

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

Improvements in both organisation of material, and quality of answer, has continued with this examination. A significant proportion of candidates are now being fully prepared for the demands of the examination resulting in a reduction in the vague, general answer that has characterised the work of some candidates in the past.

The reduction in the length of answer to **(a)** questions has continued with many now producing succinct responses which offer straightforward factual recall without unnecessary comment which was often unrelated to the demands of the question. The mark scheme does offer the opportunity for an Examiner to reward an extended response with up to two marks and this will continue to operate in the future. Part **(b)** gives the opportunity for candidates to identify and explain reasons, i.e. causation. Candidates should realise that the quality of their explanation and understanding within the context of the question is what gains credit in the highest level.

The ability of the many candidates to challenge the hypothesis given in the question continues to improve. The better responses often leave their decision until the end as to 'most important' or 'how far', basing their judgement on the evidence they have presented. This helps to remove the one-sided approach which leaves answers in the mid-range of marks.

Increased use was seen in this examination of the stimulus material provided. This material is given to help with one of the sub questions and can often give a starting point.

A different format for part **(c)** was used in this examination in **Question 11(c)**. There was no indication that it affected performance. Essentially the approach is the same where the candidate is required to argue for the 'most important' of the issues given. Credit is not given for other reasons introduced by the candidate.

The number of rubric errors remains small and is often the result of candidates answering both questions from one Depth Study. From summer 2007 the time allocation for this paper will increase to 2 hours to give the opportunity for thoughtful planning of responses, and checking and reflecting upon a completed answer. It is not expected that candidates will write at greater length than currently.

Comments on specific questions

The following comments are given to aid teachers in their work with learners. They reflect where either the responses failed to meet the demands of the question or misconceptions identified. These comments relate to the questions that were more popular and do not imply that the questions identified were poorly answered.

Section A: Core Content

Question 1

There were very few answers to this question. A small number, who attempted the question, answered fluently, deploying extensive knowledge of Cavour and Garibaldi in part **(c)**. The answers were weaker from others, whose factual knowledge was limited.

Question 2

Again there were very few answers to this question. The quality of answers to **(a)** and **(b)** were mixed with more general answers about differences between North and South rather than describing conditions in the South. Some candidates only displayed limited knowledge of carpetbaggers whilst in **(c)** answers were often limited to rebuilding of the infrastructure rather than the wider issues.

Question 3

Only a small number of answers were seen. Some candidates misread part **(a)** and wrote about the benefits to Britain. Part **(c)** did produce some good historical knowledge, with an attempt to evaluate 'how far' by evaluating the importance of issues within the argument presented as to what had been achieved.

Question 4

Part **(a)** was generally not very well answered. Candidates struggled to recall information to describe the rivalry and wrote generally about imperialism and colonisation. Answers to **(b)** were characterised by their descriptive nature, often failing to develop explanation with candidates often not prepared to differentiate between 1905 and 1911. The quality of answers to **(c)** varied, with the better ones able to offer explained alternatives to the question hypothesis whilst others had more difficulty explaining the naval race, resulting in answers being limited to information about Dreadnought.

Question 5

This was by far the most popular question with many candidates scoring high marks. Answers to part **(a)** often achieved full marks, showing a clear awareness of why the League of Nations was set up. Occasionally an answer did wander into the activities of the League but this was rare. Part **(b)** was answered well considering the possible difficulty of handling the concept of 'structure'. Many not only explained the weaknesses of the League but in addition backed their explanation with an actual example. The part **(c)** question was much wider in nature than previously asked, allowing candidates to select the material for their arguments from a much wider range. Many did this very successfully. There were some candidates who were fully aware of the disputes in which the League was involved and these were identified and in many instances success, or failure, was indicated. However, in these instances the candidates failed to explain why they were a success, or failure. A common phrase used by many is that the League 'took no action'. This does not constitute an explanation. This comment often related to Manchuria and Abyssinia where the League did take action. To gain higher level marks it is important that the relevance of this action is explained. A small number were able to develop answers around the work of the League but then failed to consider relative success.

Question 6

Common errors which occur when a question on Hitler's foreign policy is set, include that the Sudetenland was land lost by Germany at Versailles, that the Rhineland was lost territory and that the re-taking of the Saarland was Hitler breaking the Treaty. Part **(a)** was well answered with many candidates achieving full marks. Occasionally candidates moved away from the question to write about Hitler's actions or the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. This wasted valuable time. In Part **(b)** the vast majority of candidates were able to identify many ways in which Hitler destroyed the Treaty and many went on to explain how this was achieved to put their answers into the top level. Some took their answer further than necessary, writing about events at the end of the 1930s rather than the destroying of the Treaty. Part **(c)** was comfortably handled with many citing up to three or four explained reasons for justification. Reasons against appeasement, on the weaker side, sometimes relied on general, moral arguments rather than the using of examples of Hitler's actions.

Question 7

Part **(a)** caused problems for some candidates who were unable to differentiate between Yalta and Potsdam. A few were confident enough to point out that in fact little was achieved and this was given credit. Often the dates in **(b)** were ignored and answers included details of the Berlin Wall. Whilst many were able to describe the events of the Berlin airlift this was not developed into explanation as to its contribution to the tension at that time. Answers to **(c)** often strayed beyond the time span in the question. Often a conclusion was reached that they were equally responsible but often this was only based on ideology, although many developed good arguments around the Marshall Plan and the role of the Red Army in relation to 'free elections'.

Question 8

A significantly minority answered this question but many failed to meet the demands posed. Most gained a respectable mark for part **(a)**, describing the events in Hungary and the Soviet Union's response to them. Answers were less well constructed in relation to part **(b)** where an explanation of the 'Prague Spring' was the limit of many. Whilst many candidates were aware of Solidarity, responses often failed to link the movement to the decline of Soviet Influence. Surprisingly little was read of the part Gorbachev's policies played.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

Some excellent responses were seen, highlighting the knowledge and understanding candidates possess of the early years of the Weimar Republic. Having said that, some candidates took the opportunity in part **(a)** to write about social and economic issues, rather than political, as stated in the question. This did not receive credit. Examiners reported seeing some good responses to part **(c)** which cited a number of explained reasons for success. Underlying weaknesses were less-well understood. An issue that still remains is that candidates are able to describe the cultural change but are less confident in explaining the impact. Some candidates ignored the end date in the question and took their answers into the early 1930s.

Question 10

Many answers to **(a)** were general descriptions of Hitler's policies. Often the only real points were the School curriculum and the Hitler Youth. Pre-occupation with attitude towards Jews was produced at considerable length. The many good answers to **(b)** were balanced by the many poor responses in which candidates wrote about 'How Nazis changed the role of women'. This approach only gained limited credit. Although some answers were developed around how the Nazis gained control, credit was given for this. Many answers were strong on how opposition was dealt with, but lacked depth of understanding of the opposition.

Question 11

Part **(a)** was not answered as well as other part **(a)** questions, with some candidates describing the war and its causes rather than its impact. Others concentrated on food shortages and Bloody Sunday. In **(b)** there were many references to the October Manifesto and the Duma but with relatively few explaining how different groups accepted or rejected the promises. For many the different format worked well, giving a structure to what has in the past produced lengthy, rambling answers. It is important, however, that the linking of each of the points given to the issue in the question is developed into explanation.

Question 12

Part **(a)** suggested a clear divide between those who knew of Lenin's 'Political Will' and those who did not. Part **(b)** was generally well documented whilst **(c)** failed to produce precise explanations of Stalin's methods of terror and propaganda, making it difficult for a judgement to be reached about which was the more effective.

Question 13

All candidates attempting this question had little problem with part **(a)**. Some offered the comment that for many there was little change. Credit was given for this. Whilst there were many strong arguments put forward for the introduction of prohibition, many wasted a lot of time describing what it was and why it was repealed. It was good to see in **(c)** candidates supporting their arguments with the use of detailed factual information and statistics. This resulted in a 'fleshing-out' of an answer compared to the 'thin' responses often seen in the past.

Question 14

Parts **(a)** and **(b)** produced many good answers. Opposition to the New Deal by the Republicans was particularly well answered with detailed, well-explained points. Part **(c)** was often unbalanced as candidates found it more difficult to go against the question hypothesis other than in relation to the degree that the New Deal solved unemployment.

Question 15 and Question 16

There were very few answers seen to the two questions in this Depth Study. Candidates' responses to 16 **(a)** were often limited to their attitude towards the Japanese and to the peasants whilst in **(b)** this was turned round to a positive for the Communists. Many made a very good effort to come to terms with the challenge of the questions, producing good arguments both for and against the two leaders. In 16 both **(a)** and **(b)** were generally well answered with good explanation of improvements with the USA. The better answers to **(c)** were read in scripts written by candidates who attempted to define 'superpower' and then use evidence in their possession to challenge or support.

Questions 17 - 25 had a very limited, or no, response and thus it is not possible to offer any comments.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The overall standard of answers was high. Comments in last year's report to centres about a failure to answer the questions set and a tendency for candidates to write down everything they knew about the topic appear to have been heeded to some extent as this was less of a problem in this year's scripts. However, many candidates still write far too much. A common approach this year was to answer the question and then to write down everything else they could think of. Candidates should be encouraged to spend longer thinking about and planning their answers, and less time writing. It is worth repeating what was written in last year's report - examiners are interested in how well each question has been answered, not in simply how much candidates know.

Nearly all the candidates could understand the sources at least at a comprehension level and comparing two sources at the level of detail was a clear strength. Candidates' contextual knowledge was also detailed and accurate. Of course, what matters in this paper is how well the candidates can deploy this knowledge to interpret, evaluate and use the sources.

Some candidates are still struggling when asked to interpret the meaning of sources. Many candidates, not only the weakest, spend too long on explaining what pictorial sources show instead of trying to interpret the messages. Other candidates focused too much upon what happens with the cartoons. Candidates also need to be aware that when they are asked why a source was drawn, written or published, they are being asked about purpose and that this means going beyond the message. They should be asking themselves what was the author, artist or publisher, trying to achieve?

Reports to centres in previous years have warned against mechanistic preparation of candidates for this paper. There is still a tendency for some candidates to run through their full range of source skills for every question - e.g. they will evaluate sources when this is not asked for. Going into the examination room equipped with detailed instructions about how to answer the questions is often counter-productive. It gives candidates a false sense of security and means they are less likely to think carefully about the specific demands of each individual question. It is interesting to note that the questions that surprise candidates the most, such as **Question 3** in the Twentieth Century option, are often the best answered. Because they have not been prepared in detail for questions like this one they have to rely on their thinking - and as a consequence, they do better. The aim of the teacher in the classroom should be to encourage candidates to develop their thinking skills and their problem solving abilities, rather than coaching them in how to answer certain kinds of questions.

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

Most candidates answered this question at the level of differences of detail, although some were also able to find similarities as well. Candidates do this type of comparison well, with care and in detail. However, the top level of the mark scheme was reserved for those candidates who went beyond details and read each source as a whole. They were then able to make a holistic comparison of the two sources - e.g. Source A thinks it is more likely that the North will win, while Source B gives the South a good chance of winning. It is important that candidates are encouraged not to be distracted by the details and to look for the overall meaning or view of a source. This can then be supported by reference to detail.

Question 2

This question was generally well answered. Few candidates were restricted to the surface details of the cartoons and most got at least to comparing valid submessages - e.g. in Source C they are finding it difficult to recruit, while in Source D they clearly have not been successful in recruiting. The best candidates went beyond this and concentrated on the overall big message of the cartoons - that the South was in deep trouble, or that it was going to lose the war.

Question 3

A few candidates simply paraphrased the sources, but most were able to at least find differences between the two sources about Davis and use these differences to claim that E does prove that F is wrong. Better candidates realised that the sources need to be evaluated and did this either through an informed investigation provenance (this obviously worked better with E than with F), or by using their contextual knowledge to check the claims made by the sources. Some candidates evaluated the sources carefully but failed to say what their conclusion was in regard to the question, i.e. does E prove that F is wrong? It is important that candidates remember that the question must be answered. Marks are not awarded for simply displaying a range of skills in using historical sources - these skills must be used as a way of reaching an answer to the question.

Question 4

There were many good answers to this question with most candidates managing to make a valid interpretation. Some of these candidates lost marks by failing to support their interpretation by reference to details in the cartoon. Better candidates went beyond interpreting the message of the cartoon and discussed its purpose. There were some excellent answers relating the purpose to the context of 1861. Some candidates find it difficult to make this move from interpretation to purpose. The first important point to make candidates aware of is the importance of deciding whether a question is asking for interpretation or purpose. This question is asking for the purpose of the cartoonist and so candidates needed to consider what the cartoonist wanted to achieve. To achieve the highest marks they also need to explain, as part of their answer, how the artist is trying to achieve his purpose in terms of the message of the cartoon.

Question 5

There was a wide range of responses to this question. A few weaker candidates failed to realise that Lee was offering his resignation but most were able to score at least reasonable marks. Some candidates gave answers at the level of everyday empathy by expressing surprise that Lee was resigning or admitting failure. Other candidates used the evidence in Source I to support their answers. Better candidates used their knowledge of Lee to explain surprise/no surprise, or both. Examples of relevant contextual knowledge included his reputation as an honourable man and his responsibility for the strategy that led to the disaster at Gettysburg. The best candidates explained why there are good reasons for being both surprised and not surprised.

Question 6

This final question was answered better than last year. Most candidates seemed to be aware that they were being asked to write about the sources and not just about the statement. Some candidates only looked for sources supporting one side of the argument, but there were many candidates who wrote full answers with good clear explanations about most of the sources. Many candidates achieved high marks but few gained full marks because of a failure to evaluate the sources.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

This question was generally well answered and enabled many candidates to get off to a confident start. Very few candidates dismissed the source because it is about events before the Cuban Missile Crisis. Most of the remaining candidates fell into one of two groups. The first group explained how Source A helps us to understand the background to the Crisis without referring specifically to particular aspects of the Crisis. The second group wrote better answers by taking specific aspects of the Crisis such as Khrushchev putting missiles into Cuba, or Kennedy being determined not to back down, and explained how parts of Source A help us understand why the two leaders behaved in these ways.

Question 2

This question was answered less well than any other question on the paper. Many candidates managed to reach at least middle levels in the mark scheme but only a small number reached the top level by comparing the big or main messages of the two cartoons. A significant minority of candidates instinctively wrote about what the cartoons show and compared their surface features - often in great detail. This got them off on totally the wrong tack and made it unlikely that they would get back to the essence of the question - what do these cartoons mean, and do they mean the same thing?

Most candidates did manage to compare sub-messages of the two cartoons, e.g. that war was likely, that Khrushchev has the upper hand in one cartoon, but Kennedy looks the stronger in the other. These are all valid readings of parts of the cartoons but they are not the main point that the cartoonists wanted to get across, which was that the Crisis was about the personal feud between Kennedy and Khrushchev. A fairly small minority of candidates understood this big message. This was disappointing and surprising given that it was referred to in the title of the paper, in the Background Information, and in **Question 6**. In fact, it was the main theme of the paper. Candidates would clearly benefit from thinking about the main messages of cartoons, instead of getting distracted by every small detail that they contain. Sometimes candidates are encouraged to investigate the meaning of every feature of a cartoon and not to think about its main meaning until later. This is dealing with cartoons the wrong way round. One's first question about a cartoon should be 'what does it mean?'. The answer to this can best be reached by looking at the cartoon as a whole. Often one's first interpretation is the right one and is often reached before all the details get in the way. Once the main message has been understood, the details can be used to support this interpretation.

Question 3

This question took some candidates by surprise, but it was answered well. It forced candidates to think on their feet and most rose to the challenge. Many found it necessary to first spend a couple of pages explaining all the options open to Kennedy, but having got this out their system they then turned to answering the question. There was a wide range of different, but valid, answers. Some suggested that Kennedy recorded the meeting for the benefit of future historians, while many explained that he did it so that he could listen to the recording later and think about the issues more carefully. Better answers concentrated on the fact that the recording was done secretly and explained that this was because Kennedy wanted to hear what his advisers really thought. The best candidates realised that Kennedy might well be looking to cover himself in case things went wrong. The recording would show that military action was not his idea. If he had been forced into military action, the tape would be a useful defence. It was encouraging to see so many candidates thinking hard, relying less on learned responses, and producing a wide range of interesting answers. Answers to this question show that candidates do best when they are taught to think rather than coached in a range of prepared strategies. Many candidates write excellent answers when they have the opportunity to think for themselves. Having said all this, there was the usual small minority of candidates who failed to read the question carefully and wrote about why Kennedy held the meeting.

Question 4

This question produced a wide range of answers. A few candidates ignored the need to compare the two sources and simply explained whether they trusted the claims made by Khrushchev in Source F. Slightly better answers compared Sources E and F. When they found differences between the sources they used them as proof that Khrushchev was wrong. Better candidates realised that it was necessary to evaluate both sources. The most common method for doing this was to check the claims made in the sources against contextual knowledge. This was done well. A few candidates used an alternative, but just as valid, method - considering the purpose, in context, of the authors of the sources.

Question 5

All candidates were able to respond to this question at their own level and there were many good answers. The weaker candidates were completely persuaded by Kennedy in Source H and explained that the cartoonist, once he had read Source H, would be convinced that he had been wrong in Source G and would realise what a nice person Kennedy really was. Better candidates compared the impressions given of Kennedy by the two sources and argued that the cartoonist would not be persuaded by Source H. Many candidates used contextual knowledge to support their answer. The best candidates compared the two sources but then suggested that the peaceful resolution of the Cuban Missile Crisis (which was known by the time of Source H, but not at the time of Source G) might persuade the cartoonist to change his mind about Kennedy.

Question 6

Candidates are gradually getting better at answering this final question. Most now realise that that they are being asked about the sources - how far do the sources support the statement? There were many good answers with candidates clearly explaining how some sources support the statement and some disagree with it. Many candidates substantially increased their final mark for this paper on the strength of their performance in answering this question. There are still a small number of centres where nearly every candidate ignored the sources and wrote an essay on what the Cuban Missile Crisis was really about. It is important to ensure that candidates are aware of what is required by this final question. Even the good candidates are still not achieving full marks because they make no attempt to evaluate the sources.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03

Coursework

There was a small increase this year in the number of Centres entering candidates for the coursework option. The overall standard of work was very high. The efficient way in which Centres organise their samples for moderation is much appreciated. It is a great help to a Moderator when a Centre's coursework scheme is easy to follow and all the supporting documentation is enclosed. This was the case with all Centres this year.

Nearly all the coursework had been marked carefully and accurately. Few changes were made to Centres marks, and changes that were made were on the whole minor ones. The detailed comments on candidates' work provided by many Centres helped Moderators follow how and why certain levels and marks had been awarded. There were very few assignments submitted that were not fit for purpose. This is mainly due to the fact that nearly all Centres use the assignments provided by CIE. Moderators would welcome Centres being a little more adventurous and setting their own assignments. Assignment 1, in particular, is not difficult to set. The ones from CIE can be used as models.

Some candidates in some Centres are still writing at too great a length. When this happens there is a danger of much of the work being descriptive or narrative in nature. Sometimes, whole sections of the work are not strictly relevant to the question. Candidates should be reminded that markers, and Moderators, are not interested in how much they can write, or even how much they know, but how well the question has been answered.

Some of the work completed for Assignment 1 contains too much description and narrative, and not enough explanation and analysis. On occasions Centres have been too generous with their marking of the final questions in this assignment. When candidates are required to compare the importance of different causal factors it is not enough to explain the characteristics of the one chosen as the most important. To gain high marks, answers must contain a comparative element - candidates must compare the importance of the different factors and explain why it is more important than another. The same is true when candidates link causal factors. It is not enough to assert that causal factors are often linked, these links must be demonstrated and explained.

In Assignment 2 there is still a tendency for some candidates to spend a long time explaining what sources show before they go on and answer the question. This is not necessary. A long, detailed description of a source adds little to an answer. Candidates should, however, use the details of a source to support interpretations of the source. The weakest area for some candidates remains evaluation of sources. There is still some simplistic evaluation by source type. Candidates should be reminded that it is the content of a source that needs to be evaluated. An informed use of the provenance of the source will help to do this, but is not enough in itself.

However, these comments should not be seen to detract from the overall message intended in this report, which is the very high quality of much of the work. IGCSE History coursework is always a pleasure to moderate.

IGCSE HISTORY

Paper 0470/04

Alternative to coursework

General comments

Once again, there was an increase in the number of candidates for this session of examinations. Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945 remained the overwhelming choice of most candidates and centres. This was followed by Depth Study B: Russia 1905–1941 and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941 in almost equal measures. There were also centres that had clearly prepared candidates for other Depth Studies in the paper and comments on all specific questions will follow later in this report.

Examiners continue to comment upon the good quality of English of most candidates' work. To a very large extent, the scripts were well set out, clearly written and all that the candidates wished to say was accessible to the examiners. There were very few rubric errors in this session. Much of what was written was of a high quality but examiners reported a number of areas where improvements can still be made and which can improve the final scores achieved by candidates.

In **Question (a) (i)**, candidates are expected to draw valid inferences and show where, from within the source, they have found evidence to support their inferences. Whilst the huge majority of candidates do this well, there are still some candidates who are fired by an element or detail in the source to write long, often accurate, answers demonstrating their considerable knowledge. However, these often have little relevance to the main thrust of the question and these answers can attract few, if any, marks.

In **Question (a) (ii)** answers, candidates will know that they will be expected to develop a balanced answer with both sides supported by evidence from the source. However, some candidates still write one sided answers while others assert an alternative argument without any support from detail and evidence from the source.

Perhaps the most commented upon element recently has been the decline in the numbers of candidates able to test adequately for reliability in answers to **Question (a) (iii)**. Many candidates satisfy themselves by comparing and contrasting the content of the sources while others offer 'stock' or undeveloped tests for reliability in their answers. For example, if we take the two sources from the most popular Depth Study in this session of examinations, candidates often said of Source A that, because Goebbels was a member of the Nazi government, 'he would know what was happening'. Of Source B, it was often said that the US Ambassador would be 'fair' and offer 'an outsider's view of what was happening'. Neither of these assertions would progress the candidates' arguments very far. Tests for reliability can be achieved by the valid use of contextual knowledge, comments on purpose or motive, comments on the tone or language used in the source, the date or timing of the source, by cross-reference to other sources etc. Candidates must choose a test which convinces the examiner that the candidates are aware of the truth or otherwise of the sources. In the case of Source A obvious comments could have been made about the veracity of the source by reference to Goebbels' role as Minister of Propaganda. Also, comments about his wish to make an impression or set a standard 'at his first press conference' would have been valid. Equally, comments could have been made about the use of terms like 'terrorise the remaining 48 per cent' and 'We will demand support'. Yet again, his comments could be set against the background of several elections, the last after emergency measures following the Reichstag Fire had given the Nazi Party a considerable advantage, and yet the Nazi Party secured only 52 per cent of the popular vote and did not have an overall majority in the Reichstag. It would not be surprising if Goebbels' words did not show signs of frustration and a determination to make more progress.

By contrast, the more measured words and balanced comments by the US Ambassador give evidence of his training and experience as a diplomat. The 1936 date of the source would show how the Nazi government had put into place measures foreshadowed by Goebbels in Source A. Candidates could have commented on how the USA, its history, constitution etc disliked all forms of dictatorship and, also could have commented that, if this source was a part of a report to the US government, the Ambassador would be expected to produce an accurate and balanced document.

Examiners often commented on the quality of many answers to **Question (b) (iii)** – causation – where explanations and examples were often given in profusion. However, answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were often disappointing. Generally, candidates appear to spend more time and score better on their Part **(a)** answers than on their Part **(b)** answers, but **Question (b) (iv)** attracts the highest mark tariff in the paper and candidates will harm their overall scores if they do not adequately address this question. It was not only miscalculations in time that presented candidates with problems. Many tended to discuss the required aspects in the question in general terms without detail, qualification or explanation. Candidates must offer balanced argument supported by relevant detail leading to a reasoned conclusion in order to score at the highest Level for this question.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945

In answers to **Question (a) (i)**, many candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A, commenting upon the determination of Goebbels and the Nazi Party. However, some candidates, provoked by either Goebbels' name or the tone of the source, offered long, accurate narratives of Nazi propaganda or Nazi terror, which did not answer the set question and gained very few marks. Most candidates were able to show how propaganda was accepted by the German people from the evidence available in Source B – **Question (a) (ii)**. However, a significant number wrote one sided answers supporting the acceptance of propaganda, while others asserted that there was opposition, supporting this with much contextual knowledge, but not with evidence from the source. Responses to **Question (a) (iii)** have been dealt with in the General Comments section.

With regard to Part **(b)** questions, some candidates were unfamiliar with the term 'repression' and this affected performances and scores in **Questions (b) (i)** and **(b) (iv)**. Whilst many aspects of Nazi rule could be interpreted by examiners as 'repression' in answers to **Question (b) (i)**, the same leniency could not be applied to **Question (b) (iv)** where a developed discussion of 'repression' and all its agencies was required, it was clear that some candidates were guessing at the meaning of the word. Also, many candidates wrote in general terms about propaganda and repression without giving detail of each area so that a balanced and informed answer could be delivered. In answers to **Question (b) (ii)**, requiring a description of how Goebbels controlled the mass media, candidates often listed the mass media (including television, chat shows etc) instead of concentrating on the methods of control that were required by the question. Most candidates were able to give a variety of reasons for the importance of radio broadcasting to Goebbels, and these responses were the most impressive answers to Part **(b)** questions.

Depth Study B: Russia 1905–1941

Many candidates were able to draw a variety of inferences from Source A in their answers to **Question (a) (i)**. They appreciated that the source showed Lenin's enthusiasm for protecting the revolution by whatever means necessary, including the spilling of much blood. The many and varied details of Lenin's appearance and qualities in Source B allowed candidates to use any or all of them to support or deny that they showed Lenin to be a good leader – **Question (a) (ii)**. There were a large number of well balanced answers to this question. In answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, candidates often asserted that neither source was particularly useful in showing why Lenin was able to become leader of Russia. Some asserted that Source A, an article by Lenin in the weekly magazine of the Cheka, was exaggerated propaganda whilst the article in the British newspaper, written after Lenin's death, would be overly kind to him as it was an obituary. While both of these concepts have some merit, they were often not developed to show how these assertions might affect the reliability of the sources.

Candidates had little difficulty in offering two groups who were the main opponents of the Bolsheviks during the Civil War – **Question (b) (i)**. Some descriptions of the Red Terror – **Question (b) (ii)** – were full but a significant number of candidates concentrated on the requisitioning of grain during the imposition of War Communism. These candidates did not comment on the intimidation, imprisonment, execution etc of those believed to be opponents of the Bolshevik regime. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on why the Red Army won the Civil War were full, detailed and often very impressive. Superior candidates offered balanced answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on how successful Lenin had been in the period 1917–1924. However, some candidates asserted that Lenin had been totally successful, while others referred to events outside the time limits to the question.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

The lyric of the best selling song in Source A appealed to many candidates and their answers to **Question (a) (i)** showed a maturity of thought and an understanding of the context. Most understood the frustration in the lyric that, after much had worked and served, many were jobless and living on handouts. Some candidates found difficulty in interpreting the lyric and spent much time in long answers that varied from details of the Wall Street Crash, to the Great Depression and on to the New Deal. Whilst most candidates saw that Source B showed a balance of evidence on the extent of unemployment, others tended to offer answers on areas of unemployment not mentioned in the source. While these contextual offerings are acceptable as additional background material, candidates must use evidence from the source to support their answers. The majority realised that unemployment depended upon industry, location and it changed from area to area and between industries. Candidates saw that the Republican attempt to ban the song in Source A was significant in testing the source's reliability. Debate on the 'best selling' aspect was interesting. While some argued that the song's popularity showed that many recognised the anguish in the lyric and that this proved it to be an accurate reflection of the public's mood, others argued that, if it was a best selling song, the purchasers of the lyric, sheet music etc could not have been poor as they had money to waste on non-essentials. Candidates commented on the British textbook being an outsider's view and on the date in the 1990s, which enabled the use of hindsight. Candidates would have been better advised to use much of the contextual knowledge they had offered in answers to **Question (a) (ii)** to confirm the evidence of Source B or to show its limitations.

In answers to **Question (b) (i)**, candidates showed that they knew what Hoovervilles were, although a minority described them as 'cardboard buildings provided by the Hoover administration for the unemployed' and others asserted that they were 'superior developments built by Hoover for his major supporters'. Despite a number of excellent answers to **Question (b) (ii)** on the measures taken by Hoover to deal with the effects of the Depression, many candidates dwelt generally on the actions being 'too little, too late'. On the contrary, there were a large number of candidates who offered reasons and developed explanations of Hoover's government's slow reactions to the Depression in their answers to **Question (b) (iii)**. These showed a mature and extensive knowledge of the economics and politics of the period. Again, while there were some balanced and developed answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, many concentrated solely on Roosevelt, while others gave prepared and extensive answers about the New Deal. They tried, often unsuccessfully, to tie the latter answers to the set question.

Depth Study D: China, 1945 – c. 1990

This Depth Study was attempted by a small number of centres. Candidates were able to draw inferences from the photograph with regard to the simple, limited and labour intensive methods of production. They also commented on the apparent youth of the work force – **Question (a) (i)**. In answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates pointed out that the Chinese government's plans for communes had been over ambitious and not fully planned but they recognised that the bad weather was not its fault and that the withdrawal of Soviet support had had a serious impact. Candidates tended to compare and contrast the information in the sources for their answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, although there were some 'stock' evaluations of the limitations of photographs as evidence.

Candidates were not always secure about the differences between co-operative and collective farms in answer to **Question (b) (i)**. The average size of the farms in terms of population and the functions of each were confused. The benefits for women from the Communist government's social legislation was better known and some candidates scored well – **Question (b) (ii)**. The Hundred Flowers Campaign was not as well known and some candidates had insufficient knowledge to handle **Question (b) (iii)** well. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** tended to dwell on all the reasons for the failure of the Great Leap Forward, and few attempted to balance their answers by offering equal reference to the impact of the withdrawal of Soviet support.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

Again, a few centres attempted this Depth Study but there was much evidence of effective preparation. In Part **(a)** answers, many candidates drew valid inferences from Source A regarding the relaxation of the Pass Laws during the Second World War and the consequent development of townships and the improvements in pay and conditions for black workers – **Question (a) (i)**. Equally, candidates wrote balanced answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, showing that the Mineworkers' Union was sufficiently powerful and determined to go on strike but, ultimately, its power was limited by the threat of force. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** tended to be comparisons of the content of the sources with, in some cases, analysis of the detail.

Several candidates showed impressive knowledge of the Pass Laws – **Question (b) (i)** – and the purpose of the 1950 Population Registration Act, and these candidates scored well. Indeed, there were very few candidates who did not earn some marks on these two questions. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the enforcement of apartheid after 1948 showed that this facet of the Malan government was well understood, as were answers to **Question (b) (iv)** of many of the issues connected with the Defiance Campaign of 1952. Overall, many of the performances of candidates on this Depth Study were superior to some of the previous sessions of examination.

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

Candidates drew valid inferences about the Black September group from Source A. The context of the hostage taking at the Munich Olympic Games was so well known that some candidates were seduced into writing long, narrative tracts to show their knowledge. These, sadly, did not always address the set question. In answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, many could support the idea that both sides wished to use terrorism and found good evidence from Source B. Superior candidates dwelt impressively on the issue of 'self-defence' and commented upon the notion that 'one man's terrorist is another's freedom fighter'. These arguments showed sophistication. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** tended to compare and contrast the content of the sources rather than analyse the provenance of each source as a means of testing for reliability.

Candidates knew two Jewish groups regarded as terrorists by the British during the Mandate period and scored well on **Question (b) (i)**. Answers to the next two questions tended to dwell upon general observations rather than offer specific and relevant detail. For **Question (b) (ii)** candidates generalised about the support offered by the United Nations, and for **Question (b) (iii)** they asserted the general hatred by Palestinians (Arabs) for Israel. However, there were candidates who offered considerable detail here and they often went on to provide full, detailed and balanced answers for **Question (b) (iv)** on whether the Israelis or Palestinians wanted a peace settlement in the 1970s and 1980s. These were impressive in detail and knowledge, balance and judgement when compared to majority of candidates who asserted that neither side wanted peace, then or now.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were very few candidates who had specifically prepared for this Depth Study but those that attempted these questions often scored well. Inferences about the London Dock Strike (1889) were easily found in Source A and comments about violence, noise and threatening behaviour were easily made – **Question (a) (i)**. **Question (a) (ii)** evoked different responses—from the acceptance of the differences between Sources A and B at face value to speculations that the witnesses must have seen the strike on different days or in different parts of London. There were some interesting observations in the candidates' answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, with comments about the obvious bias of John Burns as a strike leader to the speculation that the writer of the letter in Source A 'must be an upper class person because he could afford to buy The Times and had sufficient education to compose a letter'.

Part **(b)** questions posed greater problems for a majority of the candidates. However, while superior candidates continued to impress, less well-informed candidates found difficulty in explaining 'peaceful picketing' in **Question (b) (i)**, and could go no further in answers to **Question (b) (ii)** than to say that 'new unionism' meant 'unions for ordinary workers'. There was a better response to **Question (b) (iii)** on the lack of unions for unskilled workers before the last years of the nineteenth century. Comments upon education, communications, and employer opposition were made but only the best candidates offered specific examples. Again, with **Question (b) (iv)**, the few candidates who knew of important legal cases applying to trade unions could score well, but many just did not have the precise or relevant knowledge.

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

Few candidates prepared for this Depth Study's questions. However, there were some good quality answers. Source A offered candidates the opportunity to draw inferences about Leopold of Belgium's attempt to bring together a multi-purpose, multi-national group to travel to Africa to bring 'new' (different) ideas to the continent. Some of the candidates answering **Question (a) (i)** were diverted from the main thrust of the question to offer comments upon Leopold's history as an imperialist. While candidates could see that Source B offered evidence of cruelty in areas under European control, they usually balanced this with the fact that 'white men at their colonial posts did not know of the hard things the soldiers did to us'. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** often compared the content of the sources but there were some observations that Source A was commenting on the planning in 1884 while Source B was the outcome of European imperialism by 1903. One candidate commented that education by Europeans must have worked as the native of the Congo could make himself understood to the interviewer (presumably European) in 1903.

Candidates knew the German and Portuguese colonies in nineteenth century Africa and scored well on **Question (b) (i)**. Equally, many knew of the origins of indirect rule and gave it context – **Question (b) (ii)**. There were full explanations for the reasons for the Berlin Conference 1884/5 and many candidates did not content themselves with the more immediate causes but went fully into the background of established colonial powers, the new nations in Europe and their wish for a 'place in the sun', against a context of European nations' rivalries, ambitions and tensions. The answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on whether Europeans governed their colonies well were varied. Weaker candidates often asserted that European countries were 'good' or 'bad' with little substantiation. Others tried to create a balance of information and a few gave detailed examples of successes and failures for most European countries concerned with comments on each individual state's performance – most often these left Belgium with few kind observations.