

How the candidate could have improved their answer

The candidate evaluated Source G and used this to state that it did not make Source F surprising. This placed the answer in Level 5. The candidate also needed to evaluate Source F. This could have been achieved by focusing on Kennedy's purpose. In his speech, Kennedy was trying to win the support of the American people for his actions over Cuba. This gave another reason why Source G did not make Source F surprising because Kennedy's speech made perfect sense in terms of his purpose at the time.

Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

5	<p>source G definitely makes source F surprising. Source F clearly states that the missiles were "an explicit threat to the peace and security of all Americans". However, source G argues that this is not true and that the US was more than capable of removing this threat in a matter of hours. However, the credibility of the arguments given in source G are questionable. For one it must be taken into consideration that source G was published in 1968 giving time for hindsight, while source F was released a few days after the crisis right after the missiles had been discovered. Kennedy's statement is therefore a natural and immediate reaction. Source G's claim that the USSR would be all but helpless in an attack from the US is flawed as Kennedy called off an airstrike against Cuba in fear of war between the US and USSR. For this reason source F is unsurprising and source G's contradictions have little impact on source F.</p>
1	
2	
3	

1 The candidate provides a good start to the answer. It reaches Level 3 by explaining how the two sources disagree and using this as a reason why Source G makes Source F surprising.

2 The candidate attempts to evaluate the two sources. The basis for this evaluation is that Source G was written with hindsight while Source F was written at the time and was a natural reaction. These attempts at evaluation do not consider the purpose or motive of the sources (for example) and are not sufficiently developed for Levels 5 or 6.

3 The candidate makes another attempt at evaluation. However, the argument that Source G's claim that the USSR would be helpless is flawed because Kennedy called off an airstrike on Cuba, does not work. The answer remains in Level 3.

**Total mark awarded =
4 out of 8**

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer started in Level 3 with an explanation of how the sources disagreed, which means Source G makes Source F surprising. Several attempts were made to evaluate the sources to demonstrate that Source G did not make Source F surprising. These did not work. The candidate understood what was required, but was unable to carry out the necessary evaluation. A more effective way of evaluating the sources would have been to focus on purpose. For instance, the author of Source G, as a supporter of Batista, was trying to show that the US could have easily destroyed the missiles and invaded Cuba. The fact that he had this purpose meant that Source G could not be trusted, and therefore could not be used to make Source F surprising.

Example Candidate Response – low

Examiner comments

5	<p>Upon finding out about the missiles based in Cuba, Kennedy had certain options he could have chosen to act upon. Those included, either being offensive or defensive. His options were to do nothing or to approach the UN for assistance; however the United States would have seemed weak in this case. He could have threatened Castro but that would have been ineffective. An airstrike or ground attack could have been in order yet seemed too risky after the Bay of Pigs invasion therefore Kennedy resorted to the only option left that was a quarantine which was deemed as an unprovoked act of aggression by Kruschev.</p> <p>On the contrary of the concerns portrayed by Kennedy in Source F, Kruschev had rather different intentions. Yes, he indeed wanted to test the American strength however had no intention of indulging in a nuclear warfare. His intentions included defense of Cuba, having weapons closer to the USA and primarily being able to bargain for concessions such as removal of American troops from Turkey and Italy.</p> <p>Concessions were made and in a rather peaceful manner, rather than what source C suggested would have been ideal. USSR removed missiles from Cuba on the condition that American interference would be terminated and later, USA abided and removed its troops from Turkey and Italy.</p>
---	---

1 The candidate makes no mention of the sources yet. Source F is not discussed and the response is not addressing the question. There is no valid response in the first paragraph.

2 Source F is mentioned, but only in passing. The candidate writes about Khrushchev's intentions rather than about the sources. This response has not yet reached Level 1.

3 The candidate makes an attempt to compare/link the two sources but no valid point is made. The answer fits the Level 1 descriptor – 'Writes about the sources but does not address the question'.

**Total mark awarded =
1 out of 8**

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer made limited use of the sources and the question was not addressed. The first step the candidate needed to make to improve their answer was to focus on what the two sources were saying. The next step was to find an agreement or disagreement between the two sources and use this as a reason for Source G either making or not making Source F surprising.

Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- A small number of responses compared and even evaluated the sources, but did not draw a conclusion about whether or not Source G made Source F surprising.
- Some responses made assertions about surprise without support or explanation.
- Some responses were limited because they were based on the assumption that finding a difference or agreement between the sources provided the full answer to the question.
- Where responses attempted evaluation, this was often less effective because it was based on the provenance of sources rather than on the purpose of their authors.

Option B – Question 6

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

<p>Q8)</p> <p>The sources that do provide convincing evidence that the Cuban missile crisis was simply about personal rivalry between Kennedy and Khrushchev are A, C, D and E</p> <p>Source A may not be very reliable as it is Kennedy speaking to an American reporter thus is heavily biased and meant to sway the public towards support of Kennedy. A states that Khrushchev acted with hostility in the 1961 Vienna summit as he sees Kennedy as weak, inexperienced, gullible and young according to Kennedy. Kennedy states that 'he cannot move forward until he removes these ideas' making the crisis a personal rivalry as Kennedy's pride is hurt by Khrushchev's perception of him and his policy throughout was motivated by proving Khrushchev</p>	<p>1 The candidate earns a bonus mark here for evaluation of Source A.</p> <p>2 The candidate gives a good explanation of Source A with effective use of source content. The candidate also explains how Source A supports the statement given in Question 6. Level 2.</p>
---	--

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

wrong and gaining respect.

Source C shows Kennedy and Khrushchev aggressively glaring at each other and Kennedy threatening Khrushchev. Castro is shown as tiny and insignificant and the focus is on how USA's nuclear missiles are bigger and more in number and pointed at Russia. The show of Kennedy being stronger makes the cartoon simply a personal rivalry with him and Khrushchev. Kennedy also directly addresses Khrushchev and not Castro; the threat is meant for Khrushchev but it is written.

3

Source D calls the crisis a 'historic showdown between' Khrushchev and Kennedy, directly highlighting the personal rivalry as the cartoon claims the crisis was about them and their individual power. They are 'eyeball to eyeball' in an intense battle.

4

Source F clearly states a personal rivalry as the two are arm wrestling traditionally a show of strength and great pride for a man. Both the leaders are glaring at each other with angry expressions whilst threatening each other with missiles. The arm wrestle makes it personal.

5

- 3 The candidate's response is not as clear as the explanation of Source A, but this comment on Source C is Level 2.

- 4 The candidate gives a good explanation of how Source D supports the statement.

- 5 The candidate provides a satisfactory explanation of how Source E supports the statement.

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

6

The sources that provide evidence that the Crisis was NOT simply a personal rivalry between the two leaders are B, F and G.

7

Source B claims Kennedy appealed directly to Khrushchev asking to help & compromise and whilst admitting his fear of a military takeover. This does not seem like a rival-like action as Kennedy did not have any pride. Whilst asking Khrushchev, Khrushchev also graciously helped without trying to avoid it. In the compromise Khrushchev negotiated for Cuba's independence proving it was also about that instead of a rivalry. This source is one-sided as it from Khrushchev memoirs, thus however it is not may be unreliable.

8

Source F states that the Crisis is about the peace and security of all Americans as the missiles provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere specifically Washington DC, Mexico City or any other city in south-eastern part of the US. It makes no mention of Khrushchev or USSR. However, it is from a speech of Kennedy announcing the blockade thus is meant for propaganda making it unreliable.

6 The candidate's response is not as clear as the explanation of Source A, but this comment on Source C is Level 2.

7 The candidate gives a good explanation of how Source D supports the statement.

8 The candidate provides a satisfactory explanation of how Source E supports the statement.

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

Source G explicitly states that the USA's & its amounts 'did not make it clear that it was a power confrontation' and that 'the leaders of both nations knew' that USA was 'undeniably more powerful than the USSR' (is a fact). This means the personal rivalry for power didn't exist during the crisis; Kennedy compromising makes it clearer that he was lenient with Khrushchev making it clearer it wasn't a personal rivalry.

9

In conclusion, these sources provide convincing evidence that the Cuban Missile Crisis was in fact simply about a personal rivalry between Kennedy and Khrushchev.

10

- 9** The candidate provides a satisfactory explanation of how Source G does not support the statement.

- 10** The candidate's answer is placed at the top of Level 3 (4 sources explained on one side, and 3 sources explained on the other side) with a bonus mark for evaluation.

**Total mark awarded =
11 out of 12**

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This was a very good answer with 11 marks out of 12 being awarded. Source content was used to support and challenge the statement in the question and Source A was evaluated effectively. To achieve 12 marks, the candidate needed another satisfactory evaluation of a source. A weak attempt was made to evaluate Source B. This would have been improved if the candidate had considered Khrushchev's purpose in context. For instance, it was possible to argue that 'This source cannot be trusted because it was written later when Khrushchev was trying to rescue his reputation after he had been toppled from power in the USSR because of his handling of the Cuban Missile Crisis'.

Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

6-	<p>After reading all the sources, this is very evident, that yes, Kruschev Kruschev and Kennedy took each other as more of a threat than the two nations to each other. We can also see how the various cartoons portray the rivalry between the two leaders much more than the rivalry in the Cold War between the two superpowerful countries. All sources do portray this, except source F and source G.</p> <p>In sources D and E we see how both the cartoonists try to express Kruschev and Kennedy trying to face off each other rather than doing it as as representatives of each other's countries.</p> <p>In no source, have we seen that Kruschev has referred to his opposition as 'USA' or Kennedy referring to his opposition as Kennedy as 'the USSR'.</p> <p>In source A, we see how Kennedy thought that Kruschev was taking advantage of the fact that the new president of the United States was young and inexperienced.</p> <p>We can see, in source B, that Kruschev wanted Kennedy to be reassured from his power when he knew that the military commanders would overthrow</p>
----	---

- 1 The candidate's first few lines contain general assertions, with no use of specific sources.
- 2 The candidate's response attempts to use Source D and Source E to support the statement in question. However, the use of source content is weak. More specific detail from the sources is needed to support points.
- 3 The candidate provides no specific use of sources.
- 4 The candidate makes just enough use of Source A to get into Level 2.
- 5 This statement is not correct.

	<p>Kennedy if the situation stayed longer. Hence, through these two sources, it is evident that Kruschev actually considered Kennedy as a rival rather than the entire nation being a rival to the US.</p> <p>It is only in sources F and G where we see the references of the 'USSR' and 'USA' more than the references of 'Kennedy' and 'Kruschev'. Hence, in the Cuban Missile Crisis can evidently be considered as a portrayal of personal rivalry between Kennedy and Kruschev.</p>
--	--

- 6 The candidate does not give enough source use and explanation to move the answer into Level 3.
- 7 The candidate demonstrates weak use of sources to try to explain that they support the statement. A low Level 2 answer.

Total mark awarded =
4 out of 12

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This answer attempted to explain how some sources supported the statement and others did not. Much of the answer was focused on support. The answer was placed at the bottom of Level 2. To improve this answer, the candidate needed to explain more thoroughly how sources support or do not support the statement. It was necessary to use the source content to support the point being made. For example, ‘Source F does not support this statement. This is because Kennedy focuses on the threat the missiles in Cuba pose to American cities. He is interested in the threat to the country and people of the USA and does not mention any personal rivalry with Khrushchev’.

Example Candidate Response – low

Examiner comments

B	6	<p>The sources are not convincing enough to prove that it was just a rivalry between 2 people. The 3 nations were involved in this crisis, countless lives were in danger.</p> <p>more than a rivalry it was a competition to get more powerful, stable, advanced and prosperous than the other, Kennedy and Khrushchev are a small part of this competition between nations.</p> <p>if it were a personal rivalry both countries as Kennedy and Khrushchev would have fought hard on of the instead of involving small nation like Cuba, Vietnam and Korea. The struggle of power between the nations caused a lot of damage to other nations this was the cold war between USA and Russia.</p> <p>Kennedy's and Khrushchev's rivalry had little to no significance in this war. for</p> <p>having said that this it is evident that it was just another conflict where USSR had the upper hand and Kennedy managed to even the score, which indeed made him a respected president of the USA.</p>
---	---	---

1 The candidate's response starts with vague assertions about the sources with no use of source detail. Level 1.

2 The candidate makes no use of sources.

3 No use of source content. The candidate addresses the statement in Question 6 and so achieves Level 1.

Total mark awarded =
1 out of 12

How the candidate could have improved their answer

This candidate addressed the statement about the Cuban Missile Crisis being about personal rivalry but did not make valid use of the sources. They needed to use the content of sources to explain whether they supported the statement or not. For instance, Source E supports the statement and shows that the Crisis was really about personal rivalry. It shows Khrushchev and Kennedy face to face having an arm wrestle. This strongly implies that the Crisis was a trial of strength and determination between the two men.

Common mistakes candidates made in this question

- Some answers were not based on the sources and were written from contextual knowledge instead.
- Many responses made assertions that the sources supported or challenged the statement but lacked an explanation which was based on the content of the source.
- A small number of responses analysed the sources without making it clear whether or not they supported the statement.
- Some misread the statement and, as a result, used the sources to test a slightly different statement from the one given in Question 6.
- There were a number of one-sided answers which only explained how sources supported the statement or only explained how they did not support the statement.
- In some cases, responses did not make it clear which source they were using by referring to the source letter or provenance.

Cambridge Assessment International Education
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA, United Kingdom
t: +44 1223 553554
e: info@cambridgeinternational.org www.cambridgeinternational.org