

HISTORY

Paper 0470/11

Paper 11

Key Messages and General Comments

A number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study. Candidates used their knowledge effectively in writing well-developed explanations and arguments for their chosen questions. The majority of candidates managed the time available well, and were able to answer all the required questions. There were only a small number of candidates who were unable to complete the paper.

Candidates should ensure that they read and follow the instructions given on the paper carefully. There were a number of rubric errors, some candidates attempting all 25 questions on the paper. Candidates should read the questions carefully and ensure they are actually answering the question as set.

Parts **(b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. Some candidates constructed a clear hypothesis in response to a question, and would have further improved their responses by using their factual knowledge to support this hypothesis.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 5

- (a)** Some candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the territorial changes in the Treaty of Versailles. Answers focused on the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France, West Prussia and Posen being given to Poland and the transfer of Germany's colonies to be run as League of Nations mandates. Some candidates were unaware of the territorial changes made, and wrote instead about other terms of the Treaty.
- (b)** Most candidates were able to state the requirements of the Allies at the peace settlement, such as Clemenceau wanting security for France, Woodrow Wilson wanting to use his Fourteen Points and Lloyd George wanting to retain Germany as a trading partner. More candidates could have developed these points into explanation by looking at the reasons why these aims made it difficult to reach a peace settlement which would please all the Allies; candidates tended to examine each leader in isolation.
- (c)** Many excellent responses developed arguments on both sides of the debate. These included consideration of the arms reductions, land losses and reparations on one side, and the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and the terms of the Armistice on the other. A number of candidates demonstrated that they had a sound knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and identified a number of relevant points; they needed to develop these points into explanation to access the higher levels.

Question 6

- (a) Some candidates demonstrated excellent factual knowledge of Hitler's policy towards Austria between 1934 and 1938. Details given included Hitler's aim of creating a Greater Germany, the failed Anschluss of 1934 and the events of 1938 leading to the completed Anschluss. Candidates need to be aware that Germany and Austria had not been one country before World War One; a number of candidates wrote about the reunification of the two.
- (b) There were some excellent responses to this question, with candidates giving clear explanations of appeasement alienating the USSR, allowing Hitler to break the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, encouraging Hitler to demand more land and resulting in opportunities to stop Hitler being missed. Candidates must ensure they read the question carefully; some answered the question as if it was asking why appeasement was justified, rather than why appeasement was wrong.
- (c) Good responses to this question made a clear statement of Hitler's foreign policy aims and then explained with supporting detail how these aims had or had not been achieved. Candidates must be aware of the difference between domestic and foreign policy; some candidates wrote at length about the Hitler Youth, Hitler's policies towards the workers and his policies towards women, which are not required in a question about his foreign policy. Candidates do need to be aware that Hitler's desire for Anschluss formed part of his Greater Germany policy.

Question 7

- (a) Many candidates had detailed knowledge of the part played by the Ho Chi Minh Trail and its importance in supplying the Vietcong. Some candidates focused their answer on the importance of Ho Chi Minh himself, rather than the Ho Chi Minh Trail.
- (b) Some responses showed clear understanding of the importance of the Tet Offensive, explaining why it was a turning point in the Vietnam War. Arguments focused upon the change in American public opinion, questions being raised about the level of spending on the war and the undermining of the official view that America was actually winning the war. Candidates need to be aware of the events and effects of the Tet Offensive.
- (c) Good responses to this question explained the role of public opinion by focusing upon the horror felt when scenes of atrocities such as the My Lai massacre were made known; the role of other reasons such as the Vietcong's guerrilla tactics, the high cost of the war and the high level of American casualties were also explained clearly. Some candidates focused on one side of the argument only; to access the higher levels both sides of the argument need to be considered.

Question 8

- (a) Candidates had detailed factual knowledge of the actions of Nagy's government, with emphasis being given to the government's desire to leave the Warsaw Pact and also to declare Hungary to be neutral in the Cold War. Other points detailed included the ending of one party rule, the proposal to hold free democratic elections and the moves towards less censorship and therefore more freedom of speech. Some candidates knew that Nagy's government was moving away from Communism, but needed to substantiate this statement with specific details. Candidates need to look carefully at the wording of each question; this question asked about the actions by Nagy's government and some candidates wrote more generally about events in Hungary, rather than concentrating upon Nagy's government.
- (b) Some candidates gave several clear explanations, with most focusing on the need to prevent people leaving East Germany and the possible undermining of Communism. Other candidates described the actual building of the Berlin Wall and its fall; these answers did not actually address the question.
- (c) Good responses to this question explained the role of Solidarity in the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe and then explained the role of other reasons, such as the withdrawal of Red Army support and Gorbachev's policies of perestroika and glasnost. Whilst many candidates demonstrated detailed factual knowledge of Lech Walesa and Solidarity, and also of Gorbachev's policies, some used this knowledge as a narrative. Candidates needed to develop this knowledge to explain the collapse of Soviet control.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Candidates adopted two approaches in their answers to this question, both equally valid. Some candidates focused upon the actual events leading to the establishment of the Weimar Republic, whilst others focused upon the actual details of the Weimar Republic's constitution. Both approaches showed that candidates had detailed factual knowledge of the establishment of the Weimar Republic.
- (b) Effective answers explained clearly the reasons for attempts at the overthrow of the Weimar Republic, such as the desire for a return to the Germany of the Kaiser, the opposition to democracy, the desire for a Communist government and the blame apportioned to the Weimar Republic for signing the Treaty of Versailles. Many answers described the events of the Kapp Putsch and the Spartacist uprising, rather than explaining why they happened. A number of candidates wrote about the Munich Putsch of 1923; candidates need to look carefully at the dates in questions – this question referred to attempts made in 1919-20.
- (c) There were some clearly explained responses to this question. Explanations of the Weimar government's successes in dealing with the attempts to overthrow the Republic, Stresemann's solutions to hyper-inflation and his success in improving international relations were carefully constructed. Explanations of failure were less secure, although explanation of the Ruhr crisis and the Munich Putsch was generally clear. This question again highlighted the need for candidates to read the question carefully. The question referred to the years 1920-4; some answers explained events in Germany from 1925 to 1929.

Question 10

- (a) Candidates demonstrated sound contextual knowledge of the activities undertaken by the Hitler Youth, such as weekend camping trips, various sports and preparation for adult roles, boys as soldiers and girls as homemakers. Some candidates wrote in depth about the school curriculum, rather than the activities of the Hitler Youth.
- (b) Responses focused upon the need for unquestioning obedience and children being the future of Germany. Most candidates were able to identify two or three reasons and developing these reasons into explanations produced sound answers.
- (c) Effective responses explained the support for the Nazis due to their job creation schemes and the appeal of the Hitler Youth. The opposition of groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the White Rose group was equally well explained. Some candidates were also able to highlight that support was an illusion; many people only supported the Nazis because they were too scared to do otherwise and related this to the actions of block wardens and the Gestapo. Some candidates described the activities of opposition groups, rather than explaining the lack of support for the Nazis.

Question 11

- (a) Some candidates were able to detail the varying problems facing Kerensky's government, focusing upon the war, land seizures by the peasants, the treatment of national minorities and the fuel and raw materials shortages. Other candidates were only able to make generalised statements about opposition to Kerensky.
- (b) There were some clear explanations of reasons for the civil war, such as the landowners wanting a return to monarchy and the desire of national groups to retain their independence. Many answers were generalised in nature, with references to opposition, and a definition or explanation of the nature of the opposition would have benefited them.
- (c) Effective responses to this question explained the leadership and aims of the Communists and then explained other reasons such as the indiscipline and corruption in the White armies, geographical factors affecting the White armies and the Bolshevik control of Petrograd and Moscow. Some candidates were clearly aware of the reasons for Bolshevik success; they needed to develop this knowledge into explanations.

Question 12


- (a) Some candidates were aware that collectivisation involved the peasants putting their lands together to form large joint farms, but were unable to add much beyond this. Candidates would improve their responses by showing an awareness that collectivisation involved the pooling of animals, tools and motor tractor stations, and the efficient use of modern farming methods using tractors and fertilisers. They also need an awareness of the details surrounding the state's compulsory purchase of produce.
- (b) Some candidates were able to explain that the New Economic Policy had always been viewed as a temporary measure because it was ideologically removed from the beliefs of the Communist Party. Candidates are expected to know the distinct features of War Communism and the New Economic Policy; there was evidence in some answers that candidates had not distinguished between the two.
- (c) Explanations of the failure of collectivisation centred on the human disaster and famine. More candidates could have explained the collapse in livestock numbers and the drop in grain harvests. Fewer candidates explained the successes of collectivisation; those who did focused upon the numbers of peasant households in collectives and therefore the perceived success for Stalin. Some candidates developed this explanation further by showing that collectivisation may be seen as a success for Stalin, but it was a disaster for the peasant population.

Question 13

- (a) Most candidates were able to detail the features of the 'boom' of the 1920s and would have improved responses by linking these features to how life was made easier for Americans. For example, the 'boom' meant that mass produced goods such as washing machines and vacuum cleaners were more widely available; this made life easier for Americans because these were labour saving devices that enabled women to do their household chores more quickly.
- (b) Some responses to this question were general, focusing upon traditional industries being old-fashioned. Some candidates were able to identify points such as cleaner fuels being available, new products being cheaper and the market for coal shrinking; these points needed to be developed into explanation. A number of candidates wrote about farming; this is not relevant to a question on traditional industries.
- (c) There were many clear explanations of Republican policies such as low taxation, the use of tariffs and laissez-faire. Some candidates were able to explain the contribution of hire purchase to the economic 'boom'. This particular question asked candidates to explain how far they agreed with the statement that Republican policies contributed more to the economic 'boom' than did the availability of hire purchase. Candidates were expected to consider both Republican policies and hire purchase as factors in the economic 'boom'. A number of candidates then went on to explain the role of mass production, America's natural resources and the role of advertising; these factors lacked relevance to this particular question.

Question 14

- (a) Most candidates were able to detail several features of Hoovervilles, describing where they were located and the conditions in them, in some depth. A few candidates wrote in very general terms about poor conditions, and would have improved their answers by detailing conditions specific to Hoovervilles.
- (b) Effective answers to this question explained the link between the actions of the banks that stopped loaning money to businesses and the cutting of production by businesses, which in turn led to shorter hours and lower wages for workers. Many candidates identified reasons and needed to develop these identifications into explanations. A number of candidates answered the question as if it asked why did the stock market crash in 1929, rather than why the stock market crash led America into depression. Candidates must ensure they read the question carefully.



- (c) There were some excellent responses to this question. Candidates explained how Hoover's policies failed to deal with the Depression and therefore made him appear to be the suffering American people. On the other side of the argument, candidates explained the treatment of the Bonus Army and the appeal of Roosevelt.

Questions 15 to 17

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 18

- (a) Answers to this question showed a detailed knowledge of restrictions in movement and employment, with focus upon describing the pass book system and the Bantu Building Workers Act.
- (b) Candidates gave clear explanations of the desire to maintain white supremacy, the desire to maintain cheap labour for the white population and the need to restrict the aspirations of the black population.
- (c) A number of candidates were able to identify the Defence Campaign and opposition to the Bantu Education Act, although these identifications often needed to be developed into explanations. Candidates needed to use their knowledge to support and develop their answers.

Questions 19 to 25

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12

Paper 12

Key messages and General comments

Many candidates were well-prepared to meet the demands of the examination. These candidates scored well on all three aspects of the question. Answers produced by these candidates were characterised by the following:

- answers which clearly focused on the demands of the question as set - this focus being maintained throughout the answer;
- in part **(a)**, concise factual detail;
- in part **(b)**, the inclusion of factual detail, reasons and explanations;
- the development of different sides of the argument, producing a balanced answer, and explained answers with some evaluation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

In answering **(a)**, most candidates were aware of the tariff-free aspect of the Zollverein and benefits brought to its members, although knowledge was more limited on the key role played by Prussia. Answers to **(b)** often needed more explanation, with identification of 'wanting better conditions' and 'following France' being the most common responses. Answers to **(c)** would have benefited from a less narrative-based approach and more detail in relation to Austria.

Question 2

In **(a)** most were aware of the Lombardy connection but the connection to the Habsburg royal family was not often written about. Metternich could have been mentioned by more candidates. In **(b)**, the role of Charles Albert was known, although often described rather than explained in relation to the revolutions. The best answers showed how the revolts in Lombardy, Venetia and Rome had been brought to an end, including the role of Pope Pius IX and Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. In **(c)**, description of Cavour's positive role, in particular his diplomatic skills, was much stronger than the 'hindrance' side of the question. The better answers provided balance by considering how he hindered Italian unification with his failure to fully commit to Garibaldi.

Question 3

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

Question 4

In **(a)** most answers indicated the introduction of railways and the increased importance of education as examples of westernisation. Points which could have been more often mentioned were the introduction of gas lighting and the adoption of the western calendar. In **(b)**, the better answers showed good knowledge and understanding of the Samurai reaction to the changes. Others needed to develop description into explanation to achieve the higher marks. Most answers tended to concentrate in more generalised terms on the role of the Meiji Emperor. To gain higher marks this descriptive approach needed to be developed into

explanation, together with the development of other factors to challenge the question hypothesis. The constitution could have been mentioned by more candidates.

Question 5

In **(a)** most candidates were aware that the two terms of the peace settlements were a punishment for Germany. The better answers dealt with each in turn, identifying the characteristics of each and making the link that reparations automatically followed the acceptance of war guilt. Some better answers made reference to countries other than Germany in relation to the imposing of reparations, this detail being taken from knowledge gained about the other peace treaties of the time. The best answers to **(b)** concentrated more on Clemenceau and Lloyd George, as Wilson did not offer the same opportunities, to the discussion of severity. Reasons for the severity of the peacemakers, such as the French fear of further attacks and destruction, were then put into a context of the severity of approach. Less successful answers lacked focus on the question, often appearing to answer the question 'What did the 'Big Three' hope to achieve?' For these candidates, this gave them the opportunity to unnecessarily include Wilson. The best answers to **(c)** concentrated on German reaction to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, rather than an explanation of whether or not the Treaty was 'fair'. This approach gave candidates the opportunity to develop quality responses to both challenge and support the 'unreasonable' part of the question.

Question 6

The steps Hitler took to challenge the Treaty, in **(a)**, were generally well-known and produced without elaboration, with the best answers placing them in chronological order. Less strong answers often consisted of over-concentration on the re-armament aspect. Some answers incorrectly gave the Saar plebiscite as a challenge to the Treaty despite the Treaty saying that this was to be held after fifteen years. Others stated that the challenges by Hitler included the stopping of the payment of reparations and Anschluss, neither of which came between the dates specified by the question. Often candidates were aware of the Anglo-German Naval Treaty but suggested in their answers that it referred to the size of the German army (rather than navy). In **(b)**, many candidates were able to identify two reasons for Hitler's involvement in the Spanish Civil War, namely to challenge communism and to test his developing military strength. The better answers produced sound explanations to these two reasons, and answers which included more explained reasons scored high marks. Strong answers additionally developed explanation of Hitler's developing relationship with Mussolini. Less strong answers were limited to identification of the testing of German military strength with, in some instances, a description of the tactics used by Hitler such as 'blitzkrieg'. Part **(c)** highlighted the lack of confidence shown by some candidates where material they have acquired can be used in different ways to meet the requirements of the question. This mental agility was demonstrated in the best answers as these candidates realised that as long as their arguments and explanations were sound, examples of Hitler's foreign affairs could be used flexibly in support of either side of the argument. Less strong answers were more predictable, less well thought out, and lacked detail in the arguments. The weaker answers identified aspects of Hitler's actions through narrative and/or description.

Question 7

A majority of candidates in **(a)** were able to give at least two pieces of correct information identifying their understanding of the 'Cold War'. What would have improved some answers was clarity over the period of time considered to be the 'Cold War period'. A small number thought that there was 'no fighting' and yet shortly afterwards they indicated that the Korean War took place. The better answers to **(b)** offered three or four explained reasons for the increasing suspicion of the West, although they often went beyond the end date of the question. Less strong answers indicated an awareness of the increasing Soviet sphere of influence but had greater difficulty in developing their point. In **(c)**, those candidates who considered the wider aspects of the subject matter for the specific period and developed this into argument and explanation and supported their answer with analysis, had few problems in scoring highly. Weaker answers were characterised by a tendency towards more generalised comment, with fewer supported arguments which were often outside the scope of the question which was indicated by the word 'starting'.

Question 8

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

Section B

Question 9

There were many full answers to part **(a)**. The better answers concentrated on giving three or four different points, making clear the impact of hyperinflation on the German people. This included highlighting the fact that different groups were affected in different ways. Less strong answers indicated the decline in purchasing power of the currency and then gave a number of examples of the impact, such as burning the currency. In **(b)**, most were able to give 'non-payment of reparations' as a valid reason, with this being developed into explanation. The best answers looked at the question in much wider terms and explained, for example, France's attitude towards Germany and France's need to continue paying its war debt to the USA. The other area developed by some was that of taking payment in goods such as coal and iron, although this often remained at the descriptive level. Many answers to **(c)** were stronger on what Stresemann achieved for Germany than on his failings, which were often limited to the use of loans to increase economic prosperity. Some candidates, whilst aware of the need to produce a balanced answer, produced one which lacked explanation as to the restoration of 'pride and prosperity'.

Question 10

Most answers to **(a)** included the movement of Jews to concentration camps and discrimination in terms of jobs. Better answers included Kristallnacht and the Nuremberg Laws. Weaker answers concentrated more on the reasons for the humiliating treatment of Jews, rather than on their treatment. From some candidates more focus needed to be shown in **(b)**, with many answers concentrating on the different forms of media, rather than the need for control. Those who concentrated on the question as set produced answers which mainly explained the benefits of being able to hear Hitler's message constantly. A small number included the reasons for the control of the press. Answers to **(c)** were stronger in relation to the support Hitler had gained, rather than continuing opposition. How he gained support was explained through the creation of employment, abolition of terms of the Treaty and the Hitler Youth. Lack of support was usually linked to youth movements, although this was more descriptive than explanatory.

Question 11

In **(a)** most candidates were able to write about the dreadful living conditions endured by the peasants. This was often developed further by comment on the long hours of work and the dangerous conditions such as unguarded machinery. Better answers commented on the resentment felt towards the aristocracy, the Tsar and the Church. In **(b)**, some candidates concentrated too much on the events of Bloody Sunday and its results, or the causes of the revolution. Those who clearly focused on the question developed explanation in relation to the October Manifesto and the idea of 'divide and rule'. In **(c)** there were many excellent answers, with detailed arguments on both sides of the debate. The idea of the 'carrot and stick' approach was often covered in detail. Other responses lacked detail and balance, with the role of Stolypin attracting marks but the opposite side being much weaker. Here explanation of how the work of the secret police and the army gave the Tsar strength would have brought more balance.

Question 12

Answers to **(a)** were sometimes general descriptions of the 'Great Terror'. Detail of individuals involved such as Zinoviev and Kamenev and reference to 'show trials' would have added depth to answers. Candidates need to be aware of the different ways Stalin imposed control, with the new Constitution being one aspect. In **(b)** many answers needed more detail, often confusing the 1936 constitutional changes with the Five Year Plans and Collectivisation. The good answers, almost without exception, referred to the introduction of a vote in a secret ballot for the national assembly, with one Communist candidate in each constituency. In **(c)** many excellent responses contained well-explained arguments on either side of the debate. Some answers, whilst covering both sides, were less strong on the cult of personality, with this being limited to the erection of statues and pictures in public places. Some answers were brief and one-sided. In these instances, the answers were characterised by description rather than explanation.

Question 13

Most candidates in **(a)** found at least two things they could write about Prohibition - either about the introduction of the actual law or what was banned. Some incorrectly stated that the consumption of alcohol was banned. The best answers to **(b)** looked beyond the fact that the law was being broken and put it in context of the situation in America to explain issues such as lost revenue and the creation of jobs. Weaker answers concentrated more on smuggling, gangsters and speakeasies. Good answers to **(c)** showed good understanding of intolerance in US society, using examples such as the Ku Klux Klan and Sacco and Vanzetti to exemplify their argument. Weaker arguments perhaps concentrated too much on discrimination against black Americans. The immigrants issue could have been better developed. The nature of the question left open the counter argument to allow candidates to select, from a much wider area, examples of where it could be argued that the US was tolerant. As expected, many concentrated on the changing role of women. Whilst better answers linked this to the question, in others this side of the argument was highly descriptive, with the link as to why the changes showed tolerance missing.

Question 14

Most were aware of Roosevelt's 'fireside chats' and were able to describe what happened, achieving some marks. Better answers gave reasons for them taking place and the opportunities this gave to Roosevelt. In part **(b)** there were many long descriptions of opposition to the New Deal; to gain the higher levels, candidates needed to answer 'why' there was opposition. Those candidates who realised this often produced a good answer which used explanation related to the Supreme Court and opposition from Republicans. In **(c)**, arguments as to why the New Deal failed to solve unemployment were generally unconvincing, being more descriptive than explanatory. Much stronger were arguments that the New Deal was a success. Some candidates argued that the New Deal was a failure but not because of unemployment but because it failed the black Americans and, in many instances, women. This approach was equally valid.

Question 15

In response to **(a)**, most candidates described the contribution of the Chinese Communists against Japan, showing how they were superior to the KMT forces and thus able to gain the support of the peasants. Others would have improved their responses by writing answers specific to China, rather than about communists in general. Quality answers to **(b)** explained the strengths of the communists which brought victory and the weaknesses of the KMT which contributed to their failure. Others just described reasons. Some answers needed to be fuller and to include more specific reasons. Part **(c)** brought many good quality answers which detailed arguments for both sides of the question hypothesis. Other candidates would have benefited from producing balanced arguments to develop explanation relating to international recognition. For those who adopted a one-sided approach, the other aspects detailing the new government's problems was generally well explained. Candidates can improve their answers by reading the question more carefully. Some who did not do this wrote answers concentrating on how the problems were solved.

Question 16

Many detailed responses were seen in answers to **(a)**. Candidates had a good knowledge of the landlord trials and the redistribution of land. Some answers to **(b)** were excellent, with candidates using their wider knowledge and understanding of the problems inherited by the Communist government. This explanation of the state of China was then linked to Mao's aspirations. Others adopted a more generalised, descriptive approach. In **(c)**, candidates were able to describe the first Five-Year Plan, often showing knowledge of what industries were involved; they then needed to develop this into explanation using detailed knowledge against which to evaluate success. The success of the Great Leap Forward was often only evaluated against the backyard furnaces.

Question 17

In **(a)**, events at Sharpeville were generally well-known, with good descriptive accounts of events being produced. Answers were generally well-focused on the question. This trend continued in **(b)**, where many produced a number of explained reasons as to why it was an important event. Less strong were the answers to **(c)**. When confronted with 'to what extent', some candidates were unable to display the balanced argument required for high marks. Most were able at least to describe the areas which were weakening and, in many instances, offer explanation for this, but were less confident with the areas that were still relatively strong.

Question 18

In **(a)** there was evidence of a more general awareness of the ANC, rather than a demonstration of specific activities. Part **(b)** brought many excellent responses, explaining the reasons for Mandela's release. Candidates needed to develop explanation at the expense of narrative. For **(c)**, the role of De Klerk was often well documented, with many developing sound explanation. Others needed at least to consider the role of Mandela to give a more balanced viewpoint.

Question 19

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

Question 20

Better answers to **(a)** were tackled in a systematic and knowledgeable way, detailing the role of Ben-Gurion. Others were less secure but took the opportunity to give more general information about events at that time, many of which had close association with Ben-Gurion. There were many good responses to **(b)**, which focused on explanation of 'why' rather than on description of violence. Responses focused on factors ranging from World War 2 experiences to the perceived intransigence of the British and, in some instances, the Arab population. Others would have improved by developing identification into explanation to gain higher marks, with the King David Hotel incident being an example. In **(c)**, many answers recognised the need for a two-sided approach, highlighting Jewish unity alongside Arab disunity. These answers often recognised the importance of a well-trained, fully equipped army, even if smaller than the enemy. Some candidates would have benefited from developing description into explanation, particularly to challenge the hypothesis.

Question 21

In **(a)** candidates were able to identify a number of responses including, in the better answers, the less obvious ones such as the closure of schools and colleges. Where **(b)** was well answered, candidates made reference to the moral and political influence of the kibbutzim, along with military and economic ones. The best answers actually linked the role of the kibbutz to modern Israeli society. Some answers required more explanation, rather than description / narrative. These answers were characterised by a good knowledge but were more general in approach, describing what a kibbutz might look like. Part **(c)** produced many excellent answers, combining historical knowledge with excellent technique. This brought many balanced responses discussing unity. 'Disunity' was the challenge side, bringing examples including issues of the Occupied Territories. Some answers would have benefited from a move from description into explanation.

Questions 22-25

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/13

Paper 13

Key Messages and General Comments

A significant majority of candidates continue to use sound knowledge and understanding of their chosen topics to answer the questions set. Again, as in previous sessions, it was clear that many candidates communicated their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features, or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement.

Teachers had, quite rightly, reminded their candidates that **part (a)** five-mark questions require short, descriptive answers which are probably no more than a paragraph in length. The emphasis is on recalling accurate details rather than explanation.

However, **parts (b) and (c)** demand explanation. Few marks are awarded for narrative or 'setting the scene'. Candidates who score highly are able to stick to the point, apply their knowledge to the precise requirements of the question, and develop each of the identified factors fully. Those who score less highly tend to assert a reason which they identify as relevant and assume that no further explanation is required. Candidates need to make sure that the assertion does answer the specific question set. In **part (c)**, the mark scheme rewards those who argue both for and against the focus of the question, and reach a valid conclusion. The conclusion should go beyond repeating what has already been stated, by addressing 'how far' or 'to what extent'. Less successful candidates tend to rely on retelling the story and including irrelevant information. Candidates can sometimes misunderstand the point of a question, either because they read the question too quickly or because they focus on one side of the argument. Those who attained the best marks on these eight-mark questions did so when they focused on explaining both sides of an argument, rather than just identifying points for inclusion.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

This was answered by a limited number of candidates. Part **(a)** answers tended to be general and confined to references to Metternich's use of suppression and Habsburg forces. A wider approach might have dealt with the way in which Habsburgs married into the ruling families of the Italian states and precise knowledge of Metternich's methods of hunting down those who expressed liberal and nationalistic sentiments. Part **(b)** attracted vague responses often related to Mazzini's youth and inexperience, although part **(c)** attracted better explanations about the achievements of the years 1861 to 1870 to unify Italy and, on the other side, what work was still left to be done. It is important that candidates always take note of the date parameters stated in this style of question.

Question 2

There were a limited number of responses to this question. Knowledge of the Frankfurt Parliament could have been better in part **(a)**, although part **(b)** was answered more confidently as candidates were able to explain why the Schleswig-Holstein problem drew Austria and Prussia into war; there was a recognition of the word 'significant' which had been included in the question. In part **(c)** weak answers tended to describe the unification of Germany, instead of explaining Bismarck's diplomacy on the one side, and economic (the Zollverein) and military (the strength of the army and its commanders) factors on the other.

Question 3

Too few responses were seen to make meaningful comments.

Question 4

A small number of candidates attempted to answer this question. Part **(a)** answers tended to be based on social and economic factors, rather than focussing on the details of deteriorating relationships over Korea, the war of 1894 and the subsequent Treaty of Shimonoseki. Candidates struggled with part **(b)**, focussing too much on what happened, instead of on the importance of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. In part **(c)** some answers were unbalanced; good on the impact of the Alliance up to 1914, but less secure about the effects of the defeat of China over Korea and of the defeat of Russia. Hence, higher level marks were not achievable where answers concentrated only on one side of the argument.

Question 5

This was a very popular question. Part **(a)** was well answered, although some candidates incorrectly claimed that both the Saar and the Rhineland were annexed by France. Part **(b)** was less well understood because the question was treated as 'why was the Treaty of Versailles unfair or harsh?' instead of 'why did Germany think the Treaty was motivated by revenge?'. Hence, a list of complaints about the harshness of the treaty or a description of what happened would achieve marks at Level 2. Nevertheless, good candidates were able to seize the chance to explain why Germans felt that Clemenceau was so intent on revenge or why the determination to exclude Germany from the peace talks was a reflection of the way that Russia had been treated. Some included an explanation of the way Germany had behaved during the retreat from French territory and its impact on the peace talks.

Responses to part **(c)** which only described the aims of the Big Three, did not progress beyond Level 2. Well-developed answers explained precisely why each representative would have been satisfied and dissatisfied by the final terms when measured against their aims and/or the specific terms of the Treaty. It is important to emphasise that, in questions of this sort, reference should be made to particular terms of the Treaty in order to reach higher levels in the markscheme.

Question 6

A significant majority of candidates scored well on part **(a)**. They were capable of drawing on their knowledge of Schuschnigg and the result of the plebiscite to score freely. Many made a good attempt at part **(b)**, explaining fully the effects of the policy of appeasement, the perceptions held by France and Britain of German rearmament and the impact of Mussolini and Hitler's friendship.

Answers to part **(c)** were weaker, although there were some strong arguments relating to the advantages that Austria and Czechoslovakia brought to Germany's war preparations on the one hand, and the effects of Britain and France abandoning appeasement for rearmament, on the other.

Question 7

Part **(a)** posed a challenge for some candidates who tended to produce general answers about the suppression of freedom imposed by Rakosi. More specific examples of Soviet control of education, the imposition of Soviet troops on the country, the use of the Russian language and the extent of the activities of the secret police attracted more credit. In part **(b)** quality answers dealt effectively with the reason why the Czechs disliked Soviet power over their country, while less successful candidates described the 'Prague Spring' which was not the focus of the question. Part **(c)** required a comparison of events in Hungary and Czechoslovakia and many candidates were perfectly capable of arguing about the similarities and differences between the two. Usually these related to the extent of Soviet violence in 1956 and 1968, the fate of the leadership of each country and Soviet perceptions of the aims of Nagy and Dubcek. It is worth emphasising that those who avoided a narrative of each feature, but linked their knowledge to comparisons of the crises, scored more highly.

Question 8

Those candidates who referred specifically to specialist agencies did well; others needed to mention particular agencies, rather than describing the structure of the UNO instead. In part **(b)** most were able to give general reasons why countries joined the UNO; the most popular were to gain security/peace, to increase the status of the country and to receive aid. The candidates who did well in part **(c)** focused on

Korea and the Congo in their answers, while less successful responses which often only identified the countries attracted marks no higher than Level 2.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Candidates knew the more obvious benefits which Hitler gained from the Munich Putsch to score well in part **(a)**. They recognised the change of tactics, Hitler's focus on the ballot box, the publicity he gained at the trial and the impact of Mein Kampf, written during his time in jail. Part **(b)** gave an opportunity to explain the ways Hitler exploited the Reichstag Fire. Most candidates acknowledged the subsequent attack on the Communists, although answers were sometimes generalised. More precise details might have included the emergency decree which suspended articles in the constitution which guaranteed personal liberty, the arrest of 4000 Communists, and the results of the March 1933 election leading to the Enabling Act. There were many encouraging responses to part **(c)**, with good explanations of a range of factors leading to Hitler's electoral success after 1929. Some answers would have been improved by a greater balance - the impact of the anti-Jewish campaign on Hitler's electoral support could have been explained more fully.

Question 10

In **(a)** the best answers covered propaganda, mass rallies, military parades and the 1936 Olympics. Part **(b)** brought detailed responses, although some were descriptive. The key was to explain why Hitler persecuted minorities. Some part **(c)** answers lacked depth; the best answers included falls in unemployment and 'Strength through Joy' programmes as evidence of success. On the other hand, opposition to the Nazi government and the activities of the police state were used to argue against 'success'.

Question 11

In part **(a)**, many candidates possessed a good knowledge of the downfall of the Tsar. It was important that candidates kept to the point of the question which was the events in February/March 1917, and responses which did this were more successful than ones which concentrated on background factors.

There were some impressive explanations in part **(b)**, particularly related to the food, land and peace problems which the Provisional Government failed to address. The best answers linked Kornilov to Bolshevik popularity. In part **(c)** some answers would have benefited from greater balance; good explanations of the weaknesses of the Whites were sometimes placed against descriptive paragraphs about Trotsky, leading to Level 3 marks. Both sides required explanation.

Question 12

Answers to this question tended to be quite strong. Those who focused on the advantages of collective farming rather than general descriptions of what it was, scored well in part **(a)**.

Responses to part **(b)** reflected good understanding of Kulak opposition and there were many well-organised answers about the Five-Year Plans in part **(c)**. Candidates who read this question carefully, not surprisingly, gained credit; the focus was on 'misery' or otherwise, rather than on the 'success/failure' of the Five-Year Plans.

Question 13

The development of the movie industry in part **(a)** attracted some high marks; candidates knew this topic well. In part **(b)** some less strong answers drifted into narrative about how the lives of women changed, rather than why. The focus of good answers was on the impact of labour saving devices in the home, of contraception and of a new culture of freedom which some women were able to enjoy.

There were many strong part **(c)** responses which covered the different sections of US society to which the term 'the Roaring Twenties' might and might not be applied. In this way, balance could be achieved attracting Level 4 marks.

Question 14

It was rare to see a weak answer to part **(a)**, while the reasons for high stock prices in early 1929, about in part **(b)**, produced generalised comments about speculators, buying 'on the margin' and the confidence of investors in a booming economy, from some candidates. The best answers explained each of these factors thoroughly. Part **(c)** reflected weaker arguments about the effect of the Wall Street Crash on the banks on the one hand, and the impact on farmers, on the rich, on business people and on ordinary workers, on the other. Credit was given for focusing on specific groups and families. Some candidates misread the question, arguing whether or not the banks were the cause of the Wall Street Crash.

Question 15

Part **(a)** was handled well; candidates knew about free health care, street committees and 'barefoot doctors'. Answers could have also explored the link between improved water supply and reductions in waterborne diseases. There were good answers to part **(b)** covering the principal reasons, except for Mao's personal beliefs. Part **(c)** answers were balanced with successes and failures identified and explained; details of food shortages after the record harvest of 1958 would have further improved responses.

Question 16

The main advantages of the 'Hundred Flowers' campaign for Mao were described in detail in part **(a)**. Answers to part **(b)** were good, while in part **(c)** candidates concentrated on the importance of controlling the opposition as a factor behind the Cultural Revolution. This meant that some answers required more balance, as there was less coverage of Mao's desire to create the 'perfect' Communism and of the aim to encourage new practices in industry.

Questions 17, 18 and 19

Too few responses were seen to make meaningful comments.

Question 20

Part **(a)** was answered effectively, while in part **(b)** candidates were able to draw on a range of reasons why the British referred the Palestine problem to the UN. A small number of answers just listed reasons without explaining each one, thus struggling to reach Level 3. Some part **(c)** responses required more balance as the reasons for a complete victory for Israel in 1948-9 were dealt much more strongly than the counter argument. When candidates brought in evidence of an incomplete victory, the reasons tended to be listed, rather than explained in terms of the question.

Question 21

Some candidates found part **(a)** challenging, as they drew on a limited number of points related to the USA's part in the Arab-Israeli conflict in the 1970s. In part **(b)** there was a tendency to describe what happened, rather than to explain the significance of Arafat's 1974 speech. Part **(c)** answers would have benefited from greater balance; the Camp David Treaties' contribution to peace was covered much better than 'other factors' which detracted from Camp David's efforts to solve the Palestinian issue. These latter points might have included the reaction of other Arab nations and the feeling that too little was demanded, such as recognition of the Palestinians' right to self-determination.

Questions 22 to 25

Too few responses were seen to make meaningful comments.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/21

Paper 21

Key Messages and General Comments

Candidates' answers showed many of the strengths that have characterised Paper 2 scripts in previous years. The general level of contextual knowledge is good, and this is often used effectively by candidates to help them comprehend, interpret and explain the sources. It is also true that this contextual knowledge sometimes dominates answers, whereas focusing on the specific question asked is the best approach. Contextual knowledge in this paper is never an end in itself; it can only be of assistance when it is used to help make sense of the sources. The other main area of strength is in source comprehension and interpretation. Those questions which ask candidates, for example, to compare sources are usually answered well, as candidates are generally capable of manipulating and explaining source content in an effective manner. The factor that limits the quality of some candidates' answers is a relative weakness in source evaluation, particularly where the question does not directly demand this. Many attempts at evaluation fall short of genuine analysis, relying instead on generalisations about source provenance. A large majority of candidates chose the twentieth century option, but, with the nineteenth century option being on the origins of the First World War, there were more scripts on the nineteenth century than is usual.

Comments on specific questions

19th century option

Question 1

This question was based on two accounts of the murder of Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo. Candidates were asked how similar the two accounts were. There were many similarities, about the failure of the first assassination attempt, about the Archduke's decision to visit to the hospital to see the wounded, about how his car took the wrong route, and so on. There were also a few differences such as the bomb missing the car in Source A but hitting it in Source B. Most candidates were able to spot some of these surface similarities and differences. However, there was a more significant difference between the two sources in whom they blamed for the war that followed the assassination. In Source A the conclusion was that Germany was to blame, merely using the assassination as an excuse for a war that would have happened anyway, but in Source B the blame was Austria's, looking for a chance to humiliate Serbia and thereby re-establish its prestige as a great power. Candidates who spotted this difference achieved better answers.

Question 2

Some candidates would have improved their responses by appreciating that Source C, though a report from the Austrian ambassador, was actually using the words of the Kaiser. Not realising this almost inevitably undermined the quality of the response candidates were able to give, since Source D was, in effect, the ultimatum given to Serbia, that was dependent on Austria previously having been given German approval for this action. Another approach to the question could be summarised as 'Given the German guarantee to support action against Serbia, and its urging that this action should not be delayed, does Source D surprise you?' The key to a successful answer was, then, identifying what it was in Source D that could or could not be explained by Source C. The usual line taken by candidates was that the German guarantee of support in Source C did explain why the Austrians then felt confident enough to issue their threat of force against Serbia. It was more unusual for candidates to spot that Source D did not, in fact, sound all that threatening. It suggests that Austria did not, for example, want to humiliate Serbia. The conclusion from this could be that Source C's urgings to take aggressive action do not explain why the Austrians then remained restrained in Source D. A similar approach contrasted Source C's insistence that action must not be delayed with the fact that, according to Source D, it took the Austrians 16 days to get around to issuing their ultimatum. The key to all these acceptable responses was that the content of *both* sources was used to explain the extent to

which Source C explained Source D. Once these matches/mismatches of relevant content had been identified, the very best answers were able to give further contextual detail to explain the critical importance of Source C – the German ‘blank cheque’ – in explaining the Austrian decision to deal aggressively with Serbia and thereby risk a general European war.

Question 3

The key to the question was being able to identify the specific claims in Source E that would make you surprised (or not) by the Kaiser’s response in Source F. The central point at issue was that Source E stated that Serbia had more or less agreed to the terms of Austria’s ultimatum. Some candidates were distracted by other, less significant claims, or by misunderstanding exactly what Source E was saying – it was not uncommon, for example, to read that Source E stated that ‘Austria was seeking an excuse for crushing Serbia.’ This could lead to the invalid conclusion that Source E did not make you surprised by Source F because both sources seemed to be looking for a quarrel with Serbia. However, given that the central point of Source E had been grasped, it was possible to be both surprised and not surprised by Source F, depending on which part of the source was used. The Kaiser accepts that Austria’s wishes had been met and that there was no further cause for war, which is not surprising given what Source E says. However, it is, then, surprising that he seeks further guarantees from Serbia, which run the risk of being rejected, thus leading to war. Finally, however, these comparisons of content did not, on their own, judge the issue of surprise on the basis of whether either Source E or F could be believed. There was the opportunity, particularly in Source E, of looking at who was making these claims, and what their particular motives might be. Although Source E was a report from the German ambassador, he was merely passing on what he had been told by Grey, who in turn was claiming to report what the Serbian ambassador had said. Both Britain and Serbia would clearly wish to represent the Serbian response in the most positive manner, in order to help defuse the crisis, and increase the chances that the response would be accepted.

Question 4

Some candidates found it hard to synthesise the message of Source G in order to compare this with Bethmann Hollweg’s accusations. The overall sense of Source G was that in the 1914 July crisis Britain did not want war, and those candidates who grasped this, had a better chance of providing successful answers. The issue of lying came down to the contrast between the two sources on Britain’s role; Grey claiming that Britain did not want war, Bethmann claiming that Britain was responsible for the war. Given the difference, someone had to be lying. However, there was one partial escape route for candidates who didn’t spot the content difference. They could still work on the provenance. Simple observations that you could not trust Source G/H on this issue because it’s British/German and the Germans were hostile to the British gained some marks, as would the better approach of doing some proper source evaluation (for example, on the author’s purpose) on Source G or Source H alone. The best answers, of course, were able to identify the content difference between the sources and then account for it by evaluating one or both of the sources. This was generally on Source H, by claiming that Bethmann was attempting to shift blame for starting the war onto the British, or even endeavouring to prevent Britain entering the war by persuading them that there was no need to fight.

Question 5

Questions asking candidates to identify the message of a cartoon are, in effect, asking what it was the cartoonist wished to say about the events depicted. Not all answers reach this level and instead they are based around what the cartoon *shows*, with interpretation of the various elements depicted. Thus, in this cartoon, some candidates said, for example, that the fact that the Austrian figure was so much bigger than the Serbian figure meant that Austria as a state was more powerful than Serbia. This is accurate, but it doesn’t fully convey the comment that cartoonist had in mind. These interpretations of elements of the cartoon, which don’t deal with the overall message, are at best sub-messages. The best answers must deal with the cartoon as a whole. This cartoon was commonly misinterpreted since its real message was almost the opposite of the words used in the cartoon. Thus any message based on the idea that Austria had good reason to punish Serbia was clearly a misinterpretation. Serbia’s representation as no more than an irritant to the Austrian giant was pointing to the cartoonist’s belief that any Austrian retaliation against Serbia would be disproportionate and unnecessary. This was the ‘Big Message’, identifying what the cartoonist wanted to say about the events of 1914.

Question 6

The hypothesis to be tested was that Austria was responsible for starting the First World War. The sources very clearly either supported this, or did not. Source A, for example, is explicit that even if the Sarajevo assassination had not happened, Germany would have found another excuse for war, and that Germany was responsible, not Austria. In contrast, Source B says Austria was responsible; the Habsburgs had been losing prestige for some time and humiliating Serbia was their chance to assert themselves. Other sources were not so explicit, and using them in relation to the hypothesis required more explanation. Source C, for example, could be taken as evidence both for and against the hypothesis; against since it shows Germany as being responsible for exhorting Austria to take warlike action against Serbia, but also for, since the Austrians recognise that the present moment is in their favour, so clearly they are open to the idea of war. This question requires candidates to *use* the sources – this means showing how the source content can be used in relation to the hypothesis – but candidates should also be aware that for the purposes of this exercise, there will always be evidence in the sources that can be used to test both sides of the hypothesis, and that only answers which do this will achieve the higher marks.

20th century option

Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to compare two fairly lengthy sources to assess how far they agreed. There were plenty of points of agreement, though the precise claims made in each source needed to be carefully matched. There were candidates who thought they saw agreements which the sources did not, in fact, support. For example, some wrote that the sources agreed that the Chinese were responsible for the explosion, whereas the true agreement was that in both sources the Japanese *claimed* that the Chinese were responsible. There was one true disagreement between the sources, which was in their assessment of the impact of the Manchurian crisis on the League; Source A concluded that it was 'not too damaging to the League's authority' whilst Source B claimed that it was 'The League's first great defeat' which led to 'lost commitment and confidence'. Since spotting this disagreement was using the overall conclusions of the two sources, it was given more credit than identifying points of agreement, but the highest marks went to candidates who responded to the prompt 'How far?' in the question by giving both agreements and the overall disagreement.

Question 2

The question asked candidates to assess the likely reaction of Chiang Kai-shek to a cartoon showing the League trying to save face whilst being walked over by Japan. To assist them in reaching a conclusion, Source C showed what Chiang thought in September 1931, when first referring Japan's aggression to the League – at this time he was hopeful that the League would successfully deal with the matter. Nonetheless, some candidates didn't use Source C and answered simply on the basis of an interpretation of Source D, generally concluding that Chiang would have been shocked/surprised/appalled by the League allowing itself to be used as a doormat. Though reasonable enough in itself, this answer was not really specific to Chiang, as any supporter of the League would have been equally appalled. It was, therefore, a better approach to explain why Chiang would have been appalled by the *contrast* between his expectations in Source C and the events in Source D. The best answers took this explanation further by using contextual knowledge of what had changed between 1931 and the publication of the cartoon in 1933, perhaps by reference to the Lytton Commission, the Japanese takeover of the whole of Manchuria, or Japan ultimately leaving the League.

Question 3

When the question asks 'Are you surprised by this source?' an essential element of the answer is a clear indication of exactly what it is in the source that is/is not surprising. Should such indications be absent, any explanation will lack a proper focus, since almost all sources will contain more than one element which can be checked. In the given source for this question, for example, it was stated (amongst other points) that sanctions would be a mistake, that sanctions would lead to war, and that you would get no reaction from the USA but words. Each of these could lead to a conclusion of surprise, or lack of it, depending on the explanation given. In some answers, more clarity on which specific claims in the source were being checked would have improved responses. Often, valid explanations were based on contextual knowledge, e.g. *I am not surprised the source says all you will get from the USA is words (claim in the source identified) because I know that at this time the USA was following a policy of isolationism so would not want to get involved in Manchuria (explained by cross-reference to contextual knowledge)*. Better answers explained elements both

of surprise and lack of surprise. However, the very best answers went beyond the checking of detail in the source, and instead addressed the issue of whether, in the context of events in Manchuria in 1931, one would be surprised that the person writing this source would say these things. From a historical perspective, nothing in the source could be a surprise, since we know that the British government determined not to play any active part in resisting the invasion of Manchuria. The source is a justification of this policy.

Question 4

Whenever a question raises the issue of proof, candidates - somewhere in their answers, need to deal with the reliability of the source(s). Some candidates would have benefited from awareness that more was needed than to just check the two sources for surface agreements and disagreements, despite the provenance of Source F providing an explicit hint of unreliability. Certainly there were matches and mismatches in the content of the sources; both agreed that Japan would expand, they disagreed over the extent of Japan's expansionism, and they disagreed on Japan's motive for invading Manchuria. These could be used to reach a conclusion on whether Source F disproved Source G, and indeed, this is the level that many answers reached. However, the issue of proof can only be resolved through an evaluation of the credibility of the sources involved. It was possible to question the accuracy of Source G, particularly the contention that Japan was provoked, by cross-reference – for example to Source A which calls the idea that the Chinese were responsible for the explosion on the railway at Mukden an 'excuse' for Japan's attack. However, of those answers which successfully used source evaluation, by far the majority used Source F, explaining the purpose the Chinese would have had in claiming that the source was taken from a Japanese government document – for example, that it would have been exaggerated in order to increase the chances of intervention by the League. Some candidates knew that they should evaluate Source F, but were unsure about how to do this. Instead they limited their comments to generalisations/speculations about its provenance; that it might be forged, that it might be propaganda, that you could not believe it because the Chinese would say bad things about the Japanese, and so on. These kinds of comments are not considered to be genuine evaluation.

Question 5

Some good answers were seen. Others would have benefited from placing less emphasis on what the two cartoons 'showed', therefore being less descriptive. The idea of a message is what a cartoon means, or what it is trying to say, and if candidates started their answers with these ideas they might identify valid messages more quickly. In fact, most cartoons contain several messages, but most of these are what can be called sub-messages; that is, they are based on part of the cartoon, rather than on it all. On the face of it, the two cartoons in this question were about the League's handling of the Manchurian crisis, which gave rise to a range of possible shared sub-messages, most typically that the League was weak. However, these missed a vital element of both cartoons – the fact that the cartoons are really commenting on the implications of the crisis for the *future* of the League. Thus the 'big message' had to include the idea that the weakness of the League over Manchuria would doom it to be ineffective in future crises – in Source I the League would rather take no action over Manchuria, but instead wait until they are 'murdered in our beds' some time in the future, and in Source H the League tries to pretend that being given a warning of aggression might make a difference in future crises, though it is evident that it will not.

Question 6

The hypothesis that candidates had to test against the sources was that the League's actions over the Manchurian crisis could be defended. This was rather more than just asking whether or not the League failed. It implied a judgement on what the League did. If its actions could be defended then they had to be shown to be justifiable in the circumstances, which could include the idea that they could be excused even if they were insufficient. If its actions could not be defended then they had to be shown to be morally lacking in some way, perhaps motivated by self-interest or cowardice. As always with **Question 6**, the crucial point was how the source content was used to illustrate a judgement (in this instance of defensible or not), and indeed, several sources could be used on both sides of the hypothesis. Although some good, balanced responses were seen, there were candidates who thought the League was so cowardly and useless that nothing it did could be defended. Whether this is historically accurate or not, they would have benefited from an awareness that for the purposes of this question, there will always be evidence in the sources that can be used to test both sides of the hypothesis, and that only answers which do this will achieve the higher marks.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22

Paper 22

Key Messages and General Comments

The Twentieth Century option was selected by a much larger number of candidates than did the Nineteenth Century option. However, the overall quality of work on the two options was about the same. The general comments that follow apply equally to both options.

The overall standard of answers remained very high. Many candidates displayed good critical thinking and an ability to tease out subtle messages from sources. Interpreting sources was generally a strength and there was also much excellent evaluation. The best answers were always rooted in contextual knowledge, with the candidates using this knowledge and understanding to interpret, infer and evaluate.

The best answers were often the shortest. They were able to be short because they directly addressed the question in the first sentence. Candidates are able to use this approach only if they have thought carefully about their answer before starting to write it. For example in Twentieth Century **Question 5**, if they have worked out whether or not they trust Hoare before they start writing they are able to state their judgement in the first sentence and then use the rest of the answer to support the judgement. This is very different to the approach adopted by some other candidates which involves writing about the context and the sources with little reference to the question. Sometimes, having read a page or so of these answers, the Examiner is still searching for the candidate's answer to the question. Sometimes the question is addressed in the last few lines and sometimes it is not addressed at all.

Another important characteristic of good answers is that they are rooted in contextual knowledge and understanding, rather than just containing large amounts of context description which may lack relevance. Instead, their inferences from sources, their interpretation of sources and their evaluation of sources are all informed by their knowledge and understanding. For example, in the Twentieth Century option some candidates' reading of the sources was undermined by their belief that Laval was British. Others misread sources because they, for example, mixed up the chronology of the Hoare-Laval Pact or Hitler's move into the Rhineland. Some candidates responses would have been improved by using their knowledge to recognise particular characters in cartoons e.g. a candidate's knowledge should tell them that the soldier on the left in Source C cannot be the League of Nations. This just would not make sense.

One important aspect of many good answers is the fact that they are based on an overall reading of sources. This applies equally to written and pictorial sources. Sources contain both detail and an overall message or meaning. Candidates should try and reach the latter as this will nearly always lead to better analysis of the sources and better answers to the questions.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth Century Topic

Question 1

The best answers focused on the overall disagreement about who or what was to blame for the war. Source A suggests it was Germany while Source B blames the mood of the time or the overall circumstances. Other candidates concentrated on comparing details. They found the agreements easier than the disagreements.

Question 2

The best answers compared the two sources and found differences between them. They then used one or both of the sources to reach a conclusion about whether they were surprised or not. Some candidates would have benefited from not paraphrasing each source and only addressing the question in the last few lines of their answers.

Question 3

This is a 'purpose' question. Although there were many answers that explained the message of the cartoon (e.g. England is in danger because of the Kaiser's violent ambitions), more candidates could have gone on to suggest reasons why a cartoon with such a message was published at this time. Some candidates only wrote about the context of 1914 and almost ignored the cartoon. To answer a question like this one well involves bringing together context, message and purpose.

Question 4

There were many good answers to this question with candidates able to compare the big messages of the two cartoons e.g. F blames Europe, while G blames Germany for starting the war. The best answers went on to compare the possible purpose of the two sources.

Question 5

The best answers focused either on the fact that the author of Source H would be outraged by the way that decisions about going to war were being made in Source I, or on his reaction to Lloyd George trying to justify himself in I. Some candidates were unable to find any connection between the two sources.

Question 6

Many of the comments about **Question 6** in the Twentieth Century option apply here (see below). The best answers are always those that include clear explanations of how sources support or disagree with the statement.

Option B: Twentieth Century Topic

Question 1

The best answers were based on overall readings of the two sources about blame. Source A can be said to blame France, while Source B blames Britain or Britain and France. There were also many good answers comparing the details of the sources. This needed careful reading. Some candidates needed to take more care over comparisons. For example, to write that both sources say that Hoare and Laval resigned did not constitute a high level response. Careful and accurate comparisons, for example that both sources say the crisis was a major test or Source A suggests that Britain was ready to stand up to Italy, while Source B suggests the opposite, were awarded higher marks. Answers that covered both agreements and disagreements were even better. Candidates should always try and read sources as a whole for their overall points of view.

Question 2

This is a 'purpose' question and the best answers interpreted the cartoon's message and then explained the purpose of sending out such a message at that time. There were some mis-readings of the cartoon. Some of these were based on incorrect chronology, for example that Hitler was remilitarising the Rhineland in 1935, while others thought that the soldier represented the League going into Abyssinia. Many candidates explained parts of the cartoon, for example that Mussolini was planning to invade Abyssinia, while some almost ignored the source and just wrote about the context of 1935. The best answers used both parts of the cartoon (Mussolini and Hitler) and explained that the cartoonist was pointing out that there was far more to fear from Germany than from Italy, and that Hitler's saw Mussolini's adventure into Abyssinia as an opportunity to forward his plans in Europe. These answers finished by suggesting that that cartoon was published to persuade the British government that it had to stand up to Hitler. Candidates should be reminded that in purpose questions such as this one it is important to explain three things: the message of the cartoon, the historical context, and what the impact of the message was intended to be at that time.



Question 3

There were many good answers to this question, with candidates able to compare the big message of the cartoon with the message of the text. For example that the League is failing in both. The best answers went one step further and compared the cartoonists' points of view - France and Britain are being blamed in Source D, while only France is blamed in Source E. Cartoons need to be read carefully. They should also be read in context. Thus the roller skates in Source D make it unlikely that the cartoonist was trying to imply that Laval and Baldwin were trying really hard to stand up to Mussolini. The candidates' knowledge of the topic should also make such an idea unlikely.

Question 4

A large majority of candidates made it clear whether they were surprised or not. Candidates who wrote some good analysis but at no point in their answers actually stated whether they were surprised or not could not achieve the highest levels in the mark scheme. Most candidates compared Sources F and G to useful effect. Some found valid reasons for being surprised, some for not being surprised, and some candidates managed to cover both possibilities. The best answers drew on relevant contextual knowledge or cross-referenced to other sources to explain why they were surprised by Source F.

Question 5

There were some excellent answers where candidates used the fact that Hoare was trying to justify himself after his resignation together with their contextual knowledge to explain how they did not trust what Hoare says in Source H. Other candidates recognised the issue about Hoare trying to justify himself and would have improved their responses by being able to develop it. It was surprising to find that a number of candidates confidently asserted that because he had just resigned, Hoare had no reason to lie.

Question 6

Some very good answers were seen and the best ones explained how sources either supported or disagreed with the statement. This explanation needs to clearly identify the source and needs to explain precisely how the source either supports or disagrees, rather than being just a paraphrase of a source. Also, it is generally better not to write about several sources as a group. When this is attempted the explanation tends to be general and doesn't apply any one source in particular. Some candidates neglected the sources and wrote an essay-style response, while others only wrote about the sources on one side of the debate, for example, they only explained how some sources supported the statement.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/23

Paper 23

Key Messages and General Comments

There were many candidates who showed a sound understanding of the period studied and some of these candidates were able to use the sources well. Other candidates found dealing with the use of sources more challenging and they tended to adopt a predominantly contextual approach.

In the use of sources there was much evidence to suggest that candidates were familiar with the context in which the sources were placed and there was good evidence of source interpretation. At times this was confined to picking out details within the sources, i.e. these candidates would benefit from looking at sources in holistic terms. The ability to grasp the overall message behind the sources is what helps candidates to progress towards the higher levels in the markscheme.

Some good source evaluation was seen, although some candidates could improve upon this. Such candidates, when looking at sources in terms of reliability, often respond in basic and simplistic terms, for example stating that the source must be reliable as it was written by a historian or it is a primary source. This tends to lead to many sources being accepted at face value. Some candidates would benefit from honing their cross-referencing skills. This is particularly important when looking at reliability.

Many candidates wrote at great length in this year's examination. Whilst some excellent full responses were seen, the best approach is to spend some time thinking about how to approach questions before starting to write the answer. This helps candidates to avoid losing the thread of the argument, problems with timing (particularly if too much has been written in the early answers), and the legibility of scripts.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth Century Topic

Question 1

Candidates were asked to say how far two sources agreed with each other. Responses to this question were mixed. There were many differences of detail between the two sources and many candidates were able to pick up on these. A number of candidates' responses would have been improved by spotting, and therefore comparing, the big message of the two sources. This message concerned the nature of the foreign policy pursued by Kaiser Wilhelm. Both sources were clearly critical of this policy, clearly implying that he did not really have any clear aims. They also clearly suggested that the policy of Weltpolitik itself provided no clear sense of direction or was indeed largely meaningless. This was seen in Source A where it was suggested that 'German "world policy" was a pretence.' Source B suggested that 'Weltpolitik did not have a very precise meaning.' This message, as stated above, was not seen by some candidates, many feeling far more comfortable dealing with the many differences in detail between the two sources.

Whilst stronger candidates were able to explain differences in terms of either sub-messages or the big message, less successful responses were sometimes characterised by half correct or inaccurate matching. Examples of this included identifying details from one source but not finding an appropriate match from the other. Some candidates misread the question and didn't establish whether they actually agreed or disagreed. There were also candidates who tried to answer the question by using contextual knowledge only, rather than the sources.

Question 2

The best responses were able to deal with the point of view of the cartoonist or indeed the purpose of the cartoon, which was to warn the British government about the Kaiser and his activities. This is an area where candidates need to be encouraged to look for the purpose behind cartoons in order to access the higher levels of the mark scheme. Other candidates responded by just writing about the source. In questions of this type, candidates need to address the question by giving a reason for the source being published at that particular time. Some candidates just wrote about the source by treating the cartoons as separate entities, each with their own particular message, rather than by viewing the source holistically. This meant that the overall message about the indecisive nature and quixotic personality of the Kaiser was missed. Some didn't recognise the Kaiser - many saw the figure as being Bismarck. Details from the source and a number of sub-messages were recognised by many candidates but the big message, as already stated, could have been recognised by more candidates. A better grasp of the significance of the 1905 crisis would have improved some responses, as it could be used to place the purpose of the cartoon in its context.

Question 3

The best responses were able to use the details from the sources to show that Source E was wrong and/or not wrong. Responses could be further improved by evaluating either Source D or E to try to reach a conclusion as to whether E was right or wrong. Some candidates just wrote about the sources, while others attempted to reach the higher levels of the markscheme by focusing on the provenance of the two sources. This was mainly achieved by considering either the time difference or the differing audiences of the two sources.

Question 4

This question provoked some interesting responses. The best candidates were able to pick out the big message - that the war was the fault of Germany or of German militarism. Many were able to show one or more sub-messages. There were many of these which could be used, including that Germany had invaded Belgium, that it was heavily armed or that it refused to accept blame. It was, on the whole, well answered, although some candidates struggled and produced some very interesting suggestions as to who the figure in the cartoon represented.

Question 5

Some responses would have benefited from a better understanding of Source G, and better contextual knowledge about the events leading to the First World War and who was involved. Contextual knowledge and/or cross referencing could have been used to show that the Kaiser was lying or not lying in Source H. However, better candidates were able to use some of the details from the sources to show this. Other candidates attempted to access the higher levels by examining the provenance of the sources. A number of candidates tried to answer the question by suggesting that the Kaiser was partly lying or that he was lying to a lesser or greater extent. Some of these responses would have benefited by being clearer about whether they were arguing for or against the statement given.

Question 6

There were some very good responses to this question. For some, further progress could be made by a more careful reading of the statement at the start of the question. The statement was whether there was convincing evidence about the Kaiser being personally to blame for the war. Some candidates thought the statement referred to the responsibility of Germany. Also, some candidates could improve by better explaining how the specific content of particular sources contributed to the decision made as to why the particular source was used. Greater reference to, and evaluation of the sources, will also help to improve responses. Some responses wrote about reliability in terms of it being written by a historian - therefore it must be reliable, or it was reliable as it was written at the time. More in-depth evaluation of sources will produce better answers.

Option B: Twentieth Century Topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates to look at how far two sources agreed with each other. Responses to the question were mixed. There were many examples of candidates appropriately identifying agreements and disagreements between the two sources. Agreements included were that both sources showed that there were problems caused by the overall weakness of the League of Nations and the fact that both sources showed that France wanted a strong League against Germany. Disagreements included that Source A suggested that the League lacked power from the start, whilst Source B stated that it did in fact start off as an all-powerful organisation. The other major area of disagreement was that Source A claimed that the League failed due to a shift in the European balance of power, whilst Source B stated that the failure of the League was entirely due to the Hoare-Laval pact.

Stronger candidates were able to explain these agreements/disagreements clearly and well, with evidence of clear matching. Less successful candidates wrote answers which sometimes included half correct or inappropriate matching. Examples of this included identifying details from one source but not providing an appropriate match from the other. Some candidates misread the question and responded with 'I agree with Source A', thus not addressing the question as set. Some would have benefited by making clearer whether they thought the sources actually agreed or disagreed. Others tried to answer the question by using contextual knowledge alone, rather than source content. Candidates were more comfortable in dealing with agreements and disagreements of detail. More successful answers recognised that the overall message of the two sources was that the League of Nations was not a total failure but was, by 1935-36, a spent force.

Question 2

This question was generally answered well. It was encouraging to see that the vast majority of candidates applied themselves to the question set by stating whether they were surprised or not surprised. Many candidates were able to use details in the source to establish surprised/not surprised using the idea that it was seen as a toy in C, whilst in D it clearly had a valid role and purpose. Some responses would have been improved by answering the question the right way round – rather than being surprised by Source D. Also a significant number of candidates rejected source D on the basis that it was not significant as the USA did not join the League, which tended to deflect them from addressing the question. In addition, whilst many candidates conducted valid evaluations of Source D, more could have applied this to Source C to check for surprised/not surprised.

Question 3

This question was generally answered well. Very few candidates were limited to the lower levels of the markscheme as they were able to progress beyond either surface description or misinterpretation. The vast majority were able to progress at least to Level 3 by using sub-messages. Most were able to see that the source showed the weakness of the League of Nations, or the fact that war would be a constant and recurring problem for the League, or that the League should have an army. To achieve the highest level it was necessary to explain the point of view of the cartoonist - that is the real message he was putting across. Some of the better candidates were able to do this either by referring to his general criticism of the League, or by adding to this by placing the cartoon in the context of the Corfu incident, thereby achieving a very high mark. Whilst the level of contextual knowledge shown was sound, many weaker candidates were confused by the large figure of war and saw it as a representation of Hitler. These candidates tended to misunderstand the context as well, by placing it as a representation of the re-occupation of the Rhineland.

Question 4

This again was answered well by the more able candidates who clearly knew of, and understood, the response of the League of Nations to the Manchurian crisis and how this was represented in the sources. Many candidates were able to spot and explain the big message of the source which revolved around the idea that unless the League or the major nations do not do something then they will regret it later. More could have gone on from this to consider either the point of view of the cartoonist, or the purpose behind the publication of the cartoon. The level of contextual knowledge displayed by candidates about the Manchurian crisis was very sound and most candidates were able to progress through some of the levels by either describing the details of the source or by considering sub-messages such as it showing the failure of the League to act. There were still a number of candidates who, despite showing in some cases both knowledge and understanding, did not address the question effectively. These candidates needed to provide a valid reason for publication in their answer.

Question 5

Many candidates were able to compare the sources to establish a match to show that Eden was not lying. This was mainly done by matching the sources to show that in both he said that sanctions had failed. Other candidates appeared to find Source H challenging. Better application of contextual knowledge and more cross-referencing to other sources to try to answer the question set, would have improved responses. For example, more candidates could have used contextual knowledge to show the possibility that Eden was lying by showing that if Britain and Eden had done as much as they said then they should have considered the closure of the Suez Canal or other stronger sanctions to resolve the crisis. Many candidates tried to use the provenance of the sources and their particular audiences to try to access the higher levels. This could have been improved in many cases, since it often consisted of assertions that, in Source G, Eden would not lie as he was speaking to Parliament. A number of candidates answered by suggesting that Eden was 'partly lying' or that 'he was lying a little'. Sometimes in this type of answer candidates tended to blur their responses and it was unclear as to what their arguments were.

Question 6

There were some good responses to this question. As with the Nineteenth Century topic, even better answers could have been produced by some through a more considered reading of the statement. The statement was that the League never had a chance of succeeding. Some candidates seemed to think the statement referred to whether the League was a success or a failure. Also, some candidates could improve by better explaining how the specific content of particular sources contributed to the decision made as to why the particular source was used. Greater reference to, and evaluation of, the sources will also help to improve responses. Some responses wrote about reliability in terms of it being written by a historian - therefore it must be reliable, or it was reliable as it was written at the time. More in-depth evaluation of sources will produce better answers.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

Virtually all Centres submitted the correct sample of candidates' work and also included markschemes, sources and helpful information about the conditions under which the work was completed. Most of the marking was accurate and although some marks were moderated, these adjustments were usually very modest.

There was a substantial increase in the number of Centres using the coursework option. Centres appeared to have understood the coursework requirements and there was an improvement in the overall quality of work. Appropriate and sometimes challenging tasks were set. The latter often produced the best work. Many Centres use the 'approved' assignments from CIE. However, many of the most interesting and effective assignments were those constructed by the Centres themselves.

Assignment 1

More Centres are moving to an essay approach for this assignment. This was often very effective and allowed many of the candidates a real opportunity to show what they could do. The essay question needs to focus on significance in some way and should require candidates to reach a judgement of their own which they have to support through analysis and informed argument. The best essay answers were those that stated their answer to the question and then spent the rest of the answer supporting it. These answers made every paragraph count and were free from irrelevant description and narrative. Candidates should be encouraged to directly address the question in every part of the answer. Many of the questions involved candidates, in one way or another, having to compare the importance of two factors. The best work compared their importance all the way through, rather than leaving any comparisons to the conclusion.

Some Centres use structured assignments. In these, some candidates answer the final and most demanding question in an essay length answer. When this happens it often raises questions about the value of the less searching earlier questions. However, the structure that this approach provides is clearly useful to some candidates.

It should be remembered that good analysis is required for high marks. For example, when a question asks about short-term and long-term causes, an examination of the different functions of these two types of causes should be included in the analysis. However, this should always be based on the particular historical causes and events being studied and should not be 'generic'.

Assignment 2

There was much good work for this assignment, with candidates showing their ability to interpret, infer from, evaluate and use historical sources. For this assignment it is essential to use a structured approach with between 4 and 6 questions. This ensures that a range of skills will be tested and a range of sources will be used. In some assignments a greater focus on the sources was needed on the final question and the candidates sometimes provided source-free answers.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

This examination as the alternative to coursework option contains questions based on sources, and questions which require the deployment of knowledge and argument. When answering questions on source-based questions, it is vital that candidates use the actual source detail and material in their answers. In order to answer knowledge and argument-based questions, candidates must develop their answers beyond superficial comments. Examiners need to see evidence that candidates not only have good knowledge but that their answers show command of the subject matter.

General Comments

The Depth Study chosen most often by candidates in this session was Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945. Also popular were Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941 and Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941. Attempts at other Depth Studies were rare.

There were a few signs that time pressures had affected the candidates' performances. Most wrote in appropriate coloured ink so that their answers were accessible to the Examiners, although there were a number of scripts that showed that candidates had not taken advantage of all the time available. Answers here lacked development and depth.

Some candidates avoid using source detail when answering **Question (a) (iii)**. Source-based questions must have source based answers. Sometimes candidates choose one source to write about when the question is about the sources' comparative utility; at other times the candidates write about what the sources are 'about', describing the general area of focus. Here, they need to use source details to avoid very low marks. Others try to evaluate the sources – even writing lists in the margin of the script of various aspects to be considered like tone, motive etc. – but the evaluation is not always completed. It is vital that candidates use source detail to make their arguments.

Also, in this session, **Questions (b) (iii)** and **(b) (iv)** generally needed to be answered less briefly and with more development. High marks can only be gained for answers to these questions with developed reasons and reasoning, and developed and balanced arguments respectively.

The rest of this report will concentrate on the three Depth Studies which were chosen by the vast majority of candidates.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945

Question (a) (i)

Most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A to show that there were two sides to the Hitler Youth movement. They saw that there was much enthusiasm, but at the same time people had misgivings about its undermining of valued areas of life like religion and free speech. Competent answers were seen and high marks awarded.

Question (a) (ii)

Again, most candidates scored well on this question, listing evidence of the Hitler Youth's successes, evidence of declining interest and even damage that could be inflicted upon young Germans. Most found a good balance of evidence.

Question (a) (iii)

All the features described above in the General Comments section applied here. Candidates wrote about the general area of the sources without using source detail, and they attempted evaluations which were incomplete e.g. 'Source B is more useful as the writer had his work published in 2005 and so would have had time to check his facts and see other research'. However, some candidates compared and contrasted the content of the sources, while a few candidates saw that there were elements in both sources that supported one another. These candidates had deployed a successful cross reference and were rewarded accordingly.

Question (b) (i)

There were many answers which were awarded maximum marks because the candidates knew of the Edelweiss Pirates. There were also some who appeared not to have heard of the group.

Question (b) (ii)

Some candidates were hindered by interpreting the word 'Protestants' as 'protesters'. Hence, they showed opposition to the Nazis but not the opposition of the Protestant Church and its members in Germany. Nevertheless, there were some full and detailed answers showing knowledge and command of the subject matter.

Question (b) (iii)

Many candidates addressed this question as to why Nazi propaganda was successful with full answers detailing its all pervading nature, impressive displays and rallies, radio, film, lack of different views etc. Others gave more superficial answers which needed more detail. Candidates must show knowledge and develop their answers.

Question (b) (iv)

Here again, there was contrast of styles of answering. The best deployed arguments demonstrated why the Nazis were popular – work, pride, parades, confidence, various beneficial movements – and why these elements might keep them in power. They contrasted this with the use of force and fear – the SA, SS, Gestapo, banning of other parties and views. All of these aspects were developed in cogent arguments. They scored well. Some other responses consisted of short single paragraphs that asserted that the Nazis were popular because Hitler was a good speaker.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Question (a) (i)

Candidates were able to find valid inferences in Source A about Rasputin. They often couched these observations in much contextual knowledge which is evidence of the fascination this man still holds for candidates. The contextual knowledge was not actually necessary for the good scores that were achieved by most.

Question (a) (ii)

Many candidates found a balance of evidence about the troops' anxiety about life at home, and they quoted relevant extracts from the source. In less successful responses candidates could only see evidence that the troops' anxiety was justified, and so produced one sided answers.

Question (a) (iii)

Although the General Comments above apply to this question, some candidates commented that the sources showed that there was a definite lack of trust shown in both sources. They commented that the Tsar's court was riven by the character of Rasputin, and that the troops in Source B were willing to believe anything of the ruling classes. Hence they concluded by cross reference that Russia and its ruling classes were not trusted or trustworthy.

Question (b) (i)

Some candidates knew exactly who the Mensheviks were and others did not.

Question (b) (ii)

Most candidates knew very well what the Okhrana did and wrote much to show their work. Detailed answers were common.

Question (b) (iii)

Good candidates were able to offer a variety of reasons why the Russian army was beaten in the First World War. They were able to develop arguments about the leadership and equipment of the army, the interference of the Tsar, the rumours about Rasputin and the Tsarina. Some even developed quite complex arguments about the interaction of the deployment of a peasant army and the lack of workers on the land. Discontent in industry was also cited. Weaker candidates tended to concentrate on the actions of the Tsar, Tsarina and Rasputin.

Question (b) (iv)

Some answers argued that the whole governmental system over many years was more at fault, and others added that Nicholas was the victim of the inevitable outcomes of changing times, war and a long term build up of frustrations in the peasantry, the workers and middle classes. Some of these answers were extremely well argued.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Question (a) (i)

Most candidates were able to draw valid inferences and score well. Some candidates interpreted 'migrant families' as 'immigrant families', and this affected their interpretation of the source.

Question (a) (ii)

Some candidates struggled with Source B a little. However, most candidates were able to show evidence on both sides of the question and scored well. If the answer was one sided, it usually argued that the New Deal was not beneficial.

Question (a) (iii)

The features of this part question outlined in the General Comments above apply here. There were general descriptions of the areas of the content of the sources, and incomplete evaluations like 'Source A is useful because it was written by an FSA worker and he would know' and 'Source B is unreliable because he was a Republican economist writing in 2003 and would want to put down everything the Roosevelt did.' There were some good contrast and compare answers but Examiners more completed evaluations were required for higher marks.

Question (b) (i)

Many knew much about the dust bowl. Some wrote very long answers for the marks available for that question. Weaker candidates knew the issue was based on land but did not have the detail required.

Question (b) (ii)

Answers to this question were often brief but scored well as the candidates' knowledge about the Conservation Corps was accurate and detailed. Less successful responses either did not know of the Corps or guessed at its activities.

Question (b) (iii)

There were some good reasons deployed by candidates to explain the second New Deal of 1935. Arguments surrounding criticism by Republicans, Huey Long, the looming election, unemployment numbers etc. were advanced. Weaker candidates suggested it was necessary to 'make up for what the first New Deal had missed'.

Question (b) (iv)

Better candidates argued about whether it was industrial workers that gained most from the New Deal. They argued that employers disliked legislation and some were savage in their reaction to strikes. Benefits from improved conditions and social security were deployed. Other groups like the old and farm workers were suggested to have done better from the New Deal. These answers were interesting to read. Other answers just agreed that industrial workers have benefited most from the New Deal but they needed more supporting evidence.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

This examination, as the alternative to coursework option, contains questions based on sources, and questions which require the deployment of knowledge and argument. When answering source-based questions, it is vital that candidates use the actual source detail and material in their answers. In order to answer knowledge and argument-based questions, candidates must develop their answers beyond superficial comments. Examiners need to see evidence that candidates have not only good knowledge but also that their answers show command of the subject matter.

General Comments

The Depth Study chosen most often by candidates was Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945. Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941 has now overtaken Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941 in terms of popularity, while Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994 continues to attract an increasing number of candidates. While there were some candidates who attempted the remaining Depth Studies, these were small numbers of candidates.

There were few signs that time pressures had affected the candidates' performances and most wrote in appropriate coloured inks so that their answers were accessible to Examiners. There were also a number of scripts that showed that candidates had not taken advantage of all the time that was available. Here the answers required more development and depth.

Some candidates tend to avoid the use of source detail when answering **Question (a) (iii)**. Source-based questions require source-based answers. Sometimes candidates choose one source to write about when the question is about the sources' comparative utility; others write what the sources are 'about', describing the general areas of focus. Here, they need to use source detail to avoid very low marks. Others try to evaluate the sources – even writing lists in the margin of the script of various aspects to be considered like tone, motive etc. – but the evaluation is not always completed. It is vital that candidates use source detail to make their arguments.

Also, in this session, **Questions (b) (iii)** and **(b) (iv)** generally needed to be answered less briefly and with more development. High marks can only be gained for answers to these questions with developed reasons and reasoning, and developed and balanced arguments respectively.

Depth Study A: Germany 1918-1945

Question (a) (i)

Most candidates were able to draw valid reasons from Source A about the German Army. They saw that it was used to crush groups that the Army did not favour and was not averse to corruption and spying. Most candidates scored well here.

Question (a) (ii)

Many, who wrote one sided answers to this question asserted that the source did not show that the Nazis had any success in the 1920s and felt the evidence showed continuous failures. Balanced answers found some positives in Source B in the facts that the SA continued to recruit, Hitler was released and wanted to use legal ways to gain power, and bans being lifted.

Question (a) (iii)

There were many responses to this question as described in the General Comments section. At the evaluation included comments that, 'Source B can be trusted as it is from a German textbook for candidates. This would have to tell the truth.' However, some candidates saw that both sources showed that the army, especially von Epp, a Nazi supporter in Source A, was not averse to using secret funds to help the Nazis, and that in Source B the Party and the SA had bans lifted by simply changing names. Both sets of actions were felt to be pushing the law to its limits, and therefore were mutually supportive in stating that the Nazis were prepared to abuse the law if it suited them.

Question (b) (i)

Most candidates were able to state that the voting system established by the Weimar constitution was proportional representation, but did not elaborate further.

Question (b) (ii)

Candidates usually scored well on this question and gave full details of the activities of the SA. Some attributed activities of other groups like the SS or the Gestapo to the SA, while others again confused the SA and the SS.

Question (b) (iii)

Many of the answers to this question on why the Nazis failed to gain more seats in the 1920s were full and impressive, covering distrust after the Munich Putsch and the success of the Stresemann years. Weaker candidates concentrated on the fact that Hitler was in prison for a while and could not organise the Nazi party.

Question (b) (iv)

There were some remarkable answers to this question about Hitler's becoming Chancellor in January 1933 due to the weakness of other politicians. Candidates gave full detail of Brüning, von Papen and von Schleicher's weaknesses and Hindenburg's dilemmas against other factors like popularity and perceived strength of the Nazis, the ongoing depression etc. There were also less successful answers that concentrated solely on the conspiratorial method of Hitler's appointment, while others would have benefited from appreciating that the question stopped at the end of January 1933. These candidates tried to use the impact of the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act. These last two factors happened after Hitler was appointed Chancellor and so were not relevant to the question.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Question (a) (i)

Candidates were easily able to draw valid inferences from Source A and pointed out the natural conservatism of the peasants. While the peasants admired the power and strength of the tractor, they were afraid of the impact of the fumes and felt that the new methods would not work. High marks were gained here.

Question (a) (ii)

Most candidates found a balance of evidence in Source B as to whether collectivisation had been a success. They pointed out the early problems of famines and the cost in human life and misery against the increasing production figures and the fact that farming was now served by agricultural experts. Again, high marks were achieved.

Question (a) (iii)

Again, answers similar to those described in the General Comments section, were found. Some evaluations attempted wrote, 'Source A was talking many years after collectivisation so could have forgotten most of it. And, anyway it was an American reporter who would have wanted to make the Russians look weak.' Of Source B, Examiners found the 'British historian would have had plenty of time to check his facts.' It was rare to find that candidates pointed out that there was an initial concern over changes and equipment in both sources which later led to success.

Question (b) (i)

Most candidates were able to show that they understood the characteristics of a kolkhoz, although fewer had knowledge of a sovkhos.

Question (b) (ii)

Candidates scored well on this question, writing about fear and intimidation and the fate of the kulaks. Some candidates appreciated that some peasants were given extra rewards and responsibilities.

Question (b) (iii)

There were many well crafted answers to this question on the importance to Stalin of the Five Year Plans. Candidates clearly understood much of the context. Although some candidates knew much about the Five Year Plans, they did not always comment on why Stalin found them to be so important. This affected the balance of the answers.

Question (b) (iv)

There were well developed and informed answers on the effectiveness of the changes made to agriculture and industry by 1941. These showed good knowledge, good argument and command of the subject matter. Other answers were less successful. Some candidates wrote about agriculture or industry but not both, while other candidates needed to deal with the question in more depth.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Question (a) (i)

Candidates were able to draw valid inferences about investors in the stock market. They pointed out that they had been duped by the bankers who had claimed to be puzzled by the circumstances and then made profits by quietly selling off their shares. Some candidates made observations about the similarities of then and now.

Question (a) (ii)

Candidates were often able to find a balance of evidence in Source B on whether the American economy was strong. They pointed to the increasing demands for consumer goods throughout the 1920s and the wealth of the 'barons' against the lack of funds of the poor when one half of a per cent of the population received 12 per cent of the national income. Good marks were achieved.

Question (a) (iii)

Many candidates pointed out that the dates when both sources were written were 74 years apart and comments were made about who would know and who would have been able to check. A few candidates pointed out that in both cases the poor and working classes were duped and the bankers and 'robber barons' were still rich.

Question (b) (i)

Most candidates understood that the 'breadline' was about food and drink to the unemployed and destitute but more could have been aware that the suppliers of the poor were charities.

Question (b) (ii)

Answers to this question showed that some candidates knew a great deal about the Bonus March and gave much context and information, while the responses of others were less full.

Question (b) (iii)

Although answers to the question about the reasons for severe unemployment in agricultural areas by 1932 varied in quality, it was clear that candidates had good knowledge of the circumstances of this unemployment. Marks depended on how well the candidates explained their reasons.

Question (b) (iv)

There were many well informed and full answers to the degree that it was Hoover's unpopularity that enabled Roosevelt to win the 1932 election. Other candidates would have improved their responses by offering more information as to why Hoover might have been unpopular. These candidates were better informed about Roosevelt's popularity.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

Question (a) (i)

Candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from Source A, and support them from evidence in the source. They saw good trends and poor trends, with increases in exports outstripped by a greater percentage of imports. They saw that government actions that increased taxes on imports were dangerous to free trade but as the taxes were on cars and TVs, then the Chinese were getting used to a better standard of living.

Question (a) (ii)

Some candidates were surprised to find that Source B saw Mao's mass murders as part of the development of modern China and all the things that Deng developed. Most found evidence for a balanced answer, but a few wrote one sided answers which usually said that Mao had benefited China.

Question (a) (iii)

Candidates usually compared and contrasted the content of the sources. There were some incomplete evaluations and the provenance of the sources being both British and recent appeared to trouble some candidates. Better candidates saw that both sources showed setbacks economically and deaths, but each also showed improvements in the daily lives of the Chinese people. They had seen that the two sources supported one another.

Question (b) (i)

Almost all candidates were able to nominate Hong Kong and Macao as the two territories that were under foreign imperial powers in 1990.

Question (b) (ii)

Most candidates knew that Deng and the Gang of Four were involved in the power struggle after Mao's death. More could have mentioned Hua Guofeng, who had been Mao's choice.

Question (b) (iii)

Candidates either had a full knowledge of the reasons for demonstrations in Tiananmen Square in April and June 1989 or they had a passing knowledge. What united all answers was an admiration for the bravery of some of the protesters and a condemnation of the brutal attacks upon protesters.

Question (b) (iv)

Good quality candidates were able to offer a balanced argument about economic developments and their social and political impact by 1990. They pointed out that social progress was being developed and that foreign investment meant contact with the West, developments at UNO and with the World Bank, and special economic zones all increased the horizons and demands of the Chinese people. Better answers also pointed out that most Chinese, especially in the countryside, would have noticed little change and that there was no political change as the Chinese Communist Party remained firmly in control of the country.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

Question (a) (i)

Candidates were easily able to draw valid inferences from Source A that the apartheid law, The Population Registration Act, would not be immediately successful as it flew in the face of the previous history of Cape Town where mixed marriages had been common. The author thought that the Mixed Marriage Act of 1949 might eventually have some impact but candidates also thought the author was less than sure of this.

Question (a) (ii)

Some candidates wrote one-sided answers on the question of whether Source B showed that separate development was for the benefit of South Africans and they showed from the source that it appeared to be a policy that was for the benefit of white South Africans. Even those who wrote a balanced answer felt that the policy said it was for the benefit of all South Africans but very much on the white South Africans' terms.

Question (a) (iii)

Most candidates compared and contrasted the content of both sources. Some candidates could have improved their responses by making a successful evaluation by way of the provenance of each source. The differences in tone and writing by the liberal Afrikaner and the communist history of apartheid could have been better exploited.

Question (b) (i)

Banning orders were described generally, rather than with specific detail, hinting that candidates were unclear of their purpose.

Question (b) (ii)

Information about the Treason Trials could have been more convincing from some candidates.

Question (b) (iii)

Answers to why the Bantustans were not a success would have benefited from a more in depth approach. Some just asserted that they failed as they were unfair to the black South Africans who lived there. More development of details or ideas would have improved many responses.

Question (b) (iv)

Answers to how far the apartheid policies had to rely on repression by the security forces were sometimes emotional responses and contained information about repression and fear in the general sense. Specific examples were required, and attempts to show reasons other than the security forces would have helped answers.

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

Question (a) (i)

Candidates were easily able to draw valid inferences from Source A, and often commented about confusion in Egypt's military command. They pointed out that the General in command of the air force had sensibly asked for concrete bunkers to protect his aircraft on the ground, but the budget seemed to be dealt with on the President's whim and those decisions would only be taken by the President himself. He would be upset and reject arguments that came from personnel that disagreed with him. They also added that President Nasser rejected honest appraisals of situations and common sense suggestions. High marks were scored.

Question (a) (ii)

There were some comprehensive answers to this question and many found a balance of evidence in Source B about the extent to which the source showed that war was expected in the Middle East in 1967. Candidates compared the over confident Israeli assessment with the hysterical and very obvious sabre rattling and movement of troops by Nasser.

Question (a) (iii)

In some ways, answers to this question could have been better with candidates wanting to evaluate, as seen by lists written in the margins of scripts, but not always complete the evaluation. Some candidates spoke of both sources showing Egyptian chaos, but they needed to show the evidence from the sources. Others compared the detail from the sources. Some candidates pointed out that both sources showed that military decisions and actions showed the same dysfunctional attitudes in Egypt's decision making. They pointed out that in Source A decisions were taken on a whim by the President and that the movement of troops in such an open and 'hysterical' fashion made no military sense. The element of first strike surprise wanted by General Mahmoud was now impossible because of the ostentatious movement of troops. These answers were well rewarded.

Question (b) (i)

Most candidates were able to identify al-Fatah as a militant Palestinian organisation set up by Yasser Arafat. Good marks were scored here.

Question (b) (ii)

Equally, most candidates understood that Cairo Radio played an enormous part in Israeli/Egyptian relations. They knew it could be both an unofficial mouthpiece for the Egyptian government, and also a propaganda tool to attack Israel, as well as rouse Egyptian and Arab people to hysteria. There were also nice comments that suggested that the hysteria raised by Cairo Radio could raise Arab expectations and commit the Egyptian government to real action when it merely wanted to threaten.

Question (b) (iii)

Very full answers were seen and in many cases they scored highly. Candidates knew the basic truths that Israel was fighting for its life under a single command and with well equipped troops, while the Arab forces were under many commands and with different agendas. Excellent detail was often given.

Question (b) (iv)

There were some answers that agreed with the suggestion in the question that the Six Day War resulted in total victory for Israel. It had now inflicted severe losses on its enemies, captured much expensive military equipment, retained the support of the USA and gained admiration around the world. Other, perhaps more shrewd candidates, showed also that Israel had even larger borders to defend, the Arab states were still defiant – the Khartoum Accord, and UN Resolution 242 had demanded that Israel vacate captured territory. These latter answers were excellent.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

Few candidates attempted this Depth Study and so comments are very general.

Question (a) (i)

Candidates sometimes struggled with finding information and inferences from the poster about the impact of the industrial revolution on workers. Some answers were general in nature and required more than marginal references to the source.

Question (a) (ii)

Candidates needed to develop a balanced argument from the evidence in the cartoon, and some found this challenging.

Question (a) (iii)

Answers to this question tended to be general and speculative.

Question (b) (i)

Not all candidates were able to deliver two accurate features of the Luddite movement.

Question (b) (ii)

Answers here were broad and general comments on the condition of the poor, rather than about the problems faced by the workers in the new factory system.

Question (b) (iii)

The Combination Acts of 1799/1800 and the reasons for their repeal in 1825 could have been better known.

Question (b) (iv)

Answers consisted of general comments on the brutality of the time, rather than specific comments upon employers being selfish and brutal to their workers.

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

Question (a) (i)

Of the few responses on this Depth Study, some were able to draw valid inferences about the benign oppression of British rule in India. The metaphor of the 'knife of sugar' was clearly understood.

Question (a) (ii)

Candidates gave evidence of the contrast of benefits of the transport and industrial development against the damage done by famines in the 1880s and 1890s. Overall, candidates felt that British rule had been beneficial.

Question (a) (iii)

Candidates compared and contrasted the content of the two sources for this question. There was much opportunity to evaluate by cross reference, date and tone and by contextual knowledge. More candidates could have adopted this approach.

Question (b) (i)

The Royal Titles Act, 1876, was not well known by all candidates.

Question (b) (ii)

This question on the main problems affecting India in the second half of the nineteenth century had some answers which generalised about poverty and famine. These answers would have benefited from more specific detail.

Question (b) (iii)

Candidates performed better here and realised that the reasons for the way British rule changed in 1858 were responses to lessons learned from the causes and experience of the Indian Mutiny 1857.

Question (b) (iv)

Answers to this question were general, with evidence of British rule being unwelcome cited in the Mutiny, and being welcome seen in transport developments.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/43
Alternative to Coursework

Key Messages

- Allocation of time in proportion to the available marks is important to ensure that answers, particularly to the higher-tariff questions, are fully supported and relevant.
- It is essential that answers to part **(a)** questions are supported with explicit material from the relevant sources, which is explained rather than just quoted, to gain higher level marks.
- Part **(a) (iii)** questions are designed to enable candidates to offer cross-reference both between the content of the sources and their own knowledge of the issue specified in the question. Thus a reasoned judgement on utility can be demonstrated. Generalisations on reliability, no matter how long, cannot gain high marks.

General Comments

Depth Studies A (Germany, 1918-1945) and C (USA, 1919-1941) were the most popular topics. Slightly fewer candidates had prepared for Depth Study B (Russia, 1905-1941) and the other Depth Studies attracted varying numbers of responses.

Scripts were well presented, written in excellent English and most displayed secure historical knowledge in **Section B** answers. The majority of candidates approached **Questions (a)(i)** and **(ii)** in line with the criteria; some could have been more effective in addressing **Question (a)(iii)**.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Question (a) (i)

All candidates made the valid inference from Source A on the severity of hyperinflation, although fewer considered the earlier gradual increase in inflation. Candidates who ensured that inferences were supported with the required specific examples from the source were able to gain the highest level of marks.

Question a (ii)

Many well-reasoned and balanced answers, supported from the source, were seen to this question and fully merited high marks. Candidates appreciated that confident investors, currency traders and those with debts were positively affected by hyperinflation, whilst others saw their savings and income destroyed.

Question (a) (iii)

Candidates who appreciated that the precise focus of this question was on the wider issue of the German economy, rather than simply inflation, did well as they deployed both content from the sources and their own knowledge of the period to assess the utility of the sources. Cross-reference could also be made on the issue of hyperinflation and its effects, whilst the evidence of well-managed companies and those who had benefited demonstrated that the years to 1923 had seen some secure economic recovery from the war. There were a number of answers which could gain only two marks for general, if often long, points on bias and hindsight indicating reliability rather than addressing the content of the sources.

Question (b) (i)

The Freikorps were correctly identified by almost all candidates who then added some knowledge of their role in the early years of the Weimar Republic to gain full marks. In some cases answers were very low in quality and did not merit the two marks available in relation to later answers which did require greater development.

Question (b) (ii)

There were many excellent answers describing the course of the Munich Putsch in detail. Some candidates weakened their response by just considering the results but, encouragingly, only a small number confused it with the Kapp Putsch.

Question (b) (iii)

Here, too, many candidates displayed excellent knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and those who linked them to explicit reasons for resentment gained full marks. Leaving the reasons only implicit, no matter how detailed the terms, was a feature in some less assured responses.

Question (b) (iv)

Some sound knowledge on the policies of Stresemann was deployed to good effect in answer to this question and many candidates ensured a degree of balance by considering flaws such as dependence on loans and right-wing resentment. The best answers showed a clear grasp of the focus on 'recover' and the specified dates to base their argument explicitly on the problems evident in 1923 and how far these had been resolved by 1929. That there were no more armed revolts after the Munich Putsch, for example, was contrasted with the weaknesses of coalition governments. Few candidates considered the significance of the resolution of the crisis over the Ruhr occupation.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Question (a) (i)

Most candidates did appreciate that the cartoon showed Stalin as a dictator who played every role in the government of Russia and good responses supported this with explicit references to the source showing him as judge, jury and prosecutor which made a mockery of the new 'Constitution'.

Question (a) (ii)

The majority saw some balance in Source B and many went beyond quotation to explain why economic and social reasons were also of significance, if outweighed by the use of purges as political necessity, as well as a means to control the population.

Question (a) (iii)

Sound responses focused clearly on the issue of Stalin's control and supported this from both sources. The best responses made cross-reference between the sources' evidence of control at all levels and supported this from their own knowledge to reach a reasoned judgement. Other candidates needed to explain and give specific support, rather than dismiss the cartoon as 'biased' and to praise the merits of Source B.

Question (b) (i)

Sergey Kirov was correctly identified by almost all candidates and some were able to describe his role in the Party and the significance of his assassination.

Question (b) (ii)

General awareness of Show Trials was shown by the majority of candidates, some of whom did explicitly consider both their 'purpose' and 'working' as required by the question and thus gained very high marks.

Question (b) (iii)

That the purge of the armed forces seriously weakened Russia's response to German invasion was noted by all candidates, although there was a tendency to vague repetition, rather than supported development and awareness of the effect on both the senior command and lower ranks of the military as well as specific battles.

Question (b) (iv)

Candidates with secure knowledge of the methods of control that inspired fear, as well as of other factors such as propaganda and improved social conditions, did well. There were some with an outstanding grasp of relevant detail which fully merited the highest level of award, so long as a balance was ensured. Other candidates needed to avoid brief generalisations and reliance on material in the sources.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Question (a) (i)

Valid inferences on the coal mining industry were drawn and supported well by a large majority of candidates. Some candidates did spend a long time deploying their own knowledge on this question, which was not necessary and, for a few, seemed to take time better spent on their later answers.

Question (ii)

There were many excellent answers to this question from candidates who ensured balanced explanation with specific support from the source for the focus on unemployment. Other responses needed to make explicit links between the problems of agriculture and unemployment and to avoid drifting into the issue of wages and profit which were more pertinent to responses to **Question (a)(iii)**.

Question (iii)

Astute candidates ensured they made the required shift to the wider issue of 'the economy' and supported this from the sources. The best answers were those which made cross-reference on the issue of farming, as well as the problems of the old industries in both sources and the unskilled in contrast to the booming cities and new industries, drawing on their own knowledge to assess the value of the sources. Some candidates just wrote that the sources were biased, without any support from the content in relation to the focus of the question, and thus limited the marks they could achieve.

Question (b) (i)

Those who did know that trusts were super-corporations that dominated vital sectors of the economy, thus strangling competition, also pointed out how far their leaders, such as Carnegie, ironically supported the Republicans.

Question (b) (ii)

All candidates were able to define laissez faire and rugged individualism and most ensured that they linked this explicitly to the economy. How far tariffs contradicted economic freedom and the principle of low taxation which had implications for the economy were also made clear by some knowledgeable candidates.

Question (b) (iii)

There were a large number of excellent answers on a range of reasons for the expansion of industry. Some candidates described industrial development, rather than the reasons for it, and some wrote about agriculture.

Question (b) (iv)

Some very good knowledge of the American economy was evident in a large number of responses and ensured some balance, usually by contrasting agriculture and industry. The best candidates appreciated that the focus of the question was on 'remained' strong and thus began with the strengths and weaknesses at the beginning of the decade and carried their answers to the flaws which the Wall Street Crash highlighted.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

Question (a) (i)

Most candidates gave good inferences and ensured that they were supported directly from Source A to gain good marks.

Question (a) (ii)

Many candidates went beyond simple quotation to explain the dangers in the relationship between China and the USSR evident in the source.

Question (a) (iii)

Secure responses did focus on the issue of Mao's foreign policy and supported this from both sources. The best made cross-reference between the sources' evidence and supported this from their own knowledge to reach a reasoned judgment on utility. Others needed to avoid dismissing the sources as biased because they were both British or to claim they must be trustworthy as they were written by historians. Explanation and/or specific support from the sources is needed to gain higher marks.

Question (b) (i)

The two countries were correctly identified by almost all candidates.

Question (b) (ii)

Relations with Tibet were better known than relations with India

Question (b) (iii)

Most candidates understood that Taiwan was a danger because its political and economic systems were different to those of the Peoples' Republic of China. More candidates could have considered the USA and UNO in this context.

Question (b)(iv)

The best candidates demonstrated their grasp of detailed knowledge on the improvements in China's relations with other countries after the death of Mao, although they were less assured on the continuity of distrust to ensure fully balanced answers.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

Question (a) (i)

Valid inferences on the De Beers Company were drawn and supported well by the majority of candidates, fully meriting Level 3 marks.

Question (a) (ii)

There were many excellent answers to this question from candidates who ensured balanced explanation with specific support from the source on Rhodes' interests, with imperialism and wealth their main focus.

Question (a) (iii)

Sound answers focused on the issue of the mining industry and drew on relevant material from the sources. The best made cross-reference on the issue of the dominance of De Beers and brought in their own knowledge of the gold industry to assess the utility of the sources. To develop effective answers on this question candidates needed support from the content, rather than just writing that the sources were biased. Answers that did not need support in relation to the focus of the question to gain good marks.

Question (b) (i)

Some candidates were able to name Zululand under Cetshwayo. Fewer were aware of Sekhukhune and the Anglo-Pedi war.

Question (b) (ii)

There were some outstanding answers to this question from candidates with excellent knowledge of both the military and political ending of the First Anglo-Boer War.

Question (b) (iii)

There were a similar number of excellent answers on a range of reasons for the outbreak of war in 1899 and candidates, to their credit, focused on developing reasons, rather than description in this question.

Question (b) (iv)

Some good knowledge of the effects of the Anglo-Afrikaner conflicts on the African peoples was displayed in a number of answers, although many could have offered greater balance by comparing this either to any positive results or to the gains and losses for the British and Boers. Those candidates who did consider and support these aspects fully deserved their high marks.

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

Question (a) (i)

There were some good answers to this question in which candidates gave specific support from the source for valid inferences. Others, whilst making similar inferences, did not provide the support from the source necessary to attain the highest level marks.

Question (a) (ii)

Most candidates did well on this question as they saw the balance in the source on the degree of readiness for conflict amongst the Arab states and ensured that their explanations were supported.

Question (a) (iii)

Some sound answers made use of the content of the sources and assessed them in the light of candidates' own knowledge to reach a reasoned conclusion on their utility as evidence about Israel. Candidates who offered only generalisations on reliability could not achieve high marks. A small number of responses wrote about the Arab states instead of Israel: the focus of the question is crucial.

Question (b) (i)

The meaning of Zionism was well known.

Question (b) (ii)

Good answers showed a detailed grasp of the terms of the British mandate over Palestine and other candidates showed some general overall awareness.

Question (b) (iii)

Better known were the reasons for Britain handing over its mandate to the United Nations, many of the domestic problems faced by Britain after the world war and the drain on its finances as important factors as well as the local issues

Question (b) (iv)

Some sound knowledge of influences outside Palestine was deployed by many candidates. Events inside Palestine needed to be more securely grasped in order to achieve fully balanced responses.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were too few responses on this Depth Study for meaningful comments to be made.

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

Question (a) (i)

Candidates drew valid inferences from Source A and those supported with specific content from the source were able to gain good marks.

Question (a) (ii)

Sound answers to this question demonstrated a grasp of its focus, with support and balance from the source.

Question (a) (iii)

Effective answers gave specific support from the sources on British rule in India.

Question (b) (i)

Governor-Generals/Viceroyes of India between 1858 and 1914 were not well known.

Question (b) (ii)

The main terms of the Government of India Act could have been better known by candidates.

Question (b) (iii)

Some reasons for India being prone to famine and disease were considered and responses would have been improved by greater development of these reasons.

Question (b) (iv)

For higher level marks candidates needed to deploy specific knowledge on India after 1858 and to provide some balance in assessing improvement; some of the responses seen would have benefited from being less general in nature.