

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

Examiners noted that a significant majority of candidates were well-prepared to meet the demands of the examination. This resulted in many good answers being seen, with candidates demonstrating the skills required to meet the requirements of individual questions.

Many candidates now restrict the length of their answers to (a) questions by endeavouring to stick to the question rather than wandering to the periphery of the topic being asked about. It is possible in these questions, as they test recall, to gain full marks by giving four points or by giving two developed descriptions. Sometimes candidates' responses to (b) questions can remain descriptive or just identification. Learners should be encouraged to turn their statements into explanations so that in the examination they are able to show the Examiner their understanding of that particular aspect of history in the context of the period it happened in.

Many sound answers were seen in relation to (c) questions that developed both sides of the argument. It is not necessary for candidates to make a judgement at the start of their answer. Indeed this approach often results in them failing to challenge the hypothesis. They may find it useful to think of a plan which allows for an initial paragraph to support the hypothesis and then to put forward reasoned arguments as to why the hypothesis should be challenged. Once a more balanced answer is produced, candidates are in a better position to make a supported judgement or reach a valid conclusion. It is important that candidates move away from writing a summary of what has just been said when trying to reach their judgement of 'most important', 'how far', etc.

Examiners reported that only a very small number of candidates failed to complete the paper. It is expected that the additional time now allocated will enable candidates to take a more thoughtful approach to their answers, particularly part (c) where they are required to support, and challenge, the question hypothesis.

A number of Examiners reported a slight increase in rubric errors with, on occasions, candidates attempting all 25 questions.

It is also important that when submitting their answers, candidates ensure that if they are using single sheets, or additional sheets, they are submitted in the correct order.

Comments on specific questions

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

Only a very small number of Centres prepared candidates for this question. The quality of responses varied considerably. Those who were well-prepared produced high calibre answers with Cavour and Garibaldi being meaningfully compared and contrasted. The factual knowledge displayed by these candidates was excellent and resulted in many high level responses. Where preparation was less secure little knowledge was demonstrated in relation to 1848/49 or indeed in relation to Cavour.

Question 2

Of the small number attempting this question, a significant number were aware of the events at Harper's Ferry. Answers to **(b)** and **(c)** were of more variable standard. In **(b)** for example, many were only able to refer to the contrasting attitude to slavery whilst in **(c)**, knowledge and understanding of reconstruction was often weak.

Question 3

Even fewer candidates attempted this question but those who did knew the constitution in depth. Their comparison of social and economic changes was supported by relevant contextual knowledge which resulted in a balanced argument in response to part **(c)**.

Question 4

It is important that candidates use their knowledge of dates appropriately. Whilst there were many sound answers to part **(a)**, candidates often wrote about the second crisis. In **(b)**, the question was limited to specific dates that were intended to get candidates to concentrate on what Austria-Hungary was up to and the role played by Turkey, Russia, Germany and Serbia at that time. Some candidates even wrote about the assassination of 1914. It is important that candidates realise marks cannot be awarded outside the focus of the question. Generally the reasons for the outbreak of war were handled well but too often the assassination and associated events was just described. To gain high marks in **(c)** questions, explanation of the significance is required.

Question 5

This was a very popular question. Part **(a)** was generally well answered, with many candidates including a number of Clemenceau's aims that did not make the Treaty, showing they fully understood the question. A small number became distracted and wrote about the Treaty whilst others made a comparison of the 'Big Three'. Some incorrectly stated that Clemenceau wanted a demilitarised Rhineland. Many very good answers were seen in response to **(b)** where the issues were identified and fully explained. Less strong candidates just listed the terms of the Treaty for which no credit was given. There were relatively few good answers to **(c)**. Too many gave the aims and/or motives of the 'Big three' or gave a quick overview of the League of Nations. Some appeared to struggle with the idea of 'peacemakers', an often used term at this time. Some did achieve marks by taking an overview and considering 'what had been achieved' by the peacemakers and what they 'had not achieved'. This approach gained high marks. A good number of candidates knew of Sevres and Lausanne and used this to good effect.

It is hoped that candidates will think more about the **(c)** questions before launching into an answer. Many were obviously disappointed that the League did not feature and were determined to tell Examiners all they knew about this topic.

Question 6

Some very good responses were seen to part **(a)**, detailing Hitler's actions in building the German armed forces. Particularly pleasing were references to the value of armament rallies and to the Anglo-German Naval Treaty. Some weaker candidates thought the Rhineland was about building the armed forces, having misunderstood the reasons for bringing re-militarisation about in the first place. Candidates, in responding to **(b)**, were able to demonstrate a sound knowledge of the topic, being fully aware of the implications of Hitler's action. For a very small minority, confusion existed between 1936 and the events in the Ruhr in 1923. As with **5(c)**, for candidates need to think before writing their response to **(c)** and thus order their arguments. Some very good, well-argued answers were seen where candidates had obviously taken this approach. On the other hand, a significant majority failed to develop their answers into explanation, being content just to describe different examples of appeasement. Incorrectly, some thought Churchill was the British Prime Minister responsible for this policy whilst others were convinced it was a League of Nations policy. Many candidates used Britain's lack of support from the Dominions to good effect.

Question 7

It was encouraging to see many attempts to answer this question, rather than **Question 5** and **Question 6**. There were many good responses to **(a)**, although on occasions detail of the Bay of Pigs predominated to the exclusion of the sugar trade and the severing of diplomatic relations. Some failed to take note of the question and made their answers over lengthy and irrelevant by bringing in the Missile Crisis and the role of Khrushchev. The vast majority produced good explanations about the significance of the Bay of Pigs invasion to the USA in **(b)**. In **(c)**, those who were conversant with the issues and took time to organise their answer had little problem gaining a good mark. Some candidates were again content to describe the events as a form of diary. Using this approach consigned their answers to a lower level mark.

Question 8

Again many more responses than normally seen for the last question in the Core Content section. Many produced good answers to the idea of the 'Domino Theory' in **(a)** and were able to name at least one country to which it could have applied. The unpopular nature of the Vietnam War in **(b)** was generally well-known, with many well explained answers that used specific examples. Again in **(c)**, guerrilla tactics were well known and explained as were other reasons for failure, with many answers gaining the highest level. It is not often that candidates make reference to the stimulus material but in this question it was used extensively in helping candidates to frame their answers.

Section B – Depth Studies**Germany, 1918-45****Question 9**

Whilst some were fully aware of the changes Hitler made, others were not. This latter group resorted to description of the Putsch itself in response to **(a)**, and then recounted Hitler's methods in the 1930s. Candidates generally fared much better in relation to **(b)**, bringing into their answers a nice mix of political issues around Hindenburg and balancing this with the methods used by the Nazis to get elected. Many answers contained details of the seats achieved by the Nazis although some mistakenly thought they had overall control. Part **(c)** offered another opportunity for careful planning. Despite being in the question, many candidates ignored the 'Night of the Long Knives', thus restricting their marks. Of those that developed this aspect, perhaps more could have been made of its impact on Hitler rather than describing what happened. Other issues were well documented, although understanding of the emergency decree could have been stronger. Despite the stimulus material, many failed to include the Reichstag Fire.

Question 10

The vast majority of those candidates who attempted this question were fully aware of the work of Goebbels and were able to answer **(a)** in some detail. Some very good answers to **(b)** were seen although there was a tendency from many to describe how minorities were persecuted. Having said that, most were able to identify target groups for persecution. Some very good answers to **(c)** were seen, with many good explanations arguing that Germany was totalitarian. Some candidates had more difficulty in presenting arguments against this view.

Russia, 1905-41

Question 11

Generally the problems faced were well known and candidates had little difficulty in scoring well in responding to **(a)**. Taking on board what they had written in **(a)**, many developed good explanations to show why the Provisional Government was a failure in **(b)**. Candidates know and understand the Civil War and this year was no exception, with many well-argued responses dealing with the Red Army and other reasons in **(c)**.

Question 12

The general comment from Examiners was that answers to this question were weaker in all parts compared to those for **Question 11**. In **(a)** many struggled to identify more than two relevant points, usually around heavy industry and targets. There were some good points made in response to **(b)**, in relation to economics and military aspects but answers were limited in relations to communist ideals. Many developed over long answers relating to collectivisation. Surprisingly, many answers to **(c)** were short of facts to present for or against the question hypothesis. Many failed to go beyond a vague paragraph on industrial expansion and cruelty in the workplace.

The USA, 1919-41

Question 13

Many candidates lacked understanding of what constituted 'older industries' in **(a)** and this restricted the mark they were able to achieve. Others were able to identify these but failed to identify the problems faced. Responses to **(b)** were much stronger with the main issues clearly known and well explained although some ignored the date in the question and wrote at length on the 1930s. There were many good answers to **(c)** supported by examples. The impact of the automobile was well-known, as were many other reasons. Many answers reached a high level.

Question 14

There were many detailed answers to **(a)**, relating to the action taken with regard to banks. When candidates moved to the Alphabet Agencies they seemed to forget that it was an **(a)** question with limited marks. In these instances they need to be more selective in the material they use. Some thought, incorrectly, that he dealt with Prohibition at that time. Attempts at answering **(b)** were weaker and often resulted in a single point about the fact that many jobs were temporary. Again in **(c)** there were many strong answers to support the benefits brought to America but candidates' responses were often limited to 'continuing unemployment', as a challenge to the hypothesis.

China, 1945-c.1990

Question 15

Overall, this question was not as popular as **Question 16**. Those that answered it had difficulty with **(a)** and were often limited to 'unpopularity'. Again in **(b)**, detail was lacking and 'popularity' was prevalent. Many answers concentrated on the negatives of the KMT rather than what the Communists offered. Again in **(c)**, knowledge and understanding was lacking. Most who answered this question found difficulty in explaining land reform. Little was offered as a challenge to the hypothesis.

Question 16

In contrast to **Question 15**, the answers to this question were much better. The Hundred Flowers Campaign was well known and answers were detailed. Many were well aware of the reasons for the Cultural Revolution and were able to explain at least one reason and often more. General issues relating to the changes after 1978 were often known but many answers lacked the detail of understanding that was required to gain the highest marks. The idea of China as a modern economy completing globally was often well put, but the impact of this was less well documented.

Questions 17-23 had a very limited, or no, take-up and thus it is difficult to offer any meaningful comments.

The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century

Question 24

In **(a)**, most candidates were able to offer a correct definition of imperialism and suggest why this happened. A small number interpreted the question as 'reasons for imperialism'. Some did try to discriminate between powers in **(b)** and their knowledge of Leopold was good but was less secure in relation to other powers. Many answers to **(c)** were stronger on economic factors, whilst other candidates interpreted the question as 'whether imperialism was good for the native population'.

Question 25

Most lacked relevant knowledge about missionaries and explorers and wrote generally in **(a)** about the scramble for Africa. Detailed understanding of colonisation in Africa was limited in the vast majority of answers to **(b)** and **(c)**.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The overall performance of the candidates was similar to last year although there was evidence that a number of Centres new to this specification are taking a little time to get used to the demands of Paper 2. The number of candidates continues to increase with the entry for the nineteenth-century option slowly growing. However, the twentieth-century option remains the more popular choice by a large margin.

The knowledge of the candidates remains detailed and accurate. This year was the first time Paper 2 has been set on the Korean War and it was reassuring to see that candidates' knowledge of this was as good as their knowledge of other parts of the specification. However, there are still areas of examination technique and using historical sources where there is room for improvement. One issue is - how should candidates use their impressive knowledge of the period they have studied. Knowledge should never be put into answers for its own sake. It should only be included when it helps to answer the question i.e. to interpret, evaluate and use the sources.

A number of candidates seem to think that the purpose of the questions is to provide them with opportunities to show off their knowledge and their source skills. They often write down all they know about the topic and analyse the sources in all kinds of ways that are not required by the question. Examiners award marks for attempts to answer the question. They are not impressed by answers that contain lots of detailed and accurate knowledge that is irrelevant to the question. The message for candidates is clear - provide a direct answer to the question in a focused and concise way and then move on to the next question. Some candidates write answers of over three pages in length. All the questions on this paper (with the exception of **Question 6**) can be answered in no more than two thirds of a page.

More worrying are candidates who do all the hard work in their answers but fail to answer the question asked e.g. are you surprised by a source, do sources disagree, does a source prove a certain point of view to be correct? Examiners want to know what the candidates' responses to these questions are! Many candidates would do better if they thought more and wrote less. It is good practice to think carefully about the question and even plan the answer. Candidates need to be clear about how they are going to answer a question before they put pen to paper. Many seem to be working their ideas out as they write. Once they have thought about their answer they can start writing it out by providing a direct answer to the question in the opening line e.g. 'these two sources completely differ about American foreign policy because...' The rest of the answer can be used to support this view and as a result will be more likely to be focused on the demands of the question.

Cartoons still present difficulties for some candidates. The key is to encourage candidates to look for the big point that the cartoonist is making and not to be distracted by other smaller sub-messages that might lurk around the fringes of a cartoon. The big message can be worked out by considering the content of a cartoon as a whole, thinking about where the cartoon has come from, when it was drawn and by bringing knowledge of the historical context to bear on one's interpretation of the cartoon. It was, for example, disappointing to find some candidates claiming that Source E on the Twentieth Century option was published to support the USA.

Some candidates struggle with questions that require them to compare sources. They often explain each source separately and then assert agreement or disagreement. These answers begin to go wrong once the candidates start to summarise the contents of the sources. This is not necessary and should be avoided. Instead, candidates should start to compare the sources in the first line of their answers. This again requires the question and the sources to be given some thought before putting pen to paper. Candidates should try and compare the overall messages of the two sources and not get too distracted by minor details.

Question 6 was answered less well than for a number of years. Detailed advice about this question is provided below in the comment on **Question 6** for the Twentieth Century option.

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

Most candidates scored reasonable marks by being able to explain an agreement or disagreement. The most common answer was based on the fact that the sources disagree about the importance of the Zollverein in the achievement of German unification. Better candidates were able to add an agreement to this e.g. the Zollverein did play some part in the unification of Germany. The top level in the mark scheme was reserved for candidates who explicitly addressed the 'how far' part of the question and explained how the two sources do agree and disagree about the role of the Zollverein, but that they disagree more than they agree.

Question 2

This question produced a wide range of responses. Most candidates were able to interpret at least one of the cartoons and many interpreted both. They understood that the cartoons show Prussia using different methods to deal with Austria and lead unification. The main weakness in answers was a failure to compare the messages of the cartoons. Candidates tended to explain each one separately and leave it to the Examiner to complete their answers.

Question 3

This question also produced answers right across the range. Weak candidates summarised each source and then simply asserted that Bismarck would/would not agree. A good number of candidates explained that Engels and Bismarck agree that the economics was an important factor in German unification. Better candidates went beyond this and inferred from Source F that Bismarck thought the role of economics was limited. This was usually backed up by cross-reference either to other sources on the paper or to the candidates' knowledge of Bismarck.

Question 4

There were a lot of very different responses to this question with many candidates producing interesting and carefully thought out ideas. The weaker candidates simply asserted that Bismarck had changed his mind or that Source G cannot be trusted because it was written later. Average candidates concentrated on the content of each source and explained either how they differ or how they are not mutually exclusive. Better candidates investigated issues relating to the provenance of Source G, e.g. it is a third hand report, why would Bismarck tell someone his plans? The best answers cross-referenced to other sources or to knowledge to evaluate the sources.

Question 5

Many candidates were able to compare what the two sources have to say about the importance of economic factors. There were some interesting answers that argued the two sources do not necessarily disagree because they focus on different aspects of economic factors. The best candidates used their knowledge to either support Source J or to reject Source I. A number of candidates did the hard work on this question without telling the Examiner whether or not they were surprised by what is said in Source I. In other words they did not answer the question. Candidates must answer the question set.

Question 6

There is little to add about the answers to this question to what has been written below about **Question 6** in the Twentieth Century option.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered quite well. A few candidates took the quotation in the source 'Nobody here but us Koreans' literally but most candidates were able to produce some sort of valid interpretation of Source A, although a number could get no further than sub-messages of the cartoon, e.g. the Russians were involved or Stalin wanted to take over Korea. It is important that candidates are encouraged to look for the big message that the cartoonist wants to put across. In this case it is that the Russians were lying about, or hiding, their involvement in the Korean War. There is also the strong suggestion that in making this point the

cartoonist was criticising the Russians. The best candidates did manage to get this far but the reason why others did not appear to be in the fact that they ignored the crucial quotation in the source. Candidates should be given practice in class in putting all the parts of a cartoon together to infer the main, big message.

Question 2

This question produced a wide range of answers and clearly highlighted a weakness that can be worked on in the classroom. A number of candidates used the whole of their answer (sometimes over a page long) to explain not why the sources disagree but how they disagree. This type of answer to a 'why' question will always be awarded very low marks. Better candidates argued that the sources differ because they were written from different perspectives - those of the USA and the USSR. To gain good marks these answers had to be explained, not merely asserted. The best candidates based their answers on the differences of purpose of the two sources and those few candidates who were able to place this type of answer in the context of the Cold War gained full marks. The important lesson for future candidates is that when asked about why sources differ, they should always try to infer the purpose of each source (they will differ) and explain each purpose in context.

Question 3

Some candidates had difficulty in interpreting Source D and claimed that it shows the USA using the UN as a tool. However, when all aspects of the cartoon are taken into account, particularly the writing on the headstone, it becomes clear that the cartoonist is showing approval of the actions of the USA and sees it and the UN acting together to do good. There is a sharp contrast between this impression of US foreign policy and that given by Source E which shows the USA being aggressive and dominating. However, a small number of candidates thought the hands shown in Source E were 'helping hands'. The way the hands are drawn and the whole image of the White House's tentacles grabbing other parts of the world makes clear that this is an incorrect interpretation - especially when one takes into account the fact that the cartoon is a Soviet one! Why would the Soviets in 1950 be producing a flattering cartoon about the USA? Candidates need to use the details in the cartoon, what they have been told about the provenance and what they know about the context to interpret cartoons, or indeed any historical source.

This question did cause average and weaker candidates' difficulties but better candidates were able to make meaningful comparisons of the two sources.

Question 4

This question was answered less well than any of the other questions on this paper. This was mainly due to faulty technique. The sensible thing to do with this question is first to establish what Source F is claiming. Then compare what each of G and H say, with what F claims. Having established some similarities and differences the sources, especially G and H, should be evaluated. If it is found that they can be trusted then they can be used to support or to reject the claims made by Truman in F. If it is found that they cannot be trusted then they cannot be used to support or reject F. Candidates are awarded reasonable marks for simply finding differences or similarities between G/H and F. However, many answers ignored Source F altogether and wrote about G and H. They asserted that G and H supported or did not support F without any use of F at all. Given the question, this approach could only be awarded very low marks. Some candidates who did do some of the right kind of work on this question then forget to use the analysis they had done to say whether G and H help decide if Truman was telling the truth. It is important for candidates to remember that they must answer the question set.

Question 5

This question produced much better answers. Weaker candidates concentrated on the limitations of photograph and explained all the things about the Korean War that it does not tell us or explained the usefulness of the source in terms of what it shows us. Better answers (and there were many) went beyond this and used either other sources on the paper or their knowledge to discuss the usefulness of Source I. Most explained its limitations in terms of the fact that it misrepresents the balance of UN troops serving in Korea - the majority of troops were American. The best candidates rejected the photograph and suggested that it had been staged by the UN or the Americans to try and give the impression that the war effort was being run by the UN and not by the Americans. A few even suggested that the fact that the photograph had been staged in this way was why it was useful - it told historians about the impression the UN or the Americans wanted to give everyone. No marks were given to candidates who claimed that the photograph could be a photograph of anywhere. The convention in this paper has long been that candidates should trust

what they are told about the source i.e. if they are told the source is a photograph of UN soldiers in Korea they must accept this.

Question 6

Performance in this final question was not as good as in previous years. There were still many good answers but there were also many very poor answers. A surprisingly high number of candidates ignored the sources altogether and wrote an essay about whether the UN was a tool of the USA. There is no excuse for this. The question clearly asks whether the sources provide convincing evidence for the statement. Answers must be based on the sources. Some candidates who attempted to do this failed to explain how sources did or did not support the statement. There were many assertions but marks are not given for these. Candidates must explain how a source supports the statement or how a source disagrees with the statement. Seven marks can be achieved by simply explaining one source on each side! The entry for this specification has risen considerably in the last few years and there is a suspicion among Examiners that while candidates from Centres who have been using this specification for some time cope with this question well, candidates from new Centres are struggling. For this reason it is important to repeat some basic points that are true for **Question 6** in every sitting of this examination:

- The question is about the sources. Answers must be based on the sources.
- There will always be some sources that support the statement and other sources that disagree with statement. The key is to explain how some sources support the statement and how other sources disagree with it.
- Sources have to be interpreted and sometimes the relationship between a source and the statement has to be inferred.
- Sometimes a source can be interpreted in different ways and could be used both for and against the statement.
- It not necessary to use all the sources. Sometimes there might be a source that does not have a bearing on the statement. The quality of the explanation is as important as the number of sources used.
- Candidates can simply go through the sources in the order in which they appear in the paper, explaining whether each one supports or disagrees with the statement.
- There are extra marks awarded for evaluation of the sources.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03

Coursework

General comments

There was a significant increase this year in the number of Centres entering candidates for the coursework option. Those Centres new to coursework took to it with few problems and the overall standard of work remained very high. The majority of Centres submitted well organised sets of coursework with all the necessary documentation. This makes the task of moderating Centres' marks much easier.

One impressive feature of this year's coursework was the care taken by Centres to mark and comment on candidates' work. Many of the comments were detailed and very helpful to the Moderators. More changes than usual were made to Centres' marks and in the majority of these cases marks were increased by Moderators although none of these changes were major. Overall, there was general agreement between Centres and Moderators. There were few instances of inappropriate assignments being set although there was the occasional example of coursework being completed on core parts of the syllabus. It should be remembered that coursework can only be set on Depth Studies -either the ones in the syllabus or ones devised by Centres and which have been approved.

Last year's report mentioned the tendency of some candidates to write at too great a length with much of the work degenerating into description and narrative. There was some improvement this year but some candidates are still writing far too much and including material that is not strictly relevant to the question. It should be remembered that the abilities to select and deploy material relevantly are skills that are assessed. It is often the case that the best work is within the recommended number of words, is to the point, directly answers the question and contains no rambling introductions setting the scene for the marker and Moderator.

Most of the work for Assignment 1 is focused on causation. It is important that the answers are overwhelmingly analytical - description and narrative by themselves will never merit high marks. To merit high marks candidates need to be able to write genuine causal explanations (rather than simply recounting what happened), demonstrate how causal factors are often linked (rather than just asserting that this is the case) and explain how short and long term factors have played different roles in contributing to a particular outcome. The latter requires candidates to explicitly show how short and long term factors differ in their functions. This needs to be illustrated through particular examples and not just asserted.

There was much splendid work in Assignment 2 with many candidates able to interpret sources in context and able to use this context, with the provenance of the sources, to evaluate effectively. There is still some simplistic evaluation where candidates think that they can evaluate a source simply on the basis of what type of source it is e.g. sources written by people involved in the events are always biased and therefore of no use.

Candidates need to make an informed use of the provenance of sources e.g. ask what the purpose of the author/artist might have been at the time. One worrying feature of the work of candidates in a few Centres was the failure to base their answers to the last question on the sources previously used for earlier questions. It is important for candidates to remember that this question is about the sources and answers that ignore the sources will never gain high marks.

Overall, the coursework reflected the hard work, interest and even enjoyment, of the candidates. Most of it was a pleasure to moderate.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/04

Alternative to Coursework

General comments

As with all previous years the most popular Depth Study with candidates was Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945. This was followed by Depth Studies B: Russia, 1905-1941 and C: The USA, 1919-1941. It was very pleasing to note that many Centres and candidates are increasingly preparing for other Depth Studies in this paper. Examiners reported that the scripts were well set out, well written and there were very few examples of rubric infringement. Also there was little evidence that candidates had not been able to organise their time to complete answers to all questions. At the higher end of the scale, there were many outstanding scripts which were a pleasure to mark. At the lower end it was clear that some candidates did not understand what was expected by way of their answers.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Part (a) Questions

In their answers to **Question (a) (i)**, the candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from the Source A picture about the nature of post-war Germany. They saw that the celebration of the Free Corps officer in the presence of death and destruction showed the conflict, sacrifice and lack of humanity amongst the population. They felt that law and order, the community and all generally accepted concepts of civilisation had gone. Weaker candidates often became preoccupied with the letter 'R' on the officer's helmet, while others indulged in long, often correct, tracts of contextual knowledge of post-war Germany, almost always ending with comments on Hitler. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, usually showed that the candidates could see evidence in Source B of men in the Free Corps with military experience and, therefore, military expertise. However, they also saw evidence of other sections of the German population represented in the ranks to disprove the 'military organisation' suggestion. Some of these answers were philosophical in nature, trying to analyse the source to show whether the behaviour of the Free Corps was consistent with a legal and obedient military force. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** often tended to compare and contrast the content of both sources. Some attempted to evaluate Source A by asserting that it was a picture 'that can only capture one moment in time' and was therefore of little value. This was incomplete and stock evaluation. A few candidates saw the starkness of the illustration, its style and its tone, with the comment 'Cheers Noske!', as a disapproving commentary on the actions of the Free Corps. In the same sense, the content of Source B could have been cross-referenced with Source A to show reliability and agreement. Both sources agreed on 'former officers', 'fanatical nationalists' 'removal of traitors' and 'formed murder squads'.

Part (b) Questions

In their answers to **Question (b) (i)**, most candidates were able to identify the power given to the President of the Weimar to rule by decree in an emergency. This was usually expressed as 'ruling without reference to the Reichstag'. However, few were able to list other powers e.g. the use of military forces to maintain public order etc. Many candidates scored well in answer to **Question (b) (ii)**, with comprehensive detail given of the Kapp Putsch. However, there were a variety of versions regarding Kapp's demise, and some candidates confused the Kapp Putsch of 1920 with the Spartacist Revolt of 1919 and/or the Munich Putsch of 1923. Superior candidates performed well and scored highly on **Question (b) (iii)**. They pointed out that not only had Germany lost its Kaiser – the very basis of the elevated position and lifestyle of the upper classes and senior military officers – but also aspects of the Treaty of Versailles, with regard to the new republic and the reduction of military forces, undermined the monarchists and senior military officers' positions as well. Weaker candidates concentrated on general opposition to the Weimar Republic without specific reference to the two required groups. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** were varied. They ranged from the long and developed arguments about long and short-term damage to the Republic and its citizens to minimalist

answers that showed little detailed knowledge and/or inevitably led to assertions about Hitler. Nevertheless, it must be said, that many of the candidates pointed out in their arguments that hyperinflation was a direct result of Treaty of Versailles decisions and thus the Treaty must have done more damage.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Part (a) Questions

In their answers to **Question (a) (i)**, candidates were able to draw many valid inferences about the poor working and living conditions of the industrial workers in Russia, and stated that the deferential tone of the petition showed that the workers believed that the Tsar could and would right all wrongs. Also, in **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates were able to show how the Tsar did make concessions after the Revolution of 1905, but that he soon suppressed the people and diminished the impact of the concessions when he had the military power to do so. Candidates often expressed the view that the concessions were merely cosmetic and a means of buying the Tsar some time until he had the military means to reassert his control. Poorer evaluations of Source A in answers to **Question (a) (iii)** saw that the originator of the petition was Father Gapon and said that he 'was an eyewitness and would have known what had happened', while Source B was a textbook with a duty to educate and was 'looking back over time'. Some said that Source B was British and, therefore, reliable/unreliable. Better answers concentrated on the tone of Source A to demonstrate deference and respect to the Tsar as a means achieving change through humility, while others saw the tone as a persuasive tool in a cynical sense. They often compared this to the stark reality of Source B to show that the 'Little Father' could not be trusted at all. Some candidates supported both sources with extra contextual knowledge to prove or disprove their reliability. Some knew of Father Gapon's flight from Russia and of his subsequent book on the relevant events.

Part (b) Questions

Many candidates knew that the Okhrana in **Question (b) (i)** was the Tsar's secret police, and many developed their answers to show some of the activities in which the organisation engaged. Candidates often scored well on **Question (b) (ii)** in their descriptions of the events of Bloody Sunday, 22 January, 1905. Some answers were admirably detailed, even far too detailed in the sense that they had gained maximum marks for the question at an early stage of the answer. Time which would have been better used on later questions was being lost. Candidates must be aware of the mark tariff of individual questions. The answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were either poor, in that the candidates had little knowledge of Stolypin's agricultural reforms and/or wrote about his reforms generally, or they had excellent knowledge of the reforms, their context and the reasons for lack of success. Comments were regularly made about opposition and ignorance of the peasants, and the hostility encountered by Stolypin from land owning aristocracy and even the Tsar. Unlike previous seasons of examinations when **Question (b) (iv)** was set with a clear date limit and the limit was ignored, this season's candidates showed far more respect for the terms of the question. There were some excellently balanced and detailed answers showing different sections of the Russian people supporting the Tsar and then recounting events, movements and groups that undermined the Tsar's overall standing. However, all agreed that the Tsar was well supported at the outbreak of war in 1914 but that support was more in the defence of Mother Russia than for the love of the Little Father.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

Part (a) Questions

Candidates performed well in their answers to **Question (a) (i)** where they were able to draw many valid inferences, supported from Source A, about the superior lifestyle and standard of living of the average American citizen. However, many wrote at length about how the boom of the 1920s was not as kind to other groups, often giving statistical and anecdotal evidence. As stated in previous reports, contextual knowledge in answers to source-based questions is acceptable as long as it enhances the use of the sources' details. It must not be a substitute. Most candidates were able to see that Source B offered a list of newly acquired freedoms for women in the 1920s. However, candidates often emphasised that these were not complete freedoms. Answers to this question sometimes ended with comments from candidates disapproving of the behaviour of flappers and also stating that their behaviour would have been equally reprehensible today. The two sources given for this Depth Study were an invitation to use contextual knowledge to evaluate them and test them for reliability. It was here that further detail to confirm or deny the assertions in Source A should have been used, and the contrast between the city flappers and the general behaviour of women in rural areas could have been contrasted. Some commented that there had still not been a female American president and few women achieved high positions – Secretaries Albright and Rice were excluded here.

Part (b) Questions

Answers to **Question (b) (i)**, requiring the names of two stars of American films, proved both amazing and inventive. Many of the well known stars were listed, and many less well/unknown were found, upon research, to have had important roles in the films of the 1920s. The most common error was to list Marilyn Monroe as a star of that period. Not only were there some comprehensive answers on developments in the film industry ranging from mass audiences, the star system, talkies and role modelling in **Question (b) (ii)**, but also some extensive and high scoring answers on the increase in crime caused by the introduction of Prohibition. It was interesting to note the intensity and detailed knowledge used in these three questions that dealt with celebrity and crime. It seems the fascination with these topics was always there! In their answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, weaker candidates listed areas of progress, showed how Americans were richer and identified groups and reasons for the success. Better candidates offered a more balanced answer by also showing details of the groups that were badly hit at the time, and there were some excellent answers that explained in great detail how minorities and immigrants were badly treated. Some offered minute and convincing detail and were of the highest quality.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990**Part (a) Questions**

Although some candidates found difficulty with Source A, the majority were able to draw valid and supported inferences that Khrushchev was mocking Chinese communism as backward, primitive and unambitious. Many answered **Question (a) (ii)** on the extent to which Source B showed that Khrushchev and Mao were enemies by commenting that, although their relationship was deteriorating, the evidence in the source showed degrees of dislike, distrust, rivalry and resentment. Answers were sophisticated in nature and well supported from the source. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** often evaluated Source A by the sarcastic tone used by Khrushchev to humiliate Chinese communism after the Chinese had made comments about Soviet communist policies. Candidates also placed the comment in the context of increasing rivalry, citing the events of the Sino-Soviet split. They also showed that Source B supported both the Sino-Soviet split information and gave background to the tone of Source A.

Part (b) Questions

Most were able to nominate at least one foreign country where the Chinese army had been involved in fighting after 1949 in their answers to **Question (b) (i)**. There was also some commendable detail and description of the relations between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China after 1949 in the answers to **Question (b) (ii)**. Superior answers to **Question (b) (iii)** combined some of the tone and description from the two sources and added comments on issues such as personal rivalry, nuclear secrets, Khrushchev's 'peaceful co-existence' policy with the West, industrial versus agricultural bases of regimes etc. Most answers here were better than acceptable and some were impressively comprehensive. In answer to **Question (b) (iv)**, weaker candidates concentrated on episodes of improving relations between the USA and China. Usually, relevant events were omitted so that the answers lacked cohesion and flow. However, there were some excellent answers that indicated improvements and set backs across the whole period from 1949 to 1990. In general, the answers to the questions for this Depth Study were better than in previous sessions of examination.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century**Part (a) Questions**

This was one of the least popular Depth Studies in this session of examinations. Nevertheless, candidates were able to draw valid inferences in their answers to **Question (a) (i)** about the Communist Party of South Africa and supported their assertions as to its very limited success because of repressive South African government legislation. Many offered balanced arguments in their answers to **Question (a) (ii)** to show that the women of South Africa had some successes in protesting about apartheid but were easily dealt with by the South African government and its agencies. In answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, many contrasted and compared the content of the sources, but did not take advantage of the opportunity to test for reliability by using contextual knowledge or by the obvious opportunity of cross-reference between the details of each source to show that the South African government was repressive.

Part (b) Questions

In answer to **Question (b) (i)**, many candidates knew that Verwoerd had been a Prime Minister of South Africa in the 1950s. Some also knew that Malan had also held this office. In answers to **Question (b) (ii)**, candidates were aware of the timing and purpose of the Defiance Campaign of 1952 but few had the knowledge to develop their answers fully. This lack of knowledge also undermined answers to **Question (b) (iii)**, although there were some candidates who understood why the Pan - African Congress rejected the African National Congress's multi-racial approach and why the Pan - African Congress wanted a more radical programme of action. Some candidates confused the two organisations. In their answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, most candidates supported the given proposition that 'The white population of South Africa supported apartheid in the 1950s and 1960s because it gave them economic benefits'. It was disappointing that only a few saw other possible reasons e.g. racism, and also disappointing that candidates did not appreciate that the 'white population' was not a single entity, but had differing groups and individuals with differing views and aspirations for their country and its peoples.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994**Part (a) Questions**

It is pleasing to note the continuing increase in the number of Centres and candidates that prepare for this Depth Study. Equally, Examiners reported an improvement in knowledge and understanding of the complicated issues involved in this area, and commented upon the objectivity of many of the answers. Candidates were easily able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the surprise nature of the attack on Israel, and made much of it being 'the most sacred day of the Jewish calendar', and that soldiers had to be called away from their prayers. Also, in their answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates discussed whether the Yom Kippur War represented a victory for Israel or whether other valid conclusions could be drawn from the evidence in Source B. Arguments were often well supported from the source. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** often compared and contrasted the evidence of the two sources, but much more could have been made by way of contextual knowledge in tests for reliability regarding the detail of the attacks and the pressure placed upon the warring nations by the USA and the USSR. Some said that Source A came from a British textbook and must, therefore, be unreliable. Perhaps these candidates would have been better served by commenting on the Beirut newspaper's assertion in Source B. Despite these last comments, there were some excellent answers here.

Part (b) Questions

Many wrote much about the Golan Heights and, as with the question on Bloody Sunday in Depth Study B, they wrote too much, showing little awareness of the mark tariff for this question. Good knowledge and understanding was shown in the descriptions of the Egyptian and Syrian attacks on Israel (**Question (b) (ii)**). These qualities were also shown in the explanations of why the superpowers encouraged Israel and Egypt to negotiate a ceasefire. The impressive answers by high scoring candidates about the issues of the time were also further developed in long, balanced and very detailed answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, as to whether the Yom Kippur War helped to bring peace between Israel and the Arab states. Examiners commented specifically on the impressive nature of the answers from candidates from well prepared Centres.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society**Part (a) Questions**

The candidates that attempted this Depth Study found it very easy to draw valid inferences from Source A, with regard to the rapid and dynamic expansion of towns in England and Wales. They not only pointed out that the Source offered evidence for these answers to **Question (a) (i)** that the towns developed at a frantic pace, but also that the expansion was uncontrolled and brought with it incredible dangers to life and limb. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** tended to agree that the picture showed new and impressive buildings in the foreground which, they believed, must have brought improvements in life for the citizens. A few, however, believed that the working class were unlikely to avail themselves of the splendours of the library, art gallery and museum etc. Very few indeed commented on the background smoke from factories or dwellings for the majority of the population. Hence, the answers did not cross-reference between Source A and B to show reliability either about the grandiose buildings of Source B being paid for by those 'who created riches' in Source A, nor did they cross-reference between the living conditions and lack of planning in Source A with the background smoke and disordered housing in Source B. Answers here were largely descriptive in nature.

Part (b) Questions

Candidates were able to nominate two industries that caused the rapid expansion in towns in answer to **Question (b) (i)**, and they listed a variety of complaints, illnesses and diseases caused by overcrowding, poor sanitation and the smoke - ridden atmosphere that faced industrial towns in answer to **Question (b) (ii)**. Responses began to become more speculative in answer to **Questions (b) (iii)** and **(b) (iv)**. The causes of slow progress towards improvements in working and living conditions were more often carefully assessed and logical extensions of the material given in the sources or, in a few cases, guesswork. Again, the advantages and disadvantages to working people brought by the growth of towns had similar qualities, ranging from a balance between the regularity of work against shorter life expectancy at a high level, to 'having many neighbours to talk to' at the opposite end of the scale.

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

Part (a) Questions

The inferences drawn from Source A in answer to **Question (a) (i)** about nineteenth century India were many and varied. Some felt that the picture showed an idyllic family home where servants undertook subservient roles happily in the service of their mistress. Others felt the picture showed severe exploitation of the indigenous population, while others still commented on the 'pecking' order (gauged by clothing) and the relevance of the cat. In answer to **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates found plenty of problems that faced the British in Sources B and C, but felt that the 'brushing of hair for half an hour' and the 'rolling on of socks' barely compensated for the 'dust, cholera and heat'. Many candidates pointed out in answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, that all the sources 'must be British' and painted a British version of life in India. Some went as far as pointing out that the British had no right to 'laud it' over the Indians, nor interfere with their social and religious practices. This understandable preoccupation with alleged interference clouded the candidates' appreciation that all three sources supported or denied evidence in each other. This was a classic opportunity to score high marks by cross-reference to test reliability e.g. the care of the judge's wife in Source A and the brushing of hair and the rolling on of socks in Source C.

Part (b) Questions

Most candidates were able to identify suttee (**Question (b) (i)**) but many were not able to list the reforms of Lord William Bentinck (**Question (b) (ii)**), although there were some distinguished exceptions to this. Answers to **Questions (b) (iii)** and **(b) (iv)** usually fell into two categories. The first category tended to be vague and used general comments about why English people went to India in the nineteenth century, and they almost always agreed that the British went to India solely in the interests of conquest and exploitation. The second group offered more detailed reasons for the British interest in India and continued this in answers to **Question (b) (iv)** with detail of British conquest and exploitation, balanced against a series of benefits that these candidates believed Britain had brought to the sub-continent.