

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

Many candidates were well prepared for the examination in both historical knowledge with understanding and also examination technique. These candidates produced answers clearly focused on the demands of individual questions. Candidates who had a sound understanding of the historical topics they had studied were able to order their knowledge to meet the slightly different emphasis that a number of questions posed.

In a significant minority of instances candidates demonstrated misunderstanding in relation to historical knowledge and lacked an awareness of the techniques required to present a successful answer. These responses were characterised by a display of historical knowledge related to the area of content of the question but showed an inability to relate this material to the question as set.

Many Centres find the layout of the syllabus helpful in ensuring a sound grounding for their candidates. Candidates are expected to show an understanding of the Key Questions and Focus Points which appear in the syllabus and should be capable of developing these through relevant historical examples.

Despite the improvements in more recent years, this year saw the return of many extended answers to **part (a)** questions. To gain maximum credit does not require lengthy description but more a clarity of thought that identifies four pieces of information. Maximum credit can also be achieved by the development of two of the points. In answering **part (b)** of a question, candidates' attempts generally produced an appropriate response. It is worth noting here that maximum marks can be gained through four correct explanations. Additionally the maximum can be achieved by the production of two well-developed explanations which contain significant supporting detail. Answers to (c) parts of a question require an explanation of the issues, with the explanation being linked to the question. An example of where candidates failed to do this was in **Question 6(c)** where appeasement was often explained in terms of benefits to Britain, France and Germany, rather than as to why it might have been partially responsible for war.

The nature of **part (c)** of a question requires candidates to construct an argument to support and challenge the hypothesis. To this end it is commendable that some Centres encourage candidates to plan responses before writing the final version. This does produce more coherent arguments with a more logical flow through each inter-related argument. In some instances, however, the planning was longer than the actual answer and in these instances it is hard to identify the benefit gained by the candidate. Disappointingly, some candidates failed to challenge the question, writing only about one side of the argument. This approach limits significantly the marks available.

This session brought a number of comments from Examiners about the presentation of responses from candidates where single sheets are being used. It was noted that on a significant number of occasions the single sheets were presented in the wrong order. Candidates should realise that whilst Examiners will endeavour to put the answers into the correct order it is not their responsibility. Additionally, where string is used, it should be of appropriate length so that it does not become undone and should be tied securely whilst allowing the script pages to be accessed. Centres do not need to include the question papers with the candidates' work, nor should answers be written on the question paper.

Comments on specific questions

The comments which follow do not imply that a question was answered badly. They are intended to help Centres in improving the preparation of their candidates. Comments are not made on every part of every question written about.

Core Questions

Question 1

This question was tackled by a very, very small number of candidates but they showed good knowledge and, indeed, flair. **Part (a)** posed few problems, and some candidates could have been awarded more than five marks had more marks been available. In (b) they were better on the military aspects than the political and diplomatic. Answers to (c) showed they had more to write on Cavour than Garibaldi but, nevertheless, found an argument and counter-argument. Cavour was the more important in their view with diplomatic skill being rated higher than passion and commitment to the cause. These responses were very enjoyable to read.

Questions 2 and 3 failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be helpful.

Question 4

This question attracted a good number of candidates but was not well done. In **part (a)**, some candidates confused the Entente with the Triple Entente or named states that were members of the Alliance. In (b), confusion again existed between the two Moroccan crises with many writing about events relating to 1911, the gunboat Panther and the port of Agadir. Many of the more successful candidates were aware that the 1905 crisis spilled over into a conference in 1906 and were given credit for this. In (c), candidates were required to focus on two aspects only. Some were able to do it though they were usually better on German militarism than on the rise of Serbia. Many answers lacked sufficient explanation. The rise of Serbia was mainly linked to the assassination and German militarism needed to be developed beyond 'there was an arms race between Britain and Germany and they built Dreadnoughts'. Even those who could develop their answers more often failed to argue the relationship to war.

Question 5

The most popular question in **Section A**, after **Question 6**. Many found it easy to gain five marks for (a) and they could have gained more. It was particularly pleasing to find a good number who did know about the slaves in Sierra Leone, the death rate on the Tanganyika railway and the Turkish refugee camps. Perhaps as a result of being well-versed, many produced over-long answers that did not gain extra credit. Weaker answers were characterised by a lack of understanding of what constituted 'humanitarian'. Whilst many knew of the commissions involved, they were less aware of the work they did. Many mentioned mandates for which credit was not given. Some good answers to (b) were seen, although there was a tendency to devote too much time to describing events and even introducing failures. Clearly, by their inclusion in many answers there are Centres where the candidates are taught that the Locarno Treaties and the Kellogg-Briand Pact were successes of the League. In (c) most candidates wrote about the Depression, often at length and often irrelevantly dealing with the Wall Street Crash. Others correctly wrote about economic collapse leading to tension, or, better, the pursuit of self-interest, or the futility of imposing sanctions. Some candidates cleverly used the diplomatic and political issues that Britain and France had to resolve in the 1930s as a counter-argument to Japan's and Italy's economic problems and easily secured high marks. There were a number of areas where candidates demonstrated misunderstanding. For example, the statement 'The League did nothing' was often used in relation to both Manchuria and Abyssinia without any further development. Also there were some who thought the League of Nations was to blame for the Depression. On occasions candidates used the general problems of the League as their counter-argument and rarely did they do more than list them: absence of USA, the assembly met only once a year, the veto etc. Many think that the assembly was the key institution in dealing with political problems. Many stated that the League failed because neither of the super powers were members (forgetting that the USSR joined in 1934) or because Germany and the USSR never joined.

Question 6

This was the most popular question in the core and many good answers were seen by Examiners. In response to **part (a)**, there were many answers containing full detail and often going unnecessarily into explanation, making answers too long. Some held a misunderstanding of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles regarding the demilitarised zone and thus in these answers remilitarisation was understood to mean rearmament. Additionally there are some candidates who think that Hitler was recovering territory lost by Germany in 1919. The quality of answers to (b) varied considerably. Whilst there were many good answers, there was a tendency to describe what Hitler did rather than offer explanations of reasons for uniting. Many thought Austria was lost during the First World War, whilst others thought the Anschluss was part of Hitler's policy of lebensraum. Some confusion existed over 'German speakers' and 'German

nationals'. In (c), the vast majority of candidates were fully aware of appeasement with many candidates showing a detailed knowledge of its workings being able to link this to the outbreak of war in 1939. One of the concerns concerning to many Examiners was that, despite the question, candidates were determined to write about appeasement as if the question was asking for the 'reasons for appeasement'. This approach quite often resulted in candidates ignoring other reasons for war.

Question 7

This was a popular question. Most candidates secured high marks for Yalta, sometimes within the first two lines of their responses if they wrote of the division of Germany and Berlin. Occasionally there was confusion with the Potsdam Conference. Many candidates knew about the Marshall Plan and the better candidates wrote well about how the Plan served US economic interests, with America having to create markets if it was to thrive. Additionally, the anti-Communist purpose was generally well developed. In (c) most candidates were stronger on Truman and USA than on Stalin, though many chose to write at too great a length on ideological differences. There was, for some, a tendency to go beyond the initial causes to write about Cuba, Korea and Vietnam and the 'domino theory'.

Question 8

Most who attempted this question gained good marks for (a), showing a sound knowledge of the structure. The key to answering (b) and (c) is that candidates do have to be clear in their minds about the role and aims of the UN and the Cold War period. If candidates cannot distinguish between the two, then the UN is lost sight of in the need to get as much as possible on paper about fighting communism. In the responses to (b), there was more on the USA's ambitions than on the UN's, although there was often reference to the absence of the USSR. For **part (c)** many resorted to narrative but when an argument was attempted it usually ended in the defeat of communism in South Korea, thereby bringing success to the UN.

Depth Studies

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-45

Question 9

Part (a) should have been a question that most candidates could have scored four to five marks on. Not only are there obvious things to say about the role in terms of control opposition meetings, but also the role of the SA during the Munich Putsch and the passing of the Enabling Act. Many candidates confused the SA with the Gestapo and the SS. After acknowledging the question candidates were keen to rush on to write about something else, in this case the Night of the Long Knives. So, although there were candidates who scored well, it was disappointing that more did not secure high marks. In (b) the reasons for the failure of the Putsch were often more prominent than the reasons for it (the question) and few candidates could resist the temptation to refer to Hitler's trial, jail sentence and realisation that the path to power was through democratic means. Most candidates referred to seizing power, some would go on to say that the time was right, giving reasons why in relation to the Treaty and the events of 1923. It was encouraging that a tiny minority remembered Mussolini's march on Rome. In responding to **part (c)**, there were candidates who confused the emergency powers, which Hitler used in the aftermath of the Fire, with the Enabling Act. Therefore the Enabling Act was used to deal with the Communists when what was meant were the emergency powers. Another error was the belief, quite widely held, that in the elections following the Fire, the Nazis secured a majority in the Reichstag, rather than being the largest party.

Question 10

Very, very few candidates knew what autarky was. Hitler's policy towards the Jews and Hitler's policy for employment were the most common suggestions. **Part (b)** provoked thought and overall produced many good responses. Questions on Germany's young people seem to elicit descriptive responses and this year was no exception in answers to (c). Some candidates found it difficult to relate what they knew – and a good number knew about the different opposition groups – to the question. In addition to the opposition groups there was much detailed description of the changed School curriculum and the Hitler Youth but it was as if candidates were just repeating verbatim what had been learnt. For example, following a good description of indoctrination in Schools, many candidates were quite happy to accept, without comment, that young people willingly followed the Nazi policies.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-41**Question 11**

This question was generally well done. Winners and losers in the civil war appears to be a well known topic and high marks were not unusual. With War Communism, the emphasis in candidates' answers was more on the peasants than on industry but, nevertheless, high marks were achieved. In (c) the difficulty was not in knowing much about the New Economic Policy but was more to do with how to measure its success, though most candidates did score reasonably well and most looked at opposition to non-communist ideas for their counter-argument.

Question 12

Answers to (a) saw many candidates relying on the source material for the basis of their response, with some able to build on this in a meaningful way. Those who looked to their own knowledge mentioned Trotsky's military activities during the civil war and what they had to tell us about his leadership qualities. There were many good efforts to answer (b), although there was some over-reliance on Trotsky's absence from Lenin's funeral and the implications of this. For many, Stalin's strong power base was developed to show its significance. Less obvious was 'socialism in one country'. The main weakness in responses to (c), was the preoccupation with description - long essays on what terror was all about and long essays on propaganda, but limited attempts to turn descriptions into explanatory or analytical points.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-41**Question 13**

A very popular question, with most candidates experiencing few problems with **part (a)**. Many produced very good responses. Particularly encouraging was the sound economic understanding that was displayed in relation to prices. Responses to (b) were characterised by references to cotton in competition with man-made fibres, and coal and oil in competition with electricity, but little in relation to a consumer-led society. **Part (c)** was well done, with candidates being well versed on government policy as opposed to the development of consumerism and new methods of production.

Question 14

Surprisingly there was only limited mention of labour saving devices in responses to (a), with candidates concentrating on the flapper and her lifestyle. Most candidates did well. For (b), the key factors of more leisure, more money and the introduction of the talkies dominated answers, although explanation at times was rather brief. In answering (c), some candidates seemed to get themselves into a muddle. They clearly had much to say but found difficulty in isolating details relevant to corruption from other factors. It is important that in the examination thought is given to the marshalling of material so that it is presented relevantly and coherently.

Questions 15 to 19 failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be helpful.

Question 20

In answering (a), candidates were uncertain of the actual problems, resorting to fairly general, but credit worthy, responses about attempted Jewish immigration and Arab opposition. More subtle aspects such as Irgun activity and US pressure were not in evidence. For (b), candidates tended to have an awareness of the key issues but often struggled to present them with supported explanation. They were comfortable with the post-war pressures on the UK and the Irgun violence, but seemed unaware of the Arab policy stance on partition, despite having sometimes implied it in **part (a)** answers. Candidates in answering **part (c)** showed a good understanding of one or two key points on each side of the argument, but struggled to get beyond Level 4, 5 marks because of a lack of support detail.

Question 21

For (a), most candidates were well-briefed on the specific territorial changes, but only the candidates considered the wider strategic and psychological benefits. In response to (b), too many answers focused on the timing of the war, and Israel's lack of preparedness, rather than Arab motivation and intention. Answers about the Arab position were too often limited to description relating to the reclamation of territory or explanation relating to Sadat needing to prove himself. Answers to **part (c)** were less strong with some candidates often struggling with the question. Some candidates suggested the provision of arms for the USSR, whilst other candidates tended to know Camp David for the USA, but not much else. The best candidates still struggled to unravel the complexities of the Soviet Union's position, or knew how to argue a mutual contribution (e.g. over initial recognition, or in respect of 1956 UN proposals).

Questions 22 to 25 failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be helpful.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The overwhelming majority of candidates were entered for the 20th Century topic although the answers to the 19th Century questions were slightly better. Although there were plenty of excellent scripts with candidates showing the ability to interpret, evaluate and use historical skills with understanding and skill, the overall performance was not an improvement on that in previous years. The candidates clearly fall into one of two groups: those who are familiar with the requirements of this paper and those who are not. The latter made a number of fairly common mistakes and demonstrated a series of weaknesses. These are listed and discussed below:

(i) some candidates never got to grips with the question set. Their answers summarised the sources and wrote about the historical context but failed to address the question directly. Some tried to answer the question in the last few lines of their answers after a page or more of description and narrative. Candidates should be encouraged to answer the question in the first line of their answers and then spend the rest of their answers using the sources and contextual knowledge in support. For example, if they are asked whether or not one source supports another, they should answer this in the first sentence instead of spending pages telling the Examiner what the sources say. This approach does require candidates to think through the questions and the sources before putting pen to paper - rough notes are allowed.

(ii) some candidates do not fully understand that this paper is designed to test their ability to interpret, evaluate and use historical sources. All the questions are about the sources. However, some candidates almost ignore the sources and write about the events. The first move candidates make in their answers should be directed at analysing and using the sources. Contextual knowledge should be used to help interpret or evaluate the sources. It should never be included for its own sake. Contextual knowledge is only rewarded by Examiners when it is used to analyse the sources more satisfactorily.

(iii) when two sources are used together in the same question, candidates should use them together. Even if the question does not explicitly ask the candidates to compare the sources (e.g. **Question 5** 20th Century topic), the fact that they are used together in the same questions suggests that comparing them will be a useful way forward. Using them separately will always lead to a less good answer.

(iv) candidates are still struggling with 'usefulness' questions. They should not dismiss sources as being useless because they think they are biased. Instead, they should consider what the source tells them about the purpose, attitudes or beliefs of the author or artist of the source. At the very least they should use what the source says, instead of dismissing it.

(v) cartoons still present problems for candidates in some Centres. Candidates should be given regular opportunities to discuss and evaluate cartoons during lessons. They should be encouraged to go beyond what cartoons appear to say on the surface. It is worth pointing out to candidates that the real message of a cartoon is often opposite to what it appears to say on the surface. They should also be encouraged to look for the 'big' message of cartoons - what is the main point the cartoonist wants to make? Too often, candidates are sidetracked by minor details in cartoons.

(vi) it is surprising and disappointing that so many candidates are still struggling with **Question 6**. The most important point they need to understand about this question is that it is about the sources. They are being asked to test the hypothesis against the sources and not against their knowledge of the topic. There will always be some sources that support the hypothesis and some that disagree with it. Candidates need to explain which sources fall in which category. They must explain how a source e.g. supports the hypothesis. It is not enough to summarise a source and then assert that it supports the hypothesis. Extra marks are awarded for evaluation of the sources and this is where candidates' contextual knowledge can be used. It should not be used to replace the sources.

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

This question was answered reasonably well. A large number of candidates were able to spot the agreements or differences between the two sources and the better candidates explained both. Gioberti sees advantages in a political confederation under the Pope but does not want to go as far as Mazzini who wants a united Italy. Both want Italy to be strong and independent but Gioberti wants to preserve the independence of the individual states.

Question 2

Only a few candidates compared the surface details of the sources. Most were able to identify a basic similarity - they are both about Italians moving into action and acting against foreigners. However, Source C is about one city whereas Source D is about the whole of Italy as an entity. The best candidates compared the viewpoints of the two artists e.g. Source D clearly shows approval of the process of Italy being aware of its existence as one nation.

Question 3

A few candidates attempted to answer this question by applying some simplistic evaluation e.g. Source F is unreliable because it was written later. Most were able to use the evidence in each source to conclude how far each supported Italian nationalism, and an encouraging number noted the reluctance, or uncertainty, of Leopold II. These candidates often brought in contextual knowledge, particularly about Charles Albert, to further develop their answer.

Question 4

Most candidates were able to achieve a reasonable mark by comparing the different impressions given of Pius IX in the two sources. The better candidates brought in their contextual knowledge. Some used this to explain why they were not at all surprised by what Pius IX says in Source I, while the best candidates applied their knowledge to both sources, explaining not only why Garibaldi had such high expectations of the Pope in Source G, but also why these expectations were always unrealistic.

Question 5

This question was not answered well. Most candidates explained how the two sources disagree rather than why they disagree. This mistake may have been due to careless reading of the question as the two men, Metternich and Mazzini, should have been known by candidates. The two had such different views about nationalism that candidates should have been able to explain why they disagree in the sources.

Question 6

Most candidates were able to achieve a reasonable mark by explaining how some sources support the view given, and others disagree with it. The main weakness was a tendency to summarise the content of a source and then simply assert that it supports or disagrees with the statement. This does not constitute proper explanation and is not rewarded as such.

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

For a good number of candidates this question provided a good start to the paper. They compared the two sources, noted the main differences, and explained that Source A did make them surprised by Source B. The explanation for such surprise was straightforward - Source A tells us about the superior American weapons and technology but Source B shows that this had little impact as the Viet Cong were not demoralised by such overwhelming fire power. However, there were some candidates, perhaps too many, who failed to follow this straightforward path. Some simply wrote about how surprised they were by Source A and ignored Source B, while others claimed that they were not surprised by either source because they simply describe what happened. The weakest candidates failed to say whether or not they were surprised and merely summarised each source. There are two important lessons to be drawn from the answers to this

Question (i): candidates should say whether they are surprised or not in the first sentence of their answer. If they should then use the rest of the answer to explain why they are surprised or not surprised, and if candidates are asked to use two sources together, they must do so - failing to do so puts the high mark out of reach.

Question 2

Although there were plenty of good answers to this question, a large minority of candidates struggled with this cartoon. Some claimed that it is saying that the US was genuinely trying to make things up to the Vietnamese. Other candidates thought it was criticising the Americans for spending too much money on compensating the Vietnamese. A not inconsiderable number of candidates almost ignored the cartoon altogether and wrote an answer about My Lai. Candidates must understand that every question on this paper is about the sources. The cartoon is, of course, criticising the Americans for their brutality and for worrying more about money than human lives. The top level in the mark scheme was reserved for candidates who saw the hypocrisy of Johnson. He is saying he cares and is giving them a lot of money, but he does not really care and is paying them a pittance for a human life – especially compared to the amount the US is spending on the war everyday. A number of candidates who took this paper would benefit from exposure to far more cartoons and from help in working out the big, main message of cartoons. It might help some of them if they can grasp the essential point that cartoons are often saying the opposite to what they appear to be saying on the surface.

Question 3

To answer this question well candidates first needed to understand each source. Source D clearly presents more of a challenge and a sizeable minority of candidates misunderstood it. The cartoon cannot be taken literally. Although it says at the bottom that the people were to blame for the loss of the war, this is not the message of the cartoonist. He has put these words into the mouth of Kissinger. If what he is saying is viewed with the rest of the cartoon it becomes clear that they are all blaming someone else – as Kissinger is. The real point the cartoonist is making is that the leaders were to blame and not the people.

Surprisingly, Source E was misinterpreted by some candidates. They were obviously surprised by what it said about the American public supporting the war and could not accept it. Instead they read it as saying that the people were against the war. These misinterpretations led weaker candidates to conclude that the author of Source E would have agreed with the cartoonist because they both blame the people. This is exactly the opposite to a good answer, as both are saying that the American people were not to blame and the leaders were. It was encouraging to see a reasonable number of candidates get this far but the gap between them and the rest of the candidates in coping with these sources was enormous.

Question 4

A number of good candidates understood that these two sources are useful for something other than their surface content. Source F is useful evidence about the tactics used by Pham Van Dong and Source G provides useful evidence about the propaganda methods of the Viet Cong in using the list and stories of Viet Cong heroes. This approach shows how the provenance of sources can be used in 'usefulness' questions. However, there are still a good number of candidates who used the provenance of the sources to simply dismiss them e.g. Source F is biased because it is from North Vietnam, therefore it cannot be useful. Usefulness questions should encourage candidates to ask themselves 'useful for what?' Often a source is useful for what it tells us about the person who produced it. There were a number of candidates in the middle range who used the sources for the information they provide - these were placed in the middle part of the mark scheme.

Question 5

A number of candidates used the sources separately. They were still able to achieve a reasonable mark by considering whether he was lying in each source. However, the point of putting these two sources together in the same question was that they appear to show McNamara saying something very different in one compared to what he is saying in the other. Some candidates were able to see this difference and concluded that he must be lying. The best candidates either reconciled what is said in the two sources or used their contextual knowledge to explain the different circumstances in 1964 and 1967 as a way of showing that he had to change his mind because of changing events - so he was not lying.

Question 6

Many answers to this question were disappointing. Candidates are meant to use the sources to support a hypothesis. There will always be some sources supporting the hypothesis and some disagreeing with it. There were a number of weaknesses in the answers: (i) some candidates ignored the sources and wrote an essay about how the US lost the war, (ii) some appeared to be checking a different hypothesis from the one given, (iii) some were able to identify which sources fall on each side, but instead of carefully explaining how each source supports or disagrees with the hypothesis they simply made assertions about this, (iv) some candidates simply ran through each source in turn, summarising what each one said. **Question 6** was answered less well than in previous years. It is important that candidates have the requirements of this question explained to them.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

The number of Centres using the coursework option remained about the same as last year. Most of the candidates produced good thoughtful work that had been carefully targeted on the appropriate assessment objectives. Many Centres make use of the CIE exemplar tasks and mark schemes. This does help to ensure that the assignments being used are appropriate and that the marking is carried out to a common standard. A few Centres had their marks changed by the CIE Coursework Moderator, but the changes were relatively minor. Reductions in marks were more common than increases. However, it is clear that there is a general agreement over the standard appropriate for IGCSE.

Marks were reduced on Assignment 1 more frequently than on Assignment 2. This was usually because too many marks were awarded when candidates were failing to produce genuine explanation or because not enough was being demanded in terms of explaining short and long-term causes or prioritising causes.

High marks should not be awarded for detailed and accurate descriptions or narratives. Candidates need to explain how causes actually contributed to bringing about a certain outcome. When analysing short and long term causes, candidates should consider the different functions of these different types. Some appear to think that a short term cause simply comes closer to the event being caused. However, for the higher levels in the mark scheme, it is important that candidates demonstrate some understanding of the different nature and role of these two types of causes. It might help candidates if the terms 'preconditions' and 'triggers' are used instead of short and long term. Finally, when candidates are asked to explain if they think one cause was more important than another they need to directly compare the importance of the two causes rather than write about each separately and then simply assert that one is more important than the other.

Much good work was produced for Assignment 2 and the marking was usually accurate.

Many Centres annotate the candidates' work in detail and this is much appreciated by the Moderator. It makes the job of moderation much more straightforward when it is clear where, and why, marks have been awarded.

It is a pleasure to see so much good work by candidates, most of whom have clearly put much careful thinking and hard effort into their coursework.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/04

Alternative to Coursework

General Comments.

Examiners once again reported an overall improvement in the quality of answers. Indeed, some scripts showed that many candidates did not only have a good understanding of the way that source-based questions should be answered but they also had considerable knowledge with which to answer the knowledge-based questions. Where candidates achieved less well, they usually scored better on the source-based questions but there were still problems encountered here, as will become clear below. In answers to **Questions (a) (iii)**, it was good to see that many candidates were aware that the provenances of sources could play an important part in the evaluation of the sources' utility, using tests for reliability. It was sad to find that many of the observations and tests were incomplete, 'stock' and did not attract either the Level or mark for a full evaluation. Some, when evaluating both sources used in Depth Study A, commented that these were memories of people present at the time 'so they would know' what had happened. Candidates must appreciate that better tests can be applied by using comments on date, place, motive, purpose, tone and language, cross-reference to show reliability, or the use of supporting and relevant contextual knowledge. There were still candidates, who used the information in Sources A and B to encourage them to answer by long essays, using contextual knowledge only rather than answer the questions that had been set on the sources provided.

As with previous seasons of examination, Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945, was overwhelmingly the most popular option, with Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941, chosen in about equal measure by far fewer candidates and Centres. In the vast majority of cases the scripts were well set out and neatly written so that all that the candidates wished to say was accessible to the Examiners. However, there were some scripts written in very small handwriting or in pale ink which made the Examiners' task a little more difficult. There were a number of rubric infringements, with a few candidates attempting more than one Depth Study.

Comments on specific questions.

Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945.

In answers to **Question (a) (i)**, candidates usually found it easy to draw one or more valid inferences from Source A with regard to the population using goods rather than money during the German hyperinflation, and that the whole population was involved in this barter. Inferences were supported from the source. However, **Question (a) (ii)** was not answered as well by a substantial number of candidates. The question asked how far the source showed that people were harmed by hyperinflation. Many interpreted this as meaning German people and crafted their answers to show that Germans could not afford to go to restaurants, had little money and were envious. They sometimes deployed the information about Swiss visitors but did not argue that the Swiss were benefiting from German hyperinflation. There were some competent answers about the comparable utility of the sources (**Question (a) (iii)**), but many fell into providing 'stock' evaluation, as described above, or by comparing the content of the sources. A small minority, and this applies to all Depth Studies, wrote generally that it depended what you wanted the sources to prove and did not make a specific evaluation or a specific comment on any source detail.

Reparations were generally understood and there were many maximum marks awarded (**Question (b) (i)**). Equally, there was excellent detail from many candidates about what happened when the French occupied the Ruhr in 1923 (**Question (b) (ii)**). Even weaker candidates were able to score well on this question. However, answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were much weaker on why there was a putsch in Munich in 1923 and why it failed. It was rare to find a full explanation to both parts of the question and the overall impression was that knowledge was incomplete in the two areas. Of course, there were some scripts that showed good knowledge but not from as many candidates who scored well on the previous question. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** varied from the full and balanced reaction as to how far the Weimar government had

achieved political and economic stability by 1929 to partial answers. Some concentrated on political events, some only, some concentrated on economic events, others had not left sufficient time to develop answers in sufficient detail, and a substantial minority did not relate any events after 1923.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941.

Source A (**Question (a) (i)**) was well understood by most candidates who correctly drew inferences about the titanic task that faced Stalin in turning a peasant society into an industrialised country. They also appreciated that unpleasant decisions would have to be made and people could be hurt. Candidates were able to quote information from Source B in their answers to **Question (a) (ii)** showing a balance of evidence on the question of how far the process of collectivisation had been successful. The answers to this question often attracted marks available for the attainment of the highest Level. Among the answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, which often compared the content of the sources, were a few very thoughtful efforts which centred on the use of the word 'Comrade' in Source A. While some saw it as proof that the writer had worked with or knew Stalin, others suggested that the ironical or sarcastic use of the word showed that the author was not an admirer of Stalin's, further shown by the dismissive comment that 'a few million' dying was of little consequence.

Most candidates were able to demonstrate that they knew who the Kulaks were (**Question (b) (i)**), and many were awarded a maximum mark. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** were also good and full, but weaker candidates tended to concentrate solely on the agricultural aspects, and some confused the New Economic Policy with War Communism. There were many full answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons for the introduction of collectivisation and it was clear that many candidates had an excellent grasp of the general background and command over the detail. There were many long and detailed answers to the extent that Stalin's rule to 1941 had improved the lives of the Russian people. At the higher end of quality, the answers were again impressive. However, weaker candidates saw the benefits only as improvement in heavy industrial production etc. when the question was about the Russian people. Some candidates failed to show the link between the Five Year Plans and improvements for ordinary Russians. The negative side of purges, working conditions, deaths etc. was very well known. Again, some candidates did not leave themselves sufficient time to develop a strong answer – many of these wrote briefly on both sides of the argument.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941.

While many candidates drew valid inferences from the cartoon detail in Source A about agriculture in the USA in 1933, some candidates were confused by the evidence and did not score well at all. Some even suggested the character of FDR in the cartoon showed that he was being blamed for the failings of agriculture. Some were provoked by the evidence of the cartoon to write much detail on the problems of agriculture from their own contextual knowledge and made minimal reference to the source detail that had provoked them. Candidates had no such problems with Source B in their answers to **Question (a) (ii)**. Most found a balance of evidence in the source to quote in support of their assertions on whether the New Deal had been successful by 1938. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, on the comparative usefulness of the two sources as evidence about the New Deal programme, had many comparing detail. There were some who gave 'stock' cartoon comments about Source A. However, there were some interesting attempts at evaluation of Source B, largely centring on the provenance of it being taken from a 1938 Roosevelt 'fireside chat'. While some said that the source could not be fully trusted because Roosevelt was talking about his own New Deal programme, others showed that, despite it being a 'fireside chat', Roosevelt gave a balance of successes and failures, admitting there was more to be done etc. Sensible comments were also made about the tone of the piece and the purpose of 'fireside chats'.

Most answers to **Question (b) (i)** were disappointing and it was rare to find an adequate definition of sharecropping. **Question (b) (ii)** was often answered partially, with candidates commenting that the drought stopped crops growing and left little water for livestock. Few went on to mention the dustbowl, and the movements of population as a result of the drought. A few candidates mentioned 'Okies' and explained the reference. Much more was known about the reasons for the setting up of the Tennessee Valley Authority (**Question (b) (iii)**) and much relevant and detailed knowledge was used to help to explain the reasons for its foundation. The response to the quotation in **Question (b) (iv)**, that the greatest success of the New Deal was its effect on farming, was interesting. While some candidates immediately denied that farming was a great success and concentrated on alternative areas of the New Deal programme, others compared the successes in the farming area and compared them to other areas' of success or failure in the New Deal as a whole. Yet another group compared the more successful parts of the farming with the less successful parts of the farming programme. All treatments were legitimate responses to the question, although the first alternative risked being classed as a one-sided argument.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990.

Too few legitimate attempts were made on this Depth Study in this season of examinations for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.

A few Centres and candidates had prepared for and attempted this Depth Study, and almost invariably the candidates performed much better on the source-based questions than on the knowledge-based questions. Having said that, a large proportion of the candidates were stimulated by Source A to give much detail of how the Pass Laws worked in general and much of this information was irrelevant to **Question (a) (i)**. Candidates performed much better on **Question (a) (ii)**, and many found a balance of evidence in Source B on the issue of opposition to the Pass Laws by Africans. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** very rarely exceeded a straight comparison of the content of the two sources.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** rarely provided a South African Prime Minister of the 1960s. However, many candidates wrote long and accurate descriptions of the events at Sharpeville on 21 March 1960. Some went far beyond the stated date in their descriptions but most scored well on this question. Only a small minority understood the issue of South Africa becoming a republic in 1961 (**Question (b) (iii)**), preferring to place this development in the post release era of Nelson Mandela and the elections that followed his release. The problem with answers to **Question (b) (iv)** was that most candidates did not pay attention to the date restrictions in the question of the 1960s and 1970s. Hence some wrote all they knew from any period of the twentieth century.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994.

This Depth Study was attempted by the candidates of a few Centres and they produced some superior answers and scripts at times. Answers to **Question (a) (i)**, using the chant from Palestinian children, had candidates drawing valid inferences regarding the early indoctrination of children, their passion to defend their homeland and the willingness to shed blood in its defence. Equally, the answers to **Question (a) (ii)** were handled thoroughly and with good balance. Some of the arguments regarding whether the source showed Palestinians were not terrorists were succinct and persuasive. Also, some candidates managed to test both sources for reliability (**Question (a) (iii)**), suggesting that the Palestinian children would have little option but to chant the oath in Source A as any hesitation about it might present problems for the individual in Palestinian refugee society. Some suggested that the oath was an expression of the belief of the whole of that Palestinian society. Tests for Source B centred on the purpose of Arafat's speech to the UNO.

Most candidates were able to give two correct Palestinian organisations that fought for Palestinian independence in answer to **Question (b) (i)**. However, a number of candidates from one Centre offered Israeli fighting groups instead. The description of the tactics used by the PLO to achieve their aims (**Question (b) (ii)**) was often detailed and comprehensive. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons that Arafat accepted the invitation to speak at the UNO in 1974 were also impressive and many candidates felt that his attendance gave him recognition internationally as a leader of the Palestinian people, that it marked the beginning of negotiations, and it gave him a platform to show that the Israelis had broken or opposed UNO resolutions. Many of the candidates who answered **Question (b) (iv)** had sufficient knowledge and skill in argument to produce balanced and supported answers and many attempted to come to a logical and reasoned conclusion.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

Too few legitimate attempts were made on this Depth Study in this season of examinations for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century.

A small number of Centres and candidates had prepared for this Depth Study and many of the candidates showed competence and knowledge. Source A allowed answers to **Question (a) (i)** to show valid inferences about British outrage to the treatment of British people during the mutiny. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, often held that Sources B and C disagreed with one another about the manner in which the British dealt with the mutiny, but better answers saw that both sources hinted at the efficiency and bravery of the British forces. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** were mostly comparisons of the content of the sources and, of those candidates who tried to test the sources for utility and reliability, most were of the 'stock' and incomplete variety.

Some candidates were able to offer two British Governor-Generals in the years prior to the mutiny, but many did not achieve the maximum mark for **Question (b) (i)**. The description of what happened at Meerut in May 1857 was well known and full details were often given in answers to **Question (b) (ii)**. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** ranged from brief and confused assertions right across the range of quality to the explanation of a variety of factors regarding the reasons why the mutiny was defeated. Some of the latter scripts were excellent to read. Again, there was a full range of answers to **Question (b) (iv)** from the very brief to long one-sided argument, and then on to balanced and well-argued observations on how the mutiny changed India.

